

AS
HISTORY
7041/1A

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

Component 1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071–1149

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the impact of the Battle of Manzikert on the Byzantine Empire?

[25 marks]*Target: AO3*

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretations/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the Battle of Manzikert had a very negative impact on the Byzantine Empire in a number of ways
- the Byzantine military was significantly weakened due to the losses suffered in the battle
- the Byzantine economy was significantly weakened due to the loss of territory and the subsequent decline in tax revenue.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the loss of Anatolia, a prime recruiting ground of the Empire, damaged its military and naval strength, forcing it to appeal for aid from Western Europe in 1095
- the issues with currency show how Alexius Comnenus had to introduce new coinage
- students may take issue with the idea of collapse. The Empire still functioned in its remaining territory and was able to attract support to help it reverse its losses.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- the impact of the Battle of Manzikert has been exaggerated and in fact the Byzantine Empire was left relatively unscathed by the defeat
- much of the Byzantine military escaped intact from the battle, therefore their forces were not significantly weakened
- the defeat did not cause the decline of the Empire, other factors played a part.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the defeat at Manzikert helped to intensify the already present internecine political rivalries between the major Byzantine noble families which weakened the Empire
- only the reserve of the army escaped intact, the rest of the Byzantine Army was surrounded by the Seljuks and the Emperor himself was captured and humiliated. His release only served to cause more internal conflict as rivals sought to replace him
- the loss of much of Anatolia and key cities such as Nicaea brought the Seljuks to within 90 miles of Constantinople and cost the Byzantines a key area for recruitment and taxation
- by 1095, Alexius Comnenus had managed to stabilise the borders of the Empire and the economy.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might consider that Extract A is more convincing as the impact of Manzikert ultimately was what led to the Byzantines appealing for help from Western Europe in 1095. Alternatively, students may argue for Extract B by noting the internal situation by 1095, Manzikert had been 24 years before and the Empire was still functioning by Alexius' reign, therefore its impact may have been over-exaggerated.

Section B

- 0 2** 'In the years 1099 to 1131, the leadership of Baldwin II was more important than that of Baldwin I in consolidating the position of the Latin Christians in the Near East.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1099 to 1131, the leadership of Baldwin II was more important than that of Baldwin I in consolidating the position of the Latin Christians in the Near East might include:

- in 1116, as Count of Edessa, Baldwin II extended the county by capturing Armenian towns in the Euphrates valley. As King of Jerusalem, he captured the important port of Tyre in 1124, with the help of the Venetians
- in 1119, the army of Antioch was decimated by Il Ghazi at the Battle of the Field of Blood. The leader of Antioch, Roger of Salerno, was killed as were the majority of the nobility. Baldwin II was forced to act as regent in Antioch throughout much of his reign, until Bohemond II came of age. Baldwin II stabilised Antioch and ruled the Kingdom of Jerusalem at the same time
- in 1125, Baldwin II assembled the knights from all the crusader territories and met the Seljuks at the Battle of Azaz. Although the Seljuk army was much larger, the crusaders were victorious, and they restored much of the territory they had lost after the Field of Blood
- the patriarch of Jerusalem tried to claim control of Jaffa and the city of Jerusalem, as he said it had been promised by Godfrey. Baldwin II refused to acquiesce, keeping the Kingdom stable and power in the hands of the nobility.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1099 to 1131, the leadership of Baldwin II was more important than that of Baldwin I in consolidating the position of the Latin Christians in the Near East might include:

- Baldwin II was captured in 1123 by Belek Ghazi after a campaign in the north of Outremer, some of his nobles attempted to get Charles of Flanders installed as king, showing dissatisfaction with his reign
- Baldwin II had married Morphia of Armenia and produced four daughters, but no sons. He was therefore unable to secure a male line for succession. He married his daughter, Melisende, to Count Fulk of Anjou. He attempted to resolve the issue of his dynasty by naming Melisende, Fulk and their son Baldwin as joint heirs to the Kingdom of Jerusalem but this created internal conflict in the Kingdom
- in contrast, Baldwin I, becoming King of Jerusalem in 1100, was instrumental in the expansion of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, gaining the entire coastal strip from Beirut in the north to Gaza in the South (but not Tyre or Ascalon), beyond the Dead Sea in the East and South to Aqaba. This gained vital ports such as Acre to enable direct links with Western Europe
- Baldwin I also established the administration of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, he made the Kingdom economically viable through trade and alliances and increased pilgrim traffic.

Students can suggest both strengths and weaknesses of Baldwin II's leadership which built on the initial advances the founders of the states had established. Alternatively, they can argue Baldwin I was more important as he established the monarchy in Jerusalem and set up its governmental infrastructure, while Baldwin II jeopardised the Latin's position by not providing for the succession, leading to conflict in the future.

0 3 'Damascus was the greatest threat to the Crusader States in the years 1131 to 1148.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Damascus was the greatest threat to the Crusader States in the years 1131 to 1148 might include:

- Damascus was the closest Muslim-held city to the Kingdom of Jerusalem's eastern border. Baldwin II had failed to take the city in 1126
- the rise of Zengi in the 1130s made Damascus an objective for him to cement his unification of Syria and Mesopotamia. If this succeeded then the Crusader States would face a united Muslim enemy to the East. Despite Zengi's death in 1146, his son Nureddin was continuing with his father's policy. A pre-emptive strike on Damascus may have prevented this
- the leaders of the Second Crusade, Louis VII and Conrad III, after failing to take the crusade's original target, Edessa, perceived that Damascus was a viable target and threat as they had a poor understanding of the regional politics of Outremer.

Arguments challenging the view that Damascus was the greatest threat to the Crusader States in the years 1131 to 1148 might include:

- Damascus had been a long-term ally with the Kingdom of Jerusalem since 1139
- internal conflict in the Crusader States, such as between Fulk and Melisende and Melisende and Baldwin III, was a greater threat than Damascus
- Fatimid Ascalon was a greater threat to the Crusader States as it gave the Fatimids a beach head to attack Jerusalem. This was recognised by Baldwin III who recommended the Second Crusade attack it before he was persuaded to attack Damascus instead
- it might be considered that a far greater threat was the Zengid dynasty, with the Second Crusade failing to target their powerbase in Aleppo and attacking Damascus instead, it pushed the Emir of Damascus into an alliance with Zengi's son Nureddin. Damascus only became a target because the crusade leadership overruled the local leaders such as Baldwin III and Melisende.

Students might argue that Damascus was the greatest threat because of the real or potential threat it posed to the Crusader States. The Crusaders' failure to capture it left a powerful, independent Muslim city in close proximity to their Eastern border. Furthermore, the potential for it to be forced to join the expanding Zengid empire meant that a pre-emptive strike to prevent this could eliminate this threat. However, due to its alliance with the Kingdom of Jerusalem under Fulk and Melisende, students might argue that other threats existed that were far more serious than Damascus to the safety of the Crusader States. Ascalon was a base for aggressive Fatimid attacks into the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The internal hostilities between Melisende and her husband and Melisende and her son, Baldwin III, weakened the already limited strength of Crusader States. Finally, the lack of awareness of Louis VII and Conrad III of local politics in Outremer made them see Damascus as a viable target because of its proximity to Jerusalem rather than it being a threat. Students can argue for any of these to conclude their answer.