

---

AS

# History

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

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

Mark scheme

---

7041

June 2017

---

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 Assessment Writer.

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

June 2017

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

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

### Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the Papacy's motives for calling the First Crusade? **[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.**

In responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

**Extract A: In their identification of Riley-Smith's argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that the reform papacy had long been planning some involvement in the Near East
- that Urban had been working with Emperor Alexius to improve relations since 1188 and so his response in 1095 fits with this
- that Urban was concerned that, should Byzantium come under further attack, Western Christendom could be threatened.

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

- Urban did not respond immediately to the appeal at Piacenza – he seems to have deliberately planned his response at Clermont and even targeted it at a particular audience, thus suggesting this was not a knee-jerk reaction
- Urban had been attempting to end the schism which had been in place since the 1050s and had recently lifted the Byzantine Emperor's excommunication
- Urban seems to have discussed a much wider range of issues at Clermont, which are not discussed here, e.g. the threat to Jerusalem itself.

**Extract B: In their identification of Asbridge's argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that Urban's motive was essentially a proactive one concerned with extending the power of the Papacy in the West
- that calling for an armed expedition under the banner of St Peter would enable him to showcase the power of the Papacy to his Western rivals for power, e.g. the Holy Roman Emperor
- that Urban and other Popes had done little about the rising Islamic threat – or Jerusalem being in Muslim hands for 400 years – and so this cannot have been a catalyst for action.

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

- Urban was a reforming Pope – very much following in the footsteps of Gregory VII, whose reign was most famous for the Investiture Contest with the Holy Roman Emperor
- Urban had been unable to even access Rome at the start of his pontificate and this call at Clermont came in a period of much increased power

- 
- there is no mention of any possible spiritual motives, which do seem to have been quite important to the reforming Popes, and certainly became a key message very early on in the Crusade itself.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that either extract is more convincing, depending upon their interpretation of the facts. Extract A is essentially arguing a reactive motive, where Extract B argues more in favour of a premeditated action by the Pope. They might, for example, argue that Asbridge has the more convincing view as Urban was more concerned with his domestic situation and the power of the Papacy in the West. Launching this mission would undoubtedly show his power to the Emperor and perhaps explains why he seems to have delayed his response to Alexius as he was assessing how the appeal at Piacenza could aid him domestically. However, any substantiated judgement should be rewarded.

**Section B**

- 02** 'The establishment of the military orders was the most significant factor in the survival of Outremer to 1143.'

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 suggesting that the establishment of the military orders was the most significant factor in the survival of Outremer to 1143 might include:**

- the Templars and Hospitallers plugged a vital gap – that of chronic lack of manpower. This meant that the King of Jerusalem had a permanent and well trained force at his disposal
- as they were very wealthy, from the mid-1130s the Military Orders were increasingly given control of the castles, especially ones in strategically important areas, and key urban sites were entrusted to their defence
- the Military Orders ensured regular contact and support from the West – notably in terms of financial donations, which were invaluable in helping to defend Outremer
- the change in theology which was associated with the development of orders of ‘fighting monks’ helped to ensure that committed and capable warriors would come to the defence of the Holy Land (without Popes needing to call a crusade).

**Arguments challenging the view that the establishment of the military orders was the most significant factor in the survival of Outremer to 1143 might include:**

- the Military Orders were not initially developed and it was not until the 1120s that they were developing a true military role
- good military leadership by men like Baldwin and Tancred ensured that Outremer survived the first few critical years
- Baldwin II and Fulk responded capably to crises, such as the problems surrounding the leadership of Antioch
- the Muslim world remained fairly disunited and it often fought against itself. Jihad was a message that was slow to take hold.

Students might argue that the military orders certainly helped to stabilise Outremer, but that they weren't the most significant factor in this period. Here the disunity within the Muslim world seems to be paramount and, at times, Outremer's survival seems to be solely down to luck that its potential enemies did not unite together. However, they might argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

- 03** 'The failure of the Second Crusade was caused by the rise of Muslim unity after the First Crusade.'

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 suggesting that the failure of the Second Crusade was caused by the rise of Muslim unity after the First Crusade might include:**

- the First Crusade had faced a divided group of leaders in the Seljuk regions, however, by the time of the Second Crusade Zengi had made great strides towards unifying key cities – Aleppo and Mosul and his son Nur ad-Din had arranged a marriage alliance with Damascus
- the Turks negotiated a peace treaty with Emperor Manuel – putting aside internal rivalries to deal with an external threat
- Nur ad-Din's relief force for Damascus was able to respond quickly and effectively – leading to a panicked decision to abandon the siege
- Damascus put up a spirited resistance to the siege in 1148 – being rallied by the rhetoric of Jihad (this had been ignored at the turn of the century when preached by al-Sulami but had since gained ground under the religious direction of the Zengid dynasty).

**Arguments challenging the view that the failure of the Second Crusade was caused by the rise of Muslim unity after the First Crusade might include:**

- poor military leadership, most notably by Louis VII
- internal divisions between the Franks – they had divided aims and might even have deliberately worked to cause the siege to fail in 1148. This had been a key weakness of the Crusader States from their founding (e.g. Raymond of Antioch refused to help with the attack on Damascus)
- Byzantine distrust of the crusaders after the First Crusade and Bohemond's behaviour in 1108 led to their support being lukewarm at best
- lack of a clear aim, unlike on the First Crusade.

Students are likely to argue that the increased unity in the Muslim world definitely hindered the Second Crusade. They may contrast this with the way in which the First Crusade and founding of Outremer succeeded largely through the disunity in the Muslim world. However, its abject failure seems to be down to poor decision making by the leadership. Unur's request for help from Nur ad-Din was very much a last resort and so the level of unity in the Muslim world should not be overstated. However, they may wish to argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be rewarded.