

---

A-LEVEL

# History

Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204  
Mark scheme

---

7042  
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

A-level

**Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204**

**Section A**

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the deterioration in the relationship between Eastern and Western Christendom from the 1170s. **[30 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:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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 interpretation/arguments/views.

**Extract A: In their identification of Bartlett’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that the sack in 1204 was inevitable and a major conflict between East and West would have happened at some point
- that the long-term doctrinal differences between the Latin and Byzantine Churches made relations difficult from the outset
- that the relationship had been worsening as a direct result of the Crusading movement
- that Byzantium was incredibly weak after 1176 and so a clash with the West was even more likely than before.

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

- there were many religious differences, but these were more controversial because of a debate about the respective powers of Pope and Patriarch, thus making it more of a political issue
- the Crusades definitely worsened relations, e.g. the taking of Antioch in 1098 or the criticisms of the lack of Greek help on the Second Crusade
- Byzantium was riven by a series of highly damaging internal disputes over the imperial throne after the death of Manuel, which set in motion the train of events leading the Young Alexius’ broken promises
- however, the source fails to take into account some of the good relations which had been built, e.g. marriage alliances between Jerusalem and Constantinople
- the source also downplays the complicated sequence of events which led to the sack in 1204, which relied upon many ‘ifs’ and does not seem to have been pre-planned.

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

- that the failure of Byzantine foreign diplomacy was to blame – they made promises to the West which they could not fulfil
- that long-term tensions might have existed, but there were also numerous examples of close contact and good relations
- that viewing 1204 as an unfortunate accident is also unconvincing
- that a conflict was becoming more likely in the 1190s as the West still expected the East to help with the Crusading movement, even if the East had not precipitated any expeditions in the recent past.

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

- the trigger for the sack was indeed Alexius’ offer of money and men for the Fourth Crusade – until that point the Crusade was still planning to leave Constantinople and continue on its way

- good relations were especially fostered under Manuel Comnenus, who arranged marriage alliances with Jerusalem
- for a long time there had been an unrealistic expectation in the West about how much of a role the Eastern Empire should play in the Crusading movement and there was a misunderstanding about the Byzantine world-view at times which raised tensions
- the source fails to take into account the decision making of the Crusaders, which was not determined by the Pope or the Emperor, and seems to have been more an ad-hoc reaction to events than is suggested here.

**Extract C: In their identification of Godfrey’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- that Venice deliberately plotted to use the Crusade for an attack on the Empire
- there was a long-term tension between the Empire and Venice, and the latter was looking for an opportunity to react
- that Venice was in a very confident mood in the early 13th Century and hoped to increase her wealth and power at the expense of Byzantium
- that the diversion was planned and plotted in advance.

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

- it was Venice who suggested the initial diversion of the Crusade at Zara and was very enthusiastic about the initial attack on Constantinople
- the Venetians were excommunicated by the Pope for their behaviour on the Fourth Crusade and do seem to have been overly interested in material gain – refusing to carry the Crusaders to their final destination without payment
- many of the treasures looted in 1204 ended up in Venice
- however, the source fails to appreciate the financial outlay of the ships contracted by the Crusaders – who got their numbers wildly wrong
- the Venetians do not seem to have known about the plight of Young Alexius before he was produced at Zara – suggesting that any premeditated attack was impossible.

**Section B**

- 02** How far was Baldwin of Boulogne (Baldwin I) the most important individual in determining the success of the Latin Christians in the Near East in the years 1097 to 1118? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 Baldwin of Boulogne was the most important individual in determining the success of the Latin Christians in the Near East in the years 1097 to 1118 might include:**

- Baldwin's military leadership in the first few vital years: especially his defeats of Egyptian forces where he displayed military brilliance, often in the face of forces which massively outnumbered his own
- Baldwin recognised the necessity of capturing the vital ports and the need to work with both the indigenous population and the Italian city states
- Baldwin handled the competing ambitions of the other rulers of Outremer effectively and, by the end of his reign, had ensured Jerusalem's feudal superiority
- Baldwin fought bravely on the First Crusade and, even after he diverted to Edessa, he provided the main body with vital supplies and he slowed down Kerbogha's relief force.

**Arguments challenging the view that Baldwin of Boulogne was the most important individual in determining the success of the Latin Christians in the Near East in the years 1097 to 1118 might include:**

- on the First Crusade Bohemond played a vital role at both Dorylaeum and Antioch
- Baldwin was not present at the capture of Jerusalem – here it was Godfrey and Raymond who excelled
- Baldwin was arguably quite rash in his military policies of the early years of Outremer and was lucky to survive at times (e.g. Ramla, 1102)
- Tancred played a vital role in securing Antioch in the north in the face of serious Muslim attacks at times.

Students are likely to argue that Baldwin was probably the most important individual who spanned the full period as many of the others who had played a vital role in the First Crusade had died fairly soon after. However, they may wish to argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

- 03** 'Outremer remained over-reliant on the Latin West for its survival in the years 1119 to 1149.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 Outremer remained over-reliant on the Latin West for its survival in the years 1119 to 1149 might include:**

- lack of manpower – this was a problem through Outremer’s history and often the rulers here would have to wait for bands of armed pilgrims to help before they could engage in battles and campaigns
- growing Muslim power certainly worried the rulers in the East and they sent letters to the West begging for support, especially after the loss of Edessa in 1144
- Baldwin II decided to inject some new life into Outremer by marrying his daughter, Melisende, to the prominent Westerner, Fulk of Anjou
- Outremer’s vulnerability in manpower terms was highlighted after events such as the Battle of the Field of Blood
- even the Military Orders relied upon the West for recruits and funding.

**Arguments challenging the view that Outremer remained over-reliant on the Latin West for its survival in the years 1119 to 1149 might include:**

- the establishment of the Military Orders allowed the King of Jerusalem to have a permanent and professional fighting force at their disposal
- Outremer used its natural geography and extensive castles to protect itself fairly effectively
- a pragmatic approach to local politics helped Outremer – they would ally with local Muslim warlords if necessary (exploiting the deep divisions within the Muslim world)
- Outremer was fairly tolerant to the indigenous population and thus everyday life – farming, tax collection etc, allowed for effective rule of the localities.

Students are likely to conclude that Outremer was chronically reliant – they did develop systems to help alleviate this, but their lack of manpower became obvious at times of crisis, such as 1119 and 1144. However, they might argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

- 04** ‘The collapse of Outremer in 1187 was more the result of increasing Islamic strength than internal Frankish divisions since 1164.’

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 the collapse of Outremer in 1187 was more the result of increasing Islamic strength than internal Frankish divisions since 1164 might include:**

- Nur ad-Din had extended his power over a huge area of Syria and was capable of stemming any successes of Amalric
- Nur ad-Din also pushed Sunni power into Egypt, thus allowing the potential for Egypt's wealth to be joined to the resources of Syria in a combined attack on the Crusader States
- Saladin worked for a long period to unite much of the Near Eastern Muslim world under the banner of jihad – he had to provide consistent leadership and negotiate/fight many potential enemies
- Saladin massively outnumbered the Franks and was capable of forcing them into a decisive battle at Hattin in 1187.

**Arguments challenging the view that the collapse of Outremer in 1187 was more the result of increasing Islamic strength than internal Frankish divisions since 1164 might include:**

- the fateful decision to fight at Hattin in 1187 was made as a direct result of Frankish divisions and mistrust
- Saladin's campaign in 1187 was helped by the divisive behaviours of both Reynald de Chatillon and Raymond of Tripoli
- Baldwin IV struggled to control faction at his court – especially the competing ambitions of his cousin Raymond of Tripoli and the newcomer Guy of Lusignan
- both Amalric and Baldwin IV had, at times, difficulty controlling the Military Orders – their actions sometimes led to failures in alliances and failed military campaigns
- political divisions were such that there was a reluctance on behalf of the West to send help, despite many entreaties in the 1170s and 80s.

Students are likely to argue that the internal political divisions were most important. Muslim Unity made the States more vulnerable, but as long as they stuck to a policy of avoiding a direct and decisive pitched battle, they probably could have managed Saladin. His forces were united only under a fragile banner, as became apparent during the Third Crusade. However, they may argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be credited.