



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/1A

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

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2019

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)

---

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. <b>Always</b> provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

## 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.

**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 reasons for the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the years 1099 to 1119. **[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 Phillips' argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Outremer's survival relied upon a pragmatic approach to the local Muslim populations
- the Franks were short of manpower and outnumbered and so could not hope to kill or remove all non-Christians
- the Franks allowed freedom of religion to Muslims and only extracted a reasonable level of taxation which ensured relative peace and acceptance of their rule
- the Franks did have a military presence but rarely had to deal with local uprisings.

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

- the vast majority of those who survived the First Crusade did return home and numbers emigrating from Europe were never high – these people tended to settle in the main cities (e.g. Jerusalem and Acre) and so many of those living and working in the more isolated and agricultural areas were local indigenous peoples, many of them non-Christians
- the Franks built few castles in these first years of settlement and so control over the local populations must have been achieved through something other than military might and fear – hence the allowance of freedoms of religion etc
- this picture is perhaps oversimplified and reflects policies in some areas but not others. For example, in some of the ports which were captured the local populations were either forced into exile (usually to Damascus) or were massacred
- rather than their own pragmatic approach, the early settlers benefited from the nature of the lands they had conquered – many of the indigenous population were Arabs and so had not had a natural affinity for their Turkish overlords – they had no real opposition to replacing these with Christian ones (indeed, these might be perceived to be less objectionable in some ways).

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

- Baldwin I's leadership was pragmatic and focused on clever use of the Western support available to him
- Baldwin I knew that he needed to expand the kingdom for security and also so that he could encourage more men to settle in the kingdom to provide security in the future
- Baldwin I expanded the territories in each direction to sensible frontiers
- Baldwin I used these new lands as a mixture of fiefs for loyal subjects, but he also built up a royal demesne to ensure that the King remained powerful.

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

- Baldwin I's reign was categorised by almost constant military campaigning and, in the early years, he prioritised capturing the ports. This was vital as it ensured that links with the West could be maintained
- Baldwin created fiefs to encourage settlement, for example allowing Tancred to carve out territory around Galilee

- Baldwin thought strategically about the extension of his kingdom, for example pushing into the Jordan and building Montreal castle, to ensure control over key trading routes. These lands he kept as part of the royal demesne
- at the time of his death Baldwin was making concerted efforts to push the borders of his kingdom southwards towards Egypt
- Baldwin didn't always utilise Western support well, for example his disaster at the Second Battle of Ramla which wiped out the remains of the crusade of 1101.

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

- the main reason for the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem was the level of disunity in the Muslim Near East
- Muslim disunity was both religious (between Cairo and Baghdad) and political (relative independence of the Syrian Emirs from their overlord the Sultan). These divisions helped the Franks to add territories at a very quick rate
- the kingdom was too small and fragmented to deal with any kind of concerted Muslim attack
- Muslim leaders made alliances with the Franks against other Muslims, most notably Damascus.

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

- the Sunni/Shia divide between Baghdad and Cairo certainly meant that the Franks could tackle threats in a more piecemeal fashion – for example Baldwin in Jerusalem could focus his attention on threats from Cairo where the Franks in the North could deal with any Seljuk threats
- the reason why Baldwin I was able to expand his kingdom so rapidly was because he faced very limited opposition from Cairo and the Sultan of Baghdad rarely intervened – and even then his interventions came in Northern Syria rather than Palestine
- there were numerous occasions where emirs in Syria allied with the local Franks against other Muslims (and even against the Sultan's own army – e.g. in 1115)
- despite a lack of unity, the Muslims were still capable of inflicting crushing defeats on the Franks (e.g. Harran in 1104 or the Field of Blood in 1119) which seriously weakened Frankish holdings, thus other factors must be important.

**Section B**

- 02** To what extent was Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade the result of the Papacy's desire for supremacy in Europe in the years 1073 to 1095? **[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 Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade was the result of the Papacy's desire for supremacy in Europe in the years 1073 to 1095 might include:**

- since 1074 the Papacy had been in conflict with the Holy Roman Emperor in the Investiture Contest. Successfully launching the First Crusade would enhance Papal claims to superiority
- Urban's actions in 1095 strongly mirrored Gregory VII's attempts to launch a Papal-led army in 1074 in aid of the Byzantine Empire
- the timing of Urban's speech at Clermont is instructive. He was in the middle of a preaching tour which was designed to assert his growing power now that he had gained control in Rome against the anti-Pope. He had also waited several months after receiving the Byzantine appeal for help which suggests an internal motive
- the Call to Crusade was an extension of the Reform Papacy's attempts to stem violence in Europe and control the nobility through the Peace of God movement. By encouraging such men to travel to the East, this would allow the Papacy to further their aims in the West.

**Arguments challenging the view that Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade was the result of the Papacy's desire for supremacy in Europe in the years 1073 to 1095 might include:**

- the trigger for the Call to Crusade seems to have been an appeal from the Byzantines. The Papacy was perhaps motivated by a desire to help Eastern Christians and to exert authority over the Greek Orthodox Patriarch
- the Pope may have been worried about the possibility of Muslim territorial advances becoming a threat to Europe
- there were rumours that pilgrims were struggling to reach Jerusalem and that Christian holy places were being defiled and this may have motivated the Papacy
- the Pope may have felt that Jerusalem (the most Holy site for Christians) should be returned to Christian hands. Certainly this became the focal point of the Crusade and so was perhaps a key motivator in the calling of it.

Students could argue that Urban was motivated by his position in Europe more than anything and the legacy of Gregory VII and the Reform Papacy is clear in Urban's actions in 1095. However, they could reasonably argue in favour of any of the above motives. Indeed there is much historical debate about this issue and higher level answers should be able to prioritise. Any supported answer will be rewarded.

**03** To what extent was Outremer weakened by Nureddin in the years 1146 to 1174? **[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 was weakened by Nureddin in the years 1146 to 1174 might include:**

- Nureddin's involvement at Damascus in 1148 helped to cause the Second Crusade to fail. Outremer was much weakened by this in the long run as it meant that Western help was less likely to be forthcoming in the future
- Nureddin defeated Raymond of Poitiers' army at Inab in 1149, killing the prince and destroying his army. This left Antioch itself vulnerable and nominally under the control of a woman and a minor
- Nureddin inflicted a huge defeat on the forces of Outremer at Artah in 1164. Once again, Antioch was vulnerable and many prominent leaders (e.g. Bohemond III and the Count of Tripoli) were captured. This victory meant that Amalric had to abandon a promising incursion into Egypt
- in the 1160s and 1170s he was working strategically to weaken the Kingdom of Jerusalem – for example his raids into the Transjordan and his destruction of Chastel-Neuf. He had a minbar commissioned which he intended to place in the al-Aqsa mosque once Jerusalem was captured
- Nureddin managed to take control of Damascus in 1154 and his lieutenant Shirkuh gained control in Egypt in 1169. This was dangerous for Outremer, which began to look encircled.

**Arguments challenging the view that Outremer was weakened by Nureddin in the years 1146 to 1174 might include:**

- many of Nureddin's military campaigns were focused on fighting other Muslims rather than the Frankish states of Outremer. He failed to press his advantage in 1149 after the Battle of Inab when Antioch was weak
- over his career Nureddin made numerous peace treaties with the Franks (e.g. 1160) which allowed them to continue to strengthen their borders and castles
- Nureddin seems to have feared the might of the Byzantines, which prevented him from attacking Antioch directly. Outremer strengthened its relationships with Manuel in the reigns of Baldwin III and Amalric
- Nureddin was not always victorious in his battles with the Franks – most notably he suffered a crushing defeat in 1163
- he didn't make a significant attempt to attack Jerusalem despite proclaiming jihad for many years
- at the time of his death open conflict with Saladin seemed likely. The reason for this was probably for control of Egypt – this meant that Outremer was more than likely safe from a concerted threat from Nureddin.

Students might argue that Nureddin posed a more significant threat to Outremer than any Muslim leader before him, but that he failed to make much progress in removing the Franks from the Levant, despite his jihad propaganda. Higher level answers are likely to appreciate that whilst Nureddin made limited territorial gains, he was instrumental in building the ideology of jihad and making Jerusalem a key focus for Muslim attacks. Candidates might also accept the premise that Outremer was weak and might consider the role of Nureddin in this vs. other possible reasons for weakness (e.g. poor leadership)- this is perfectly acceptable. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.

**04** 'Western interventions in the Near East achieved little of significance in the years 1177 to 1204.'

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 Western interventions in the Near East achieved little of significance in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:**

- the Kingdom of Jerusalem failed to effectively use the limited Western help which it did receive in the 1170s and 1180s, e.g. Philip of Flanders returned home in 1177 after a planned attack on Egypt floundered after disagreements over land and power and the possibility of Sybilla marrying one of his vassals. The money sent by King Henry II of England was wasted by Guy in 1187
- the city of Jerusalem was not recaptured after its loss to Saladin in 1187 and the 'Kingdom' of Jerusalem remained a narrow coastal strip despite the efforts of the Third Crusade and the crusade of Henry VI
- the Fourth Crusade completely lost focus and ended in the sack of Constantinople – a Christian city
- expeditions after 1187 failed to inflict major lasting defeats on their Muslim enemies. Even Richard the Lionheart was forced to conclude a truce with Saladin in 1192
- expeditions tended to lack clear direction and focus, e.g. Richard failed to convince his troops about the importance of Egypt and Pope Innocent failed to secure the numbers needed for his Fourth Crusade. This weakened them from the outset and led to half-hearted campaigns.

**Arguments challenging the view that Western interventions in the Near East achieved little of significance in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:**

- Westerners continued to arrive in the East and offer assistance (e.g. William Marshal in 1183 – whose biographer claimed he performed great deeds of arms)
- numerous gains were made by the Third Crusade (e.g. Acre and Jaffa) which meant that future expeditions had a place to land and launch further campaigns from. Henry VI also had some success in 1197 and gained another vital port in Beirut
- the Third Crusade showed that Saladin was not invincible (e.g. at Acre and Arsuf) and did help to cause a disintegration of the 'united' Muslim coalition he had been able to assemble by 1187. During the Crusade he struggled to maintain unity and there was a succession crisis after his death
- the Kingdom of Jerusalem was maintained and strengthened by the accession of Henry of Champagne (a crusader) and the acquisition of Cyprus by Richard on the Third Crusade
- the capture of Constantinople in 1204 did remove the Byzantines as a possible threat to what remained of Outremer and ensured a friendly ally in Constantinople. This would be important in launching future expeditions.

Students are likely to conclude that interventions after 1177 did not achieve the startling successes associated with the First Crusade, but that important territories were gained which were vital in ensuring that crusading could continue into the 13th century. Higher level answers should recognise that Western interventions are different from the internal policies of Outremer itself. Any supported argument will be rewarded.