



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1A

The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204

Generic Mark Scheme

Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Question 1(b), Question 2(b) and Question 3(b)

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Question 1

(a) Explain why the Seljuk Turks were unable to resist the First Crusade. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

- To Sidney Painter, the First Crusade succeeded because it took place at 'an excellent time'. Such was the disunity of the Muslims in the Near East that 'even a threat of this magnitude (the crusade) could not produce a collective response' (Riley-Smith). Scott suggests 'if the Muslims had maintained the unity Muhammad had preached, no crusade could possibly have succeeded'.
- Under Alp Arslan, the Seljuk Empire reached its peak in 1071 with victory at Manzikert over Byzantium, and his son Malik-Shah's capture of Jerusalem. By 1085, Antioch had been captured, but the 1090s saw the continuation of the long drawn out struggle for control of Syria between the Fatimid Caliphs of Egypt and the Seljuk Sultans in the east.
- Following the death of Malik-Shah in 1092, the Seljuk sultanate disintegrated as his kinsmen fought over his empire. Turkish warlords pursued independent local policies. During the 1090s, in the aftermath of Malik-Shah's death, North Syria was a war zone, riven by civil war. Seljuk rule was weakened by internal dissension and Fatimid assaults.
- In 1095, semi-independent Turkish warlords fought for dominance, while local Arab rulers were hostile to both. Divided by doctrines and rituals, religious schisms and political ambition, the Muslim leaders of the Near East included Atabaks, semi-independent Turkish military governors such as Kerbogha of Mosul, Ridwan of Aleppo, nephew of Malik-Shah, and Duqaq of Damascus; also, local Arab dynasties such as the Emir of Shaizar and schismatics such as the assassins based at Qadmus.
- At Nicaea in May 1097, the crusaders captured the chief city of Kilij Arslan, the Seljuk sultan of Rum. However, he was in fact more concerned with fighting his key rivals, the Danishmed Turks, for supremacy in Anatolia. Similarly, in June 1098 the Seljuk rulers of Aleppo, Antioch, Damascus and Mosul were more concerned with personal rivalry and also Kerbogha of Mosul was defeated at Antioch by the crusaders.

Analysis may also focus on the skills and commitment of the crusaders as they crossed Anatolia and at Antioch.

(b) How important was spiritual motivation for participants in the First Crusade? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

- **Spiritual motivation** will prompt discussion of key ideas and concepts such as: the lure of Jerusalem and the Holy Places, especially the Holy Sepulchre; the crusade as pilgrimage and the importance of the crusader vow: the indulgence and the promise of remission of sins and crusade as a penitential act. Also, by the Apocalypse – the masses were inspired through their fear of judgement day and a desire for salvation. The Church had won its battle for control over the hearts and minds of the European population, and the crusades were the logical conclusion of this victory as the masses sought their salvation and remission of their sins. Jerusalem lay at the heart of the Christian faith as the Holy City. In an age of relics and miracles, every stone in the city was sacred and had to be saved from the Turks so it could offer salvation to Christians. The good harvest in 1096 signalled God's approval of the Crusades, replacing his displeasure with the people that had led to the previous poor harvests.
- **Social attitudes** will provide a useful means of evaluation since feudal and familiar obligation provided motivation for many knights. Many were attracted by values such as status and the knightly ethos, vendetta and their sense of honour, and a resolution to their knightly dilemma.
- Students may give examples of **key moments** in the course of the crusade to illustrate motivation, such as Antioch and the finding of the Holy Lance, or the siege of Jerusalem; or may discuss the motives of key participants and social groups.
- **Evaluation** may also include economic motives, as put forward by traditional historians such as Runciman. Western Europe was overpopulated, resulting in land shortages and squabbles over inheritance. As such it was the second and third sons that led the drive for land in the east as part of a colonial expansion of western civilisation. Many saw the possibility of settling in the east, notably the Normans such as Bohemond, from Southern Italy and Baldwin of Boulogne, who took his wife and sons. The preceding years had seen a succession of bad harvests due to drought, making it increasingly difficult to survive in the poverty-stricken west. The east was known to be prosperous, with its luxury goods and reputation as the 'land of milk and honey'. The possibility of seizing the treasure and possessions of the Turks was reported as forming part of Urban's initial appeal in 1095. The pope had granted the crusaders pilgrim's rights, which meant that debts need not be settled until the crusader returned, whilst the church protected property. As such, there was everything to gain and nothing to lose. The poor sought to improve their lot from nothing.

Question 2

(a) Explain why Jerusalem was lost in 1187.

(12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)***Indicative content**

- **Analysis** may focus on weak leadership and the events surrounding the Battle of Hattin in 1187, especially Guy of Lusignan's role in the campaign preceding Hattin, his decision to march the field army to Tiberius, his weak character and claim to the throne, his rivalry with Raymond, and his actions during the battle will be of a central importance. Also, the roles of Guy, Gerald and Reynald during 1187 may be developed.
- **Political issues** may be developed, such as the condition of the Crusader states; the relative importance of internal rivalries between hawks and doves, Raymond and Guy, disunity amongst the Franks and the decline of Byzantium, shortage of manpower, problems of defence. The reign of Baldwin IV, 'the leper king', may be evaluated as another key example of internal rivalries and weak kingship, or the period after his death, and the reign of Baldwin V may give a focus for short-term versus long-term weaknesses.
- The **strength** of Saladin and Muslim unity. His use of *Jihad* and image as the champion of Sunni Orthodoxy; his marriage to Nur ad-Din's widow; his control over the wealth of Egypt and over North Syria with his capture of Aleppo and Mosul.
- The **weakness** of Jerusalem's military position, the geography of Outremer, shortage of manpower, problems of defence.

(b) How successful was the Third Crusade in achieving its aims by 1193?

(24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)***Indicative content**

To answer this question candidates need to analyse the intentions behind the Third Crusade, its outcome, and military and political reasons for the success/failure of the Third Crusade. In particular the importance of Jerusalem as an aim and stimulus.

- **Analysis** may focus on the relative impact of divisions within the leadership; the death of Frederick Barbarossa and the rivalries of Richard and Philip, and Conrad and Guy. **Success** may contrast the Christian position in 1188 when only Tyre and two isolated fortresses survived with 1193 when they held nearly the whole of the Palestinian coast.
- **Evaluation** on the issue of success will develop the relative importance of Richard's successes in regaining the coastal cities, victories such as Arsuf and the issue of failure over Jerusalem and the Treaty of Jaffa. The Third Crusade preserved Outremer.

- Conflict between Guy and Conrad was resolved when Richard granted Guy the lordship of Cyprus. The island's capture was a major addition to Outremer and removed both the Byzantine threat to Antioch and the threat of the Egyptian fleet to Outremer. The Battle of Arsuf ended the myth of Saladin's invincibility. The Treaty of Jaffa gave Christian pilgrims access to Jerusalem and the Holy places.

By October 1192 when King Richard left the Holy Land most of Saladin's victories of 1187–1188 were wiped away, although Jerusalem was not retaken. The coastal cities were restored, the kingdom was united under Count Henry of Champagne, and peace was secured with their greatest enemy – indeed Saladin's death in March 1193 ended the Muslim unity which so endangered Outremer.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Byzantium and the West were so hostile towards each other c1200.

(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

- **Analysis** can focus on a wide range of tensions between east and west – religious, political, economic and historical. Western visitors to Constantinople were impressed by the wealth of the city of Constantinople but thought its Church schismatic and its people effeminate and deceitful; on the other hand, the Greeks thought the Latins were conceited, uncouth and undisciplined barbarians. This was a clash of civilisations, tensions of incomprehension, intolerance and hostility between Catholic, western Europeans or 'Latins', and the Orthodox, Greek-speaking, eastern Byzantines. This would culminate in 1204 in the capture and sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade.
- **Theological doctrine** and **political tensions** emerged in 1154 over papal claims of universal leadership within Christendom and supremacy over the Orthodox Church. The two churches differed over the *Filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed in its interpretation of the Trinity. A schism developed following mutual excommunication by the Papal legate, Cardinal Humbert and the Orthodox Patriarch – a state of schism between Rome and Constantinople which continues to divide the Orthodox and Catholic churches today.
- **Crusading** added its own tensions to this mix, e.g. difficulties between Alexius and the crusaders in the 1090s, especially regarding Bohemond and Antioch. After the failure of the Second Crusade Byzantium became the scapegoat for the crusade's failure, accused, perhaps rightly, of collusion with the Muslim powers. Manuel had a twelve-year truce with the Seljuks and encouraged their attacks on the crusaders as they crossed Asia Minor.
- **Mutual antipathy** also grew due to the economic expansion of western maritime states such as Genoa, Pisa and in particular Venice, which monopolised the city's trade with western Europe. The mob in Constantinople deeply resented Venice, which held trading privileges and tax exemptions. In both 1171 and 1182, Venetian merchants were murdered *en masse*.

(b) How important were the Venetians in the failure of the Fourth Crusade? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

In April 1204, the Christian city of Constantinople, capital of the Byzantine Empire, fell to a crusader army of western knights. Rather than attacking their planned destination of Egypt, or providing aid to the beleaguered kingdom of Jerusalem, the crusaders sacked Constantinople in an orgy of violence and dismembered Byzantium, appointing a westerner, Baldwin of Flanders as Emperor.

- **Support** for the view that the failure and diversion of the Fourth Crusade was the fault of the Venetians may focus on the role of Enrico Dandolo, devious Doge of Venice, in the attack on Zara and the further diversion to Constantinople. Was he behind the agreement which stipulated an optimistically large number of crusaders and an inflated price? Was the crusade hijacked by Venice for material advantage, as the attack on Zara suggested? Issues may include the 'secret treaty' with Egypt, a desire for revenge after the anti-Venetian pogrom in Constantinople in 1171, and a desire for profitable trading rights and privileges.
- **Evaluation** may stress the contribution made by Venice which supplied 50 warships of their own and committed much of their shipping to the crusade. Rather than mercenary inspiration for Venice, it may be shown that material advantage and genuine religious commitment were not mutually exclusive in motivating crusaders.
- **Alternative explanations** for the failure may analyse the theory of accidents put forward by Villehardouin, or the responsibility of Villehardouin and the other envoys for an over-optimistic estimate of numbers – 33 500 were expected and contracted for, but only 11 000 turned up. Issues include the lack of a King to provide focus, the impact of the arrival of Young Alexius, and above all, the issues of recruitment and finance may be analysed to show the need for money (a commitment for 85 000 marks) was the impetus for the diversion of the Fourth Crusade to Zara and then Constantinople.

Rather than a predetermined plan drawn up at Hagenau or Venice, the diversion of the Fourth Crusade and the capture of Constantinople were the result of optimism and chance and not conspiracy, reflecting the mix of motives, pragmatism and idealism which characterised all the crusades. Ironically, the overarching need to preserve the crusade led to its diversion and collapse. Necessity and circumstance drew the crusade step by step towards failure on the shores of the Bosphorus.