

A-level
HISTORY
7042/1A

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

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

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

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

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

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

Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120s and 1130s.

[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.

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

- Outremer was surviving, but on an ad-hoc and rather precarious basis where castles were vital for protection
- the settlers had few resources of their own
- the settlers were isolated from Byzantium and received only infrequent help from the West
- Jihad and a Muslim counterattack was becoming more of an issue from the 1120s.

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

- it is true that castle building developed significantly in the 1120s and 1130s – with Fulk building key castles to protect from Fatimid raids and fortresses being handed over to the Military Orders, who had the expertise, manpower and finances that the lay rulers of Outremer lacked
- that they could only press for further development and expansion with Western help can be evidenced by appeals to the West in the 1120s (eg embassy of Hugh of Payns) and the 1129 attack on Damascus once Fulk had arrived with his retinue. Otherwise they were able to do little to oppose, (for example) the rise of Zengi – apart from make alliances with Damascus
- not only were the settlers isolated from Byzantium, but John actually posed a direct threat to Antioch in the 1130s
- this interpretation perhaps overstates the vulnerability of the Franks. They were able to attempt an aggressive policy inland (attacking Damascus and Aleppo in the 1120s and Shaizar in the 1130s) – this suggests a clear strategy, rather than an ad hoc approach
- help from the West was actually quite forthcoming, eg the Venetians who helped in the capture of Tyre and links with France were developed following the marriages of Fulk to Melisende and Raymond of Poitiers to Constance.

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

- the situation after the Field of Blood was not that disastrous – Outremer was viable
- the Muslim world remained too disunited to pose a serious, sustained threat
- instability in Outremer was caused by internal problems rather than external pressure – usually the deaths of promising leaders
- ties with Europe helped to bring in new ‘blood’ and this helped to stabilise things.

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

- although Antioch lost a significant amount of territory in 1119, Baldwin II was able to stabilise the principality and even defeated Il Ghazi in battle, taking his momentum away. Under Raymond from 1136, the principality of Antioch became a formidable power again
- the interpretation is very convincing in suggesting that the Muslim world was still disunited – Zengi, for example, seems to have spent more time fighting other Muslims (in Mesopotamia) and focusing on Damascus (leading to an alliance between Fulk and Unur)
- there were significant internal problems in Outremer, eg Fulk vs. Hugh of Jaffa which caused a near state of civil war or Alice's behaviour in Antioch after the death of Bohemond II
- it is true that the arrival of Westerners helped to stabilise the situation in Antioch. However, it could be argued that Fulk's arrival in Jerusalem actually caused more problems – with the native Levantine nobles being resentful at positions being given to foreigners. Pons of Tripoli and Joscelin of Edessa both attempted to reject Fulk's authority over them, precisely because he was a newcomer
- the impact of the Field of Blood could be questioned. It seemed to put an end to any Antiochene pretensions about control of Aleppo and the Council of Nablus/formation of the Templars suggests a major concern about the future of Outremer. It also helped to galvanise the Muslim world – who now recognised that the Franks were not invincible. Jihad rhetoric increased in the 1120s.

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

- the Franks had a clear and sound strategy, but lacked the resources to implement it successfully
- they were not able to press their position militarily once away from the coast
- the Muslims surrounded them and were becoming united and threatening under men like Zengi
- manpower remained an insoluble problem.

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

- It seems clear that the Franks had some sort of plan by the way that they focused on targets that were inland in this period (especially after Tyre was captured in 1124). Fulk neutralised the threat from Ascalon by building a series of castles and, so, most attacks took place inland, eg Aleppo in 1125 and Damascus in 1129
- many of the successful sieges that the Franks had implemented along the coast had the support and expertise of the Italian naval forces (Tyre illustrates this perfectly) – inland they lacked the materials and skills necessary. This is evidenced by the abject failures at Aleppo and Damascus – the battle plans here are debatable (Damascus was attacked as winter was approaching) and so it seems that they were reliant upon the populations helping them – rather than their own siege craft
- Zengi posed a direct threat, as he controlled both Mosul (wealthy) and Aleppo (close to Frankish territory) by 1128. He inflicted defeats upon the Franks – such as at Montferrand where Fulk was forced into a surrender. That Fulk was worried is supported by his alliance with Unur in 1139
- it might be that Zengi's importance is overstated – Zengi spent much of the 1130s fighting in his Eastern territories, and seems to have been more concerned about Damascus than tackling the Franks (Jihad ideology was probably a front for his ambitions)
- lack of resources may also not have been the issue. In 1138 the Byzantines attempted to attack Shaizar, but this attack failed due to the reluctance of Raymond of Antioch and Joscelin to help, rather than through lack of resources, which the Byzantines had in plenty.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent were those taking the Cross, in the years 1096 to 1146, motivated by a desire for economic gain rather than spiritual reward?

[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 those taking the Cross, in the years 1096 to 1146, were motivated by a desire for economic gain rather than spiritual reward might include:

- Crusaders such as Bohemond, Tancred and Baldwin of Boulogne behaved in such a way during the course of the First Crusade which suggests that economic gain (in terms of gaining land) was of primary importance to them. They had little to lose in the West and everything to gain in the East
- on the First Crusade there are examples of reward being very important (the anger at Alexius at Nicaea as he prevented the Crusaders from plundering, the arguments between Bohemond and Raymond over Antioch, Raymond's behaviour in 1099)
- the Italians played a key role in Crusading in this period (eg Venice 1122–24) and they were largely interested in setting up trading bases in Outremer – their support was conditional on receiving trading privileges
- the wording of the Papal Bull *Quantum Praedecessores* suggests that there was a concern that people might go on Crusade for material reasons – the bull explicitly mentions that this should not be a motive for going. Both major Crusades in this period led to attacks on the Jews – wealthy European communities targeted with the Crusading message as an excuse
- Damascus was chosen as the target by the Second Crusade potentially due to its economic importance and position on a vital trading route.

Arguments challenging the view that those taking the Cross, in the years 1096 to 1146, were motivated by a desire for economic gain rather than spiritual reward might include:

- the evidence from the First Crusade charters implies that the majority of nobles going on Crusade were senior lords who held many lands. Robert of Normandy, for example, had to mortgage his lands in order to be able to go
- very few people remained in the East after going on a Crusade – this is shown by Outremer's chronic manpower problems across this whole period – given that Crusading cost 4/5 times a knight's income, it would seem that desire for Salvation was the primary concern
- the leaders of the Second Crusade, Louis VII and Conrad III, were kings and so were unlikely to have been seeking material gain. Louis, in particular, caused financial problems in France in order to pay for his expedition. Both men faced the prospect of losing control of their lands in their absence and, so, spiritual motivation seems to be key – especially for Louis who needed to perform penance for burning down a church
- many prominent nobles continued to journey to the Holy Land in this period (eg Thierry of Flanders) and then they returned home. This would appear to be more like a pilgrimage – noble families often had long traditions of pilgrimage to the East, and they seem to have been continuing that tradition
- behaviour on the expeditions largely supports the view that spiritual motives were key (eg the behaviour of crusaders at Antioch after finding the Holy Lance in 1098; the way they marched barefoot around Jerusalem in 1099).

This question can be answered in a range of ways, though students are likely to disagree with the premise and suggest that spiritual motives were paramount for the majority of crusaders. However, stronger students will probably comment on the fact that it is difficult sometimes to separate out the differing motives and that it might be entirely possible to hope for economic reward at the same time as wanting to gain salvation. Students should refer to examples from across the time period and not just focus on the First Crusade.

0 3 'In the years 1171 to 1193, Saladin was primarily motivated by jihad.'

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 in the years 1171 to 1193, Saladin was primarily motivated by jihad might include:

- Saladin lived an extremely pious and austere lifestyle and he encouraged his subjects to do the same. He spent money on schools, madrasas and mosques
- Saladin abolished the Shi'ite Fatimid caliphate in 1171 and ensured that the Abbasid Caliph's name was the one used in Friday prayers in Egypt from that point onwards. This might suggest that he was committed to a wide interpretation of jihad – dealing with all examples of unorthodoxy from his own Sunni branch of Islam
- Saladin focused on the importance of Jerusalem within Islamic belief and was the Muslim leader who managed to recapture it from the Latin Christians. He fought against the Kingdom of Jerusalem for a long period of time and inflicted crushing defeats, eg Jacob's Ford, Hattin and the capture of the city itself. Saladin prioritised the capture of the Holy City in October 1187, when the best move strategically would have been to consolidate his hold of the coast
- Saladin was relatively merciful in his treatment of captured enemies, but it is noticeable that he executed the members of the Military Orders captured at Hattin – did he view these men as implacable religious enemies who he could not work with?
- Saladin had the complete backing of the caliph and his death was viewed as a real blow to the unity of Islam – indeed, infighting broke out almost immediately as political matters were once again prioritised over commitment to jihad.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1171 to 1193, Saladin was primarily motivated by jihad might include:

- in 1171 to 1174 Saladin seemed to be more focused on a power struggle with his co-religionist Nureddin, rather than uniting with him to invade Palestine and tackle the Franks
- Saladin spent much of the period 1174 to 1183 targeting Muslim held lands and fighting with other Muslims. It could be argued that he was just trying to carve out a powerbase for himself in the north by attempting to oust the heirs of Nureddin in Aleppo and Mosul
- Outremer had key periods of weakness (eg the accession of Baldwin IV, the death of Baldwin V) and Saladin failed to capitalise upon these as he was engaged in fighting with other Muslims. Saladin also made truces with the Kingdom of Jerusalem so that he could focus his attentions elsewhere
- Saladin's eventual decision to target Outremer in the late 1180s was possibly because he was under increasing pressure to deliver the jihad he had long promised. He was widely criticised for promoting an Ayyubid dynasty at the expense of the Zengids
- by the time of the Third Crusade it was clear that Saladin was losing control of his army – they had perhaps become disillusioned and realised that their leader was not as committed to jihad as he professed (note the treatment of the Christians inside Jerusalem in 1187 and his negotiations with Richard in 1192).

This question can be effectively answered in a number of different ways, and students will be rewarded for any opinions and judgements which are backed up with evidence. Stronger students might realise that it is difficult to ascribe one singular motive to any person and they might also comment on the issues of the sources we have for the life and actions of Saladin. As these were written mostly after his successful capture of Jerusalem in 1187 they are likely to be influenced by this. Equally, other students might decide that Saladin started out as less committed to jihad and had a change of focus after a key event (such as his illness in 1186). Stronger students may also debate the nature of different types of 'jihad', where less able students might consider 'jihad' more simply as a struggle against non-believers.

0 4 'The diversion of the Fourth Crusade to Constantinople in 1204 was the result of divisions between the Byzantine Empire and Latin Christians since the Second Crusade.'

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 diversion of the Fourth Crusade to Constantinople in 1204 was the result of divisions between the Byzantine Empire and Latin Christians since the Second Crusade might include:

- the Venetians played a key role in the diversion of the Fourth Crusade and they themselves had a rather chequered history with Byzantium. In 1171 they had been expelled from their trading bases in Constantinople. Many of the precious and valuable objects plundered in 1204 ended up in Venice, suggesting a possible long-term grievance which had built over a long time
- Emperor Manuel Comnenus had offered little in the way of help to the Second Crusade, and the Crusaders accused their Byzantine guides of duplicity. The Crusaders had expected Byzantine help, failing to recognise that their commitment to Crusading was not necessarily one shared by the Byzantines. This lack of understanding of the Byzantine view of Holy War would manifest throughout the subsequent years – the Fourth Crusade expected help for example – see Innocent III's letters at the time of the Fourth Crusade. Thus, some sort of complete breakdown in relations could be seen as germinating for a long time
- almost every crusade which had gone through Byzantine territory had come with the implied threat that Constantinople itself would be attacked, eg the French on the Second Crusade. Richard had also attacked Byzantine lands in 1191 when he took Cyprus
- differences in religious and cultural focus between Latin and Greek Orthodox Christians had also led to tensions building over a long period of time. The Byzantine concept of *oikoumene* didn't sit very well with the Latin concept of *Holy War*. In the 1180s these tensions had become very noticeable in Constantinople itself thanks to the anti-Latin activities of Andronicus I
- In the aftermath of the Second Crusade there were efforts made by French bishops to initiate a crusade against the Byzantines. Whilst unsuccessful, there was clearly a great deal of bad feeling.

Arguments challenging the view that the diversion of the Fourth Crusade to Constantinople in 1204 was the result of divisions between the Byzantine Empire and Latin Christians since the Second Crusade might include:

- relations between the Byzantines and the Latins actually improved significantly in the 1160s and 1170s – there were marriage alliances between Outremer and Constantinople and Amalric seems to have sworn fealty to Manuel in 1171. This suggests that an attack was not inevitable – especially as the Fourth Crusade had initially agreed to help Young Alexius
- Manuel Comnenus helped to smooth relations between Greek Orthodox Christians and Latins – he married a Latin and had a number of Latin advisors. Perhaps his death in 1180 was a more significant turning point.
- one of the reasons for the sack of Constantinople in 1204 was due to Byzantium's own internal problems – the factional infighting between Isaac II and Young Alexius and Alexius III. The initial Crusader attack on Constantinople was meant to place Alexius IV and his father on the throne, but it was Alexius' failure to pay his debts and supply the troops he'd promised that led to violence breaking out
- Pope Innocent III's own role could be criticised as he had sought to impose various rules and regulations upon his crusade from the outset. This led to problems of recruitment and finance – it was manpower and money that Young Alexius had offered to the Crusaders – if they had not been so desperate, then they might not have responded to his offer
- the Treaty of Venice commissioned far too many ships, at far too high a cost. It can be debated whether the Crusade leaders or the Venetians were to blame for this, but the resulting debt of

34 000 marks was a principal reason for the initial diversion to Zara and the later agreement to help Young Alexius.

Students are likely to approach this question in a range of ways and any supported judgement will be rewarded. Higher level answers will be aware that the situation between Byzantium and the Latins was more nuanced than just complete division from the late 1140s onward and will be aware that the relationship changed and developed over the period of time covered in the question. It is important that students consider some long-term factors and evidence and do not entirely focus on just the events of the Fourth Crusade, however, they should be allowed freedom of choice as to what they include and should not be constrained if they do not cover specific material given in the mark scheme.