

A-LEVEL

# History

Paper 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version: 1.0

---

---

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)

## A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 1A The Age of Crusades, c1071–1204

#### Section A

- |          |          |  |                   |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the reasons why the Kingdom of Jerusalem collapsed. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

*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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic 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.   | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | <b>Either</b> shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only <b>or</b> 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. | <b>1-6</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

**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.

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

**Extract A: In their identification of Phillips' argument, students may refer to the following:**

- the extract presents the overall interpretation that there was nothing inevitable about the fall of the kingdom
- the Kingdom of Jerusalem was not ineffectual and was capable of action against the threats it faced
- the Franks were unlucky even though they did contribute to their own downfall
- the strength of Saladin should not be considered an inevitable development.

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

- Baldwin IV demonstrated his military skill on several occasions despite his growing infirmity. The most notable example would be Montgisard (1177)
- Saladin faced considerable problems within the Muslim world, especially from the Zengids and from the Assassins. The latter had been a longstanding threat to unity
- the unexpected and premature deaths of Baldwin III (1162), Amalric I (1174) and William of Montferrat (1177) were rather unlucky as was Baldwin IV's leprosy, Baldwin V's sickly disposition and the lack of alternative male heirs
- the coup of Sibylla and Guy was a choice and not a consequence of luck. The consequent divisions with Raymond III were particularly damaging
- Guy's action including his inability to restrain Reynald of Chatillon and his fateful decisions during the Hattin campaign
- much of the effort required to unify Muslims against the Franks had been undertaken by Nur ad-Din and the direction of Jihad was well established before Saladin rose to power which potentially increased its inevitability by the 1180s.

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

- the extract suggests that overall there were a range of reasons why the Kingdom of Jerusalem fell but that poor leadership was only partly to blame
- it suggests that the crusader states of Outremer had an image problem with Western Christians in Europe
- problems within the royal family played a major role in the collapse of the kingdom
- political divisions and infighting were a significant distraction
- the finances of the kingdom were not as good as they appeared.

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

- the existence of the split between the so-called 'hawks' (or 'court party') and the 'doves' (or 'pullani'). Their differing views regarding the succession to Baldwin IV and the approach to take with Saladin
- the previous actions of Nur ad-Din against the crusader states. The battle of Inab (1149) and the death of Raymond of Antioch could be used to highlight the long-term nature of the threat. Nur ad-Din's acquisition of Damascus and Egypt also demonstrate this
- the lack of crusading activity from Western Europe and the poor response to attempts to encourage it. In 1184, for example, the Kingdom of Jerusalem sent a mission headed by Heraclius, to the West seeking help. This appeal involved the masters of the Templars and the Hospitallers. Pope Lucius III, issued another crusading bull and they offered the keys to Jerusalem to both Henry II and Philip II but they both refused
- rather than being a problem Amalric I's divorce and second marriage to Maria strengthened the kingdom by renewing the Byzantine alliance
- Baldwin IV demonstrated his military skill on several occasions despite his growing infirmity. The most notable example would be Montgisard (1177)
- meaningful attempts to bolster defences were made. The attempted construction of a new castle at Jacob's Ford (1179) highlights this
- the militarily successful shadowing of Saladin's army in 1183 demonstrated an awareness of appropriate defensive measures even if they had political consequences.

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

- the extracts overall interpretation is that the collapse of Byzantine military power was devastating to the survival prospects of the crusader states, including Jerusalem
- the threat of Byzantine military action had restrained Muslim leaders in the past
- there was no adequate replacement for the lost Byzantine military power and no meaningful western support despite attempts to launch new crusades.

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

- the battle of Myriocephalum led to a gradual decline in the Byzantine position regarding Anatolia. Attempting to limit the damage was Manuel I's priority for the remainder of his reign
- appeals for help from Western Europe achieved little. Alexander III issued a crusade appeal and in 1183 a small force led by Henry of Lotharingia arrived in the kingdom but it was of very value
- Henry II found the prospect of crusading less appealing after the death of Amalric I due to the infirmity of Baldwin IV and the uncertain succession. Louis VII was increasingly infirm and tainted by the Second Crusade. Neither could leave Europe without the other due to the rivalry between them in France
- the scale of the defeat at Myriocephalum was, arguably, exaggerated. Whilst Manuel I lived, the alliance remained and the Kingdom of Jerusalem still benefitted from the, still substantial, Byzantine fleet

- the most immediate impact of Byzantine military collapse might initially seem positive for Frankish Antioch rather than negative for Jerusalem
- the usefulness of the Byzantine alliance (and therefore the significance of its loss) is questionable. It had not helped Amalric I in Egypt and it was arguably the failure of the Franks to gain that territory, that exposed Jerusalem to encirclement
- concern about future potential Byzantine involvement was considered by Saladin who worked to secure an alliance of his own with Emperor Isaac II.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'The military skill of Western Christians was key to their successes against their Muslim opponents.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1095 to 1119.

**[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 military skill of Western Christians was key to their success, might include:**

- Bohemond was an able general whose aggressive tactics and military skill created the victories over Ridwan and Kerbogah, he led the crusading armies to victory at Dorylaeum and Antioch. Bohemond made the crusaders use rear-guards and instilled the discipline necessary to defeat Turkish cavalry at Dorylaeum
- Bohemond was appointed as sole commander in moments of crisis, such as June 1098 at Antioch
- other demonstrations of military skill during the First Crusade could include Robert of Normandy, who rallied the troops at Dorylaeum and led the charge at Ascalon
- the sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem relied on military skill and co-ordination
- Baldwin I repeatedly demonstrated his military skill, notably against the Fatimids at the first and third battles of Ramlah. Tancred too had an excellent military reputation, the victory at Artah (1105) is a good example of this.

**Arguments challenging the view that the military skill of Western Christians was key to their success, might include:**

- mistakes were made by the Seljuk Turks during the First Crusade linked to their disunity. Kilij Arslan underestimated the crusade and his pre-occupation of warring with his neighbours helped the crusade early on. Divisions amongst Muslims included the fragmentation of the Seljuk Empire after 1092, the inability of Ridwan and Duqaq to work together and of Kerbogha to maintain the unity
- tensions between Turks and Arabs, Fatimids and Abbasids and Sunnis and Shias all aided the crusaders in the disputed territory of Palestine. These tensions continued and were important in undermining attempts to remove the newly established crusader states in Outremer
- the massive victory of Muslim forces at the Battle of the Field of Blood (1119) demonstrated what could be achieved when Seljuk Turks were unified and well led
- the role of Byzantium contributed to the success of the First Crusade – in particular the provision of guides and supplies during the crossing of Anatolia and at Antioch, where the Byzantine fleet proved vital. However, it was clearly not of any help to Western Christians establishing the crusader states to 1119 as the question of Antioch, among other issues, meant that Byzantium was increasingly hostile
- religious zeal was of some importance to the successes – the attraction of Jerusalem provided drive which proved vital at Antioch. The 'Holy Lance' and the determination of ordinary crusaders to complete their armed pilgrimage with or without their leaders, as demonstrated at Ma'arrat, are good examples. This also encouraged settlement and pilgrimage to Outremer. Minor crusades such as the crusade of 1101 and the Norwegian crusade of 1110 played a role
- the role of the Italian city-states, especially Genoa, Pisa and Venice, in the capture of key coastal cities e.g. Genoa at Acre in 1104 and Venice at Sidon in 1110.

In summary, good answers may well show an awareness that although Western Christians often displayed impressive military skill, and that this was often energised by religious motivation, their limited numbers made the disunity of their Muslim foes more decisive.



**0 3** 'The military orders were the most effective form of defence for the crusader states.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1119 to 1149.

**[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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.  | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## 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 military orders were the most effective form of defence for the crusader states, might include:**

- the military orders provided armed contingents to protect pilgrims who visited the crusader states, they also escorted the Second Crusade across Anatolia
- the military orders served as commanders and garrisons of key castles, like Bethgiblein (1136) and Krak des Chevaliers (1144) for the Hospitallers and Baghras (late 1130s) and Gaza (1149) for the Templars
- the growing wealth of the military orders in Western Europe was used to build, hold and strengthen castles in Outremer as well as to hire mercenary forces
- the backgrounds of the military veterans who joined the military orders and their constant presence in Outremer gave them valuable experience
- they were organised religious orders that imbued their men with discipline and zeal.

**Arguments challenging the view that military orders were the most effective form of defence for the crusader states, might include:**

- the military orders were small to begin with and were only a major military force in the open field and through custody of castles by the end of this period
- additional manpower could be gained at certain periods. The use of the feudal system meant that men served for money fiefs and the Church and the towns both provided quotas of sergeants. Light cavalry were recruited from local Christians. The assistance of the Italian city-states of Pisa, Genoa and Venice as a navy was also useful although this came at a cost. Pilgrims knights on minor crusades could also swell the ranks temporarily although these forces were hard to control
- the defence of Outremer relied on the divisions of their Muslim enemies and the Franks were active in both encouraging and exploiting these. Alliances were formed at various times between crusader states and individual Muslim rulers, such as that between the Kingdom of Jerusalem and Damascus. Attempts were made, with variable success, to form alliances with groups such as the Ortoqids
- castles defended strategic routes checking enemy movements such as along pilgrimage routes, as demonstrated by Toron. Castles such as Ibelin and Blanchegarde and Kerak inland were built to defend the borders
- defensive strategies such as the avoidance of pitched battle were employed particularly as the Muslim forces grew stronger. The purpose was to contain the enemy forces until their army began to dissolve due to the time taken, internal divisions and logistical problems
- the individual actions of rulers of the crusader states were often vital to their defence, especially early on. There was a willingness to support each other at critical moments as shown by the repeated actions of Baldwin II in assisting Antioch and the earlier support from Antioch for Edessa.

In summary, good answers may show an awareness that although the military orders played a growing role they were small to begin with and for much of this period. They could never hold back a determined enemy with the numbers to flood the land with troops, so maintaining Muslim divisions was vital. The role of Frankish leaders in sustaining this division, their ability to raise some forces and the external assistance may have contributed decisively to effective defence.

**0 4** 'The most significant consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade was the alliance between Byzantium and Outremer.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1149 to 1176.

**[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 alliance between Byzantium and Outremer was the most significant consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade, might include:**

- by 1157 Baldwin III of Jerusalem was determined to improve relations with Byzantium. This was a practical necessity given that support from Western Europe had not been forthcoming after the failure of the Second Crusade
- in 1158 Baldwin III married Theodora of Byzantium, and established a personal alliance with it. By 1159 this alliance was being used to threaten Aleppo, the heart of Nur ad-Din's power. The Emperor was reluctant to be too supportive for fear that once the threat from Nur ad-Din was gone the Franks would break their promises. Nevertheless Byzantine protection played a vital role in deterring attacks on Antioch and secured the northern frontiers of the Franks' territories
- the Byzantine alliance was maintained in 1167 when Amalric I (1163-74) married Maria. Amalric renewed the oath of loyalty sworn by his brother Baldwin
- despite the weakness and internal problems within the principality Nur ad-Din is said to have declined to attack Antioch itself out of fear of Byzantine military strength
- in 1169 Manuel I sent a large fleet to help the Franks drive Nu ad-Din's forces from Egypt. This failed due to a lack of co-operation between the Franks and the Byzantines. This led to recriminations and Amalric himself, travelled to Constantinople to smooth over the divisions and restore the alliance.

**Arguments challenging the view that the alliance between Byzantium and Outremer was the most significant consequence of the failure of the Second Crusade, might include:**

- there was a widespread reaction against crusading as a large-scale movement due to the failure of the Second Crusade. Over the next forty years there were no more major crusades. Crusaders went in small bands, led by local nobles on their own initiative. There was nothing coordinated and nothing on the scale needed
- in 1176 when Emperor Manuel of Byzantium proposed a joint campaign with westerners there was little response, despite the urging of Pope Alexander III
- Zengi's attack on Edessa had started a development towards greater Muslim unity. This was not his intention and he was dead before the crusade but his son Nur ad-Din was able to exploit this
- the crusader attack on Damascus and its rescue by Nur ad-Din had turned the populace to his cause and in 1154 he was able to capture the city peacefully. By doing so he unified Syria against the Franks
- Nur ad-Din gained allies and support by promising to fight the Franks and used the failure of the Second Crusade to demonstrate that they could be defeated
- Nur ad-Din used the Second Crusade to strengthen his own narrative of a Jihad against the Franks. He made alliances with religious authorities and patronised centres of Sunni orthodoxy
- lacking western support the crusader states sought to gain wealth and power by taking Egypt. Nur ad-Din exploited this situation to send his own forces to Egypt under Shirkuh and Saladin. The people were converted to Sunni Islam.

In summary, good answers may argue that whilst the alliance between Byzantium and Outremer was a significant consequence, other results were of greater long-term significance.