

AS

History

Paper 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1149
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

AS History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1A The Age of Crusades, c1071–1149

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of why the crusader states survived between 1099 and 1124? | [25 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: | Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. They will evaluate the extracts thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated judgement on which offers the more convincing interpretation. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion as to which offers the more convincing interpretation. However, not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements may be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show a reasonable understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. Comments as to which offers the more convincing interpretation will be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will show some partial understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be some undeveloped comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The answer will show a little understanding of the interpretations given in the extracts. There will be only unsupported, vague or generalist comment in relation to the question. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 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.

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

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate or challenge.

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

- the self-interest of emirs in Syria, their rivalry with each other and fear of the Sultan becoming too powerful is given as the reason why effective external leadership was needed
- the Sultan sought to control the emirs as well as to expel the Franks
- the lack of Muslim unity can be contrasted with the willingness of the Frankish states to work together when necessary.

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

- Ridwan of Aleppo tried to persuade the Assassins to murder Tughtegin of Damascus
- in 1114 Tughtegin of Damascus and Il-Ghazi allied with Roger of Antioch to fight off the mutual threat of Bursuq, commander of the sultan of Baghdad's army
- Baldwin II's willingness to march to the rescue of Antioch in 1119 is an example of co-operation for self-preservation
- at the battle of Harran in 1104 Baldwin of Edessa was captured, many knights killed and the area of the Principality of Antioch was reduced by almost sixty percent
- Mawdud and Toghtekin co-operated in 1113 and defeated the Franks at al-Sannabra
- in 1119 Il-Ghazi was able to gather a large enough Muslim force to decisively defeat and kill Roger of Antioch. The Battle of the Field of Blood almost resulted in the destruction of Antioch
- the extract is rather limited in scope and is narrowly focused on the Seljuk forces.

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

- the leadership of both Baldwin I and Tancred was crucial in that they were flexible in their approaches to the situations that they faced
- there was a clear lack of Muslim unity for the Frankish leaders to exploit
- the role of diplomacy and the use of resources, including the native population was valuable and of use to both rulers.

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

- the role Baldwin I played in the capture of the coastal cities of Palestine which was critical to the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem
- the importance of Tancred to the expansion of Antiochene territory following the captivity and departure of Bohemond
- the use of Armenian forces in the defence of Edessa and the use of Turcopoles. Baldwin II's marriage to Morphia, an Armenian princess
- the imposition of tributes by the Franks upon local emirs, including the rulers of Aleppo and Shaizar. Muslim disunity was helpful to the leaders
- when Baldwin of Edessa (later King Baldwin II) was captured Tancred became regent in Edessa and was reluctant to hand it back later when Baldwin was released
- both Baldwin I and Tancred suffered significant defeats such as the Second Battle of Ramlah and Harran respectively
- the capture of the coast relied upon the support of the Italian city-states especially Genoa for the seizure of Acre (1104) and Venice for Tyre (1124).

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each extract, students may conclude that Extract B is generally more useful than Extract A in providing a convincing interpretation in that it provides a wider range of explanations and acknowledges the importance of the Muslim divisions noted in Extract A within the context of the leadership of Outremer.

Section B

- | | | |
|----------|----------|---|
| 0 | 2 | 'The weak position of the Byzantine Empire by 1095 was a consequence of internal dynastic rivalry.' |
|----------|----------|---|

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be 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 weak position of the Byzantine Empire was a consequence of internal dynastic rivalry might include:

- the confused nature of Byzantine imperial politics in the late eleventh century meant that many nobles had been 'born in the purple' or could claim descent from a previous emperor
- the military defeat of Romanos IV at Manzikert can be attributed to the treachery of Andronicus Doukas, a rival for the Imperial throne
- the period of civil war between 1071 and 1081 was a consequence of rivals to Romanos IV, especially the Doukas family, exploiting his failure at Manzikert to blind and depose the emperor
- the rule of Michael VII between 1071 and 1078 was blighted by the constant attempted coups of rivals such as Philaretos Brachamios, John Doukas and Nikephoros Bryennios
- the fall of Michael VII and his replacement by another dynastic rival, Nikephoros III, ended the possibility of aid to Byzantium from Pope Gregory VII. He excommunicated the usurper
- the usurpation of Nikephoros III was used as a justification by the Norman Robert Guiscard to justify his own invasion
- Nikephoros III was himself overthrown by Alexios I, a dynastic rival from the Komnenos family, in 1081.

Arguments challenging the view that that the weak position of the Byzantine Empire was a consequence of internal dynastic rivalry might include:

- Alp Arslan's military victory at Manzikert in 1071 had a devastating impact on Byzantine morale
- strong leaders of the Seljuk Turks had pushed the Byzantines back from their previous borders. Malik Shah ruled a Seljuk Empire that stretched from Syria to Iran
- rival Turkish groups established their own control over parts of Anatolia and established the sultanate of Rum as well as the holdings of Caka and Danishmend
- the influx of refugees from recently lost territories in Anatolia put a strain on the resources of Byzantium
- the need to hire mercenaries to deal with the many military threats from the Normans in the west, Pechenegs in the north and Seljuk Turks in the east increased the financial pressure on the empire
- debasement of the coinage, helped to relieve financial problems in the short term but led to inflation that further undermined the Byzantine economy.

Good answers may conclude that although there were a series of external threats to the empire this, in and of itself, was not a new situation. The internal infighting and civil war allowed others to exploit the rivalries, especially Turkish mercenaries, and these exacerbated the threat and undermined the empire's long term stability.

0 3 'The growth of the concept of Jihad was key to the fall of Edessa to Zengi in 1144.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 growth of the concept of Jihad was key to the fall of Edessa might include:

- the Syrian legist al-Sulami was an early voice for Jihad in this period. His influential work, *the Book of Holy War* (1105), played a role in increasing its appeal
- in 1111 the Aleppan Ibn al-Khashshab burst into a mosque in Baghdad and smashed the minbar in protest against the inactivity of the Sultan
- the Battle of the Field of Blood (1119) can be seen as a potential turning point and early indication of the potential of Jihad
- Zengi was a highly powerful and effective Muslim leader whose influence had grown and who had become a focus of growing Jihadist sentiment.

Arguments challenging the view that the growth of the concept of Jihad was key to the fall of Edessa might include:

- the lack of legitimate authority to promote Jihad. The Muslim rulers of Syrian cities did not have this as they had usurped power. They could fight a Jihad but were not under any obligation to do so
- authority for a Jihad for the Sunni Arabs and Turks could only come from the Caliph and Sultan in Baghdad but they often lacked the interest or ability to project this into Syria. Attempts to do so were usually sabotaged in this period by emirs or assassins
- Zengi was, in the view of some contemporary Muslims, a questionable role model to lead a Jihad. The main focus of much of his aggression was other Muslim territories rather than the Franks. He had also allegedly violated some oaths he had made to surrendering enemies
- the breakdown of the traditional partnership between the princes of Antioch and counts of Edessa. Joscelin II has meddled in the election of the patriarch of Antioch and had sided with Raymond's enemy Sawar of Aleppo. Raymond had insisted on asserting formal overlordship which Joscelin resented. Prince Raymond refused to send aid to support Joscelin II against Zengi
- Joscelin II and Raymond of Antioch had both worked against the Byzantine Emperor John II in the 1130s. They had undermined his attempts to fight the Seljuks in Northern Syria out of fear of resurgent Byzantine influence
- the county of Edessa was territorially large and wealthy in terms of natural resources but suffered from its exposed position. Edessa was far from the normal pilgrim routes and held little religious significance. It did not attract much regular support from Europe the way that Jerusalem did
- the recent death of King Fulk of Jerusalem in 1143 made the situation in Outremer precarious as he left a child as his heir
- Joscelin II had entangled himself in an alliance with the Ortoqids. Zengi's attack on them lured him away from Edessa. Zengi used a complex series of tunnels to bring down a section of the walls.

Good answers may conclude that in general the Christian divisions certainly hastened the fall of Edessa. However, given its exposed position and the resurgence of a unified Muslim threat under Zengi's leadership its fall was, if not inevitable, then highly likely in the event that it became a target, although the specific appeal of Jihad was not yet sufficiently strong to achieve this aim alone.