



AS History

7041/1A - The Age of the Crusades, c1071-1204

Component 1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071-1149

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

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

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

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, i.e. 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.

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

Component 1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071–1149

Section A

- 01** With reference to these extracts and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two extracts provides the more convincing interpretation of the threat posed by the Seljuk Turks to the Christians in the 1070s and 1080s? **[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 to 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 Runciman's argument, students may refer to the following:

- the Seljuks were a serious threat to Christians in the 1070s and 1080s
- the Byzantines were under threat as the Turkish capital of Nicaea was so close to Constantinople itself
- the Western Christians heading to Palestine on pilgrimage were under threat and found their routes blocked.

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

- in the aftermath of Manzikert the Byzantines lost a good deal of territory to the Turks, especially in Anatolia, and they also lost the important city of Antioch. It certainly looked possible that an attack on the capital city itself was imminent
- there were incidents of pilgrims struggling to get to Jerusalem and being persecuted by the Turks en route, e.g. as reported by Peter the Hermit
- a lot of the propaganda about Turks attacking pilgrims, desecrating holy places and even planning to invade Western Christendom was fabricated by both Alexius and Pope Urban to gain support. Many pilgrims still travelled to Jerusalem in this period and Christians living in Palestine were free to worship as they wished.

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

- the Turks were not a serious threat to Byzantine Christians and the problems faced by the Byzantines were due to their own internal problems as opposed to Turkish strength
- the Turks were more focused on fighting the Fatimids from Egypt on religious grounds than in attacking Christians
- the Turks were good cavalymen but not naturally good at siege warfare and so any capture of cities was due to Byzantine weakness rather than concerted Turkish strength.

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

- the Turks do not seem to have been especially keen to persecute Christians on religious grounds and it is true that the bulk of the Sultan's time and forces was engaged in fighting the Fatimids in Syria and Palestine
- the ease with which Alp Arslan was able to defeat the mighty Byzantine army would suggest that the Turks were a serious threat if they chose to direct their attention westwards
- the speed with which certain Turkish groups seized control of Byzantine lands across Asia Minor might suggest that, whilst the Sultan himself was not that interested in this region, the minor scions of the Turkish tribes did have a concerted interest in pushing westwards.

In arriving at a judgement as to which extract provides the more convincing interpretation, students might conclude that Runciman's interpretation is the most convincing as, regardless of Alp Arslan's objectives, the Turks did decimate both the army in 1071 and the Byzantine holdings in Asia Minor in a very short space of time. Indeed, at the time, there seems to have been a deep fear in both Byzantium and the West about Turkish expansion. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

Section B

- 02** 'Franks travelling to the Holy Land, in the years 1095 to 1107, should be considered primarily as pilgrims.'

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 suggesting that Franks travelling to the Holy Land, in the years 1095 to 1107, should be considered primarily as pilgrims might include:

- they took a pilgrim vow – with the associated behaviours of chastity, poverty etc. They described themselves in charters and letters home as pilgrims in arms and wore the sign of the Cross on their clothing
- participants seem to have been highly motivated by the promise of the Papal indulgence/ complete remission of sins spelled out by Pope Urban in 1095. Those taking the Cross in 1101 and 1107 were similarly encouraged by Papal rhetoric about rewards in the afterlife
- behaviours on the crusades in this period are consistent with the behaviour of those engaging in a pilgrimage – there was a focus on reaching the city of Jerusalem on the First Crusade and in helping to protect it on the mission of 1101
- events during the First Crusade in particular show a religious motivation that would be consistent with pilgrimage – fasting and praying at Antioch (1098) and Jerusalem (1099) for example.

Arguments challenging the view that Franks travelling to the Holy Land, in the years 1095 to 1107, should be considered primarily as pilgrims might include:

- for some there was a clear material motivation (e.g. Bohemond and Baldwin of Boulogne) and there are instances where the Crusaders seemed extremely interested in material gain whilst on the First Crusade (e.g. Dorylaeum battle cry)
- the expedition of 1107 targeted the Byzantine Empire and attacked their port of Durazzo. Clearly this campaign against a fellow Christian nation is not in keeping with the pilgrimage message
- some of those who journeyed to the Holy Land in this period had less altruistic motives: some were escaping legal problems or poor harvests in the West (e.g. many on the People's Crusade) and many in 1101 and 1107 wanted to emulate the deeds of the First Crusaders and achieve material/gain social advancement as a result.

Students might argue that the vast majority of participants seem to have considered themselves as pilgrims, even if they then displayed behaviours which were not quite consistent with their vows. Men like Bohemond seem to have been the exception which might be supported by the fact that after the capture of Jerusalem in 1099, most participants returned home as their vow had been fulfilled. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

- 03** 'The success of the First Crusade and the failure of the Second Crusade were due to the situation in the Muslim Near East.'

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 suggesting that the success of the First Crusade and the failure of the Second Crusade were due to the situation in the Muslim Near East might include:

- the disunity amongst Turks in Asia Minor in the 1090s meant that Kilij Arslan prioritised fighting his Turkish neighbour rather than tackling the First Crusade – thus allowing them an easier passage
- the collapse of the coalition created by Kerbogha in 1098, which allowed the Franks to snatch victory at Antioch, seems to have been because of internal rivalries between the Muslim rulers of Mosul, Aleppo and Damascus, rather than any real crusader strength
- the German contingents on the Second Crusade were largely wiped out in Asia Minor because of a more united front from the Turks based here. This fundamentally weakened the forces available in the eventual attack on Damascus, as did the losses the French suffered on their route overland
- the main reason for the quick abandonment of the siege of Damascus in 1148 seems to have been the speed with which Nur al-Din responded to Unur of Damascus' appeal for help. The citizens of Damascus had put up spirited resistance to the Crusade initially and they risked being trapped by two united Muslim forces.

Arguments challenging the view that the success of the First Crusade and the failure of the Second Crusade were due to the situation in the Muslim Near East might include:

- good leadership can be seen on the First Crusade (e.g. Bohemond at Dorylaeum and Godfrey at Jerusalem) and this was notably lacking on the Second (e.g. Louis' lack of control and Conrad's failure to listen to advice)
- the First Crusade was highly motivated and focused on its goal of Jerusalem. This helped to keep up morale and determination despite setbacks (e.g. the Holy Lance and vision of Adhemar at Jerusalem). In contrast, the Second Crusade did not have a clear goal and there was much dispute over what it should do when it arrived in Outremer. This helped to lead to a much less united and focused force deciding to attack Damascus (e.g. Raymond of Poitiers refused to help)
- the First Crusade received a lot of outside assistance (e.g. the Byzantines supplied the army and sent troops, at least as far as Antioch), where the Second Crusade received only lukewarm support from Manuel. Some French sources even suggested that Manuel deliberately tried to sabotage the Crusade by getting his guides to send them into traps and by not providing enough ships at Attalia.

Students might conclude that the political situation in the Muslim Near East was key, as the sheer number of Muslims in the territories targeted by the Crusades meant that it would be impossible to fight them effectively if they were in any way united. This is why the Second Crusade had such a limited impact. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.