



---

AS

# History

The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

7041/1A The Crusader states and Outremer, c1071–1149

Mark scheme

---

7041

June 2016

---

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 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).

---

June 2016

**The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204**

**AS History 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 why the Jerusalem monarchy lost authority in the 1130s and 1140s? **[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 Barber’s argument, students may refer to the following:**

- Barber’s argument focuses on external issues being a cause of declining authority
- Barber asserts that after Baldwin II's reign there was shift towards increased baronial ambition and therefore possible resistance to royal authority
- Barber states that both the Italian city states and military orders more actively asserted their influence, in competition with the monarchy.

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

- the Italian city-states had extracted extensive privileges
- castles held by the military orders like Krak des Chevaliers and Gaza increased their power
- the military orders were still relatively small and had not yet developed the range of possessions that later made them central to the defence of Outremer.

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

- Bartlett’s argument focuses on internal problems within the monarchy itself
- Bartlett argues that Fulk was not an inspiring king and was resented by many Franks
- he claims that Melisende's attempts to dominate her son made matters worse and the clash led the monarchy to lose more authority.

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

- resistance to Fulk’s leadership nearly caused a civil war
- the unexpected death of Fulk caused further problems as Baldwin III was a child; thus creating a problem of authority
- the conflict with Hugh of Jaffa was resolved by 1134 in favour of the crown.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each extract, students may conclude that Extract A, with its focus on the wider range of competing challenges over a longer period of time is more compelling overall than the more narrowly focused failures of rulers in Extract B. However, only supported judgement should be credited.

---

**Section B**

**02** 'The Papacy was successful in strengthening its authority in the years 1073 to 1099.'

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 Papacy was successful in strengthening its authority in the years 1073 to 1099 might include:**

- Pope Gregory VII gained some secular support during the Investiture Contest and the Emperor submitted at Canossa
- By the mid-1090s Urban II had established his position in Rome and could undertake a European 'tour'
- there was a massive response to the call for a crusade at Clermont and papal leadership of the expedition was recognised through the role of Adhemar
- Jerusalem and Antioch were captured and Latin patriarchs installed

**Arguments challenging the view that the Papacy was successful in strengthening its authority in the years 1073 to 1099 might include:**

- The Emperor was able to expel Pope Gregory VII from Rome and install his own anti-Pope
- The religious focus of the crusade was diverted by some of the participants for material ends, especially after Adhemar's death
- The Pope failed to ensure that Jerusalem was run as a theocracy after 1099
- Relations with Byzantium remained poor

Good answers may conclude that the Papacy successfully strengthened its authority in this period, most notably as a result of the First Crusade's outcome, but that the quarrel with secular rulers such as the Holy Roman Emperor was not completely resolved. However, any supported judgement should be rewarded.

- 03** 'Poor relations between Byzantium and the crusader states of Outremer in the years 1099 to 1130 were the result of the disputes that had occurred on the First Crusade.'

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 poor relations between Byzantium and the crusader states of Outremer in the years 1099 to 1130 were the result of the disputes that had occurred on the First Crusade might include:**

- the nature of the capture of Nicaea in June 1097 led to resentment on the part of the crusaders who felt betrayed by Alexios
- the refusal of the crusaders to hand over Antioch to Byzantine control after its capture in June 1098 was a major obstacle to future relations between the crusader states and the empire
- the debate over Antioch worsened as a result of Bohemond's attacks in 1108

**Arguments challenging the view that the poor relations between Byzantium and the crusader states of Outremer in the years 1099 to 1130 were the result of the disputes that had occurred on the First Crusade might include:**

- the long term religious schism had not been healed, and was worsened by the expulsion of Greek Orthodox churchmen from Outremer
- Tancred made relations worse by deliberately attacking, and capturing, former Byzantine territories
- Alexius and John were unable to intervene in Outremer's politics as a result of their own internal problems and so this might explain the lack of co-operation
- In times of need Antioch looked to Jerusalem, rather than Byzantium for help, as a direct result of Byzantium's reluctance to get involved in this period

Good answers may conclude that, whilst there were serious religious differences beforehand, it was the First Crusade which seemed to worsen relations. The debate over ownership of Antioch especially was to rumble on for decades and caused some of the later disputes. However, any supported judgement should be rewarded.