

History

Answers and commentaries

A-level (7042)

1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071 — 1204

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Question 1	3
Question 2	9
Question 4	12

Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written and have not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

Question 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]

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**

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/1A – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

- 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**

Student responses

Response A

Extract A, adapted from the works of J Riley-Smith is very convincing in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120's and 1130's in that its main argument is that a lack of provisions and aid from the West meant that Outremer was weak, The extract states 'The Franks in the East regularly appealed to Europe for help and irregularly received it'. Whilst there were minor crusades from the West, these were sporadic and not massively helpful. The Venetian crusades of 1120-24 did capture the last Muslim coastal city of Tyre for the Kingdom of Jerusalem, but did nothing much to aid Antioch which had been affected by the Field of Blood in 1119, which was the reason the Venetian Crusade was called. The Damascus crusade of 1129 also ended in failure as it did not capture Damascus or aid the Outremer in any way. The ineffectiveness of these Crusades show clearly that there was a lack of aid which meant the already weak Outremer had no further effect, and makes this extract very convincing in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120s and 1130s. The extract also states that 'Effective authority depended on possession of castles or walled towns'. Baldwin II and Fulk both built castles in Outremer and utilised them. Castles such as Montreal, Scardalion and Bagluros aided Outremer and helped the Franks with their weak control of Outremer. Having the castles meant that Outremer could still work effectively despite its weakness. The convincingness of this extract is massively supported by this.

However there are some limitations to the convincingness of this extract. The extract states 'they were also unable to truly influence the course of political events in the Muslim world'. Riley-Smith is arguable exaggerated Outremer's weakness here. The Franks did have some influence over the Muslims. The Franks often made alliances with the Muslims. Damascus for example allied with Jerusalem against the house of Zengi. Overall, this extract is very convincing in relation to the condition of Outremer as it does show that Outremer's position as weak and unstable.

Extract B, adapted from Asbridge is quite convincing in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120's and 1130's in that its main argument is that bad luck caused instability rather than the actions of the Muslims. The extract states 'This was the result of misfortune rather than entrenched Muslim aggression'. The 1120s and 1130s were not filled with huge Muslim aggression towards the Franks. Whilst Zengi did become atabeg of Mosul and Aleppo in 1127 and 1128 and began to become hostile towards the Franks in the late 1130's, his actions were mostly against fellow Muslims, as shown in his attack on a Muslim garrison. The Franks didn't really have to worry too much about the Muslims. The extract also states 'as captivity and untimely death robbed the Franks of a series of leaders'. Baldwin II for example was captured by Belek and so was Joscelin II. BII also died in 1131, leaving his daughter Melisende to rule with Fulk. This instability would have caused the condition of Outremer to be quite unstable. The extract is made very convincing by this as changing of leader always creates disturbances in a state.

However, there are some limitations to the convincingness of this extract. The extract states that 'the crusader states were plagued by instability'. Asbridge is perhaps overexaggerating here. Outremer remained quite stable despite the sudden death of Baldwin II and the capture

of the likes of Joscelin. To say the crusader states were 'plagued by instabilities' shows that Outremer was very weak when in fact this wasn't the case. No major territories were taken by the Muslims, nor were there any major battles overall, the extract is still quite convincing as bad luck was perhaps the cause of untimely death and instability in Outremer rather than an active offensive from the Muslims.

Extract C from Tibble has lots of convincingness in reaction to the condition of Outremer in the 1120s and 1130s in that its main argument is that lack of manpower meant that Outremer could not expand further and that capturing more territory from the Muslims was very difficult. The extract states 'The manpower issue was critical'. After the first crusade and capture of Jerusalem in 1099, most of the soldiers and men returned home. After that, battles such as Hattin in 1187 and the Field of Blood in 1187 would have further depleted Frankish manpower. Even with pilgrims coming to Outremer, they would have to return. Outremer had massive borders meaning more manpower would have been diverted to protect them, meaning there wasn't enough manpower to expand Outremer and attack any major Muslim population centre. The extract further states 'being far from their fleets which provided experienced siege engineers and logistical support'. The support of the Italian City states (Pisa, Verona, Venice) were invaluable to the Franks when capturing the coast, for example Acre in 1187 and Tyre in 1187. The Franks did not have the same support in the mainland and couldn't rely on ships sailing down with them. This further exasperated the lack of manpower as it could be clearly seen without the help of the Italian city-states, This massively supports the convincingness of the account as Outremer did not have enough people to help gain new territory from Muslims.

However, the extract does have some limitations to the main argument. Despite the lack of manpower meaning the Franks couldn't gain more territories they were still able to defend territories. The extract states 'The tactical reality was that Frankish armies, once inland, were outnumbered, surrounded and isolated in enemy territory'. Zengi had to attack Tripoli twice, once in 1131 and then in 1137 to gain anything from Tripoli means the Franks were able to hold off against the enemy. Furthermore, via alliances with cities like Damascus, the Franks had some sort of control over Muslim population centres. The capture of castles such as Baghdad from the assassins is also an example of a Frankish victory despite the lack of manpower. Overall, extract C has lots of convincingness in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120s and 1130s as there really was a massive issue with manpower.

This is a Level 5 response

The candidate has shown clear understanding of the arguments used within the extracts, and they have demonstrated this by explaining the overall main argument of each, as well as a number of the sub-arguments. They have used the extracts holistically, rather than taking a line-by-line approach. The candidate has used their strong subject knowledge to support and develop the arguments, and their assessment of any limitations is nuanced and convincingly explained (how they have tackled Extract A is a good example of this). The overall evaluation reached is convincing.

Response B

Extract A is a convincing argument in relation to the condition of Outremer during the given time period. This is due to the fact it mentions that the Franks had managed to alienate the Byzantine Empire. After the first crusade there was tension with the Byzantine Empire which lasts until after the 4th crusade, the tensions can be put largely down to Bohemond who fell out with Alexios over the city of Antioch and who was in their right to possess it. Bohemond eventually led an expedition against Alexios and failed, Bohemond agreed Alexios could have Antioch under the Treaty of Devol but Tancred who was now in possession of Antioch refused. This tension continued into the 1130's between Raymond and Emperor John. In 1137 John moved against Antioch and Raymond submitted against John's considerable force. They negotiated that Raymond would hold Antioch until they could find an alternative equal area for Raymond to keep. This tension and ongoing disagreement with the Byzantines certainly left Outremer 'isolated'. This was not just because they lacked the support of the Byzantines but also due to its geographical position. The Byzantine Empire was stuck in between the crusader states and the west so any support from the west was made harder to come by.

Extract A is also convincing as it highlights how the ideas of Jihad 'began to spread and come to surface in Aleppo in the 1120's.' This is a good point to make as Zengi became governor of Aleppo in 1127. Zengi was the first Muslim leader to unite the Muslims under the ideas of Jihad, he'd incorporate the ideas not just into his fighting but into the way he acted once he took a city, he would camp outside his new cities walls, He also made sure his soldiers wives were very well looked after while they were away.

I think that Extract A is a very convincing extract for a historian to look at. It gives good insight to what the state of Outremer was like and makes good points on how the Franks had alienated the Byzantines and how the ideas of Jihad were beginning to spread under Zengi.

Extract B is convincing as an argument for the condition of Outremer in the 1120's and 1130's as it states how the battle of the field of Blood proved to cause unfounded alarm. You can certainly argue that this is the case as the consequences were limited, mostly down to the way Baldwin II mopped the mess up. He nominated men of his own to marry the widows of the nobles to provide stability to the area and travelled a further 6 times, during his 13 years as leader, to Antioch. Arguments can also be made against this comment though. You can argue that the alarm caused by the Field of Blood was not unfounded and that there was a cause for concern. The Field of Blood was where the seeds of Jihad were sown and should have been a big warning for the crusader states of what was coming.

Another reason why the extract labelled B was convincing is that it mentions how the Franks often looked to 'secure eligible European husbands' which is the case with Fulk. Baldwin looked to the west for a husband for his eldest daughter Melisende and Fulk responded positively. Fulk also came on a crusade in 1129, although it failed he still had considerable wealth which backs up the comment in Extract B: 'this helped to bring new wealth'. Fulk did also help to calm 'political turbulence', 3 castles were built under him: Bethgiblin, Blanchegard and Ibelin which defend against the muslim part of Ascalon which helped to calm political worries by minimising the threat from the muslims.

I think that Extract B is convincing and provides a lot of good arguments, especially linking to European husbands but I do think that you can certainly argue against Field of blood having caused unfounded alarm as this was where the seeds for Jihad were sown and should have been a warning to the Franks in my opinion.

Extract C is convincing as an argument in relation to the condition of Outremer in the 1120's and 1130's as it highlights how the capture of targets inland was often far too ambitious and ended in failure, it highlights how this was only a problem away from the coast which I find valuable. Taking coastal towns and cities was easier for the Franks as they often had the support of the Italian maritime states, for example when Tyre was taken in 1124. The Italian maritimes states were of huge help to the crusader states and when they helped they were heavily awarded by the Franks with things like tax exemptions. Only being able to take towns and cities that were coastal isn't as bad as you would think, however, controlling the ports meant that trade and pilgrimage flowed, the crusaders were able to gain military support from the coast and by controlling the ports it stopped the muslims from having ports in order to store their ships.

Extract B can be seen as unconvincing due to Baldwin II. He was a very able military campaigner and went on 9 campaigns in 13 years in power. He had successes in A'zaz then Zerdona before succeeding in Damascus then Ascalon then Damascus again between May 1125 and January 1126. In 1126 he also was successful in Raphania in Egypt so this shows that not all in land expeditions were failure and there were some successes at capturing land away from the coast.

Overall I think that Extract C has convincing points that are valuable arguments in relation to the state/condition of outremer in the 1120's and 1130's but I also think that the argument does have limitations as not all in land attempts to take targets were failure.

This is a Level 3 response

The candidate shows an understanding of the context to the question and has evaluated each of the extracts. However, they have a tendency to select a couple of sub-arguments from each extract and interrogate them, rather than thinking holistically about the overall argument presented. For example, Extract A only briefly mentions issues with the Byzantines, but the candidate chooses to spend a lot of time discussing this element and frequently strays from the relevant time period. There is an overall imbalance in the quality of the analysis being offered.

Question 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]

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**

Student responses

Response A

Although it could be argued that spiritual motivations were an important part of why people took the cross from 1096 to 1146, economic motivations were ultimately the main cause.

One such example of someone taking the cross is Bohemond I. This is because when he captured Antioch in 1097, he essentially stopped crusading and refused to give the city back to the Byzantines, which he had promised to do. This is a clear example of someone coming on the crusade purely for economic gain, as he would become a wealthy man as ruler of Antioch. It also shows that he clearly did not come for purely pious reasons as he lied and broke his promise to the Byzantines as well as never even making it to Jerusalem. It can also be seen why any person would want to come on either the first or second crusade from 1096 to 1146. Europe as a whole had been ravaged by famine and plague for decades before the First Crusade and leading up to the Second Crusade, whereas Outremer was renowned for its riches and was often called 'The land of Milk and Honey', so it is clear that a large number of those who took the cross from 1096 to 1146 may have been motivated purely by potential economic gain and simply wanted to escape the poor, famine ravaged West to the riches of the East. It can also be argued that the call for the Second Crusade, Quantum Predacosseres, wasn't for religious reasons at all. This is because the main cause for the 2nd Crusade was one fall of Edessa in December 1144, however, Edessa held little to no religious importance in Christianity. Quantum Predacores also had no clear goal as the important Holy Sites were all in Frankish hands, therefore it could be argued that the Second Crusade was not for religious reasons at all and may have been simply caused due to the potential economic gain of recapturing Edessa.

Although the main motivation to those taking the cross from 1096 to 1146 was potential economic gain, religious motivation was clearly a huge factor for some who took the cross. For example, those who joined the Knights Templar when it was formed in the 1120's and the Hospitallers in the 1140's were clearly on the Crusade for religious reasons as they took orders directly from the Pope and their goal was to help other piously motivated pilgrims either by protecting or healing them. Therefore clearly showing religious motivation was also an important motivation for those who took the cross from 1096 to 1146. Another clear example of those who were motivated by religion were the people who came on the people's crusade in November 1095. Although they were destroyed in 1096 by Muslim forces, they were clearly motivated by religion as their leader, Peter the Hermit refused to wait for the other crusaders believing God would protect him and his followers. Although this ultimately led to their demise, it is a clear example of religious motivation and spiritual reward being an important factor to those who took the cross from 1096 to 1146.

Overall, although economic gain was then main motivation to those who took the cross from 1096 to 1146, spiritual reward and religious motivation was also a huge contributing factor.

This is a Level 3 response

The candidate shows an understanding of what the question is asking them to debate; there is some balance and an attempt to deal with the date range in the question. The examples used are relevant and accurate but tend to be rather generalist and some statements are assertive. Some points are quite unconvincing, such as the one about the Military Orders. They do keep focused and reach a decisive answer at the end, however, this is not fully substantiated by the main body of the essay.

Question 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]

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**

Student responses

Response A

Relations between Byzantium and Latin Christians had been severely strained ever since the Great Schism of 1054, but also took a downwards spiral during and after the Second Crusade. The Latin West didn't want Byzantium to become stronger, and Byzantium simply wanted to survive, believing that this was best achieved through independence and isolation. However, the diversion to Constantinople on the Fourth Crusade was more of a short-term decision and was in fact the result of a Greek, Prince Alexios Asking for help. Innocent III never wanted the Fourth Crusade to get to Constantinople but the situation was forced by contemporary events, not greater design.

Relations between east and west had deteriorated on the Second Crusade. Emperor Manuel wanted nothing to do with Louis and Conrad, forcing them on their way as quickly as possible without any help. In return, Louis wanted nothing to do with Manuel, resulting in him refusing to aid Raymond of Poitiers in taking Aleppo. This was because Raymond was Manuel's vassal, and Louis didn't want to indirectly strengthen Manuel. Clearly, relations were poor, and the participants of the Fourth Crusade were descendants of the Second Crusaders. Consequently, they would have borne a grudge, so may have encouraged the diversion to Constantinople in 1203. The Venetians too, bore a grudge against Byzantium. In 1171, Manuel had imprisoned or expelled the Venetians which was a grave insult and boiled over into the war. Similarly in 1182, Andronikos Komnenos had rode a wave of anti-Latin sentiment into power and encouraged the massacre of the Genoese and Venetian quarters. This too was a direct challenge to the West and the Venetians especially would have been motivated by a desire for revenge against Byzantium. They were further justified in taking action against Constantinople in 1204, as in Andronikos had created an alliance with Saladin, and this treaty had continued under the successive Byzantine emperors and al-Adil, Saladin's son. Clearly, Byzantium's policy of self-preservation had resulted in hostility to the West, justifying the diversion to Constantinople in 1204.

Furthermore divisions between the West and Byzantium continued into the reigns of the Angel: Isaac II had initially attempted to reserve Byzantine isolation since the West had cut ties due to Byzantium's loss of prestige at Myriokephalon in 1176 and the massacres of Andronikos in 1182. This was achieved through marriage alliances, with Isaac himself marrying the daughter of King Béla III of Hungary, and his sister marrying Conrad of Montferrat. However Isaac's desire to maintain the alliance with Saladin, as well as his suspicion of Barbarossa's force prompted him to reverse his authorisation of safe passage in 1190. This proved that the Byzantines couldn't be trusted, even when the west was on Crusade allowing for the attack on Constantinople in 1204 when Alexios IV betrayed them by refusing to pay what he owed. Relations also suffered under Alexios IV,, who like his brother, was entirely ineffectual and ran the empire into the ground. Seeing such an incompetent Emperor, the Fourth Crusaders decided to overthrow him in favour of Alexios IV who had promised to heal the Great Schism of 1054 and join them on their Crusade to Egypt. As a result, the Fourth Crusades were, at least partially, motivated by the desire to heal divisions between Byzantium and Latin Christendom.

However, Byzantium and Latin Christians had shared good relations under Manuel in 1150s and 1160s. Manuel was personally fond of Baldwin III as the pair shared a hatred of Reynold of Châtillon who had raided Cyprus in 1156. The House of Jerusalem was joined to the Komnenos through marriage, with Baldwin, and then Amalric, being married to Manuel's nieces. Manuel even supported Amalric, being married to Manuel's nieces. Manuel even supported Amalric's Egyptian campaigns in 1169 although they were defeated at Damietta. Clearly, relations were surprisingly strong, especially after Manuel received Amalric's submission in 1170. As a result, Outremer had no major desire to see the Fourth Crusade go to Constantinople, even after relations declined after Myriokephalon in 1176 and Manuel's death in 1180. This implies that the Sac of Constantinople was instead motivated by short-term events rather than divisions in Christendom since the Second Crusade.

One such motivation was necessity. At the Treaty of Venice 1201, Venice was promised 85,000 silver marks in return for transporting and supplying 33,500 Crusaders. However, Innocent III's *Post Miserabile* allowed for people to contribute funds to the Crusade, rather than fighting. This along with a slow muster and unrecognised departure, meant that only 12,000 Crusaders arrived in Venice and were 35,000 marks short. Consequently, Egypt, the Crusade's target, was out of the question, so Dandolo had the Crusade diverted to Zara in 1202 to recover part of the debt. When this wasn't enough, the Crusaders were stuck. Consequently, they were incredibly receptive to Prince Alexio's offer of 200,000 marks, along with support for the Crusade, if he was elevated to the throne in Constantinople. Such a diversion hadn't been planned, but the Fourth Crusaders had no choice as they didn't have enough provisions or funding to carry on to Egypt or return home. As a result, the diversion to Constantinople was a spur of the moment decision rather than the culmination of decades of Byzantine-Latin division.

Furthermore, the Fourth Crusade's diversion to Constantinople was more likely driven by Byzantium's internal divisions rather than its dreadful relations with the West. The rise of the Angeloi greatly weakened Byzantium as Isaac II lacked military power, so had to rely on mercenaries. This resulted in repeated losses to the Bulgarians in the 1190's, greatly weakening Byzantium. Alexios III's coup in 1195 was also detrimental as he was just as incompetent as Isaac. He ruined the already fragile economy by trying to buy the loyalty of his nobles, which failed, as well as wasting money on art whilst his empire rotted around him. Consequently, Constantinople was vulnerable and like easy pickings to the Crusaders. They were given green light to attack by supporting Prince Alexios against his uncle, and were further justified in their sack of the city in April 1204 after Alexios V's coup. Clearly, Byzantium brought such an attack upon itself due to its own internal strife, not because of its previous actions against the West. They just added an excuse.

Overall, whilst there were deep divisions between Byzantium and Latin Christians since the Second Crusade, they did not result in the Fourth Crusade, they did not result in the Fourth Crusade's diversion to Constantinople. Whilst the Franks and Venetians probably did bear a grudge against Byzantium, they merely took advantage of Byzantium's internal strife. They, like Innocent III, had never intended to go anywhere other than Egypt, but found themselves victims of circumstance. Ultimately, they were lured to Constantinople by Prince Alexios, a

Greek, in the hope of recovering from their recently acquired debts, not to avenge decades-old disputes.

This is a Level 5 response

This is a wide-ranging answer, which shows a clear understanding of the long and short-term causes of the diversion to Constantinople. When discussing the long-term causes, the student has made direct analytical links to the events of 1203/4, as opposed to just narrating events. There is good balance and a sustained line of argument: the answer is stated in the introduction and the essay is logically organised, arguing towards a conclusion which is convincingly supported and well-explained. The supporting detail is impressive in its scope and precision, and there is clear awareness of key concepts.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/7042

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

