



A-level HISTORY 7042/1A

Component 1A The Age of the Crusades, c1071–1204

Mark scheme

June 2025

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 Examiner.

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Supporting Marking Guidance

A separate Supporting Marking Guidance document has been created for use in this series and any future series.

It has been written by the senior examining team. It applies to all A-level History options. The purpose of the guidance is to clarify key aspects of the mark scheme and further ensure consistency of approach across all options. The guidance does not reflect a change in the standard applied, but clarification and amplification of the standard. We hope that the guidance document will aid you in your understanding of how the standard should be applied and deepen your understanding of how the key aspects of the mark scheme work. The Supporting Marking Guidance should always be used in conjunction with the mark scheme, and any relevant examiner standardising and teacher training material.

Examiners can find the Supporting Marking Guidance on the associate extranet.

Teachers can find the Supporting Marking Guidance alongside the current mark scheme on Centre Services on results day. It will also be published with any future assessment materials on the public website.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the Papacy's reasons for the calling of the First Crusade.

[30 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:** 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**
- 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**

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.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretations/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the Papacy's main aim was to liberate the Eastern Church from Muslim/Turkish oppression
- Jerusalem was used to attract recruits but was not Urban's aim
- later evidence suggests that Jerusalem was a key aim, but this was in the light of later developments and creates a false picture
- Jerusalem made no sense as a military objective.

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

- since 1089, the Pope had been seeking to improve relations with the Byzantines, and this included attempts to repair the Great Schism and relations which had soured ever since. It makes sense that Urban wanted to aid the Greek Orthodox Christians, who were under threat from the Turks, especially according to the appeal Alexius I sent to Piacenza
- the Reforming Popes had been long interested in the concept of liberty – freeing the Church from oppression of any kind. Freeing the Byzantines from the threat posed by the Islamic world would have appealed to a reformer like Urban
- that Jerusalem was a recruiting tool only makes sense in the light of Pope Gregory's failed efforts to encourage a force to head east to help the Byzantines in 1074. Gregory's appeal encouraged Western Christians to help the Byzantines in the aftermath of the disaster at Manzikert, but did not attract much support. Urban's 1095 appeal was essentially the same, but the addition of Jerusalem into the message meant that it was wildly popular, as the Pope probably intended
- Jerusalem was certainly problematic as an objective – it was highly unlikely that an armed force would be able to make its way through Turkish territory in Anatolia and Syria all the way to Jerusalem with much success, given that the Turks had proven themselves to be very strong in battle against serious opponents, such as the Byzantines. It had also been in Muslim hands for 400 years, and so it seems odd that the Papacy would not have targeted it much sooner if it was seen as a viable option
- however, the interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that Urban's message was clearly viewed as a primarily religious one, focusing on Jerusalem from the outset, and that he would have risked the success of the whole mission if he had not been clear about the objectives from the start. Placing Adhemar of Le Puy in charge as Papal Legate seems to imply that the focus was spiritual rather than military.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- Jerusalem was the primary goal of the First Crusade as this was Christ's patrimony and it had been usurped by Muslims
- Urban was also interested in helping the Byzantines and uniting the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, but Jerusalem was paramount
- the primary evidence from chronicles and charters supports the view of Jerusalem's capture being a primary aim
- Urban presented his expedition as having a just cause – it was acceptable in the eyes of God.

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

- Jerusalem was viewed as the navel of the world and was depicted as such on medieval maps. This made it a very potent target for the head of the Latin Church, who would be horrified by the fact that it was not in Christian hands. There had been atrocities against Christians in the city in the 11th century, which the Pope would be very concerned about
- Urban was a member of the reform papacy and modelled himself on Pope Gregory VII, who had also encouraged the knights of Europe to fight on behalf of the interests of the Church and of Christ – recovering Christ's patrimony was viewed as a feudal obligation
- the success of Urban's appeal suggests that Jerusalem was paramount in the messaging, which is reflected in the accounts of eyewitnesses at Clermont, such as Robert the Monk. However, it is important to remember that all of the accounts of the Council of Clermont were written after 1099, and so had hindsight that Jerusalem did become the eventual goal of the expedition. We have no way of knowing exactly what Urban said at Clermont
- the first crusaders primarily viewed themselves as an armed pilgrimage and many non-combatants also participated. This would only have been the case if there was a palpable sense that this was a true pilgrimage to a proper pilgrimage destination, ie Jerusalem
- the interpretation can be challenged on the grounds that the Pope made no clear plans for what was to happen in the event that Jerusalem was successfully taken. This would surely have been the case if it was the primary objective. Equally, if Jerusalem was so important to Urban, then it seems odd that he did nothing about making an appeal regarding its capture until he had received the appeal from Alexius. By this point, he had been Pope for seven years and he seems to have said little about any desire to liberate the Eastern Church.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- the Crusade was a way of Urban dealing with a wide range of problems that he was facing
- a successful expedition, especially one which led to the capture of Jerusalem, would prove his superiority across the whole of Europe
- Urban realised that the chance of the First Crusade being a resounding success was unlikely and so he hoped for some modest gains only
- of primary concern was to further improve relations with Byzantium – any attempt to attack Jerusalem would probably come much later once closer ties with Constantinople had been developed.

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

- when Urban became Pope he was facing the problem of a German-backed anti-Pope (Clement III) – this was a longstanding issue from the time of Gregory VII. The reasons for this dispute, known as the Investiture Contest, were about who had the most power, Pope or Emperor – a successful Crusade would hopefully answer this question with some finality – especially in an era where God's approval was often looked for in the arena of military victories

- Urban had already been working to improve relations with Alexius Comnenus (eg rescinding the latter's excommunication) and so it makes sense that he would want to continue to improve these relations
- it is certainly the case that it would have been very difficult to conceive of a military conquest of Jerusalem without Byzantine assistance, given the terrain that would need to be covered and the scale of the Turkish threat that any invading force from the West would face. The Byzantines had been struggling to recapture any of their own territory and so it would have been highly improbable that an army from the West would have more success, given the issues they would have with transport and supplies over such a geographical area
- that Urban's initial aims were quite modest is implied by his failure to plan ahead for any eventual recapture of Jerusalem. Indeed, the crusaders adopted a very ad hoc approach when they began to capture territory in the East, suggesting that even the Papal representative on the Crusade had no prior instructions about what should be done
- the interpretation can be challenged as it seems that this would have been a very risky strategy if Urban was gambling his security in Europe on simply achieving slightly better relations with Constantinople. He had already improved relations greatly via diplomacy and it seems unlikely that Urban would want to risk those lay princes who did support him leaving Europe en masse at a time when his own security in Rome was questionable.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The rise of ideas of jihad was the main threat to Outremer's stability in the years 1119 to 1144.'

Assess the validity of 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 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 rise of ideas of jihad was the main threat to Outremer's stability in the years 1119 to 1144 might include:

- the Franks suffered a crushing defeat at the Battle of the Field of Blood in 1119. Il Ghazi had preachers address his troops before the battle, inspiring them. The consequence of this battle was that Antioch lost much of its territory and its ruler was killed, putting an end to the principality's expansionist policies (until this point they had posed a serious threat to Aleppo). The psychological effects of the defeat were very serious
- the Franks had long relied upon a disunited Islamic world, but rulers who promoted jihad could use this as a method of beginning to unite previously divided areas. By 1128, Zengi had gained control of Aleppo, adding it to the area of Mosul which he already ruled. This made him a significant threat to Outremer as he was close geographically and he had access to vast resources.
- Zengi promoted himself as a warrior of jihad and used this to amass greater forces behind him than the Franks had had to deal with before. He posed a significant military threat to them in the 1130s as he took control of key areas (eg Banyas and Homs) and he inflicted military defeats upon them (eg Fulk at Montferrand in 1137)
- Zengi besieged and captured Edessa in 1144, which was a catastrophe for the northern part of Outremer. He presented his victory as one of jihad against a Christian invader and this is supported by the fact that he only executed the Latin Christian prisoners. The Second Crusade was prompted as a result, which shows how serious the problem was viewed to be back in the West.

Arguments challenging the view that the rise of ideas of jihad was the main threat to Outremer's stability in the years 1119 to 1144 might include:

- whilst the Franks did begin to suffer bigger defeats in this period than they had been used to previously, jihad was not necessarily the issue. Men like Zengi and Il Ghazi saw the benefits of using jihad as a rallying cry, but they were not fully committed. Zengi, for example, spent much of the 1130s and early 1140s focusing upon Damascus, as he wanted to take control of this wealthy and fertile region. He often ignored the Franks, only fighting them if they got in the way of his expansionist plans
- Outremer's stability was also affected by internal factions and rivalry. Baldwin II faced down a potential coup in the 1120s and Fulk struggled to control his own nobles for a period in the 1130s. The rulers of Antioch and Tripoli often refused to cooperate with Jerusalem, which affected overall stability
- Outremer's stability was negatively affected by the Byzantines, especially in the latter part of this period. Emperor John had the ambition to take control of Antioch and he actually threatened an attack on the city on a couple of occasions. That Outremer could not effectively work with their closest natural ally would be unhelpful and strategically important targets such as Shaizar could not be successfully captured as a result
- Outremer's stability was negatively affected by their continued reliance upon the West in their attempts to expand beyond the relatively narrow coastal strip that they had secured by 1118. The Franks were capable of capturing key territories (eg Tyre) but this was usually with foreign naval support and a huge influx of armed pilgrims to bolster their armies. When they made serious efforts to capture big targets which were in the hinterland (eg Aleppo and Damascus) then they failed.

Students may argue that the rise of ideas of jihad marked a worrying turning point for the Franks of Outremer, as they had relied so heavily upon Muslim disunity in the successful establishment of the states. Zengi was a particular concern as he used jihad, alongside ruthless campaigning, to expand his sphere of influence and this often brought him into direct conflict with the Franks. In these conflicts they

were often defeated. Edessa was lost in 1144 which saw the northern buffer zone of Outremer wiped out and some have even argued that this was the beginning of the end. However, students might also successfully argue that, whilst jihad ideology was a worrying development, we should be careful of exaggerating the threat that men like Zengi actually posed. They could argue that the states actually had many of their own internal problems, which were a far bigger threat to their overall stability. Any valid answer should be rewarded, though answers should have balance and they should try to reflect the full time period within the question.

- 0 3** To what extent was Outremer reliant upon the Latin West for its survival in the years 1149 to 1174?

[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 Outremer was reliant upon the Latin West for its survival in the years 1149 to 1174 might include:

- by 1174, the Franks had failed to make any significant headway into Egypt since the capture of Ascalon in 1153. Indeed, any successes they had achieved (eg 1167 occupation of Alexandria) had been reversed, and the joint campaign on 1169 broke up with mutual recriminations on both sides, damaging the Byzantine alliance. Without Western assistance, their attempts to expand were found lacking
- the Kings of Jerusalem continued to send quite desperate appeals to the West for help, Amalric was very candid and explained that the Kingdom of Jerusalem had to expand southwards, or it would become even more isolated – as the failure to capture Damascus in 1148 had pushed the city into Nureddin's hands. They did not have enough manpower to survive a series of big defeats – as the Battle of Inab demonstrated – reinforcement from the West was going to be vital in the long term
- Outremer became very reliant upon the Military Orders (themselves reinforced by the West) as only they had the strength in depth and financial resources to maintain the huge network of increasingly defensive castles which were needed. The Military Orders were often very independent and difficult for the King of Jerusalem to control, and he was forced into this simply because he had few other viable options
- the Franks of Outremer were desperate to try and ensure that the West continued to send aid and they also needed to stabilise the kingdom. Amalric had only one male heir and he had leprosy, and so a husband was needed for his eldest daughter. Amalric preferred to look for a Western husband for her (William of Montferrat) which shows his clear desire to encourage the West to keep sending help and reinforcements.

Arguments challenging the view that Outremer was reliant upon the Latin West for its survival in the years 1149 to 1174 might include:

- in this period, Outremer had some very capable rulers who were able to focus upon expansion of the states, this suggests that they felt confident and were not on the backfoot, or overly worried about the limited Western support which they were receiving (eg Baldwin III captured Ascalon and Amalric pushed into Egypt as part of numerous campaigns)
- Outremer had developed methods for dealing with its manpower shortages. They had built castles across the states and had put many of these under the control of the Military Orders. The Orders had the skills and the resources to maintain and garrison these castles. Despite the fact that Nureddin posed quite a serious threat, he was never able to make any serious headway into the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and this is in part due to their defensive capabilities
- in this period, Outremer fostered much closer relations with Byzantium, under the rule of Emperor Manuel Comnenus. Manuel was keen to forge marriage alliances with the Franks of Outremer, and he proved a deterrent to Nureddin's ambitions in the area around Antioch. There were even some joint expeditions into Egypt between the Franks and the Byzantines. In 1171, Amalric travelled to Constantinople to strengthen relations further
- the Islamic world remained quite divided in this period, despite the problem of Nureddin. He was not invincible (as shown in 1163) and he faced many internal problems of his own. He was unable to launch a serious invasion into the Kingdom of Jerusalem due to lack of help from Saladin in Egypt. By 1174, it looked increasingly likely that the two Muslim rulers would end up fighting each other, rather than working together against the Franks
- the Western help which did arrive in this period was not always especially helpful. Thierry of Flanders' 1157 expedition, for example, achieved little due to arguments over what territory he would gain in the

event of military success. Appeals for help were largely ignored by the West, and there was definitely a drop in enthusiasm for crusading following the disastrous outcome of the Second Crusade.

Students might argue that following the disaster of the Second Crusade, help from the West was much less forthcoming than it had been in the past and Outremer had to learn to cope on its own. They effectively managed to do this by developing their defensive lines by using castles, often manned by the wealthy and committed Military Orders. That Amalric spent much of his reign campaigning aggressively into Egypt seems to indicate that Jerusalem felt strong enough to work to expand, they were not just desperately defending their current territory. However, they might also argue that this was all just evidence of the rulers doing their best to cope with an increasingly dire situation. Nureddin posed a serious threat in the north, and there was a serious concern that he might gain control of Egypt too. Appeals to the West continued to be made but tended to be largely ignored. Any supported answer should be rewarded, though answers should have balance and they should try to reflect the full time period within the question.

- 0 4** 'Poor Latin Christian leadership was the main reason why attempts to strengthen Outremer failed in the years 1177 to 1204.'

Assess the validity of 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 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 poor Latin Christian leadership was the main reason why attempts to strengthen Outremer failed in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:

- Baldwin IV suffered with leprosy and this meant that he was often incapable of ruling and required a regent. This led to factions developing through the 1170s and into the 1180s as different groups jockeyed for position. Baldwin did not help this division by changing his mind several times over who his regent would be – Raymond of Tripoli or Guy of Lusignan. The tensions which built here would have disastrous consequences in 1187 when Guy decided to march to meet Saladin at Tiberias instead of adopting a more sensible defensive strategy
- Baldwin IV struggled to control the ambitions of men like Reynald de Chatillon which would actually weaken Outremer. For example, it was Reynald's provocative behaviour which gave Saladin a *causus belli* in 1187. Equally, Baldwin failed to effectively harness any Western help which did arrive, such as Philip of Flanders in 1177 – he quarrelled with members of the Syrian nobility and went home by 1178
- the Third Crusade suffered under the divided leadership of Richard of England and Philip of France. The French king went home in 1191, with the Crusade unfinished, and Richard often struggled to control the French troops who remained behind
- the Fourth Crusade struggled as it was an expedition launched by Pope Innocent III, but, once it was underway, his legates completely failed to control the direction that the Crusade was taking (diversions to Zara and Constantinople). The leaders of the expedition, like Boniface of Montferrat and Doge Dandolo, had different ambitions to many of the rank and file crusaders and lesser lords, and this meant that many abandoned the expedition and made their own way to the Holy Land. Any such piecemeal arrivals would have only limited impact.

Arguments challenging the view that poor Latin Christian leadership was the main reason why attempts to strengthen Outremer failed in the years 1177 to 1204 might include:

- Baldwin IV was arguably a very capable ruler – evidenced by his victory at Mt Gisard and his vision in attempting the construction of Jacob's Ford in 1179. Although he provided strong leadership, he faced a far more serious threat in Saladin than any of his predecessors had faced and he was perhaps unlucky that he was not able to press the advantage of his victories of the 1170s due to his increasing ill-health
- ultimately, the Battle of Hattin was lost because Saladin had more manpower and strength in depth than the states of Outremer. The Military Orders were basically wiped out in this battle and there were very few knights left to defend the entire Kingdom of Jerusalem. This was a long-term problem which had long plagued the Crusader States and was not solely limited to the 1180s. However, what was different now was that Saladin had managed to achieve some measure of unity across Syria and Egypt and so he could capitalise upon his victory at Hattin in the immediate aftermath
- although the Third Crusade faced problems internally, it actually did help to strengthen Outremer. Key cities, like Acre, were recaptured and the weaknesses of Saladin's control over his army were highlighted. The 1192 Treaty of Jaffa put Outremer in a much stronger position than it had been since 1187
- the Fourth Crusade was derailed from its mission by the appeals from Alexius IV for assistance in Constantinople. He offered the crusaders a huge sum of money and a large number of reinforcements in return for their help and it was Byzantine internal divisions which meant that he could not fulfil these promises, rather than any fault of the crusading leaders. Indeed, the capture of

Constantinople and creation of the Latin Empire under Baldwin of Flanders arguably helped to strengthen Outremer as they now had a close Latin Christian ally.

Students might argue that the reason why attempts to strengthen Outremer in this period failed were the result of internal divisions and poor leadership. There are numerous examples which they could use to support both from within Outremer itself but also on the various crusading expeditions which came East in this period. However, they might also argue that, whilst such divisions were unhelpful, ultimately the issue was that Outremer was either doomed to fail from the outset or that the Muslim world was now too strong for Outremer to realistically survive. Any valid answer should be rewarded, though answers should have balance and they should try to reflect the full time period within the question.