



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **AS History 1041**

### **Unit 1: HIS1A**

### **The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination - June series*

**This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010**

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **Generic Introduction for AS**

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

#### **Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level**

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

---

**Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**
**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation****HIS1A: The Crusading Movement and the Latin East, 1095–1204****Question 1**

- 01** Explain why Byzantium was important in Pope Urban II's decision to call the First Crusade at Clermont in 1095. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Pope Urban II preached the First Crusade at Clermont on 27 November 1095. In a speech full of emotional rhetoric, he called up the image of Jerusalem and called for a war of liberation. He spoke also of the suffering of the Christians in the East. So the Crusade was to be a war of liberation, of fellow Christians and of a place – Jerusalem, a city sanctified by Christ, the focal point of the Christian faith, the site of the Holy Sepulchre and Christ's burial place. The Crusade then, would also be a pilgrimage and a spiritual penance for participants.

- When Pope Urban II preached at Clermont in November 1095, reports suggest he raised several issues. Because all known reports of Clermont were written after the capture of Jerusalem, they may have been coloured by that achievement, making his precise motives difficult to ascertain. Was Jerusalem really of primary importance, or just a means to an end?

- His calls to arms may have been motivated by a desire to aid Byzantium following the Emperor Alexius's request for help at the Council of Piacenza, or to reunite the Greek and Roman churches after the schism of 1054. Carl Erdmann suggested the real reason was to answer the request for help sent by the Byzantine Emperor. As the Seljuk Turks swept into the Near East in the mid-eleventh century they conquered Armenia, Syria and Palestine. In 1071 the Seljuk leader, Alp Arslan, won a decisive victory over Byzantium at the Battle of Manzikert. Anatolia was lost and a Seljuk capital established at Nicaea, a short distance from Constantinople. Antioch was lost by Byzantium in 1085. Expansion continued under Alp Arslan's son, Malikshah. From 1081 Alexius I rallied the Empire and in 1095 at the Council of Piacenza he requested help from the west against the Seljuks. However, by 1095 the Turkish threat to Byzantium was receding; was the Crusade, as Erdmann suggested, really designed to help the Greeks against their Seljuk enemies and facilitate a union with the Orthodox Church, so asserting papal supremacy?
- He may have wished to enhance papal authority in the west as part of the investiture contest with the German Emperor.
- His speeches stress the need to aid Eastern Christians; above all, the liberation of Jerusalem may have been uppermost in his mind. He may have wished to ensure easier access for pilgrims to the holy places.
- In some reports the Pope spoke of the feudal anarchy caused by knightly violence and Urban may have hoped to enhance the Peace of God movement and export such violence elsewhere.

### Question 1

**02** How important was Muslim disunity to the success of the First Crusade? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

#### Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

**L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

**L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying

historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

**L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

**L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

### Indicative content

In July 1099 the First Crusade succeeded in its objective and captured the holy city of Jerusalem. Muslim disunity was a key factor in this; the divisions within the Muslim world with the fragmentation of the Seldjuk Empire after 1092, and tensions between Turks and Arabs, Fatmids and Abbasids and Sunnis and Shias all aided the crusaders. To Sidney Painter the First Crusade succeeded because it took place at 'an excellent time'. Such was the disunity of the Muslims in the Near East that 'even a threat of this magnitude (the Crusade) could not produce a collective response'. (Riley-Smith).

- During the 1090s, in the aftermath of Malik-Shah's death, North Syria was a war zone, driven by civil war. Seljuk rule was weakened by internal dissension and Fatimid assaults. Fatimid armies re-captured Jerusalem as semi-independent Turkish warlords in cities such as Aleppo Damascus and Mosul fought for dominance, while local Arab rulers were hostile to both. Scott suggests, 'if the Muslims had maintained the unity Muhammad had preached, no crusade could possibly have succeeded'.
- At Doryaleum in 1097 the crusaders defeated Kilij Arshan, Seljuk sultan of Rum in Asia Minor whose military occupation lacked support from the local Muslim and Armenian population. The Fatimids actually offered the crusaders an alliance in 1098, dividing up Syria between themselves and the crusaders. The defeat of Kerbogha, Emir of Mosul, at Antioch was aided by the disunity of his army – 'an uneasy alliance' (Scott). The previous year the Emirs of Aleppo and Antioch had been at war against the Emir of Damascus. Local Arab dynasties were delighted by the collapse of Seljuk power – the Arab Emir of Shaizar offered guides and provisions on the journey to Jerusalem whilst the Emir of Azaz, in rebellion against his overlord in Aleppo, paid the crusaders an annual tribute. In 1099 the Emirs of Hama and Tripoli brought gifts to Jerusalem and promised not to attack the crusaders.
- The military leadership provided by key figures such as Bohemond of Taranto, Raymond of Toulouse and Adhemar of Le Puy was also of key importance. Bohemond was an able general whose aggressive tactics created the victories over Ridwan and Kerbogah, while Robert of Normandy was a vital military commander who rallied the troops at Dorylaeum and leading the charge at Ascalon. They led the crusading armies to victory in sieges at Nicaea, Antioch and Jerusalem and battles at Dorylaeum and Antioch. Adhemar played a key role in uniting the lay princes – as is shown by the near collapse of the crusade after his death at Antioch.

- Other factors which contributed to success include: the role of Byzantium also contributed to the success of the First Crusade – in particular the provision of guides and supplies during the crossing of Anatolia and at Antioch, where the Byzantine fleet proved vital, religious zeal – and the attraction of Jerusalem provided drive, determination and ideological cohesion which proved vital at Antioch in particular.

## Question 2

**03** Explain why Bernard of Clairvaux preached the Second Crusade. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

### Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

### Indicative content

Bernard undertook his preaching tour for three key reasons: to help preserve the Church's control over the Crusading movement, to halt the anti-Semitic activities of a rogue Cistercian monk, and to provide the knighthood of western Europe with the opportunity to gain salvation.

- In December 1144 the first crusader state, the county of Edessa, had fallen to the Muslims. The response by the papacy was a call to crusade through a Papal Bull, 'Quantum Praedecessores'. The spontaneous enthusiasm of 1095 was not shown in 1145–1146 and it took the preaching of Bernard to enthuse the knights of Europe to undertake another expedition to the east. He played a key role in rousing the French when he preached at Vezelay and his preaching at Speyer in December 1146 persuaded King Conrad of Germany to go. However, King Louis VII also voiced his own decision to undertake an armed expedition to the east. The preaching mission by Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux was launched then, as an attempt by the papacy to regain



control over the crusading movement. Bernard and Pope Eugenius III were close allies and both were Cistercians.

- Bernard's preaching was also important in halting a wave of anti-Semitic attacks on Jews in Rhineland. This followed the preaching activities of a rogue Cistercian monk called Rudolf. Good order and Bernard's prestige were at stake, but most importantly to Bernard the Jews were to remain unharmed, a living symbol of God's grace.
- The words of the 'honey-tongued preacher' did much to stir crusading fervour, but Bernard's own motives were also closely linked to the crusader privileges offered in the Papal Bull, in particular the indulgence offered to participants. To Bernard the Crusade was a work of penance, offering salvation to the men of the west. Indeed, the east was simply the means to an end, and that end was the spiritual reward of the indulgence: 'See with what skill he plans for your salvation and be amazed...O mighty soldier, O man of war, you now have a cause for which you can fight without endangering your soul'.

## Question 2

**04** How important was a lack of clear aims in explaining the failure of the Second Crusade? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

### Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

**L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

**L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

**L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

**L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary.

**22-24**

### Indicative content

The Second Crusade had advantages the crusaders of the 11th century were denied. It was led by kings and it had friendly states in Syria to serve as a bases and ports which would allow travel by sea. The Papal Bull issued by Eugenius III following the fall of Edessa should have led to further success for the crusading movement in the Latin East. Instead, Conrad III's Germans were wiped out almost to a man, whilst Louis VII managed no more than to besiege Damascus for four days before abandoning the crusade. By 1148 the Second Crusade had failed.

- A key factor in this was lack of unity of purpose and clear aims. Unlike the First Crusade with its focus on Jerusalem, the Second Crusade included expeditions in the Iberian Peninsula and against the Wends on the Baltic coast – it simply attempted too much. Edessa lacked the earlier resonance of Jerusalem in the First Crusade. The call was to save the Holy Land, generally defined. 'Crusade' meant different things to different groups – against Jews in Germany, pagans in Eastern Europe, Muslims in southern Spain and Muslims in Lisbon. People desired spiritual reward in return for service, not through a desire to rescue the East.
- Nevertheless, there were other reasons for the failure of the Crusade. For example, King Louis VII lacked a clear military objective since the Crusade was not undertaken to regain Edessa, but as a penitential pilgrimage after the events at Vitry. He provided weak leadership in the journey through Anatolia where he failed to maintain discipline, and then abandoned his army at Attalia. He made significant mistakes at Antioch where he refused to aid Raymond in attacking Aleppo. He can also be criticised for his role in the decision to attack Damascus in July 1148 and then shift the siege army. Although Louis remained in Jerusalem until Easter 1149 he attempted nothing more.
- Also, the role of Conrad of Germany and the lack of help from Byzantium, indeed, the French accused the Emperor Manuel of colluding with the Turks. The Crusade was an inconvenience and so the Emperor gave it little encouragement. Manuel had a peaceful alliance with the Sultan of Rum, which was threatened by the Crusade. Byzantium had to co-exist peacefully with the Turks once the crusaders had been and gone. As such it made more sense to aid the Turks than the Franks. Manuel had little incentive to aid the crusaders having seen how Baldwin and Bohemond refused to restore territory to Byzantium during the First Crusade. The actions of the crusaders in pillaging Greek towns led to Manuel refusing to provide supplies and ordering his troops to defend his people – Greeks ended up fighting fellow Christians, weakening the crusader force. He gave limited aid to the Germans (guides and troops) with the result that 90% of Conrad's force was wiped out near Dorylaeum. He failed to provide more than a couple of ships when Louis needed transport to Antioch. The bulk of Louis's army then travelled on by foot and was destroyed by the Turks. Manuel was more concerned with Byzantium's position within the region than the fate of the Latin states. His concern was the Normans in Sicily, to which end he had made an alliance with Germany, Venice and the Papacy. The Crusade shattered this proposal. In 1148 Manuel and Conrad renewed their vow to attack Sicily.

---

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why Guy of Lusignan was made King of Jerusalem in 1186. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)*

**Generic Mark Scheme**

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

**L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

**L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

**L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

**Indicative content**

Guy of Lusignan became king by right of marriage to the blood-line of the house of Jerusalem, following a prolonged succession crisis. He became king in 1186 even though many of Jerusalem's barons thought him unequal to the task of ruling the kingdom, and King Baldwin IV had attempted to exclude him from the succession. Guy became king because there was no more suitable candidate; also as a result of a court intrigue, a palace coup by a faction within the ruling elite, and also because that ruling elite was not prepared to be ruled by Sibyl as Queen regnant. Above all, he became king because of a clever ruse by a devoted wife.

- Baldwin IV, 'the leper king' died in 1185, leaving as his next of kin his sister Sibyl and her infant son by her deceased first husband, who was crowned as Baldwin V. Following the eight year old child's death, in August 1186 Sibyl was crowned as Queen of Jerusalem; she in turn then crowned her husband, Guy of Lusignan, who ruled as King consort. Guy was a newcomer to the east and had married Sibyl in 1180. As a vassal of King Baldwin IV's Angevin cousin, King Henry II, it was hoped Guy could strengthen links with the West.
- In 1184 Baldwin IV had attempted to marginalise Guy and weaken his claim to throne by arranging the succession in the kingdom's High Court, with the Pope and western rulers asked to decide between the competing claims of Sibyl and her younger sister Isabella. This should have happened after Baldwin V's death in August 1186.

- In summer 1186, after the child-king's death, Regent Raymond III and the general council met to discuss the succession, while in Jerusalem, Sibyl, Guy and their supporters, including patriarch Heraclius and Reynald of Chatillon, met for Baldwin V's funeral. Sibyl's supporters then chose her as Queen, on condition she divorce Guy. She agreed, if she was given a free choice of husband, and immediately she was crowned Sybil – she then selected and crowned Guy.

### Question 3

- 06** How important was Guy of Lusignan's weak leadership in explaining the collapse of the Crusader states in the years 1187 to 1188? *(24 marks)*

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

### Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

**L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

**L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

**L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

**L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

**L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

---

**Indicative content**

King Guy's decision to march his army from Saffuriyah and challenge Saladin at Tiberius, 26km away, was a key reason for Saladin's victory. Previously, Guy had used Febian tactics and avoided battle. However, King Guy's claim to the throne was tenuous. He was only king consort, though his wife, Sibyl, eldest daughter of Almeric. Guy feared for his power and these fears were finally realised when Saladin besieged Tiberius. He was persuaded, late at night on the eve of departure to Tiberius, to march to its aid, and seek battle in the field. Guy's weak kingship and the wider divisions and factions in the Crusader states may be seen as another reason for Saladin's success. Guy faced conflicting advice and pressures from characters such as Raymond of Tripoli (ironically the position of Raymond's wife Eschiva, under siege at Tiberius, was a 'chivalrous' reason for the march to defeat at Hattin). Guy was only persuaded to leave his safe base and march late on the night of 2 July. This must have constituted much confusion and hasty preparations, one of which was to take no water. It seems the precipitating factor in their defeat. They found themselves outside the safety of a stronghold, facing a 26km march in hot barren desert, with the hounding force of Saladin attacking them all the way.

The roles and responsibility of Reynald of Chatillon and Gerard de Rideford may be evaluated. General reference may be made to a variety of other issues relevant to collapse, the relative importance of internal rivalries between hawks and doves. Raymond versus Guy, compared to other reasons for collapse, e.g. growing Muslim unity in contrast to disunity amongst the Franks and the decline of Byzantium. The reign of Baldwin IV, 'the leper king', may be evaluated as another key example of internal rivalries and weak kingship, or the period after his death and the reign of Baldwin V may give focus for short-term weaknesses.