



A-level HISTORY 7042/1A

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 A / M S

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.

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 © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 situation in Outremer by 1187.

[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 interpretation/arguments/views.

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

- Outremer was never viable and was completely reliant upon external factors to stay alive: without these it would crumble
- Western help was essential for survival, but tensions between Western Christians and settlers grew over how to approach the issues of Islamic opposition and Byzantine neighbours
- Outremer was reliant upon Muslim disunity continuing as they were in the midst of enemy territory
- the failure of the Second Crusade just made the whole situation worse for Outremer.

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

- Outremer had benefited from an extremely fragmented Muslim Near East in its early years and, once Nureddin and Saladin began to achieve some level of unity through their messages of jihad, it became more difficult for Outremer to resist
- Western help was much more fragmented in the aftermath of the Second Crusade and desperate appeals for help in the 1160s, 70s and 80s failed to spark any large-scale response
- when Western help did arrive, there were often arguments between the Westerners and the local nobility. This was especially problematic in the 1180s when the factionalism in the Kingdom of Jerusalem was partly fuelled by differences of opinion about how the threat of Saladin should be handled. This then led to nothing being done and thus he was allowed to become very powerful
- the interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that Outremer was actually perfectly viable. Key long-term issues had been addressed through the development of the Military Orders and the building of castles for defence
- the interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that it suggests that the Muslim world was 'united' under Saladin. In reality, his control was much more fragile, as events during the Third Crusade would prove.

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

- the reasons for the crisis in Outremer were because of Muslim strength rather than Christian weakness
- the Kingdom of Jerusalem was militarily very strong in 1187, despite factional infighting
- Saladin was able to defeat the Christians due to greater manpower and resources
- Saladin's takeover of Damascus in 1174 was a critical turning point.

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

- King Guy was able to put a huge army of around 18 000 men into the field at Hattin in 1187. This was not much smaller than Saladin's army and the Franks had shown numerous times that they could win in pitched battles where they were numerically inferior
- whilst there had been much factionalism in the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the 1180s, these disagreements had largely been put to one side by the time of the critical battle – if Saladin had been defeated then it would have been difficult for him to overrun the Crusader States in the aftermath. Arguably, Saladin's tactics were better than the Franks in July 1187
- Saladin had much strength in depth thanks to the fact that he directly controlled Egypt, Damascus and Aleppo and was overlord of Mosul. This meant that he could fight on several fronts at once, and resupply his armies easily. The Franks did not have this luxury and had to empty their castles and cities of defenders to put a huge army into the field – they could not afford to lose the Battle of Hattin, where Saladin would have been able to recover if he had
- the interpretation could be challenged as it downplays the role of factionalism. The role of Raymond of Tripoli in allowing Saladin into the Kingdom in the first place, as well as King Guy's flawed decision making in July 1187, were key in securing a victory for Saladin
- 1174 as a turning point could be questioned. It would take Saladin many years of conflict with his fellow-Muslims before he was in a position to threaten Jerusalem directly. In 1179, King Baldwin IV had even felt secure enough to build a castle which directly threatened Damascus, and Saladin himself suffered a crushing defeat in 1177.

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

- factional infighting within the Kingdom of Jerusalem was the main reason for collapse – the Franks should have won at Hattin
- there had been instability within the court before Baldwin IV's reign and the situation deteriorated significantly after 1180
- Saladin's control over the Muslim world was more ephemeral than it appears
- the Franks were quite capable of defeating Saladin in battle, as they had done in the past.

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

- King Amalric had faced problems with factionalism during his reign (eg role of the High Court in the annulment of his marriage to Agnes and the reasons why joint attacks on Egypt with the Byzantines failed). In Baldwin IV's reign, this became more problematic as he had leprosy and so required regents. This became even more complicated after 1180 as the regency flipped between Guy of Lusignan (favoured a more aggressive approach to Saladin) and Raymond of Tripoli (tended to focus on diplomacy)
- tensions and lack of trust between Guy and Raymond led to a series of events including Raymond and then Guy being stripped of the regency and, eventually a coup being staged by Guy and Sybilla in 1186. Guy was thus in no mood to listen to Raymond's (probably sensible) advice about whether to fight Saladin at Hattin
- despite presenting himself as true heir to Nureddin and a jihadi warrior, Saladin spent much of his time between 1169 and 1186 fighting his fellow Muslims. He often forged treaties with the Franks in order to allow him to concentrate upon this. He was under great pressure to deliver a serious blow to Outremer by 1186–7 and, it is a reasonable assumption that he would have struggled to keep his huge army together if the Franks had refused to fight (as they had done successfully in 1183)
- the interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that Baldwin IV has been perceived as a good King of Jerusalem. During his reign Saladin faced defeats (1177, 1182) and was not able to make

much progress against Jerusalem on the occasions that he tried (eg 1183). Perhaps the key turning point was actually 1186 and the death of Baldwin V as it was this that led to Guy's coup

- the interpretation could be challenged because of its suggestion that, if ignored, Saladin might have just gone away as a threat. Saladin needed to deliver a critical blow to the Crusader States by this point and it is possible that he would have been able to keep up the pressure this time – something he couldn't do in 1183 as he was still distracted by Aleppo/Mosul – this situation had been resolved by 1186.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Western interventions in the Near East were primarily a response to Byzantium's requests for help in the years 1071 to 1099.'

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 Western interventions in the Near East were primarily a response to Byzantium's requests for help in the years 1071 to 1099 might include:

- Pope Urban, when launching his expedition at Clermont, spoke extensively about the need to help fellow Christians in the East. The speech he delivered at Clermont was in 1095 – the same year that he had received a letter from Alexius Comnenus asking for Western help against the Turks
- in 1074, Pope Gregory VII tried to organise a Papal army to go to the aid of the Byzantines after the disaster at Manzikert in 1071
- Alexius was quite reliant upon Western help from the start of his reign; the Seljuk take-over of much of Anatolia had negatively affected his ability to raise troops. For example, it was help from the Count of Flanders which helped him to deal with the Pecheneg threat in 1091. That the Count of Flanders was a key participant in Urban's crusade might suggest that there was a desire to help
- when the First Crusaders arrived in Constantinople, they were mostly happy to agree to return any former Byzantine lands that they might capture to the Emperor. They were keen to see Alexius directing them, and even requested that he take personal charge of the Crusade in 1098
- in 1095, the Seljuk world was quite divided thanks to the death of Malik Shah, and it is possible that the West wanted to help Alexius to regain territory whilst his opponents were much weakened.

Arguments challenging the view that Western interventions in the Near East were primarily a response to Byzantium's requests for help in the years 1071 to 1099 might include:

- the timing of the First Crusade, and any significant Western interventions, came over 20 years after the disastrous defeat at Manzikert. This suggests that Western interventions had some broader motive, such as a desire to capture Jerusalem
- Pope Urban did nothing about the request for help from Alexius between receiving it in March and preaching in November. Again, this suggests that the rhetoric about helping the Eastern Christians was just a cover for wider ambitions – such as a desire to prove Papal supremacy over the Orthodox Church
- Pope Gregory's requests for help for the Byzantines in the 1070s were ineffective, and Urban's preaching in 1095 was largely paraphrased by popular preachers – the focus seems to have been more on the recapture of Jerusalem and the crusade indulgence, than the need to help Constantinople
- the participants on the Crusade were suspicious of the Byzantines from the outset – and this intensified after Antioch. The failure to return Antioch suggests that, at least some of, the participants had more material motives.

Students may argue that the requests for help from Byzantium were merely a catalyst; for example, allowing Urban to pursue other objectives to do with Papal supremacy. Equally, participants on the First Crusade were probably more focused on their own salvation than a desire to help Alexius. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded. Good answers will be aware that there were discussions about Western interventions in the 1070s and will provide some supporting evidence which addresses the breadth elements of the question.

0 3 To what extent was Outremer weaker in 1149 than it had been in the 1120s?

[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 weaker in 1149 than it had been in the 1120s might include:

- the failure of the Second Crusade to take Damascus was extremely damaging – it made the possibility of reviving the earlier alliance between Jerusalem and Damascus much more remote and also made the Damascene citizens more susceptible to the jihad propaganda of Nureddin
- Prince Raymond of Antioch, a strong and capable leader, was killed in 1149 at the Battle of Inab, his army was annihilated and much of Antioch's territory east of the Orontes River was now in the hands of Nureddin
- relations with the West were damaged during the Second Crusade, as the Westerners blamed the Syrian Franks for the failures at Damascus. During the history of Outremer, reinforcements from the West had been critical in the establishment and extension of the Crusader States, and this help would be much less forthcoming now
- Nureddin was able to capitalise upon Christian disunity – the speed with which he had set off to support Damascus in 1148 helped to prove his claims that he was a true warrior of jihad. The Franks had never before faced a leader like Nureddin (even Zengi had been quite distracted with his affairs in Mesopotamia) and this was at a time where their own invincibility in battle was being questioned
- by 1149, Baldwin III was beginning to chafe at not being allowed to rule independently of his mother Melisende. A further distraction now came in the fact that he needed to bolster Antioch and that the county of Edessa was virtually destroyed and not worth saving. This loss removed an important buffer zone which the Crusader States had relied upon in the past.

Arguments challenging the view that Outremer was weaker in 1149 than it had been in the 1120s might include:

- in 1119, Antioch had suffered a huge defeat at the Field of Blood, its ruler had been killed, army wiped out and lands lost. However, this had not led to a collapse of the Principality thanks to the actions of Baldwin II (eg military victory over Il-Ghazi, development of the Knights Templar) and so there is no reason to think that this would be the case in 1149 either
- in the 1120s and 1130s, the Military Orders had developed rapidly and were now an integral part of the defences of Outremer. Since 1136 onwards, they had been given control of key castles (eg Beth Gibelin and Krak des Chevaliers) and effectively acted as a standing army. This all meant that help from the West was less necessary than it had been in the early years
- the Fatimids posed very little threat to Outremer by 1149, where they had still been a cause for concern in 1120. The capture of Tyre in 1124 had meant that the Egyptian fleet had nowhere along the Palestinian or Syrian coast to resupply once they had left Ascalon. Fulk's strategy of building castles near to Ascalon also helped to mitigate the threat from any raids on Jerusalem from this direction
- in 1149, Baldwin III was a young and vigorous ruler and he ruled alongside his mother Melisende. She was very capable, had the support of many of the Syrian nobles, but also the indigenous population thanks to her Armenian heritage
- the death of Zengi in 1146 meant that the most immediate threat to Outremer's security was removed. His combined territories of Aleppo and Mosul were split amongst his sons, and, in 1149, Nureddin had much work to do to persuade various disparate Muslim groups to ally underneath his banner. This caused him to be rather distracted from fighting the Franks.

Students might argue that, whilst the aftermath of the Second Crusade looked quite disastrous for Outremer, we must be careful of allowing hindsight to intrude upon our evaluation of its strengths and

weaknesses in 1149. In reality, Outremer was, in many ways in a similar, or maybe even stronger position than it had been in the 1120s. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded. Stronger students will be aware that 'Outremer' and the 'Kingdom of Jerusalem' are not the same thing.

0 4 'In the years 1146 to 1174, Nureddin was motivated more by personal ambition than by his religious beliefs.'

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 in the years 1146 to 1174, Nureddin was motivated more by personal ambition than by his religious beliefs might include:

- following his defeat of Prince Raymond at Inab in 1149, Nureddin failed to capitalise upon Antioch's weakness and accepted a bribe to leave the city alone, despite a lack of defenders. It seems as if he was more focused upon opening the route to Damascus than truly eliminating the Franks
- Nureddin used some force to target the city of Damascus – a city of fellow Muslims who he had previously allied with against the Second Crusade. He blockaded the city and refused to allow supplies in until he had been invited in to take control. The Damascene leaders were keen to ally with the Franks against him
- throughout the 1150s, he made treaties with the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and he failed to capitalise upon the untimely death of Baldwin III in 1163
- Nureddin focused many of his resources into Egypt in the late 1160s and early 1170s. Initially he was responding to a request for help from the Shi'ite Shawar – suggesting that Nureddin's religious conviction was not necessarily driving his politics. The material advantages that taking Egypt would bring are clear as it was extremely wealthy
- at the time of his death, it looked very likely that Nureddin was about to invade Egypt to start a war with his fellow Sunni Saladin.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1146 to 1174, Nureddin was motivated more by personal ambition than by his religious beliefs might include:

- Nureddin committed himself to an austere lifestyle as a devout Muslim, and he engaged in many building projects focused around his faith – he established numerous hospitals, mosques and madrasas
- Nureddin was the first of the Turkish leaders to focus on Jerusalem specifically as a target, due to its importance in the Islamic tradition. He even had a minbar constructed which he planned to place in the al-Aqsa mosque. It was Saladin's refusal to work with Nureddin in the 1170s which prevented a full-scale invasion of the Kingdom from taking place
- Nureddin responded speedily to Damascus' request for help in 1146 when they were being attacked by the Second Crusade and he also massacred the Latins in Edessa in the same year – he allowed others religions and races to live – suggesting a deliberate policy of trying to remove the Franks from the region
- Nureddin undertook the Hajj to Mecca
- Nureddin inflicted key defeats upon the Franks, critically damaging their strength, eg Inab in 1149 and Artah in 1164. For these victories, he was granted titles by the Caliph in Baghdad who recognised him as a warrior of jihad.

Students will be rewarded for any opinions and judgements which are backed up with evidence. Looking at Nureddin's actions across his long career, it could be argued that he was simply trying to establish himself as the key power in the Near East and that he fought whoever was in his way. However, his actions could also be viewed as part of a bigger plan and students might argue that Nureddin certainly lived a life which was consistent with the messages of jihad. They might point to the fact that Nureddin always played down his Turkish roots and focused on the fact that he was a Muslim first and foremost – this is something that previous Turkish rulers had not necessarily done well. Stronger students might realise that it is difficult to ascribe one singular motive to any person. They might also debate the nature of different types of 'jihad', where less able students might consider 'jihad' more simply as a struggle against non-believers.