

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/52**

Paper 5b (Special Subject: The Crusades, 1095–1192),  
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	52

- 1 (a) How far does the information given in Document C corroborate the view of the threat posed to the Byzantine Empire by the crusaders given in Document B? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Document B describes the crusaders as a mass movement, using the pretext of a crusade as an excuse to attack the Byzantine Empire. Manuel, worried by this, intends to extract an oath from them to ensure that they will not attack the Empire. Document C gives evidence that an assault on Constantinople was considered by the crusaders, but rejected by many. It confirms that the Emperor 'feared' the crusaders, and hints also at the momentum that had built behind the crusade ('speeding against the pagans'), although this momentum is aimed at the Muslims, not the Byzantines. It also suggests the crusaders were in a weaker position than C suggests ('Louis could hardly endure the emperor's demand for homage') and portrays Louis's leadership as calculating, but in a different way: here, again, his ultimate aim is to defeat the Muslims, not the Byzantines, and he sees the oath as a means to that end. C also focuses on Louis's individual role, whereas B does not focus on leadership at all. The provenance of both documents is significant here: Kinnamos is reflecting the prejudices of the Byzantines towards the crusaders, whereas Odo of Deuil is trying to emphasise Louis's pious intentions and portraying his actions solely in that light.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Louis VII was a weak crusading leader? [20]

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as the documents in this set (A–E)

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The set of documents should be seen in broad context. There is considerable evidence of weak leadership in these documents:

- In Document A, we are told that Louis did not inspire the French nobility with enough zeal to enable the crusade to be successfully launched at the first attempt.
- In C, he is forced into agreeing to an oath of homage to Manuel.
- D reports heavy losses on the journey through Anatolia, 'partly through our own fault.'
- E shows him to have been undermined by Raymond of Antioch at Damascus. It also suggests that the nobility in the army were easily persuaded to be disloyal to Louis.

On the other hand, candidates could argue:

- Louis's piety, an important element of crusading leadership, is emphasised in A and C (although the author, as Louis's chaplain, might naturally seek to exaggerate this).
- This piety to some extent rescued his reputation after the crusade, as reported in F.
- It could be argued (as does Phillips) that the reason for the initial lack of enthusiasm in December 1145 (shown in A) was not Louis's lack of inspirational leadership, but that the crusading bull had not, at that stage, been published.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	52

- **B** reports large numbers, and although this may well be an exaggeration, it appears that the crusade was large enough to inspire fear in the Byzantines.
- **C** demonstrates a sense of strategic thinking in Louis's dealings with Manuel.
- **D** suggests a good deal of success on the journey through Anatolia, although Louis, not surprisingly, is omitting mention of specific difficulties such as the defeat at Mt Cadmus and the problems of the lack of ships at Attalia.
- **E** suggests that bribery by certain unnamed 'persons' may have been a cause of failure.
- Louis's early departure from Antioch, reported in **E**, made good sense at the time as Raymond was seeking to hijack the crusade for his own personal advantage.

## 2 Did the Byzantine Emperor Alexius I do more to help or hinder the First Crusaders? [30]

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Knowledge of the events of the First Crusade is essential here, and in particular the dealings of the crusaders with the Byzantines, before the crusade, at Constantinople, Nicaea, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Ways in which Alexius could be said to have helped the crusade:

- His appeal to the west at Piacenza in 1095 initiated the crusade.
- He allowed the crusaders through Constantinople and provisioned them, having extracted oaths from them.
- He sent a force under Tatikios to join the crusade.
- He approached Antioch with a military force, perhaps intending to help the besieged crusaders, only to be turned away by Stephen of Blois.
- The Byzantines supplied the crusaders at Antioch.

Equally, he did much to hinder the progress of the crusade:

- He delayed the crusade at Constantinople.
- His army took Nicaea from the Turks after the crusader siege.
- He made diplomatic links with the Fatimids in Cairo to hinder the crusade.

Candidates might also consider Alexius's motivation: he initially needed help from the west, but was worried about the intentions of the crusaders, especially after Peter the Hermit's first wave. Thereafter his aim was to preserve the 'oikumene' and ensure the crusaders fulfilled their oath to hand over captured lands to him, whilst at the same time hoping that the crusade succeeded in alleviating the Turkish threat.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates –

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	52

fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.

### 3 How is the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 best explained? [30]

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates will need to show knowledge of the long- and short-term causes of the fall of Jerusalem. This includes the dynastic problems in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the problems of supply and isolation, the defeat at Hattin and the rise of Saladin.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might consider the following factors:

- Long-term problems of supply and isolation.
- Dynastic problems and divisions in the Kingdom of Jerusalem.
- Military failures at Hattin.
- Rise of Saladin.
- Lack of resources available after Hattin (loss of garrisons in the battle).

The best responses are likely to provide some sort of hierarchy of reasons and argue clearly why one or more is more significant than others, and/or demonstrate links between the factors.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.

### 4 How valid is the judgement that the Third Crusade reached stalemate because of the weaknesses, rather than the strengths, of both the Christian and Muslim armies? [30]

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a sharp response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Knowledge of the events of the Third Crusade is obviously vital here. Candidates will need to demonstrate knowledge of the tactics of both the Christian and Muslim armies, and some understanding of the difficulties which faced both Richard and Saladin as the campaign progressed. They should also address the issue of ‘stalemate’.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>52</b>

engage with controversy. One view of the Crusade is that it was the strengths of both sides which led to stalemate:

- Saladin had built a vast empire surrounding the Crusader States and incorporating the wealth of Egypt.
- He had scored a triumphant victory at Hattin.
- He continued to occupy Jerusalem.
- Richard had captured Acre, despite the departure of Philip Augustus, and shown great brutality in his treatment of the garrison there.
- He had beaten Saladin at Arsur.
- He had captured the coastal strip, ensuring continued supply lines.

However, by 1192, it could also be argued that both men faced enormous difficulties:

- Saladin's forces were exhausted and divided.
- Saladin was considering abandoning Jerusalem.
- Richard faced threats to his lands in France.
- Richard thought that he did not have enough troops to hold on to Jerusalem even if he had captured it.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance, and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of presentation.