Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

Thursday 23 May 2024

Morning (Time: 2 hours 15 minutes)

Paper reference **9HI0/1A**

History

Advanced

PAPER 1: Breadth study with interpretations

Option 1A: The crusades, c1095–1204

Extracts Booklet

Do not return this Booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P75751A

©2024 Pearson Education Ltd.

F:1/1/1/1/1/1/

P 7 5 7 5 1 A

Pearson

Extracts for use with Section C.

Extract 1: From Chris Breyer, *Culpability and Concealed Motives: An Analysis of the Parties Involved in the Diversion of the Fourth Crusade*, published 2007.

Historians that seek to blame one specific individual, including Pope Innocent III, for the failure of the Fourth Crusade are misguided. They overlook the fact that nearly everyone involved was in some way to blame.

For example, among key leaders of the Fourth Crusade, there were pre-existing motives to divert the Crusade to Zara and Constantinople. This is especially true of Boniface of Montferrat and the Venetians led by Doge Enrico Dandolo. Boniface was angry about the mistreatment of his brothers by previous Byzantine Emperors and this was clearly a guiding factor in Boniface's decision to support the young Prince Alexius. This in turn led Boniface to lead his army against one of the largest Christian cities in the world, Constantinople.

Similarly, the diversion of the Crusade to Zara was because Doge Dandolo held grievances against that city, that he thought of as an obstruction to Venetian interests. After the successful venture to Zara, Dandolo's bitterness increased over Byzantium's choice to give preferential treatment to Venice's competitors from Genoa and Pisa. For this reason, Dandolo diverted the Crusade to Constantinople.

Extract 2: From Christopher Tyerman, *How To Plan A Crusade*, published 2015.

Innocent III thought that he possessed the ability to plan the vast international enterprise of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade, however, was to prove him wrong.

Innocent was an accomplished lawyer and he used his expertise to provide a legal justification for the Fourth Crusade. He claimed that the Crusade would be a just war, but 'justice' was to include the notion of taking revenge on God's enemies. Those who were shown to have insulted God should face the consequences.

Innocent proclaimed that the Holy Land had been conquered by the 'treachery' of Muhammed. Innocent compared avenging an insult to Christ with the obligation to fight for one's secular lord. The right to vengeance was strengthened by the use of horror stories that in turn gave the crusaders the idea that taking vengeance was both legal and holy.

Innocent's desire to motivate Christians to join the Crusade through taking vengeance on God's enemies was disastrous for the Fourth Crusade. Innocent only wanted holy vengeance against Muslims. But the crusaders did not understand vengeance in a purely legal sense. They took their own brutal vengeance at Zara and then Constantinople.

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements:

Extract 1 from: *Culpability and Concealed Motives: An Analysis of the Parties Involved in the Diversion of the Fourth Crusade*, By Chris Breyer, © Western Oregon University, 2007

Extract 2 from: *How to Plan a Crusade: Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages*, By Christopher Tyerman, © Penguin, September 2016