



GuideMyGrades

— YOUR GOALS. OUR EXPERTISE. —

EDEXCEL AS AND A LEVEL HISTORY: QUESTIONS BY TOPIC

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

AS and A Level History · Paper 2 · Option 2A.2

53 questions · 964 marks · Mark schemes included

Pearson Edexcel AS (8HI0) and A Level (9HI0) History, June 2016 - June 2025

 [guidemygrades.com](https://www.guidemygrades.com)

 @Guidemygrades

 @Guidemygrades

 @Guidemygrades

 info@guidemygrades.com

 Piccadilly Business Centre, Unit C, Aldow Enterprise Park
Blackett Street, Manchester, M12 6AE

HOW TO USE THIS BOOKLET

Questions are grouped by specification sub-topic; within each sub-topic they run from the lowest mark tariff to the highest.

Click any heading or question row below to jump straight to it.

On every question page, click ANSWER in the top-right corner to jump to its mark scheme.

Diagrams, graphs, tables and data are printed exactly as they appeared in the original papers.

QUESTION	SOURCE	MARKS	PAGE
1 RESTORATION OF ROYAL AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND, 115...		18 questions · 312 marks	4
1. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2017	8	5
2. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2018	8	7
3. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2019	8	10
4. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2022	8	13
5. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2017	20	15
6. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2018	20	16
7. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2019	20	17
8. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2019	20	18
9. Q2	A Level Paper 2 October 2020	20	19
10. Q5	A Level Paper 2 October 2020	20	21
11. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2022	20	22
12. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2023	20	25
13. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2023	20	26
14. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2023	20	27
15. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2024	20	28
16. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2024	20	29
17. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2025	20	31
18. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2025	20	32
2 HENRY II AND THE CHURCH: THE QUARREL WITH BECKET, 1162–74		12 questions · 216 marks	33
19. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2016	8	34
20. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2024	8	37
21. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2017	20	40
22. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2017	20	41
23. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2018	20	42
24. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2019	20	45
25. Q6	A Level Paper 2 October 2020	20	46
26. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2022	20	47
27. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2022	20	48
28. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2023	20	49
29. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2025	20	51
30. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2025	20	52
3 HENRY II AND THE EXTENSION OF CONTROL OVER THE ANGEVIN LANDS,...		8 questions · 160 marks	53
31. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2017	20	54
32. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2018	20	55



33. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2018	20	56
34. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2019	20	57
35. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2022	20	59
36. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2023	20	60
37. Q6	AS Paper 2 June 2024	20	61
38. Q5	A Level Paper 2 June 2024	20	62

4 THE GREAT REBELLION AND THE COLLAPSE OF ANGEVIN POWER, 1173–89

15 questions · 276 marks

63

39. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2023	8	64
40. Q2	AS Paper 2 June 2025	8	66
41. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2017	20	68
42. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2017	20	69
43. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2018	20	71
44. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2018	20	72
45. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2019	20	73
46. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2019	20	74
47. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2022	20	75
48. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2022	20	76
49. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2023	20	77
50. Q8	AS Paper 2 June 2024	20	78
51. Q6	A Level Paper 2 June 2024	20	79
52. Q7	AS Paper 2 June 2025	20	80
53. Q2	A Level Paper 2 June 2025	20	81



QUESTIONS

53 questions · 964 marks · grouped by sub-topic, lowest tariff first



KEY TOPIC 1

RESTORATION OF ROYAL AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND, 1154-

18 questions in this sub-topic · 312 marks · lowest tariff first



2 (a) **Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.**

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into Henry II's extension of control over his nobility in England by 1166?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Source for use with Question 2(a).

Source 3: From the *Cartae Baronum*, 1166. This extract comes from Archbishop Roger of York's reply to King Henry II.

Your most excellent lordship has ordered all your vassals to send to you answers to the following questions: how many knights does each possess from the time of your grandfather King Henry I, and how many knights has he now, and how many knights are there on the demesne of each? In this return, I am declaring all these things to you as my lord. Know therefore my lord, that there is no knight's fee on the demesne of the archbishopric of York. We have sufficient knights to perform all the service which we owe you, and which our predecessors have performed. We have indeed more knights than are necessary for that service, as you may learn from this return. For our predecessors held more knights than they owed to the king, and they did this, not to provide knights for the royal service, but because they wished to provide positions for their relatives and servants.

5

10

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*. William of Newburgh was a monk who lived in England in the years 1136–98. He gained his information from travellers and neighbouring abbeys. Here he is describing Henry II's treatment of Brittany in 1166.

When King Henry considered making his son Geoffrey the sovereign of Brittany, he also began preparing the means to achieve it, as he had not yet subdued Brittany to him. It happened that Conan, who was the sovereign of the greater part of Brittany, died, leaving as his heir an only daughter. Having betrothed this girl to his young son Geoffrey, King Henry took all of her rights under his own control. But there were in Brittany certain noblemen, of such wealth and power, that they would never agree to submit to the authority of any person. For many years they had oppressed their weaker subjects. These weaker people called upon the king of England for help, and they voluntarily submitted to his control. By readily and generously granting aid to these weaker persons, King Henry was enabled to subdue the stronger men who had been deemed indestructible. Thus, in a short time King Henry succeeded in obtaining possession of the whole of Brittany. Having expelled or subdued Brittany's disturbers, he governed it and brought it peace throughout all its borders.

15

20

25



BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



You should start the answer to part (a) on page 11.

2 (a) Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the role of the Chancellor in Henry II's government?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Source for use with Question 2(a).**

Source 3: From Richard fitzNigel, *The Dialogue Concerning the Exchequer*, written in the years 1178–89. *The Dialogue* was an essay written to inform the numerous clerks who were learning the business of the exchequer. Richard fitzNigel was the treasurer. Here he is commenting on the role of the Chancellor.

Just as the Chancellor is great in the court, so is he also great at the exchequer. Nothing great is done or may be done without his consent and advice. He has the control of the royal seal which is in the treasury. The seal is taken by the treasurer to the exchequer, for the sole purpose of carrying on the business of the exchequer. This having been performed, the seal is put in its box and the box is sealed by the Chancellor and is given then to the treasurer to be guarded.

5

The Chancellor has the supervision of the roll. The Chancellor is equally responsible, with the treasurer, for all the writing on the roll. He may not tell the treasurer what to write, but he is allowed to criticise the treasurer and suggest what he shall do. But if the treasurer is unwilling to change his words, the Chancellor can challenge him, but only in front of the barons.

10

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From a manuscript known as the *Lansdowne Anonymous*, written in the reign of Henry II. This section provides the only existing account of the settlement reached in 1172 at Avranches between Henry II and the Church following the death of Thomas Becket.

King Henry swore, in a clear voice persuasive to all, that he had never ordered or desired that Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury be killed. But the King had often been moved to anger and had provoked his attendants against the Archbishop. He swore that the Archbishop's murder had by no means been done through him, but did not deny that it had perhaps been done on his behalf. He promised not only to make amends for the death of the Archbishop but to provide guarantees for his good behaviour according to the advice and judgement of the Church.

15

20

These then are the terms of the peace and settlement between the most favoured Pope Alexander and the most invincible King Henry of England. The King would abolish his Constitutions of Clarendon entirely, and none of them would be revived in the future. He would allow every church its liberties and privileges. In addition, he would pay for 200 knights to fight in Jerusalem in defence of the Christians. And finally, the King himself would fight in Jerusalem, unless excused by the Pope.

25



BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



You should start the answer to part (a) on page 11.

2 (a) Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the development of royal justice under Henry II?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Source for use with Question 2(a).**

Source 3: From Glanvill, *Treatise concerning the Laws and Customs of the kingdom of England*. This was the first legal textbook. Ranulf de Glanvill was justiciar in England in the years 1180–89. Here he is writing about the use of the writ of *Mort d'Ancestor*.

When anyone dies possessed of a freehold of land, an heir may justly claim it as the possession of his ancestor, and if he is of full age, he shall have the following writ of *Mort d'Ancestor*.

The writ of *Mort d'Ancestor* is received by the sheriff, and a fee is given by the claimant in the shire court to pursue his claim. The case comes to an assize in this manner. First, twelve free and lawful men of the neighbourhood are to be elected. If these jurors should decide for the claimant, the sheriff shall be directed to put him into possession of the freehold by the following writ: 5

'The king to the sheriff greetings.

Know that N.* has in my court proved his claim to the possession of this land by recognition of *Mort d'Ancestor* against R.**, and therefore I command you to give him possession without delay'. 10

*N. – the name of the claimant would be inserted here

**R. – the name of the person currently holding the land would be inserted here

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, 1169–92*. This extract from the chronicle is believed to have been written by Roger of Howden who served as a royal clerk to Henry II in the years 1185–89. Here he is writing about the war between Henry II and Philip Augustus in 1189.

Coming to Le Mans, Philip positioned his army to make an assault on the city. A large struggle occurred and a great many men on each side were slain. Many others from the army of the king of England were captured, and others fled. And the French entered the city. The king of England, despairing, fled with seventy knights to Chinon*. 15

At once King Philip besieged Chinon until finally, it was captured. On the next Monday, the city of Tours was captured and in the assault eight knights and 100 foot-soldiers were captured. Oh misery! On the one hand the men of Poitou laid plots against their lord, King Henry; on the other hand the men of Brittany surrendered to the king of France. Truly King Henry, in terrible difficulties, made peace with King Philip in this way: 20

'Henry, king of England, has submitted himself in every way to Philip, king of France, so that whatever the king of France may provide and judge, the king of England will accomplish entirely and without contradiction'. Truly then the king of England again rendered homage to the king of France. 25

*Chinon – the castle held by Henry II as Count of Anjou



BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



2 (a) **Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.**

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into developments in the legal system under Henry II?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Source for use with Question 2(a).

Source 3: From Roger of Howden, *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, AD 1169–1192*. Roger of Howden was clerk to Henry II and Justice of the Forest from 1185. Here Roger is commenting on the appointment of the judges in 1178.

The lord King investigated whether the judges, whom he had appointed, had dealt effectively with the men of the realm. He learnt that the people had been greatly burdened by the multitude of judges, for there were eighteen judges. On the advice of the wise men of his realm, he chose five only, all members of his private household. He commanded these five judges to hear all the complaints of the realm and to do right judgment. They were not to leave the King's court, but should remain there to hear the complaints of the people. If any case should come before them which they could not decide, it should be presented to the King. The case would be determined as might seem good to the King and to the wise men of the realm.

5

10

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From William FitzStephen, *Life of St. Thomas*, written in the 1170s. FitzStephen was a member of Becket's household from the time that Becket was appointed as Chancellor.

All things were entrusted to Thomas, while the King indulged in youthful pursuits. Thomas differed from the King only in name. Thomas governed the whole realm according to his own will. The nobles and magnates were subject to Thomas' orders. They knew for certain that only what Thomas judged acceptable would be pleasing to the King. It was difficult at that time for any action to be taken which Thomas had not first approved.

15

The house and table of the Chancellor were open to all men of whatever rank who came to the King's court. It did not matter whether they were really honourable or only seemed so. Thomas hardly ever dined without the company of various earls and barons whom he himself had invited. His table was splendid with gold and silver bowls and dishes and overflowed with rich foods and precious wines. No price was too high for such luxuries.

20

Magnates of the kingdom of England placed their sons in the Chancellor's service, and he gave them an honest education. When these young men had been knighted, he sent them back with honour to their fathers. The King himself entrusted his son Henry, the heir to the kingdom, to Thomas' training.

25



BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgements**

Source 1: English Historical Documents Vol II 1042-1189 By David C Douglas & George W Greenaway
© London, Eyre and Sportiswoode, 1953

Source 2: English Historical Documents Vol II 1042-1189 By David C Douglas & George W Greenaway
© London, Eyre and Sportiswoode, 1953

Source 3: English Historical Documents Vol II 1042-1189 By David C Douglas & George W Greenaway
© London, Eyre and Sportiswoode, 1953

Source 4: The lives of Thomas Becket By Michael Staunton © Manchester University Press, 2001



- 6 'Henry II's financial reforms were more significant than his legal reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154–80.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



-
- 6** How accurate is it to say that, in 1154, the most significant obstacle to the restoration of royal authority in England was the power of the barons?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



-
- 6** How accurate is it to say that the Chancellor was the most significant official in Henry II's government in England in the years 1154–89?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*. William of Newburgh was a clergyman in the abbey of Newburgh in Yorkshire in the years 1136–98. He gathered the information for his history from travellers and from neighbouring abbeys. Here he is commenting on Henry II's actions when Henry arrived in England in 1154.

In the year of our Lord 1154, Henry came over from Normandy and took possession of his hereditary kingdom. So many evils had sprung up in the previous reign that the people now hoped for better things. First, King Henry issued an edict against the many mercenaries who, under King Stephen, had come into England from foreign parts. These he ordered to return to their own country. He set a date after which they would be punished if they prolonged their stay in England. Terror-stricken by this edict, they slipped away in so short a time that they seemed to have vanished in a moment like phantoms. Next, he ordered the newly-erected castles to be razed to the ground, with the exception of a few sited in advantageous places. These castles he desired either to keep for himself, or to be maintained in the hands of peaceful men for the defence of the realm. 5 10

In these early days, he revived the strength of the laws in England, which had seemed to be dead and buried. Throughout the realm he appointed judges to restrain the behaviour of wicked men and to dispense justice. And if any of his judges acted either too leniently or too harshly, King Henry applied the remedy of a royal order to amend effectively their negligence or severity. 15

Such were the first acts of the new monarch. Wicked men were put to flight or they were made, through fear of the law, to live peacefully.



Source 4: From the Charter of Henry II granted to the city of Lincoln, c1157. This charter describes the rights and customs granted to Lincoln after the civil war between Stephen and Matilda. Lincoln had supported Matilda, Henry II's mother, during the civil war.

Know that I have granted to my citizens of Lincoln all their liberties and customs and laws which they had in the time of the kings Edward and William I and Henry I. And I have granted them their right to trade, just as well and as freely as they had in the time of Edward, William I and Henry I. 20

And all the men who live and trade within the city shall have the same rights to taxes and customs duties as ever they had in the time of Edward, William I and Henry I, kings of England. 25

I grant also that if anyone shall buy any land within the city of Lincoln, and shall hold it for a year and a day without dispute, then let him who bought it hold it well and in peace and without a challenge to his possession.

I also confirm to them that, if anyone has lived in Lincoln for a year and a day without dispute from any claimant, and has paid the customs, and has remained in England during that period, then let him remain in peace in my city of Lincoln as my citizen, without having to defend his right. 30

BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that, in the years 1154–89, Richard fitzNigel was the most significant royal official in Henry II's government?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the reasons for the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From Walter Map, *Trifles of Courtiers*, written in the 1180s. Map was a member of Henry II's court. Map was sent by Henry on missions to the French and papal courts. He recorded a series of tales and observations based on court gossip. Here he is commenting on sheriffs in the government of Henry II.

In hell there are creatures of the night, such as the owl and the nighthawk. These creatures have eyes that love the darkness and hate the light. These devils are sent out from the underworld, to use their cunning to spy out and report back on all the ill-deeds they observe. And so it is the same in the court of King Henry. In the same manner, officials called sheriffs and under-sheriffs are sent out from the court, with the duty to enquire cunningly into the deeds of men.

5

At the time of their appointment to their office, in the presence of the highest judge, sheriffs do swear to serve God and their master faithfully and honestly. However, these sheriffs take everything they lay their hands upon. They are like bees; they land upon flowers to draw forth some of the honey. These sheriffs punish actions that are inoffensive, but they let true deeds of evil go unpunished. These sheriffs are corrupted by taking bribes. Wrongdoers win favour from the sheriffs by offering sheriffs money as bribes.

10

Source 4: From the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170. This Inquest was made when Henry II returned to England after having spent four years in his continental lands. This section outlines the nature of the Inquest.

In the first place, let an inquiry be made concerning the conduct of sheriffs and their bailiffs* since King Henry II crossed over to Normandy in 1166. During this time, the land and the people of England have been oppressed. Let inquiry be made into what and how much sheriffs have received from each hundred and from each village and from each man. 15

Let inquiry be made into what payments the sheriffs have received in giving judgments in the courts of the county or the hundred. 20

Likewise, let inquiry be made as to what, and how much, land the sheriffs or their bailiffs have bought or mortgaged.

Likewise, let inquiry be made concerning the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, sub-tenants, knights, citizens and burgesses as to what, and how much, they have received from their lands since the above date. 25

Let inquiry be made as to what, and how much, the foresters and their bailiffs and officers have received, since the above date, and whether they have cancelled any of the King's rights for reward. And let inquiry be made into the breaking of forest laws, including those who have trespassed in the King's forests and injured his stags and other wild beasts. 30

After they have been examined themselves, let my sheriffs and officers investigate into the rest of the business of my kingdom. Let them swear an oath to apply themselves lawfully to the inquiry to be made throughout the lands of the barons. 35

*bailiffs – local officials who collected rents and other dues on a manorial estate

BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgements**

Source 1 from: The Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster By Frank Barlow © Oxford University Press, 1992

Source 2 from: English Historical Documents II 1042-1189 By David C Douglas & George W Greenaway © Eyre and Sportiswoode, 1953

Source 3 from: The Restless Kings: Henry II, His Sons and the Wars for the Plantagenet Crown By Nick Barratt © Faber & Faber, 2019

Source 4 from: English Historical Documents II 1042-1189 By David C Douglas & George W Greenaway © Eyre and Sportiswoode, 1953



-
- 6 How accurate is it to say that the *Cartae Baronum* survey was the most significant factor in extending royal authority over the nobility in England in the years 1154–72?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



-
- 5 How accurate is it to say that the purposes of *Cartae Baronum* (1166) and the Inquest of the Sheriffs (1170) were remarkably similar?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



- 6 How accurate is it to say that itinerant kingship played the most significant role in maintaining royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1154–89?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 To what extent were financial reforms responsible for the growing power of the king in the years 1154–89?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the importance of the Chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From Richard fitzNigel, *The Dialogue concerning the Exchequer*, written 1178–89. The *Dialogue* was an essay, written to inform the numerous clerks about the business of the Court of the Exchequer, where much of the business of government was managed. Here the author is outlining the duties of the Chancellor.

The head of the Exchequer is the most important member of that court. The Chancellor sits next to him. The Chancellor is as important at the Exchequer as he is in the King's Court. Nothing of importance is done, nor can be done, without the consent and advice of the Chancellor.

The Chancellor has the custody of the royal seal, which is kept in the Treasury. It is not removed from the Treasury except for when the justiciar orders it. Then, the Treasurer takes it to the Upper Exchequer, where it is used to carry out the business of the Exchequer. When the royal seal is needed, it is presented to the Chancellor in front of all the members of the Upper Exchequer. It should never be removed from the Treasury either by the Chancellor or by anyone else on any other occasion.

The Chancellor also has custody of the roll of the Chancery. The Chancellor and the Treasurer are held equally responsible for everything that is written on the roll. The Chancellor cannot dictate what is written by the Treasurer, but the Chancellor and the Treasurer write together. If the Treasurer makes a mistake, the Chancellor can suggest what he should write. If the Treasurer refuses to alter it, the Chancellor can challenge the Treasurer in front of the barons of the Exchequer, and these barons can give a judgement.

Source 4: From William FitzStephen, *Life of Saint Thomas*, written 1173–74. FitzStephen was a household clerk to Thomas Becket for 10 years. FitzStephen was authorised by Becket to act for him during Becket's chancellorship. He returned to the King's service in the early 1170s after Becket's death. Here he comments on Becket's role as Chancellor.

When Henry II had been crowned, Thomas was chosen as the King's Chancellor. Thomas was a hardworking man, thoughtful and enterprising in many great things. He performed the duties of obedience and honour so thoroughly that it is hard to say whether he was more noble, magnificent, and useful to the King in peace or in war. 20

The Chancellor of England is considered second in the realm only to the King. He holds the other part of the King's seal, with which he seals his own orders. The Chancellor maintains whatever vacant church offices and baronies fall into the King's hands. He attends all the King's councils. All documents are sealed by the Chancellor's clerks, and everything is carried out according to his advice. 25

Through the hard work and counsel of the Chancellor, King Henry prospered in all his doings. The realm of England was enriched. 30

At one point, King Henry decided to ask the King of France to join his daughter, Margaret, in marriage to his son, Henry. It was the Chancellor who was chosen to make this request. Thomas prepared to display the magnificence of England's wealth. When some of the French saw the Chancellor of the King of England on a mission to their King, they said: 35
'If this is how the Chancellor proceeds, how great must the English King be!'

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements:

Source 1 from: <https://epistolae.ctl.columbia.edu/letter/409.html>

Source 2 from: <https://www.concordatwatch.eu/topic-877.834>

Source 3 from: *English Historical Documents II 1042-1189*, By David C. Douglas & George W. Greenaway, © Eyre and Spottiswoode

Source 4 from: *The Lives of Thomas Becket*, By Michael Staunton, © Manchester University Press, 2001



- 8 To what extent did the relationship between Henry II and the leading barons in England change in the years 1154–89?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154–89?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



KEY TOPIC 2

HENRY II AND THE CHURCH: THE QUARREL WITH BECKET, 1162–74

12 questions in this sub-topic · 216 marks · lowest tariff first



You should start the answer to part (a) on page 7.

2 (a) Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into Henry II's reaction to Becket's decision to go into exile in 1164?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Source for use with Question 2a.**

Source 3: From a command issued by Henry II to his sheriffs on 24 December 1164 after Thomas Becket had fled into exile.

I hereby command you that, if any one, either clerk or lay person, in your bailiwick* appeals to the court of Rome, then you are to have him arrested and put under guard until my pleasure shall be known. Also that you seize into your own hands all the revenues and possessions of the archbishop of Canterbury, as Ranulf de Broc** and my other officers shall instruct you. 5
Also I command you to arrest the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, nephew and nieces of all the clerks who are with the archbishop, and put them and their chattels into my keeping, until my pleasure shall be known, and that you bring this document with you when you are summoned.

* bailiwick – the area under the authority of a bailiff

** Ranulf de Broc was one of Henry II's supporters. He was granted some of the lands of Canterbury during Becket's exile

Source for use with Question 2b.

Source 4: From Gerald of Wales, *The Conquest of Ireland*, written in 1189. Gerald was archdeacon of Brecon and a chronicler. In 1184 he became a chaplain and royal clerk in Henry II's court. He travelled extensively in Wales and Ireland and accompanied Henry II on an expedition to Ireland in 1185.

The valiant King Henry landed in Ireland in the seventeenth year of his reign, being the year of our Lord 1172. While Henry was resting a few days at Wexford, the men of Wexford, to court his favour, brought to him their prisoner Fitz-Stephen*, who was bound in chains. These men tried excusing themselves because it was Fitz-Stephen who had been the first to invade Ireland without the royal licence, and he had set the others a bad example. 10
The King, having loudly rebuked Fitz-Stephen, and threatened him with his anger for his foolish enterprise, at last sent him back, bound and chained, to be kept in safe custody in Reginald's Tower**. 15

Soon afterwards, Dermotus, king of Cork, came of his own free will and made his submission to the King of England, doing homage and swearing fealty to the English king as his lord, and giving hostages for the regular payment of a yearly homage. The King of England thence marched to Cashel. There Duvenald, king of Limerick, came to meet him and having asked for peace, which was granted, became also a subject of the King and did him fealty which he promised faithfully to observe. Indeed there was scarcely anyone of name or rank who did not pay to the King the homage due from a liegeman to his lord. 20
25

* Fitz-Stephen was Gerald of Wales' uncle

** Reginald's Tower – a defensive tower which was used as a prison



BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



You should start the answer to part (a) on page 11.

2 (a) Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the significance of the coronation of Young Henry in the quarrel between Thomas Becket and Henry II?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Source for use with Question 2(a).**

Source 3: From William Fitzstephen, *The Life of St Thomas*, written in the 1170s.

Fitzstephen was Becket's household clerk. Here Fitzstephen is quoting Becket's words to Henry II when Becket met with Henry in July 1170.

I am indebted and accountable to you as my king and worldly lord, especially now when you have just recalled and admitted me to your peace and favour. But among all the individual evils which in your anger and resentment I have endured – exclusion, plunder, my banishment and that of my people and whatever oppressions of the church of Canterbury – there is one that disturbs me most. I cannot leave this evil untouched or uncorrected. You had your son crowned by the Archbishop of York in the province of Canterbury. You have taken from the church of Canterbury, the church which anointed you as king with holy oils, its privilege of consecrating kings. This, among all its privileges, Canterbury has regarded as its own and special privilege ever since the See of Canterbury was established.

5

10

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From *The Annals of Roger of Howden*. Roger of Howden was an English clergyman who served Henry II after 1174 as a negotiator in France and Ireland. Here he is writing about negotiations between Henry II and Louis VII of France in 1161.

In the year of 1161, King Henry and King Louis of France disagreed over the divisions of their territories, and the castles of Gisors and Neaffle in Normandy, which at that time were in the hands of King Louis. King Henry claimed them as rightfully belonging to his dukedom of Normandy. The kings came to these terms:

15

The king of France should give his two daughters, Margaret and Alice, in marriage to the two sons of King Henry, namely, Henry and Richard, who were then little children.

King Louis should place the castles into the care of the Templars for safe custody, until his daughters were married to the sons of King Henry.

20

After the marriage of Margaret and Young Henry, both castles should be handed over to King Henry.

After these terms were agreed and confirmed by oaths, King Louis handed over both of his daughters to King Henry, and the castles into the custody of the Templars. Then King Henry married his son to Margaret. The Templars immediately handed over the castles to King Henry. In consequence, King Louis was extremely angry, and banished these Templars from his kingdom. King Henry welcomed these Templars and rewarded them with many honours.

25

BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgements**

Source 1 from: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/12Chenry1-murderfine.asp>

Source 2 from: 'English Historical Documents 1042-1189', David C. Douglas (ed) and G. W. Greenaway (ed), Eyre & Spottiswoode 1953

Source 3 from: 'Henry the Young King, 1155-1183', Matthew Strickland, Yale University Press 2016

Source 4 from: https://archive.org/stream/annalsofrogerdeh01hoveuoft/annalsofrogerdeh01hoveuoft_djvu.txt



- 7 How accurate is it to say that Henry II's policy towards the English Church was a complete failure in the years 1162–74?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that Henry II's aim to control the Church was responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162–70?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the reasons for the failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a letter written by Archbishop Thomas Becket to Pope Alexander II, 1167.
At this time, Becket was in exile. Here he is commenting on his quarrel with Henry II.

I have endured enough and more than enough, most loving Father, while waiting for the reformation of the King of England and yet I have gathered no fruits whatever from my long suffering. I have many times called upon him, and have frequently invited him to settle this dispute. I have instructed the King that he will face the Divine wrath and vengeance if he fails to come to his proper senses. Yet he more and more persists in his evil ways, both persecuting myself personally and those who are in banishment with me. 5

I have publicly condemned these wicked, I will not say customs, but perversions or corruptions, which the King wishes to impose on the Church of England. I have also, in general terms, excommunicated his accomplices and advisers, whosoever they may be, whether clergy or laity, and have absolved my bishops from the oath by which they have been violently forced to observe the said customs. 10

I have not as yet personally excommunicated the King, being still in expectation of his reformation. However, I shall not delay to excommunicate him if he does not speedily recover his senses and submit to discipline for what he has done. 15

Source 4: From Edward Grim, *The Life of Thomas Becket*, published 1180. Edward Grim was a clerk from Canterbury who was present in the Cathedral when Thomas Becket was murdered on 29 December 1170.

The four knights were received with respect as the servants of the King. They rejected the food offered, thirsting rather for blood. The Archbishop consented to see them and they entered. 20

Fitz Urse, who seemed to be the chief and the most eager for crime among the knights, breathing fury, exclaimed, 'We have something to say to you by the King's command. The King commands that you depart with all your men from the kingdom. From this day there can be no peace with you, or any of yours, for you have broken the peace.' 25

'Do you come to kill me?' the Archbishop asked. As they went out, Fitz Urse, called out, 'In the King's name we order you, both clerk and monk, that you should take and hold that man.'

The Archbishop consoled his clerks, and told them not to fear because, as it seemed to us who were present, it was him alone that they wanted to slay. We asked him to flee, but he did not forget his promise not to flee from his murderers from fear of death, and refused to go. 30

The knights came back with swords and axes and other weapons fit for the crime which their minds were set on. 'Absolve', they cried, 'and restore to communion those whom you have excommunicated and restore their powers to those whom you have suspended.' 35

The Archbishop answered, 'I will not absolve them.'

'Then you shall die!' they cried.

BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



- 8 How accurate is it to say that the main cause of Henry II's problems with the church was the clash of authority with the church courts?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



- 6 How accurate is it to say that relations between church and state declined continuously during the years 1162–74?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 How accurate is it to say that Henry II's authority over the English church did not change in the years 1154–74?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that Becket's rejection of the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164 was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162–70?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the role of Thomas Becket in the dispute between church and state in the years 1162–70?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From Gervase of Canterbury, *History of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. Gervase was ordained as a monk in 1163, probably by Becket. He was one of the monks who buried Becket. Gervase began compiling his *History* in 1188 from documents available in his monastery. Here he relates the early stages of the quarrel between Henry II and Becket.

King Henry ordered Thomas Becket to take the position of archbishop of Canterbury. The King did that in order that he might more easily rule over the church in England. But Thomas knew that if he undertook that duty, he must abandon either the favour of God or the approval of the King. Thomas opposed the wishes of his sovereign, but he was unanimously chosen as archbishop. 5

Immediately on becoming archbishop, Thomas put on the haircloth and the character of a monk. He devoted much time to prayer. He refused all bribes. He was eager for justice. His great aim was to restore those rights to the church that it had been deprived of by kings. Consequently, many persons influenced the King's mind unfavourably against the Archbishop, and a disagreement arose between them. 10

The disputes between the King and the Archbishop grew immensely. The King tyrannised over everything and everyone, while the bishops remained silent. The dispute began at the Council of Westminster, continued at Clarendon, and was completed at the court of Northampton. The King desired to preserve for himself the ancient customs of the crown. However, the bishops and the archbishops would make no promise that undermined the rights of the clergy. 15

The Archbishop refused to agree in writing, so the King and his court rose up in anger against him. When a case was brought against Thomas regarding money matters, he disguised himself and departed by night. Thus, this representative of Christ was driven into banishment. 20

Source 4: From a letter written by Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London, to Archbishop Thomas Becket, July 1166. Foliot intended this letter to be made public. Foliot had aspired to be Archbishop of Canterbury before Henry II selected Becket in 1162. Foliot was Henry II's key agent in the dispute with Becket. Here Foliot comments on the causes of the quarrel.

The whole dispute with the King is regarding certain ancient customs. The King claims these customs were observed and maintained by his predecessors, and he wants them to be observed. He did not introduce these customs; he found them already established. Though you, as Archbishop, threatened the King over this matter, the King would not renounce these things, which he claimed were ancient and long-held customs of the realm. This is why you threatened this holy and noble King. 25

You should have handled such matters with mature deliberation, not with the enthusiasm of a novice. You should have sought advice from your fellow bishops. You should have studied the works of the Fathers of the Church and weighed the gains of the Church against its losses. What kind of wisdom is it to desert the Church in this way and revolt against your King, because of some matters that could have been settled easily? 30

Those terrible letters, which you dispatched to the King in 1166, displayed neither the affection nor the modesty of a bishop. Everything that the Papacy had achieved for the Church was ruined by your threats. 35

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements:

Source 1 from: The History of the English People 1000-1154 By Henry of Huntingdon & Diana Greenway © Oxford University Press, February 2009

Source 2 from: The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester, Florence of Worcester By Florence of Worcester & Thomas Forester © Independently published, February 2017

Source 3 from: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/1205gervase1.asp>

Source 4 from: The Lives of Thomas Becket By Michael Staunton © Manchester University Press, 2001 and Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154-1216 By Martin Evans © Cambridge University Press, 2016



-
- 6** How accurate is it to say that Becket's attitude to reform was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162–64?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 6 'In the years 1162–74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was a complete failure.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



KEY TOPIC 3

HENRY II AND THE EXTENSION OF CONTROL OVER THE ANGEVIN LANDS, 1154

8 questions in this sub-topic · 160 marks · lowest tariff first



-
- 6** How accurate is it to say that Henry II followed a similar policy towards Wales and Scotland in the years 1154–74?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 How accurate is it to say that Henry II's desire to conquer land for his son John explains his invasion of Ireland in 1171–72?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How accurate is it to say that Henry II succeeded in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



Explain how England and the Angevin empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154-74.

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154-74?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Sources for use with Question 2.**

Source 3: From William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*. William of Newburgh was a priest who lived in England in the years 1136–98 and recorded the key events of the time soon after they had happened. Here he is describing the relationship between the English and Scottish kings in the years shortly after Henry II came to the throne.

King Henry summoned Malcolm, the king of Scots, who was treating the northern counties of England, namely Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, as his own property. King Henry ordered King Malcolm not to defraud the king of England of so large a part of his realm. The king of England would not patiently suffer these lands to be torn apart, since justice demanded that his lands should be restored to him. Wisely, remembering how the king of England had established the justice of his cause in this matter, the king of Scots restored the lands in question to King Henry in their entirety. In return for this surrender, King Malcolm received from King Henry the earldom of Huntingdon which belonged to Malcolm of ancient right.

Matters having been thus settled, England enjoyed, for a time, peace and security throughout her borders. Moreover, in all parts of his realm, King Henry won the reputation of a monarch who ruled over a wider empire than all who had hitherto reigned in England, for it extended from the far border of Scotland to the Pyrenees.

Source 4: From the Treaty of Falaise, 1174. This was the treaty agreed between Henry II and William the Lion, king of Scots, after William's capture in the Great Rebellion 1173–74.

William, king of Scots, has become the vassal of King Henry for Scotland and for all his other lands. He has done fealty to King Henry as to his liege lord, as all the other men of King Henry are required to do.

The earls and barons holding land from the king of Scots shall also do homage and swear fealty to King Henry as their liege lord.

The king of Scots and his men shall not shelter, either in Scotland or in any of his other lands, any person who has been expelled for law breaking from the lands of King Henry. If the king of Scots shelters an exile he must justify himself in the court of King Henry and submit to the judgement of his court.

In order that this treaty with King Henry may be faithfully kept by the king of Scots and his heirs, the king of Scots has delivered to King Henry the great castles of Scotland at Roxburgh, Berwick, Jedburgh, Edinburgh, and Stirling. And the king of Scots shall pay for the garrison of these castles out of his own revenue.

When the castles have been handed over, then William, king of Scots, and his brother shall be released. And (again after the castles have been handed over) the earls and barons shall be released, but only after each one has delivered his own hostage, either his legitimate son if he has one, or otherwise his nephew or nearest heir.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.

-
- 6** How far did the peace of Montmirail succeed in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169–72?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 How accurate is it to say that Henry II achieved complete control over Brittany in the years 1154–72?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



-
- 6** How accurate is it to say that Henry II succeeded in achieving complete control over Ireland in the years 1154–72?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



-
- 5** How far did Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France change in the years 1154–72?

(Total for Question 5 = 20 marks)



KEY TOPIC 4

THE GREAT REBELLION AND THE COLLAPSE OF ANGEVIN POWER, 1173–89

15 questions in this sub-topic · 276 marks · lowest tariff first



2 (a) **Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.**

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into Henry II's treatment of his son Henry, the Young King?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Source for use with Question 2(a).

Source 3: From the *Chronicle of the Princes*. The chronicle was compiled in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in a Welsh monastery founded by Robert FitzStephen, one of Henry II's most important vassals in Wales. Here the chronicle comments on a discussion between Henry II and the Young King in 1173.

Whilst the King of England, Henry II, was staying in his lands beyond the sea, Henry the Younger, his son, came to him. Young Henry asked his father what he was able to do, or what he should do, now that he had been crowned king. For although Young Henry was now a king with many knights under him, he still had no means by which he could reward these knights, unless he obtained funds from his father, King Henry II. 5

Young Henry's father replied that he would give the Young King twenty pounds daily from the money of the Young King's land for Young Henry's expenses. And Young King Henry, when he heard that, said that he had never heard of a king being a paid servant, and that he would not be such a servant. 10

Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From a history written by Gerald of Wales in the years 1184–88. Gerald of Wales was a clergyman. Henry II had refused him a bishopric in Wales in 1176 but, from 1184, he had employed Gerald of Wales in his court as a clerk and chaplain.

To the dismay of the great men of the realm, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, died at the hands of unholy men. This was after the Archbishop had suffered banishment for nearly seven years, worn sackcloth on every part of his body, and devoted himself to reading and prayer. Now his martyrdom finally demonstrated the extent of his sufferings and the glory he deserved. 15

Thomas himself had willingly opened the doors of the sanctuary to his furious enemies. Thomas met their drawn swords boldly and bowed his consecrated head to their violence. This took place in the Cathedral of Canterbury in front of the altar. There, Thomas received four wounds on the crown of his head – the shaven crown, which used to be regarded as a token of the protection due to the clergy. These wounds were inflicted with great violence by four brutal retainers from the court. 20

Thomas, this famous soldier and martyr of Christ, was renowned for suffering, just as Christ had suffered. The Archbishop exchanged a corruptible crown on earth for an incorruptible crown in Heaven. Numerous miracles were performed in his name, including the marvellous restoration of sight to the blind. It plainly appeared that he was a new martyr. 25



BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgements**

Source 1 from: The Norman Conquest of England: Sources and Documents By R. Allen Brown
© Boydell Press, 1984

Source 2 from: English historical documents. Volume 2, 1042-1189 By David C Douglas; George William Greenaway © Routledge, 1981

Source 3 from: Henry the Young King, 1155-1183 By Matthew Strickland © Yale University Press, 2016

Source 4 from: The History and Topography of Ireland By Gerald of Wales Giraldus Cambrensis & Thomas Forester © Digireads.com, 2013



2 (a) Study Source 3 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

Why is Source 3 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the relationship between Henry II and Philip Augustus of France in 1180?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89**Source for use with Question 2(a).**

Source 3: From the Peace of Gisors, 28 June 1180. This agreement, renewing the Treaty of Ivry of 1177, was made between Henry II and the newly-crowned King of France, Philip Augustus. Philip Augustus, who was 15 years old, was ruling for his father Louis VII who had suffered a stroke.

I, Philip, by grace of God, King of France, and I, Henry, by the same grace, King of England, notify to all men that We have renewed, on oath, the alliance and friendship between Us.

To avoid any possibility of disagreement between Us from this moment onwards, We have agreed that neither of Us shall claim, against the other, any of the lands, possessions, and other things that We now hold. 5

This agreement excludes Auvergne*, concerning which there is now a dispute between Us.

This agreement also excludes the small fees and divisions of the lands of Berry**. If We cannot come to an agreement over the lands of Berry, We have each chosen three bishops and barons to decide between Us. We have agreed to abide by their decision in good faith. 10

*Auvergne – a region in France that was controlled by Henry II as a result of his marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine

**Berry – a region in central France held by the French crown



Source for use with Question 2(b).

Source 4: From Roger of Wendover, *Flowers of History*, written between 1188 and 1236. Roger was an English monk of St Albans Abbey. His history was based on accounts contained in materials held at St Albans that Roger considered worthy of use. Here he comments on events in the years 1156–57.

In 1156, King Henry crossed into Normandy where, after a long siege, he took the castles of Mirabeau and Chinon. The King's brother, Geoffrey, had expelled Hoël, Count of Brittany, and taken control of the city of Nantes with the consent of its citizens. Geoffrey now made peace with King Henry, on the condition that he would receive yearly a thousand pounds of English money, and two thousand of the money of Anjou. 15

In 1157, King Henry crossed into England. Malcolm of Scotland restored to Henry the city of Carlisle, Bamburgh castle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and all the county of Lothian. Henry returned the earldom of Huntingdon to King Malcolm. The castles at Pevensey and Norwich, and all the fortresses in England and Normandy, which had been held by King Stephen, were surrendered to King Henry. 20

King Henry prepared to attack Wales by sea and land. When all was ready, the King entered Wales and laid siege to Rhydlar castle. He recovered all the fortresses that had been taken from his ancestors and, when he had reduced the Welsh to submission, returned in triumph to England. 25

BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgements:**

Source 1 from: *The Normans in Britain*, Donald Wilkinson and John Cantrell, Palgrave 1987

Source 2 from: *English Historical Documents 1042–1189*, David C. Douglas (ed) George W. Greenaway, Eyre and Spottiswoode 1953

Source 3 from: *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History: Comprising the History of...*, Volume 2 By Roger (of Wendover), Matthew Paris.

Source 4 from: <http://www.melocki.org.uk/wendover/Flowers1.html>



- 8 How accurate is it to say that Henry II was personally responsible for the Great Rebellion of 1173–4?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173–74?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From Gerald of Wales, *The Conquest of Ireland*, written in 1189. Gerald was a chronicler of his times. He became a chaplain and royal clerk in Henry II's court in 1184. Here he is commenting on events in 1173–74.

In the month of April, Henry, the younger King of England, was no longer able to conceal the wickedness he had long planned against his father through evil counsels. Young Henry withdrew to the court of Louis, King of France, whose daughter he had married. He took with him his two brothers, Richard, Earl of Poitiers and Geoffrey of Brittany, and hoped, with his father-in-law's assistance, to replace his father, King Henry II, before his father died. He had also many accomplices among the nobles of England and foreign dominions, as well as many more who were his secret accomplices. 5

In these two years, King Henry had to wage war both in England and Aquitaine, and undertake many hurried expeditions between these lands. He thwarted the enterprises of his many powerful enemies with so much vigour that it would seem he had divine Providence giving him success over the unnatural rebellion of his sons. But a man's household are his worst enemies, and of all plagues, internal enemies are the greatest. King Henry was almost reduced to despair by the conduct of the gentlemen of his privy chamber, a chosen band, on whose loyalty his life or death depended. Nearly every night, some of them would disloyally join his sons, and when their services were wanted in the morning, they could not be found. 10 15

Source 4: From a letter written by Peter of Blois to Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine, 1173. Peter of Blois was the Archbishop of Rouen and a subject of Henry II. It is thought that this letter was written at the request of Henry II. Here Peter of Blois is referring to the Great Rebellion.

Greetings in the search for peace.

Marriage is a firm and unbreakable union. This is public knowledge and no Christian can take the liberty to ignore it. Truly, whoever separates a married couple becomes a sinner against God's commandment. 20

So the woman who leaves her husband and fails to keep the trust of this social bond is the one at fault. A woman who is not under the headship of the husband violates the condition of nature and the law of Scripture: 25

We condemn publicly and regretfully that, while you are a most prudent woman, you have left your husband, but what is worse, you have opened the way for your children to rise up against their father. We know that unless you return to your husband, you will be the cause of widespread disaster. While you alone are now the delinquent one, your actions will result in ruin for everyone in the kingdom. 30

And so, before this matter reaches a bad end, you should return with your sons to your husband, whom you have promised to obey and live with. I beg you, advise your sons to be obedient and respectful to their father. We say these things to you, most pious queen, in the zeal of God and the disposition of sincere love. 35

BLANK PAGE

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



- 8 How successful was Henry II in extending royal power in the years after the Great Rebellion (1173–74)?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



...

- 6** 'The Great Rebellion of 1173-74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 had similar causes but very different results.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 How accurate is it to say that the power of Eleanor of Aquitaine declined in the years 1154–74?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



...

- 6** 'In the years 1180-89, Philip Augustus played the most significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 8 How accurate is it to say that, in the years 1180–89, the main cause of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire was the ambitions of his sons Richard and John?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



- 6 How accurate is it to say that the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey weakened, rather than strengthened, Henry II's control of the Angevin Empire in the years 1183–89?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



8 Henry II's heir, Henry the Young King, died in June 1183.

To what extent did Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire change from June 1183 until his death in 1189?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



- 8 How accurate is it to say that the main reason for the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 was the weakness of those rebelling against the king?

(Total for Question 8 = 20 marks)



- 6 'Opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173–74) than were the feuds within Henry's own family.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

(Total for Question 6 = 20 marks)



- 7 How significant was the capture of William the Lion in the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173–74?

(Total for Question 7 = 20 marks)



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Study Sources 3 and 4 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 2** How far could the historian make use of Sources 3 and 4 together to investigate the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173–74?

Explain your answer, using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Total for Question 2 = 20 marks)

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*. William, an English clergyman, was born in 1136 and died in 1198. His *History* was based on manuscripts kept in his monastery and on oral accounts. Here he comments on events at the start of the Great Rebellion.

A foul and detestable conflict arose between King Henry II and his son, 'Henry III', who had been crowned king two years earlier. Young Henry desired, at the least, to reign jointly with his father. Indeed, some people whispered to Young Henry that, after his coronation, his father's reign had ended, so Young Henry now had the right to reign alone.

5

Young Henry secretly fled to his father-in-law, King Louis of France. He was graciously received by King Louis and was provoked against his father by the malicious advice of the French.

Young Henry went secretly into Aquitaine where his brothers, Richard and Geoffrey, were with their mother. With her support, he brought them back to Paris. Young Henry was persuaded by the French that the men of Aquitaine and Brittany might be easily won over to his side because King Henry II had granted Aquitaine to Richard and Brittany to Geoffrey. Young Henry also allied himself with the count of Flanders, a man of great power.

10

At the same time, many powerful barons, both in England and overseas, deserted King Henry for Young Henry and prepared for war. Among them were the earl of Leicester, the earl of Chester, and several others formidable because of their great wealth and their strong fortresses. To these was added a more ferocious enemy, the King of the Scots. However, while so many and great barons deserted the elder king, there remained a few who were loyal to him.

15

20



Source 4: From Jordan Fantosme, *Chronicle of the War Between the English and the Scots in 1173 and 1174*. Fantosme served the bishop of Winchester, a supporter of Henry II. His *Chronicle* was based on his own eyewitness observations and those of his bishop. It was written in verse to be recited by minstrels. Here, he comments on messages received by Henry II regarding events in the north of England in 1174.

At Westminster, King Henry was anxious
Because the King of Scotland, who had acted madly,
And Roger of Mowbray, a noble warrior,
Were laying waste his land by night and day.

There came a piece of news from which he gained great honour 25
When the messenger came to the door and gently called,
'Lord Ranulf de Glanvill* sent me here,
In order to speak with the King.'

'Sire,' said the chamberlain,
'It is a messenger from the north.' 30
'By my faith!' said King Henry, 'now am I very uneasy.'

'What news do you bring?' said King Henry,
'Has the King of Scotland entered Richmond?
Has Newcastle-upon-Tyne been seized, and the fortifications?
And all my barons expelled from their estates?' 35

'Sire,' said the messenger,
'The King of Scotland is captured and all his barons too.'

And King Henry was so joyful that night
That he went up to the knights and awoke them all:
'Men, wake up. 40
The King of Scotland is captured.'
And the knights say, 'Now thank the Lord God.
Now is the war ended, and your kingdom in peace.'

*Lord Ranulf de Glanvill – Chief Justiciar of England

BLANK PAGE**Acknowledgement:**

Source 1 from: *The History of the Kings of England*, Simeon of Durham © RenaissanceAlive.com, February 2013

Source 2 from: *The Normans in Europe*, Elisabeth Van Houts © Manchester University Press, 2000 / *The Norman Conquest of England*, R Allen Brown © Boydell Press, 1995

Source 3 from: *English Historical Documents II 1042–1189*, David C Douglas & George W Greenaway © London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1953

Source 4 from: *Chronicle of the War Between the English and the Scots in 1173 and 1174*, Jordan Fantosme © Elibron Classics, 2007



MARK SCHEMES

official Pearson Edexcel mark schemes



Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into Henry II's extension of control over his nobility in England by 1166. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It provides evidence that Henry II was making a detailed enquiry of all the barons in his realm for the purpose of exerting his control ('Your most excellent lordship has ordered all your vassals to send to you answers') - It suggests that Henry II intended to prevent his barons from keeping more knights than they were allowed ('how many knights does each possess from the time of your grandfather King Henry I, and how many knights has he now?') - It suggests that Roger of York is aware that he has been keeping more knights than allowed and is excusing this as not threatening to the king ('they wished to provide positions for their relatives and servants'). - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was an official record of the holdings of the barons and the feudal tenancies of the many thousands of small fiefs that were held from the Crown. It was important to Henry II that it was accurate - The purpose of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was to allow Henry to know exactly what was owed to him by his barons and knights and whether any barons were keeping more knights than they were permitted - The return from York is likely to reflect the records submitted by other barons. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: - Henry's restoration of authority over his nobility had started as soon as he came to the throne in 1154 with the demolition of illegal castles. <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was the final stage in this process <i>Cartae Baronum</i> extended Henry's financial control over his nobility by providing information about the feudal rights owing to him from his fiefs. These included military service or scutage, the right to aids, and wardship fines <i>Cartae Baronum</i> recorded whether there were more knights enfeoffed on the barons' estates than were necessary for the quotas. This would alert the king to any potential threats from his barons.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into Henry II's extension of control in Brittany in 1166. - The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: - As a monk and chronicler, William of Newburgh was not a close associate of Henry II and thus might be considered to be relatively impartial as an observer - William of Newburgh lived in England during Henry II's reign, and is commenting on Henry's actions taking place outside the kingdom which may impact on his position to know - Chronicles were recorded from the perspective of the chronicler, which leads some historians to question their impartiality. The tone used here suggests support for Henry, his king. - The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: - It provides evidence that Henry used marriage as a method of extending his control ('Having betrothed this girl to his young son Geoffrey, King Henry took all of her rights under his own control') - It suggests that Brittany had sunk into lawlessness with some of its barons assuming powers to which they were not entitled ('For many years they had oppressed their weaker subjects') - It indicates the people of Brittany wanted Henry to rule over them ('weaker people called upon the king of England for help, and they voluntarily submitted to his control') - It provides evidence that Henry was successful in his attempt to obtain control and that this was beneficial to the people ('Having expelled or subdued Brittany's disturbers, he governed it and brought it peace throughout all its borders'). - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: - Henry II had long wanted control of Brittany. He had lost it to Conan in 1158 after the death of his brother Geoffrey. Conan had denied Henry's claims as his brother's heir - Louis of France had made Henry II seneschal of Brittany but had not supported his claims to overlordship which were also resisted by leading barons from Maine and Brittany - Henry invaded Brittany in July 1166, took Combourg Castle and deposed Conan for not controlling the rebel barons. He betrothed seven year old Geoffrey to Conan's daughter but intended to rule Brittany himself.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the role of the Chancellor in Henry II's government. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It suggests that the Chancellor was the key official in the royal government ('Chancellor is great in the court, so is he also great at the exchequer') - It provides evidence that the Chancellor had authority over the use of the royal seal ('He has the control of the royal seal which is in the treasury') - It implies that the Chancellor's authority over the treasurer was limited ('He may not tell the treasurer what to write', 'the Chancellor can challenge him, but only in front of the barons.'). - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: - Richard fitzNigel, as another key royal official, was in a good position to comment on the role of the Chancellor - The source provides a valuable account of the relationship between the Chancellor and treasurer - The purpose of the source was to train clerks in the business of the exchequer and the role of the Chancellor within it, which means Richard fitzNigel had a vested interest in ensuring accuracy. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: - The Chancellor was the king's secretary and was at the heart of royal government and the administration system - The Chancellor examined all petitions and pleas that were sent to the king and he had a key role in the justice system - Thomas Becket was appointed as Chancellor in 1154 and developed the office into a large and important part of the government with improved record keeping.



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the settlement between Henry II and the Church in 1172. - The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: - This is the only surviving account of the settlement between Henry and the Church and is therefore invaluable to the historian - The authorship of the source cannot be confirmed - The tone of the source suggests some partiality to Henry II ('persuasive to all', 'the most invincible King Henry'). - The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: - It claims that Henry had not ordered the murder of Becket that had brought the relationship with the Church to a crisis point ('he had never ordered or desired that Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury be killed') - It claims that Henry bore some responsibility for the death of Becket ('did not deny that it had perhaps been done on his behalf') - It implies that Henry submitted entirely to the demands of the Church ('not only to make amends for the death of the Archbishop but to provide guarantees for his good behaviour'). - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: - Henry performed a ceremony of public penance at Avranches Cathedral before agreeing the settlement and submitted himself to a flogging at Canterbury on his return to England in 1174 - The Pope did not enforce the agreement made in the settlement and Henry did not go on Crusade - Henry's authority regarding the Church was not diminished by the settlement at Avranches; English bishops agreed to obey Henry and the definition of 'evil customs' was left to the king to define.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the development of royal justice under Henry II. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It provides evidence of the development of the jury in the legal system ('twelve free and lawful men of the neighbourhood are to be elected.') - It provides evidence that royal justice was pursued by using a writ ('he shall have the following writ') - It implies that the king is the fount of all justice ('in my court', 'therefore I command you') - It indicates that the king did not need to be present for claims to be pursued and judged ('these jurors should decide', 'the sheriff shall be directed'). - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: - The <i>Treatise concerning the Laws and Customs of the Kingdom of England</i> was a legal textbook which was intended to lay down accurate details of the laws of England - Ranulf Glanvill was the justiciar of England and an authority in the law - The tone and language of the source is impartial. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <i>Mort d'Ancestor</i> was introduced to deal with issues over the rightful possession of land that had arisen out of the problems caused by the Anarchy <i>Mort d'Ancestor</i> could be bought by a standardised writ introduced in the Assize of Northampton 1176 - The use of juries of recognition in the justice system was an important stage in the development of trial by jury and an evidence-based legal system.

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the defeat of Henry II by Philip Augustus in 1189. 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: • Roger of Howden was royal clerk to Henry II at the time of the defeat and should therefore be well-informed about events • The tone and language of the account has the ring of truth; there is no evidence of the author underplaying the extent of the defeat • The tone used suggests that the author favoured Henry II. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It suggests that Henry II's army was weaker than the French force ('Many others from the army of the king of England were captured, and others fled') • It provides evidence that Henry was betrayed by his own men ('the men of Poitou laid plots against their lord, King Henry') • It indicates that Henry II's defeat was total ('Henry, king of England, has submitted himself in every way to Philip, king of France'). 4. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: • Henry II faced the combined forces of Philip Augustus and Richard, Duke of Aquitaine, and his favourite son, John, joined forces with them • Henry II lost the territories of Berry and Maine to Philip Augustus • Henry II was forced to retire through illness and obliged to agree to terms, including doing homage for all of his French possessions • Henry II did not regard the defeat as final and was planning revenge, but he died on 6 July 1189.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106



2	3–5	• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions.
---	-----	---



Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that Henry II's financial reforms were more important than legal reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's financial reforms were more important than legal reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry restored finances by introducing payments called gifts and aids, imposing scutage and tallage, increasing feudal fines and seizing lost royal estates which restored the authority of the crown after the civil war • The reforms of the coinage in 1158 and 1180 secured the value of the silver penny, with severe penalties for forgers and moneyers producing substandard coins, which enforced Henry's control over the money supply • Henry strengthened royal finances and hence his authority by introducing an effective system of auditing the accounts, including those of the sheriffs, by experienced treasurers in the exchequer • The Cartae Baronum 1166, investigated the fiefs held by his tenants-in-chief, what they owed him in feudal dues and the number of knights they retained. This enforced his control over his great vassals • In the Inquest of the Sheriffs of 1170, Henry investigated malpractice in local government. This enhanced his authority by replacing of almost all the sheriffs with new sheriffs chosen by, and loyal to, the king • Royal income increased from £10,300 in 1155 to £22,000 by the end of Henry's reign which strengthened royal authority because it meant the king had the money he needed e.g. to build castles and wage wars. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's legal reforms were more important than financial reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's legal reforms, including the development of a mass produced writ, had financial benefit. Justice was available for a price and the profits of justice swelled the king's coffers and enhanced his powers • The assizes of Clarendon and Northampton made testifying under oath the standard procedure and serious crimes could be tried by the ordeal of trial by water. Uniformity strengthened the authority of the king • The introduction of itinerant justices in eyre led to the number of convictions rising significantly in the counties that they visited. This enhanced the authority of the king by ensuring felons were punished • The Court of the King's Bench at Westminster became the headquarters of the itinerant justices. Records of judgements were kept so that precedents could be established which ensured uniform justice • The introduction of <i>Novel disseisin</i> and <i>Mort d'ancestor</i> played an important role in settling the many disputes over land after the civil war which prevented conflicts that would have unsettled the kingdom • The introduction of the Grand Assize offered trial by a jury of 12 knights in the royal court as an alternative to trial by duel which developed the provision of justice away from violence as a method of settling disputes. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that in 1154 the most significant obstacle to the restoration of royal authority in England was the power of the barons. Arguments and evidence that in 1154 the most significant obstacle to the restoration of royal authority in England was the power of the barons should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The previous anarchy had completely undermined royal authority. In 1154 the English barons controlled land as if it was their own realm, dispensed their own justice and some even minted their own coins • There were 22 earldoms in 1154 these earls held rights and privileges, which reduced the Crown's income • The English barons had built illegal castles during the Anarchy which now challenged the authority of royal rule, e.g. William Le Gros, Count of Aumale, built Scarborough castle and established a mini-kingdom in Yorkshire. Arguments and evidence that in 1154 there were other more significant obstacles to the restoration of royal authority in England than the power of the barons should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II was capable of dealing with the power of the barons in England, e.g. he carried out a simultaneous siege of three of Hugh Mortimer's castles and forced him into surrender in July 1155 • The condition of the Crown's revenues in 1154 was a significant problem for asserting royal authority. Royal revenues had fallen by between a half and two-thirds since the outbreak of civil war in 1135 • Henry needed the fighting strength of the Flemish mercenaries to establish his control but their presence in England was unpopular. The mercenaries pillaged the local areas when they were not paid for their services • The anarchy had allowed the Scottish king and the Welsh princes to increase their territory at the expense of the English king and left England with weak borders. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Chancellor was the most significant official in Henry II's government in England in the years 1154–89. Arguments and evidence that the Chancellor was the most significant official in Henry II's government in England in the years 1154–89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Chancellor was the king's secretary and at the heart of the government and administration of the kingdom • The Chancellor was responsible for the production of the writs and the charters that were the main instruments by which the kingdom was governed • The Chancellor attended all the meetings of the king's council; he controlled the Great Seal which was needed to authenticate all official documents • The reliance that the king placed on the Chancellor is demonstrated when Henry II chose Thomas Becket to be his Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162; he expected the same absolute loyalty as Becket had shown as Chancellor. Arguments and evidence that there were other more significant officials in Henry II's government in England in the years 1154–89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Richard de Lucy's role at the Exchequer was of great importance; in the years 1154–79 he improved the collection of revenues from the royal demesne • Bishop Nigel of Ely further developed the importance of the Exchequer; he introduced twice-yearly sessions of the Exchequer court, which extended control over the financial dealing of the sheriffs • The role of the justiciar was of great significance; he acted as co-regent for the king during his absences and was superior to any other official. He was the contact between the crown and local barons • The justiciar was the senior royal judge and managed the itinerant justices. He was responsible for ensuring peace throughout the kingdom and his role in the legal system was vital in raising revenues. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II. Arguments and evidence that there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II introduced more regular visitations of the justices in eyre. They began to replace sheriffs and local officials and by 1170 their visits lasted several weeks. They provided a more impartial judgement in the localities • A group of 20 professional judges developed out of the itinerant justices who became experts in the law • Standardised writs were developed that could be used in the king's absence and meant that the justice system became faster and more accessible and tenants were better protected than ever before • Significant changes were introduced with the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, which increased the powers of sheriffs, introduced juries of presentment and developed <i>novel disseisin</i> and <i>mort d'ancestor</i> • The Court of the Kings Bench was established in 1178 and it became the most important court in the land • Ranulf Glanville's <i>Treatise on Laws and Customs in England</i> laid down a standardised system of common law for the first time. Arguments and evidence that there were not considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Justices in eyre had existed before Henry II's reign, their visits became more regular but their role had not really changed • The sheriff continued to be the key local law official • Villeins continued to receive justice at the hands of their lord • Trial by ordeal continued to be the main way of determining guilt. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • William of Newburgh was able to gain a wide perspective on events at this time through the variety of travellers who visited his abbey and provided information • William of Newburgh lived through the Anarchy and will have experienced the disorder and the restoration of royal power after 1154 • William of Newburgh was not an eyewitness to events and relied on material that was selected for him by those who visited his abbey. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II: • It provides evidence that Henry II restored order by expelling the mercenaries ('issued an edict against the many mercenaries ... he ordered to return to their own country') • It suggests that men were afraid of thwarting Henry's authority ('Terror-stricken by this edict, they slipped away') • It claims that Henry revived the legal system ('revived the strength of the laws in England', 'he appointed judges to restrain the behaviour of wicked men') • It indicates that Henry curbed the powers of the barons ('ordered the newly-erected castles to be razed to the ground, with the exception of a few ... These castles he desired either to keep for himself'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • The removal of mercenaries enhanced Henry II's authority by reducing

Question	Indicative content
	his costs and assisting in the restoration of royal finances - Henry began a programme of decommissioning and destroying adulterine castles at the end of 1154; he besieged three of the baron of Wigmore's castles simultaneously in 1155 and forced him to surrender - The royal writ was restored across the country and Henry II spent his first year in power hearing and settling grievances regarding rights and lands. Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: - This is an official charter that outlines the rights granted by the king to Lincoln - Lincoln had been a supporter of Matilda fitzEmpress during the civil war and was therefore likely to be favoured by Henry II - The purpose of the charter is to restore law and order and the financial well-being of the city to Lincoln. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II: - It indicates that the law in Lincoln was in need of restoration ('I have granted to my citizens of Lincoln all their liberties and customs and laws which they had in the time of ... Henry I') - It implies that a key element of the restoration of royal authority was to restore the financial position of the city ('shall have the same rights to taxes and customs duties as ever they had') - It provides evidence that Henry was asserting his own authority over the city ('in my city of Lincoln as my citizen'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: - The restoration of the law and order in cities was a key factor in the restoration of royal authority - Towns were excellent sources of royal revenue through licences to hold fairs and markets and tolls to enter the town walls - Henry II made the most important towns, London, Lincoln, York,

Question	Indicative content
	Winchester, Exeter, Oxford and Leicester, royal boroughs under Crown rather than baronial control. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The two sources together suggest that royal authority was restored in military, legal and financial terms • The two sources contrast by offering a perspective of the restoration across the whole country and in a single city • The two sources are contrasting in nature. Source 1 is an historical account while Source 2 is a charter of rights.

Section B: Indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that, in the years 1154-89, Richard fitzNigel was the most significant royal official in Henry II's government. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1154-89, Richard fitzNigel was the most significant royal official in Henry II's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Richard fitzNigel improved the management of the kingdom by his development of the Exchequer and overseeing England's financial affairs that was essential for funding Henry II's government and wars • Richard fitzNigel's influence extended beyond his own role through the development of standardised procedures in the auditing of accounts of the royal household and in local government in his <i>Dialogue of the Exchequer</i> • In 1180, Richard fitzNigel oversaw the reformation of the coinage based on procedures established by him to monitor the quality of the currency. This improved the king's control and prevented a loss of revenues • Richard fitzNigel's oversight of the Exchequer played a key role in boosting royal revenue. Before 1160 royal revenue stood at £13,300 per annum. By 1189 it had been increased to £23,300 per annum. Arguments and evidence that challenge the significance of Richard fitzNigel in Henry II's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bishop Nigel developed the Exchequer before the rise of Richard fitzNigel. He was responsible for establishing the twice-yearly sessions of the Exchequer and in recording accounts on pipe rolls • The role of the justiciar was an important point of contact between the king and the barons in the regions. He travelled in the kingdom and supervised the itinerant justices who dispensed justice in the localities • Richard de Lucy was the sole justiciar after 1168. He was a vital figure in Henry II's government: an expert at court politics, astute at managing the church and responsible for defeating the barons in 1173-74 • The chancellor was a key member of the administration. Under Thomas Becket, the chancery developed into an efficient component in the

	government machinery with responsibility for issuing writs and charters. Other relevant material must be credited.
--	--



2	4-7	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
---	-----	--



Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the <i>Cartae Baronum</i> survey was the most significant factor in extending royal authority over the nobility in England in the years 1154-72. Arguments and evidence that the <i>Cartae Baronum</i> survey was the most significant factor in extending royal authority over the nobility in England in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was central to the restoration of the balance of power in favour of the Crown after the Anarchy. It ensured that feudal dues were paid to the King • Henry II was able to use the returns from <i>Cartae Baronum</i> to identify barons who were creating private armies by retaining knights in excess of the <i>servitium debitum</i> and to end this challenge to the authority of the king • <i>Cartae Baronum</i> enabled Henry II to demand scutage for the actual number of knights held by barons, including those who were not enfeoffed. This increased royal revenues and hence royal power • <i>Cartae Baronum</i> enabled Henry II to identify the knights held by his tenants-in-chief and to require that they swore an oath of allegiance directly to the King. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more significant, factors in extending royal authority over the nobility in England in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Royal authority was extended by reducing the power of the barons. Illegal castles were destroyed, the most important towns taken under royal control and the feudal rights of wardship and escheat enforced • Royal control was extended over the localities in 1166 by allowing sheriffs to pursue felons on barons' lands. The 1170 Inquest of the Sheriffs replaced the majority of sheriffs with royal officials accountable to the Crown • Royal authority was enhanced by the reviving of England's finances. The new tallage tapped the wealth of towns, and the 1158 reform of the coinage guaranteed the Crown did not lose revenue through debased coinage • The Assizes of Clarendon of 1166 extended royal authority. This established juries of presentment and boosted the profits of justice for the Crown through the sale of chattels if the accused was found guilty. Other relevant material must be credited.



5	17–20	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.
----------	--------------	---

Section B

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	- Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. - Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. - The overall judgement is missing or asserted. - There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	- There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. - An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. - The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	- There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. - Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. - The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. - The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. - The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.



Section A: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
1	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons why William Rufus was able to defeat the rebellion of 1088. Source 1 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • As an Anglo-Norman, Henry of Huntingdon was in a good position to offer a balanced view of a dispute between the English king and the Duke of Normandy • Henry of Huntingdon would have been able to draw upon his good political connections, forged in the household of one of England's most important bishops, to complete his <i>History</i> • Henry of Huntingdon was only a small child at the time of the rebellion and would not be able to draw on any meaningful personal experience to offer an insight on the rebellion. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons why William Rufus was able to defeat the rebellion of 1088: • It claims that William Rufus' supporters were aided by divine intervention to defeat the rebels (saintly Bishop Wulfstan called on the most-high God, he miraculously forced the rebels to flee.) • It indicates that Rufus' military skills played a key role in defeating the rebels ('the royal army stormed the castle', 'besieged Bishop Odo and Count Robert there for six weeks') • It provides evidence that Robert Curthose's invasion failed ('overwhelmed and sank ships carrying the Norman army.') • It suggests that Rufus' siege tactics were successful in starving out the rebels ('whose food had run out, surrendered the castle to the King.') 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • William Rufus was quick to identify Bishop Odo as the most dangerous opponent and direct his military force to the rebels in Kent, leaving other reliable barons to deal with the rebels in the midlands and the north • William Rufus retained the support of four of the ten most powerful barons and the majority of the lesser barons in England, as well as the support of the Church, except for the Bishop of Durham • Rebellions elsewhere in England collapsed after Rufus took control of the south • Odo of Bayeux was exiled to Normandy. The English soldiers jeered and called for him to be hanged as he departed Rochester.



Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Florence had good access to papers and documents that had been kept in the monastery at Worcester from which to compile his <i>Chronicle of Chronicles</i> • Florence's work preserved a now lost version of the <i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> • The <i>Chronicle of Chronicles</i> was commissioned by the bishop of Worcester with the purpose of recording the major events in history for future generations • Florence's <i>Chronicle</i> was written with hindsight of these events and was therefore likely to emphasise the effectiveness of William Rufus against the defeated rebels. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences the reasons why William Rufus was able to defeat the rebellion of 1088: • It provides evidence that William Rufus was able to put an army of Normans and English into the field ('assembled troops...., to form an army', 'contained as many Normans ... consisted chiefly of English') • It implies that Rufus won over the population to his side in the rebellion ('After promising rewards to his supporters') • It implies that Bishop Odo and Robert of Mortain were relying on the Duke of Normandy to defeat William Rufus ('Duke of Normandy would arrive soon with a large army... make himself master of the kingdom.') • It suggests that William Rufus was skilled in the art of siege warfare ('he prepared his war engines... place was strongly fortified, but he made constant efforts to destroy it.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • William Rufus secured the support of the English laity by promising to give relief from geld and the forest law and to restore the laws of Edward the Confessor • Robert Curthose did not come in person to press his claims for the throne, his advance force was destroyed and so the expected support for the rebels never arrived • William Rufus was a seasoned military commander, having fought campaigns with his father in Normandy and England. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources emphasise the importance of William Rufus' measures to win over the support of the English people • Both sources emphasise the significance of Duke Robert's failure to come to England and aid the rebels in their effort to put him on the throne • While the author of Source 1 was able to draw on his political connections to complete his account, Source 2 relied on the compilation of accounts gathered over time in his monastery.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the role of Thomas Becket in the dispute between church and state in the years 1162–70. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • As a monk of Canterbury, Gervase was known to Becket and would have been in an excellent position to get the archbishop's views on the quarrel • Gervase's role in burying Becket after his murder may have had an impact on his account, which is clearly pro-Becket in its tone and content • Gervase began to write his account in 1188; he was able to draw upon the benefit of hindsight in assessing Becket's role in the quarrel. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Thomas Becket in the dispute between church and state in the years 1162–70: • It claims that Becket did not want to be archbishop as he foresaw it would create problems ('he must abandon either the favour of God or the approval of the King. ... opposed the wishes of his sovereign') • It implies that Thomas' aim to restore the rights of the church was a primary cause of the dispute ('His great aim was to restore those rights to the church that it had been deprived of by kings.') • It implies that Henry's behaviour was entirely responsible for the quarrel ('King tyrannised over everything and everyone', 'desired to preserve for himself the ancient customs', 'rose up in anger') • It suggests that the bishops were weak and undermined Becket ('bishops remained silent'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Henry II had expected Becket to assist him in asserting his control over the church; he was surprised when Becket adopted the role of a churchman with such fervour • When Becket's body was being prepared for burial, it was found that he wore a hairshirt and that his body showed signs of scourging • Becket clashed with Henry over the issue of criminous clerks at Westminster. He was naïve in accepting a chirograph from Henry that legally bound the church to the Constitutions of Clarendon • Becket escaped to France after Henry II summoned him to Northampton to answer charges of embezzlement.



Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Bishop Foliot was a committed royalist and supporter of Henry II in the dispute with Becket. The content and tone of his letter, which was intended for a wide audience, make his sympathies for Henry II very clear • Bishop Foliot had ambitions to be archbishop of Canterbury. His animosity towards Becket, who was appointed to the coveted position, may have affected his attitude towards the quarrel • Bishop Foliot was close to Henry II and would have been in an excellent position to represent the views of the King in the quarrel • Foliot's letter gives an immediate reaction to the events while the dispute was ongoing. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Thomas Becket in the dispute between church and state in the years 1162-70: • It implies that Becket was responsible for the quarrel ('He did not introduce these customs', 'you ... threatened the King') • It implies that Becket's handling of the dispute was incompetent ('should have handled such matters with mature deliberation, not with the enthusiasm of a novice. You should have sought advice') • It claims that the dispute could have been settled if Becket had acted with greater circumspection ('some matters that could have been settled easily') • It claims that Becket's handling of the dispute was to blame for its escalation ('terrible letters, which you dispatched to the King', 'Everything that the Papacy had achieved ... ruined by your threats.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Becket advised the bishops to accept the Constitutions of Clarendon, only to refuse to seal them himself later. Most bishops relied on Henry II for their position and remained loyal to him during the quarrel • Becket spent some of his time in exile in the court of Louis VII, Henry's principal enemy on the continent. This was bound to escalate the quarrel • Becket won the support of Pope Alexander to his cause while he was in exile. This reinforced his position and meant the quarrel continued • Becket spent his time in exile writing letters defending his position and admonishing the King for his behaviour. Reconciliation proved impossible until late in 1170, and this proved to be very precarious. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The sources offer contrasting views of Becket's role with Source 3 favouring Becket's position, while Source 4 is critical and suggests that Becket was responsible for the quarrel, its escalation and continuation • Both sources identify the issue of the ancient customs of the realm as the key element in the dispute • The suggestions in Source 3 that Becket was not supported by the bishops are verified by Foliot's complaints about Becket's behaviour in Source 4.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that Harold's effective military leadership was the main reason why the Anglo-Saxons achieved victory at Stamford Bridge in September 1066. Arguments and evidence that Harold's effective military leadership was the main reason why the Anglo-Saxons achieved victory at Stamford Bridge in September 1066 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Harold was a seasoned warrior, having previously led the campaign that defeated the Welsh Prince, Gruffydd ap Llywelyn, as well as fighting with Duke William of Normandy on campaign in Maine • Harold was successful in recruiting mounted levées from the shires on his route north to meet the Vikings. It is claimed that he had recruited the whole strength of southern and central England, about 10,000 men • Harold's tactic of surprising the Vikings, having marched his army 200 miles north in 4-8 days, played a key role preventing the Vikings from consolidating their position and defeating them at Stamford Bridge • Harold was able to direct the battle from his secure knowledge of the landscape; he held an estate at Catton and was very familiar with the area • Harold was effective in directing troops to dispose of the Vikings caught on the west bank, wrest control of the Derwent Bridge from the Vikings and engage the bulk of the Vikings, killing Hardrada in the ensuing battle • Harold gave quarter to the defeated Vikings, allowing them to leave and recruiting some to join the Anglo-Saxon army that faced Duke William. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more important reasons why the Anglo-Saxons achieved victory at Stamford Bridge in September 1066 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Vikings had suffered heavy losses at Fulford Gate, as high as 4,000 men. Hardrada's decision to leave a large part of the army at Riccall, 15 miles away, meant he was fighting with a diminished force of 5,000 men • Hardrada's need to take hostages indicated his weakness in the north. Despite Tostig's claims that the Northumbrians would welcome a Viking invasion, the northern population remained loyal to Harold • Hardrada allowed his men to discard their armour because of the clement weather. The lack of armour weakened the Viking army in the battle and played a key role in its defeat • The reinforcements that Hardrada summoned from Riccall, when the Anglo-Saxon army arrived, were too late to play an effective role in the battle • The death of Hardrada broke the morale of the Viking troops, who fled back to their ships. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
4	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 was a significant threat to William I's authority in England, but the revolt of the earls in 1075 did little to threaten his authority. Arguments and evidence that the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 was a significant threat to William I's authority in England, but the revolt of the earls in 1075 did little to threaten his authority should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The leaders in the East Anglian Rebellion were a threat to William I. Edwin and Morcar were former earls with significant regional support (e.g. Aethelwine, bishop of Durham), and support from Malcolm of Scotland • The leaders of the East Anglian Rebellion had foreign support. With Viking help, Hereward's men launched an attack on Peterborough Abbey. The possibility of a Viking victory was a significant threat to William I • The rebel base at Ely, with its access to the sea, enabled disgruntled English exiles to join the rebels by boat. The landscape was difficult to navigate and William I had to launch a prolonged siege to retake it • The punishments meted out after the East Anglian Rebellion, including blinding and mutilation, were harsh. This suggests that William I regarded it as a significant threat • In 1075, the earls had expected support from the Danish fleet, but it arrived too late to assist in the rebellion and thus did not threaten William's authority • The leaders in the 1075 revolt were weak. Waltheof confessed the plan to Lanfranc, Earl Roger was held in Herefordshire and was unable to join the revolt and Earl Ralph was forced to retreat by Odo of Bayeux. Arguments and evidence that the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 did little to threaten William I's authority in England, but the revolt of the earls in 1075 was a significant threat to his authority should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Despite their credentials, the leaders in the East Anglian Rebellion proved to be weak. Morcar was captured, Edwin was killed by his own men and Hereward, a thegn whose resources were limited, fled • The Danes were easily bought off by William in the East Anglian Rebellion. They returned to Scandinavia, leaving the English rebels to face William's forces alone • William's military skills were more than a match for the rebels in East Anglia. He launched a combined assault from land and water, blockaded the island and besieged Ely into surrender • The aim of the earls in the 1075 revolt was very threatening to William I. They intended to overthrow him, divide up the kingdom and select one of themselves to be king • The severity of the punishments in 1075 suggests that William was threatened. The Breton rebels were blinded, Roger was imprisoned, Ralph was exiled and Waltheof was executed. Other relevant material must be credited.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the purposes of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> (1166) and the Inquest of the Sheriffs (1170) were remarkably similar. Arguments and evidence that the purposes of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> (1166) and the Inquest of the Sheriffs (1170) were remarkably similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: - Both <i>Cartae Baronum</i> and the Inquest of the Sheriffs had an investigative purpose. They were national surveys, conducted across the whole of England, to investigate those who sought to deny the king his feudal rights - The purposes of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> and the Inquest of the Sheriffs were similar in that they were intended to increase royal power. Henry used <i>Cartae Baronum</i> to demand personal oaths of allegiance from knights, while the Inquest led to the appointment of royal officials in the shires - The purpose of both <i>Cartae Baronum</i> and the Inquest of the Sheriffs was to increase royal revenues. <i>Cartae Baronum</i> gave Henry an exact record of how much scutage he could demand, while the Inquest ended the practice of sheriffs directing the taxes collected into their own coffers - Both <i>Cartae Baronum</i> and the Inquest of the Sheriffs were intended to facilitate effective local government. Arguments and evidence that the purposes of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> (1166) and the Inquest of the Sheriffs (1170) were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was only directed to investigate the behaviour of Henry's tenants-in-chiefs. The Inquest of the Sheriffs had a much wider remit, investigating the behaviour not only of sheriffs but also barons, bishops, knights, bailiffs, foresters and burgesses - One of the purposes of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was to gain a complete record of feudal dues owed by tenants-in-chief so that Henry II could call upon the customary feudal aid for the marriage of his daughter, which he did in 1168. The Inquest was responding to complaints about embezzlement - A key purpose of the <i>Cartae Baronum</i> survey was to gain a complete record of the number of knights that each tenant-in-chief held to ensure that the king could call upon the full feudal army. The Inquest did not have this military purpose - A key purpose of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> was Henry's suspicion that barons were retaining more knights than they should be and building private armies that could threaten his kingship. The nefarious activities of sheriffs did not represent the same military threat to Henry. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether itinerant kingship played the most significant role in maintaining royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1154-89. Arguments and evidence that itinerant kingship played the most significant role in maintaining royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II built a highly organised, well-administered and very visible government that did not rely on the king's presence in one place to function. The standardised writ facilitated royal justice in his absence • Royal authority was maintained effectively using itinerant kingship through the appointment of justiciars and seneschals who ruled in Henry's absence, overseeing all royal matters • Henry II used itinerant kingship to develop a direct relationship with his subjects. The <i>curia regis</i> travelled with him. In each place he stopped, the <i>curia regis</i> absorbed local courts for the duration of the visit • Henry II was in constant contact with his other lands when he was absent, e.g. when in France, he had 25 ships on constant standby to carry men and royal orders across the channel. Thus, royal authority was maintained • Itinerant kingship played a vital role in crushing the Great Rebellion, e.g. the speed with which Henry moved back and forth across the Channel, as well as the role of Richard de Lucy in crushing the rebels in England. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more significant factors in maintaining royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's financial reforms played a vital role in maintaining royal power. The revival of the Danegeld, the introduction of the tallage and the imposition of feudal dues provided funds for his government and wars • The restoration of royal lands after the anarchy provided Henry with the personal revenues that were needed to establish and maintain his kingship • Henry's legal reforms enforced his authority over his subjects. The Assizes of Clarendon (1166) and Northampton (1176) developed a systematic approach to law across the realm and increased his power in the localities • The establishment of the Court of the King's Bench, the use of itinerant justices and general eyres meant that a system of justice was developed by royally-appointed officials • The surveys, <i>Cartae Baronum</i> and the Inquest of the Sheriffs, played vital roles in maintaining royal authority by curbing the powers of the barons and local officials at the expense of the king. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which financial reforms responsible for the growing power of the king in the years 1154-89. Arguments and evidence that financial reforms were responsible for the growing power of the king in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1154 Henry took steps to restore the value of the currency by re-minting the coinage at 30 approved royal mints; royal authority was reasserted over a system widely regarded as a symbol of royal power • Henry revived tax revenues by restoring the danegeld and introducing new taxes <i>dona</i> and <i>auxila</i>, which he collected from a wide section of communities • Henry appointed effective officials to oversee the management of royal revenues; Richard de Lucy managed the exchequer while Thomas Becket was responsible for imposing a flat rate scutage of 20 shillings on the barons • Revived finances played a key role in providing funds for castle building and raising armies for Henry's wars of conquest. Arguments and evidence that other factors were responsible for the growing power of the king in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The destruction of illegal castles in 1154-55 and the removal of the barons' 'mini-kingdoms' was a prerequisite in the extension of royal authority after the Anarchy • The evidence from <i>Cartae Baronum</i> in 1166 was a key factor in extending the power of the king over his barons by ensuring that they were not keeping private armies • The Inquest of the Sheriffs launched in 1170 ensured that the power of the king was extended to the localities by removing sheriffs that had evaded royal authority and replacing them with loyal officials • The reform of the legal system with the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, the establishment of the Court of the King's Bench and the general eyres meant that the king's justice was extended across the realm. Other relevant material must be credited.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.

Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the relationship between Henry II and the leading barons in England changed in the years 1154-89. Arguments and evidence that the relationship between Henry II and the leading barons in England changed in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1154, Henry faced challenges from powerful barons who held 225 castles compared to 49 held by the Crown. Henry's destruction of adulterine castles redressed the balance. He kept 30 of the captured castles for the Crown • When Henry came to the throne in 1154, leading barons had built up personal armies by retaining knights. <i>Cartae Baronum</i> curbed the barons' power by enforcing scutage and requiring knights to do homage to the King • The relationship between the King and his leading barons in the legal system changed. Henry II enhanced the powers of sheriffs to enter barons' lands and reinforced the protection of tenants through the use of writs • The relationship between the King and his barons in the governing of England changed. There was a gradual trend away from appointing leading nobles to appointing able, but lower-ranking, men to key positions. Arguments and evidence that the relationship between Henry II and the leading barons in England did not change in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1154, Henry II could count on the support of most of the English barons. This continued throughout his reign, e.g., the support of the earls of Gloucester, Cornwall and Arundel in the Great Rebellion • Henry continued to face challenges from leading barons, e.g., in 1173-74, the earls of Leicester, Norfolk and Chester joined the Great Rebellion on the side of the Young King • Leading magnates continued to play leading roles in Henry's government, e.g., Robert of Leicester was justiciar from 1154-68; Bishop Nigel managed the Exchequer until 1169; nobles were appointed to the <i>Curia Regis</i> • Henry II's continued need for his leading barons was demonstrated in the Assize of Arms 1181. Despite the restrictions it imposed, it showed that the King depended on his barons and their men for the defence of the realm. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89. Arguments and evidence that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Assize of Clarendon was significant because it developed a more systematic approach to law and order in the kingdom and particularly in the localities • The powers of the sheriff were significantly enhanced by the Assize of Clarendon. Sheriffs were empowered to enter any land in pursuit of criminals, which decreased the powers of barons to protect vassals • The Assize of Clarendon introduced juries of presentment, which strengthened the legal system by enabling juries to draw upon local knowledge in building a court case • The Assize of Clarendon strengthened the king's powers by boosting his revenue. The accused was made to hand over all chattels before the trial. If found guilty, the chattels were sold and the proceeds given to the king. Arguments and evidence that the Assize of Clarendon was not the most significant reform /there were other more significant reforms introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The introduction of the Inquest of the Sheriffs was a significant legal reform. It removed sheriffs who had taken bribes and replaced them with royal officials who were accountable to the crown in enforcing the law • The Assize of Northampton was significant because it strengthened royal authority by requiring every man to make an oath of fealty to the king. It also deterred crime by making punishments for lesser crimes harsher • <i>Novel disseisin</i> and <i>mort d'ancestor</i> were significant reforms that dealt with property disputes that dominated legal cases. They generated a caseload that led to five members of the Curia Regis sitting permanently • The development of standardised writs was a significant development in the legal system. They were mass produced and made justice faster and accessible to many more people because they could be bought for 6d • The Court of the King's Bench became a permanent court. It developed the idea that the king was a permanent source of justice, because the court sat whether he was present in the country or not • Henry II extended the role of itinerant justices and the general eyres. Visitations were frequent and, by 1170, eyres were lasting several weeks. Judgements were recorded in Westminster, thus establishing precedents. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into Henry II's reaction to Becket's decision to go into exile in 1164. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It provides evidence that Henry II intended to punish Becket by seizing his wealth ('seize into your own hands all the revenues and possessions of the archbishop of Canterbury') - It provides evidence that Henry intended to punish Becket's supporters ('to arrest the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, nephew and nieces of all the clerks who are with the archbishop') - It suggests that Henry did not accept that he was answerable to papal authority ('if any one ... appeals to the court of Rome, then you are to have him arrested') - It indicates that Henry was reserving judgement on the final reaction and that this would place pressure on Becket and his supporters to submit ('until my pleasure shall be known'). - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: - This was issued by Henry and demonstrates his personal reaction to Becket's decision to go into exile in December 1164 - This is a direct command from Henry to his sheriffs, which they were bound to implement and thus is no idle threat - The purpose of this command is to threaten Becket and his supporters and frighten them back into obedience. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: - Henry II's reaction to Becket's exile was particularly harsh because he had expected the Archbishop to support his plan to extend control over the church - Becket initially fled to the court of Louis VII, King of France and Henry's enemy. This antagonised Henry further - Henry ordered the deportation of Becket's entire family, household and anyone who supported Becket - Henry's threats were ineffective; Becket remained in exile for six years.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into Henry II's extension of control in Ireland in 1172. - The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: - Gerald of Wales was a clerk in Henry II's court from 1184 and the nephew of Fitz-Stephen. He would have been in a good position to gather information about the King's expedition to Ireland in 1172 - Gerald of Wales was not present in court or in Ireland in 1172. He is likely to have been given an account of that expedition favourable to Henry's views - The purpose of this source was clearly to praise Henry's achievements and to emphasise the ease with which Henry extended control in Ireland about which Gerald of Wales makes sweeping claims. - The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: - It provides evidence that Henry himself was responsible for the extension of control and he would not tolerate subordinates acting without his authorisation ('Fitz-Stephen ... had set the others a bad example') - It suggests that Henry II conquered Ireland with ease with the Irish kings submitting freely to his control ('Dermitius, king of Cork, came of his own free will and made his submission to the King of England') - It indicates that threat of force was used to persuade the Irish to submit ('The King of England thence marched to Cashel'). - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: - Henry II launched his invasion in Ireland in 1171 taking with him a large army of conquest including at least 500 knights and 4,000 foot soldiers - The Norman lords who had been fighting for control of Ireland since 1170 submitted to Henry and kept the lands they had conquered as fiefs. Dublin, Wexford and Waterford were declared crown lands - The Irish kings submitted to Henry in 1172 because they wanted to curb the incursion of the Norman lords into their lands - Rory O'Connor and the kings of Meath and Ulster did not submit to Henry and remained outside of his control when Henry returned to England in April 1172.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the significance of the coronation of Young Henry in the quarrel between Thomas Becket and Henry II. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It provides evidence that Becket considered Young Henry's coronation to be his greatest grievance against Henry II ('among all the individual evils ... there is one that disturbs me most') - It implies that Henry II had no right to have Young Henry crowned by the Archbishop of York ('its own and special privilege') - It suggests that Becket would not compromise over this issue ('I cannot leave this evil untouched or uncorrected'). - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: - Fitzstephen was Becket's clerk and had a complete knowledge of Becket's correspondence - The purpose of the source is to record Becket's views and objections to the coronation of Young Henry - The account was written shortly after Becket's death. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: - Young Henry was crowned by the Archbishop of York because Becket was in exile in the summer of 1170 - Becket excommunicated the Archbishop of York for his part in the coronation - The complaints to Henry about the excommunication played a key role in his loss of temper in December 1170 that culminated in Becket's murder.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the relationship between Henry II and King Louis VII of France. - The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: - Roger of Howden is writing about events that happened before he held a position in the court and will have relied on court sources for the information - Roger of Howden served Henry II as a negotiator and will have developed an informed view about Henry's relationship with the French king - As a subject of Henry II, Roger of Howden has adopted a tone that favours the king of England. - The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: - It provides evidence that the two kings were in dispute over claims to castles in Normandy ('at that time were in the hands of King Louis. King Henry claimed them as rightfully belonging to his dukedom') - It indicates that marriage alliances were a key way of settling disputes and forging relationships ('give his two daughters, Margaret and Alice, in marriage to the two sons of King Henry.') - It implies that Henry II took advantage of the settlement to achieve his desires ('King Louis handed over both of his daughters to King Henry...The Templars immediately handed over the castles to King Henry.') - It provides evidence that the marriage alliance did not settle the dispute between Louis and Henry ('King Louis was extremely angry, and banished these Templars ... King Henry welcomed ... and rewarded them'). - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: - The relationship between Henry II and Louis VII was complicated because Henry was Louis' vassal in France but as king of England he wielded great power in his own right - Henry II sought the permission of the Pope to marry Young Henry and Margaret while they were still children in order that he could take possession of the castles - Margaret's dowry, the Vexin, became a constant source of dispute between Henry, who took possession of it on the marriage of the children, and Louis, who expected to hold it till the children were adults.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Henry II's policy towards the English Church was a complete failure in the years 1162–74. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's policy towards the English Church was a complete failure in the years 1162–74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's decision to manage the Church by appointing his Chancellor and friend Thomas Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury was a failure because, to Henry's surprise, Becket wholeheartedly embraced his clerical role • Henry's aims to reform the church and force it to obey the 'ancient customs' as laid out in Constitutions of Clarendon led to Becket breaking away from the king and escalated the quarrel between Church and state • Becket's actions during his exile secured Papal support for his position as archbishop, reinforced the authority of the church and challenged Henry's claims to control the English church • Henry's decision to ignore the rights of the archbishop of Canterbury in crowning Young Henry prompted Becket to punish the clergy involved which led to Henry's outburst and Becket's murder in 1170 • Henry was forced to do public penance for the murder of Becket and to revoke the Constitutions of Clarendon. His grievances over church courts and the punishment of the laity by the clergy remained. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's policy towards the English Church was not a complete failure in the years 1162–74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II retained the loyalty of most of his clergy during the quarrel • Pope Alexander did not excommunicate Henry II or place England under interdict as a consequence of the murder. He realised that there was an opportunity for reconciling Henry with the church and worked towards this • At Avranches in 1172, it was left up to the king to identify the 'evil customs' that he would abolish and English bishops agreed to obey Henry and the laws of the realm • The pope refused to support Louis VII in the Great Rebellion in 1174. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Henry II's aim to control the Church was responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's aim to control the Church was responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: - Henry pursued traditional aims with regard to the Church. Since the Conquest, English kings had reacted by defending their rights to rule the Church in their dominions against the Church's claim of superiority - Henry aimed to prevent the evasion of proper punishment by clerical criminals, stop the Church punishing laymen too harshly in church courts and reassert the traditional boundaries between Church and state - Henry intended to achieve his assertion of control over the Church by appointing his chancellor Thomas Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162. He believed that Becket would favour the king not the Church - Henry's aims for the Church were laid out in the Constitutions of Clarendon. His decision to have the 'ancient customs' written down was a major cause of conflict as they were all phrased in favour of the king - Henry's decision to have Young Henry crowned by the archbishop of York and his outburst against Becket is evidence of his determination to control the Church. Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons that were more responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: - Becket's character played a major role in the conflict: After his appointment, he embraced the clerical life in a manner that Henry had not expected and undermined Henry's achievement of his aims - Becket's determination to defend the Church against Henry's claims fueled the conflict. At Woodstock Becket refused to pay sheriff's aid and, at Westminster, he insisted that the king's laws had to be validated in terms of canon law In 1164 Becket instructed the clergy to seal the Constitutions of Clarendon but subsequently refused to seal them himself. This provoked Henry into accusing him of embezzlement and led to Becket's exile - Becket's actions in exile and on his return enflamed the conflict. His support from the papacy and his excommunication of Henry's clerical supporters escalated the quarrel to the final murder - The clergy contributed to the quarrel. Many supported Henry against Becket after Clarendon. They had no loyalty to Becket who had only been ordained the day before his investiture. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the reasons for the failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Becket is the author of this letter and is giving a highly subjective account of the nature of the quarrel • This is a private letter to the Pope written while Becket was in exile and Becket is able to express his true feelings with less fear that his correspondence would be intercepted • The tone of the letter explicitly reveals the depth of Becket's anger towards Henry II. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70: • It implies that the Constitutions of Clarendon were a major reason why a compromise could not be reached ('I have publicly condemned these wicked, I will not say customs, but perversions or corruptions') • It provides evidence that Becket was not prepared to reach a compromise in the quarrel with Henry II ('I shall not delay to excommunicate him if he does not speedily recover his senses') • It suggests that Becket expected Henry to give way entirely to his demands ('I have many times called upon him, and have frequently invited him to settle this dispute'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Becket's refusal to seal the Constitutions of Clarendon had led to an open quarrel with Henry and prompted Henry to charge Becket with embezzlement which had resulted in Becket's decision to go into exile • While in exile, Becket had sought and gained the support of the papacy and King Louis of France which had further infuriated Henry II • Henry II had escalated the quarrel by seizing the property of Becket's family and clerks and by allowing the Archbishop of York to crown Young Henry which encroached on the rights of the Archbishop of Canterbury • In 1166 Becket intensified the quarrel by excommunicating Henry's justiciar together with other leading barons involved in the Constitutions of Clarendon. Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Edward Grim was an eyewitness to Becket's murder in the Cathedral

Question	Indicative content
	- The tone of the source demonstrates that he was a highly subjective witness in his support for Becket and in his animosity towards Henry II - The account was published in 1180 after Becket had been canonised. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70: - It provides evidence that Becket's excommunication of Henry's men was a key reason why a compromise had not been reached ('restore to communion those whom you have excommunicated') - It implies that the knights had come with the intention of murdering Becket ('thirsting rather for blood', 'the most eager for crime') - It portrays Becket's actions as courageous ('he did not forget his promise not to flee from his murderers from fear of death, and refused to go') - It implies that Becket was murdered on the King's orders ("In the King's name we order you, both clerk and monk, that you should take and hold that man."). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: - Becket's return to England in early December did not end the quarrel; Henry did not invite him to court for Christmas in spite of a previous promise that he would meet Becket in Rouen or England very soon - On his return Becket carried out a visitation in his archbishopric during which he excommunicated Henry's supporters including Robert de Broc - Henry II is reputed to have lost his temper over the excommunications and expressed a desire to be rid of Becket which led to the despatch of the four knights - The knights did not have their weapons in their original encounter with Becket; he had the opportunity to flee while they returned to their horses to collect them, but he chose martyrdom instead. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: - Both sources emphasise the responsibility of Henry II in escalating the quarrel whilst implying that Becket's own actions played a key role in the failure to reach a compromise - There is a clear contrast in the dates of the sources that impacts upon their content – Source 1 is private correspondence that was produced during the quarrel whilst Source 2 was written in the hindsight of Becket's murder and canonisation - There is a clear contrast in the purpose of the sources with Source 1 designed to emphasise the justice of Becket's position while Source 2 is written to glorify his actions as a martyr to the Church.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106



Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the main cause of Henry II's problems with the church was the clash of authority with the church courts Arguments and evidence that the main cause of Henry II's problems with the church was the clash of authority with the church courts should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The church claimed the right for members of the clergy to be tried by canon law in its own courts. About five per cent of the male population could claim this benefit of clergy although not all were ordained as priests • Clergymen held important roles in Henry II's government; his inability to try them according to his laws undermined his authority • Ecclesiastical courts applied more lenient sentences to criminal clerks than they would have received in the secular courts and any fines applied went to the church rather than the state • Henry II wanted to try serious, non-religious crimes in the royal courts; he argued that clerics who broke their vows (e.g. the priest of Worcestershire who committed rape and murder) no longer merited the benefit of clergy. Arguments and evidence that there were other more important causes of Henry II's problems with the church should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Fundamentally the problem was the authority of the state and the king's claim to assert the supreme authority over his subjects • The problems were caused by the growing assertiveness of the papacy and the significance of the churchmen as powerful landholders in Henry's kingdom • The problems with the church were brought about by Henry's decision to make Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury in the expectation that he would ensure the absolute obedience of the church to the king • Becket's refusal to accept the customs of England by sealing the Constitutions of Clarendon played an essential role in Henry II's problems with the church, resulting in Becket's exile and a prolonged conflict. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that relations between church and state declined continuously during the years 1162-74. Arguments and evidence that relations between church and state declined continuously during the years 1162-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Becket's appointment as archbishop of Canterbury in 1162 led to the decline in church-state relations; his decision to resign as chancellor led to Henry's accusations of betrayal • Relations declined in the period 1162-64 over Henry's attempts to assert authority over the church and Becket's refusal to agree to allow clerics to be tried in royal courts • The relationship declined further in 1164 with Becket's refusal to accept the Constitutions of Clarendon and Henry's attempt to destroy Becket at Northampton, leading to Becket fleeing into exile • The decline continued in the period 1164-70: Becket found the favour of the pope and the French king; Henry attacked Becket's family and household and had Young Henry crowned by the Archbishop of York • Becket's return in 1170 did not improve relations and culminated in his murder in December 1170. Arguments and evidence that relations between church and state did not decline continuously during the years 1162-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • English bishops co-operated with the king during Becket's exile in 1164-70, e.g. the archbishop of York crowned Young Henry in 1170, which suggests it was not a church-state conflict but a Becket-Henry conflict • A form of settlement was achieved in 1170 when Becket and Henry exchanged a kiss of peace and Becket returned from exile • There was a measured response from the papacy after Becket's murder in 1170. The pope did not seek to exploit Henry's guilt but to develop opportunities for reconciliation • After Henry's public penance in 1172, a compromise was reached between church and state at Avranches

- In 1173-74, the papacy supported Henry during the Great Rebellion and refused to allow Louis VII to launch a crusade against him.

Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Henry II's authority over the English church did not change in the years 1154-74. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's authority over the English church did not change in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • For the whole period, the authority of the King to punish criminals was affected by the ambiguity over who was a member of the clergy • Throughout the period, the authority of the King over the church was limited by the weapons of interdict and excommunication that were used by the church • The issue of church courts and the limitations they placed on royal justice continued after the agreement of Avranches in 1172, just as they had since 1154 • The necessity for the Crown to co-operate with the church continued throughout the period, meaning that Henry needed to submit over Becket's murder, and his authority remained unchanged. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's authority over the English church did change in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Peace of Avranches, 1172, strengthened Henry II's powers in punishing a member of the clergy if the clergyman had committed an offence against the royal forest and in issues concerning crown tenants • In the years 1154-70, Henry was able to use the schism to limit the authority of the papacy in England. This changed in 1172 when Henry recognised Alexander III as the true pope in the Peace of Avranches • In the Constitutions of Clarendon, Henry II forbade the clergy to appeal to the pope without his permission. In the peace of Avranches, he agreed not to obstruct appeals to Rome • In the Constitutions of Clarendon, Henry forced the clergy to agree to abide by the ancient customs of the realm. In the peace of Avranches, he agreed to abolish all customs that were prejudicial to the church. Other relevant material must be credited.

5	17–20	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.
---	-------	---



Section B

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	- Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. - Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. - The overall judgement is missing or asserted. - There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	- There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. - An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. - The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	- There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. - Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. - The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. - The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and



Level	Mark	Descriptor
		substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.



Section A: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
1	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the significance of the Godwin family in the governing of Anglo-Saxon England in the years c1053-66. Source 1 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • The writer had close connections to the court of King Edward and his account is likely to have been based on first-hand observations of the Godwins • The book was dedicated to Queen Edith, the daughter of Godwin, and is clearly subjective in its fulsome praise for the Godwins • The purpose of the book was to revere King Edward, and the tone adopted is complimentary to the King in his choice of the Godwins. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the significance of the Godwin family in the governing of Anglo-Saxon England in the years c1053-66: • It provides evidence that the Godwins were favoured by the King as advisers ('Harold, the eldest and wisest Godwin, was appointed ...by the King's favour', 'King Edward appreciated the brothers') • It provides evidence that Harold and Tostig played important roles in the defence of the kingdom ('Harold drove back enemies from the south and Tostig scared them from the north') • It implies that the Godwins dominated the government ('Harold ...the earldom of Wessex', 'Tostig, ...earl of Northumbria', 'their sister, Queen Edith', 'Gyrth ... shire in... and promised to increase Gyrth's lands') • It suggests that Harold and Tostig were of great significance to the governing of Anglo-Saxon England ('no time or place has reared two men of such value at the same time'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • By the 1060s, the Godwins held four earldoms, Wessex, Northumbria, East Anglia and Kent. Only Mercia was out of their control • The power and authority that the Godwins could exert in the governing of England is demonstrated by their total income of approximately of £7000 per annum, which exceeded King Edward's income of £5000 per annum • The Godwins used their resources to recruit many housecarls who were loyal to them and fought in their armies. King Edward relied on the Godwin armies for the defence of his realm • Harold was described as <i>subregulus</i>. Edward relied upon him for the defence of



Question	Indicative content
	the kingdom and also for special missions, e.g. the embassy to Normandy in 1064. Source 2 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • The chronicle was written in a monastery in the earldom of Mercia, which was not controlled by the Godwin family, giving it a measure of impartiality • The chronicle was based upon reports that were received by the scribes in the monastery • The purpose of the chronicle was to record the most important events of the year and the monks would have intended that the record would be as accurate as possible. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the significance of the Godwin family in the governing of Anglo-Saxon England in the years c1053-66: • It suggests that Harold and Tostig played an important role in defending the Anglo-Saxon kingdom against its enemies ('together the Godwin brothers forced the country into submission') • It suggests that Harold was held in equal importance to the King in governing in the west ('killed ... because of the wars he had fought against Earl Harold', 'gave hostages to King Edward and Earl Harold') • It suggests that King Edward held ultimate control ('His head was brought to Earl Harold, and Harold brought it to King Edward', 'pay greater sums of money from Wales to King Edward'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Wales was a major threat to England after the rise of Gruffydd ap Llywelyn. He had allied with Ælfgar of Mercia in 1055. Their forces had raided Herefordshire and King Edward sent Harold to put down the attack • It was the Godwins' decision to attack Wales to capitalise on the demise of Ælfgar of Mercia and to strengthen their own family • Harold played a key role in crushing the Welsh in 1063. His complex land and sea invasion ended the threat to England from Wales and enhanced his reputation as Anglo-Saxon England's military commander. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources agree on the importance of Harold and Tostig in the defence of the kingdom • Source 1 tends to downplay the role of King Edward in government compared to the Godwins, whereas Source 2 emphasises that King Edward held ultimate



Question	Indicative content
	control Both sources give favourable accounts of the role of the Godwins in the government, although Source 1 hints that aspects of Tostig's character could be a liability to smooth government.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Walter Map was a member of Henry II's court and was able to observe the functioning of the government of Henry II from close quarters • Map's book was a series of anecdotes based on court gossip and the content and tone of the source suggests a measure of exaggeration • Map was more than a peripheral observer in the court. His role as an emissary to the court of the King of France and to the Papal court suggests that Henry II must have trusted Map, and his observations. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170: • It claims that the Inquest was necessary because sheriffs were like devils who had been perverted in performing their duty ('devils are sent out', 'same in the court of King Henry', 'take everything') • It implies that the Inquest was necessary because sheriffs had broken their oath to the King ('At the time of their appointment ... sheriffs do swear to serve God and their master faithfully and honestly.') • It suggests that Henry needed to implement the Inquest because the sheriffs were dishonest ('these sheriffs are corrupted by taking bribes.') • It suggests that before the Inquest the sheriffs did not fulfil their role properly because they allowed lawbreakers to avoid the King's justice ('punish actions that are inoffensive, ... true deeds of evil go unpunished'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Sheriffs, and their deputies, played a key role in the local government of Henry II, including collecting taxes and presiding over the shire courts and visiting the hundred courts. Henry II needed to be able to trust them • The office of a sheriff was a lucrative one. Sheriffs exploited every possible source of profit, both legitimate and illegitimate. The 1170 Inquest was prompted in part by the outcry against their exactions and injustices • The powers of sheriffs were extended under the Assizes of Clarendon. Sheriffs were allowed to go where they pleased on King's business. By 1170, there were concerns that sheriffs were abusing this power • The Inquest found that, in the city of Worcester, the sheriff held a hundred properties on which he did not pay rates or taxes.



Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • This is an official source outlining the way in which the Inquest of the Sheriffs was to be conducted • The purpose of the source is to ensure that sheriffs were fulfilling their oaths to the King and to deal with complaints that had been made about the conduct of the sheriffs • The Inquest was made four years after the powers of sheriffs had been extended and after Henry II had been absent from England for four years • The content and tone of the source suggests that there were concerns about the behaviour of sheriffs. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences the reasons for the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170: • It suggests that the sheriffs had been abusing their powers ('During this time the land and the people of England have been oppressed ... how much they have received from each hundred') • It provides evidence that the inquiry extends beyond the role of sheriffs ('the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, barons, sub-tenants, knights, citizens and burgesses') • It suggests that local officers have cheated the King of his dues ('whether they have cancelled any of the King's rights for reward... trespassed in the King's forests') • It provides evidence that the Inquest will provide the opportunity to bind local officials to the King and to tighten controls on the barons ('swear an oath... inquiry... throughout the lands of the barons.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • The Inquest was national. It required written returns about every payment made to sheriffs since 1166 • The scope of the Inquest went beyond sheriffs and inquired into any fines or financial demands made by those with an official capacity in local government • When the Inquest was finished, 22 out of the 29 sheriffs in England were dismissed • The dismissed sheriffs were replaced by royal officials from the Exchequer who Henry II could trust. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination:



Question	Indicative content
	• Taken together, the two sources suggest that there were concerns about sheriffs abusing their powers by taking bribes or other payments • Source 1 focuses only on the abuses by sheriffs, whereas Source 2 suggests that there was widespread abuse by other local officials • The nature of the two sources is contrasting. While Source 1 is satirical and based on gossip, Source 2 is an official response to problems in local government.



Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion whether, of all the changes introduced into England by the Normans, it was the forest laws that had the most significant impact on village life. Arguments and evidence that of all the changes introduced into England by the Normans, it was the forest laws that had the most significant impact on village life should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • William I and his sons designated large sections of forest in Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset and Essex to be royal forest, which would be used by the King for the purpose of hunting rather than for agriculture • Royal officials expelled the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants to create the royal forests. Twenty villages and a dozen hamlets were destroyed to create the New Forest • Villagers were restricted from using the forests as they had done before the conquest for foraging for firewood and food, and restrictions were placed on farming and grazing cattle • Villagers were forbidden from enclosing their crops to protect them from the hunt, e.g. in Sherwood Forest and the New Forest, where the forests were given over to the wild beasts necessary for royal hunts • The punishments under forest law were severe. The punishment for disturbing a deer was blinding, shooting a deer was punished by cutting off the hand and killing a deer was punishable by death. Arguments and evidence that there were other changes introduced by the Normans that had a more significant impact on village life should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the northern villages, the new method of control by harrying had a more significant and long-lasting impact. The Domesday Book, recorded nearly two decades later, detailed swathes of wasted land in the north • William's destruction of villages in Sussex in 1066 had a long-lasting impact. The value of manors fell by 40 per cent and had only partially recovered by time of the Domesday Survey in 1086 • The manorial system, with the nucleated village, was developed in England, with planned villages in the north. This gave the Norman lords a greater degree of control over the peasants than had existed previously • The Normans demanded higher rents from peasants and increased their obligation to their lord. This meant that the peasants had to work harder to produce sufficient to pay their dues and to feed themselves • The rewards for Normans who fought at Hastings, and the introduction of the feudal system, meant that many Anglo-Saxons lost their lands and were reduced from landowner to tenant and from tenant to villein • The Normans ended the use of slavery in England. Slaves were no longer available to carry out heavy agricultural work.



	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---



Question	Indicative content
4	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the opposition of King Philip I of France was the main reason why William I's control of his continental lands was challenged in the years 1066-87. Arguments and evidence that that the opposition of King Philip I of France was the main reason why William I's control of his continental lands was challenged in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Philip I challenged William I's control by securing an alliance with Flanders, close to Normandy's northern border, through marriage to Bertha of Hainault, half-sister to the count of Flanders in 1072 • Philip supported Edgar Atheling, who had a claim to the English throne, e.g. in 1074, Philip I gave Edgar the castle of Montreuil-sur-Mer as a base from which to launch raids into Normandy • Philip I brought his army to Dol in 1076, broke William I's siege and forced him into retreat. This action destroyed William I's reputation as an invincible general and encouraged further challenges • In 1077, Philip I occupied the Vexin, a strategically important territory on the Norman border. This placed the hostile French neighbour directly on William I's border • Philip I supported Robert Curthose's rebellion in 1078. He was responsible for supplying Robert with knights and the castle at Gerberoy where William I was subsequently defeated, with the loss of many knights • In 1087, Philip I launched raids on Normandy from his garrison at Mantes. William I was mortally injured and died in his attempt to crush the invasion. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more important reasons why William I's control of his continental lands was challenged in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • William's control over Maine was always precarious and frequently challenged by lords who did not accept William's rule, e.g. Geoffrey of Mayenne led a revolt in 1069-70 while William was absent in England • Fulk le Rechin, Count of Anjou, had ambitions to extend into Norman lands. He seized Maine in 1072, attacked William's supporter, Jean de la Flèche, in Maine in 1076, and took part in the siege at Dol in 1076 • Ralph de Gael established an anti-Norman coalition in 1076, when he returned to Brittany after the revolt of the earls. He reinforced the castle at Dol with troops from Anjou, and forced William I into retreat • William's control was challenged by Robert Curthose who wanted power to rule independently of his father. He attracted the support of many sons of the great families. In 1078, he defeated William I at Gerberoy • Queen Mathilda undermined William's control by supporting Robert Curthose with money for his rebellion against his father • Robert of Flanders challenged William I by providing support for Robert Curthose in his rebellion against William I and support for King Cnut of Denmark in his plan to invade Norman territories in 1087.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that Becket's rejection of the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164 was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-70. Arguments and evidence that Becket's rejection of the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164 was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Becket's rejection of the Constitutions was threatening to monarchical authority by demonstrating that obedience to the Church superseded obedience to the King. This set church and state on a collision course • Henry II interpreted Becket's rejection of the Constitutions as treachery by a vassal and this made conflict inevitable • Becket withdrew his initial agreement to swear the oath to uphold the Constitutions after the bishops signed them, causing confusion in the church and angering Henry II • Becket accepted the chirograph in order to use it as irrefutable proof that Henry intended to encroach on the Church's rights. This angered Henry because, initially, he interpreted it as Becket's acceptance of the customs • Becket's refusal to accept the Constitutions was the catalyst to Henry II's attack on Becket for contempt and embezzlement at Northampton in November 1164, which resulted in Becket's decision to go into exile. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more important reasons for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II was determined to extend his control over the Church from the start of his reign. Conflict was inevitable because his aims conflicted with the Gregorian reform movement to exercise authority over secular rulers • In 1162, Henry expected Becket to combine the roles of Chancellor and Archbishop and give the King unprecedented control over church and state. Relations had already broken down before the Constitutions • Henry and Becket had already clashed at the Council of Westminster, after Becket had excommunicated a baron without permission. His claim to respect the customs 'saving our order' enraged Henry II • The conflict was escalated by Becket's decision to go to the court of Louis VII during his exile and by Henry II's decision to use the Archbishop of York to crown Young Henry in 1170 • Henry's decision to attack members of Becket's household while Becket was in exile sustained the quarrel and made it difficult to resolve the conflict • The apogee of the conflict was reached in 1170 by Becket's decision to excommunicate bishops who had remained loyal to Henry during his exile, and by Henry's loss of temper that culminated in Becket's murder. Other relevant material must be credited.



2	4–7	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
---	-----	--

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement whether Becket's attitude to reform was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-64. Arguments and evidence that Becket's attitude to reform was the main reason for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Becket's belief that the clergy were separate from the rest of the population and that they were ruled and punished according to their own laws clashed with Henry's aims for reforming the church and caused the conflict • At Westminster in 1163, Becket opposed Henry's demand that criminal clergy should be handed to secular authorities for sentencing. He opposed the reform on the ground that 'God does not judge the same case twice' • Although Becket agreed that the clergy would stand by the 'ancient customs' of the realm, he added the caveat 'saving our order', in effect negating any reform that he believed undermined canon law. This incensed Henry II • Becket's attitude towards the Constitutions of Clarendon led to the breakdown of relations between church and state. His refusal to seal the Constitutions and his appeal to the Pope were major causes of conflict. Arguments and evidence that there were other, more important, reasons for the conflict between church and state in the years 1162-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II wanted to assert royal authority over the church. He chose Becket because he expected Becket to act as his loyal instrument in reforming the church. His disappointment in Becket was the main cause of the conflict • Henry's treatment of Becket after Westminster played a key role in the outbreak of the conflict. The confiscation of Becket's castles and removal of Young Henry from his custody was a visible show of a lack of faith in Becket • Henry's insistence that Becket must seal a written version of the 'ancient customs' at Clarendon, containing specific limitations to the clergy's authority, moved the 'goalposts' and undermined Becket's position • Henry was responsible for the conflict by bringing in trumped up charges of embezzlement at Northampton. His attempt to move the battle on to secular grounds was undermined by the separate legal systems of church and state. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that in the years 1162–74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was a complete failure. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1162–74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's attempt to bring the Church under royal control by judging secular crimes failed. The Constitutions of Clarendon were rejected by Becket and not enforced after his death. Church courts continued to try clerics • Henry II's appointment of Becket as Archbishop, believing that this would make it easier to extend royal control over the Church, failed. The quarrel between Henry and Becket culminated in Becket's murder in 1170 • Henry's decision to present Becket with a written version of the ancient customs of the realm in the Constitutions of Clarendon caused Becket to reject them • In attempting to end the quarrel with Becket, Henry II agreed to allow papal legates to reach a judgement. This went against one of the key clauses in the Constitutions of Clarendon • Becket won the support of the Papacy when he went into exile. This prevented Henry from pushing forward his reforms. After his murder, all of Becket's excommunications were upheld by the Pope • In order to atone for Becket's murder, Henry was obliged to submit to a public scourging by the clergy. He agreed to abolish the 'evil customs' that he had introduced with regard to the English Church. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1162–74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • During the quarrel with Becket, Henry II retained the loyalty of most English bishops and clergy, indicating that he had extended control over the Church • In 1170, the Archbishop of York crowned Young Henry on Henry II's orders and in flagrant violation of Canterbury's traditional rights. Young Henry's kingship was never denied, thus confirming Henry II's authority • Within two years of Becket's murder, the Pope had lifted the suspensions and excommunications imposed by Becket • Pope Alexander was keen to restore good relations with Henry II. He allowed Henry to exert his authority over the bishops by taking securities from them before they were allowed to travel to Rome • In the Compromise of Avranches, Henry was able to assert the principle that the Crown had the right to defend itself if the Church encroached on its authority or on royal government • In theory, Henry II was to observe free elections to bishoprics but, in practice, the results were only confirmed after Henry had approved, e.g. the election of Richard of Dover as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1173. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Henry II followed a similar policy towards Wales and Scotland in the years 1154-74. Arguments and evidence that Henry II did follow a similar policy towards Wales and Scotland in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The borders with Wales and Scotland were unstable and both countries represented a threat to Henry's rule which meant Henry II had to formulate a policy and act upon it • Henry's policy with both countries was to secure homage from the Welsh princes and Scottish king that acknowledged that he held the greatest authority in Britain: they were summoned to Woodstock for this in 1163 • Henry attempted to force good behaviour on the Welsh princes and Scottish king by holding their family members as hostages; the Welsh princes gave 22 hostages in 1165 and William the Lion gave 21 hostages as the result of the Treaty of Falaise 1174. Arguments and evidence that Henry II did not follow a similar policy towards Wales and Scotland in the years 1154-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry conducted three expeditions into Wales to secure his authority over the Welsh princes but he fought with and defeated the Scottish king on English soil e.g. when William the Lion invaded in 1173 • The Welsh princes were not easy to defeat and Henry preferred to use a political solution to secure his western border. This was not used with Scotland • Henry needed to establish peaceful relations with the Welsh princes in order to secure passage through Wales to Ireland; he therefore made Rhys of Deheubarth the justiciar in Wales in 1172. This strategic policy was not used with Scotland • Henry promised English land, Northumberland, to the Scottish king in 1154 but in 1157 he forced his successor, Malcolm, to return it. English land was not promised to the Welsh for support. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that Henry II's desire to conquer land for his son John explains his invasion of Ireland in 1171-72. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's desire to conquer land for his son John explains his invasion of Ireland in 1171-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The 1169 Treaty of Montmirail settled the inheritances of Young Henry, Geoffrey and Richard but there was no land available for John. This prompted Henry's decision to invade Ireland • John was Henry II's favourite son and he was determined to provide an inheritance for him • A successful invasion would enable Henry II to create a wealthy and stable kingdom for John to inherit. Henry insisted on having control of the richest areas Waterford, Wexford and Dublin • The Pope had been encouraging Henry II to invade Ireland since 1155 but Henry had not shown a strong determination to do so until it became evident that he needed to provide land for John. Arguments and evidence that other reasons explaining Henry II's invasion of Ireland in 1171-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II had been given permission to invade Ireland in 1155 by Pope Adrian IV by papal bull. When Henry invaded in 1171, he had the force of this bull behind his invasion • Henry was implicated in the murder of Becket and the invasion may be regarded as an attempt to either avoid the consequences or placate the papacy by bringing Ireland into line with the rest of Christendom • In 1171 Strongbow angered Henry II by claiming the kingdom of Leinster, which Henry interpreted as the action of an over mighty vassal extending his power beyond that permitted by the king. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that Henry II succeeded in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172. Arguments and evidence that Henry II succeeded in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1166 Henry II asserted control over Brittany by deposing Conan and betrothing his son, Geoffrey, to Conan's daughter. In the autumn, the Breton barons did homage to Henry • Henry campaigned for 20 years to take control of Toulouse. In 1171 he took homage from Count Raymond V • Henry strengthened his control over Normandy by investigating land holdings and taxes and by enforcing his feudal rights. The return of the Vexin as part of Margaret's dowry strengthened Normandy's defences • In the Peace of Montmirail in 1169, Henry II settled the quarrel with Louis VII over disputes on Normandy's border as well as the succession to his dominions. The barons were obliged to swear fealty to his sons • Henry strengthened his control over his southern lands by negotiating the betrothal of John to the daughter of Count Humbert of Maurienne in 1172. Arguments and evidence that Henry II did not succeed in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Even though the Breton barons had paid homage to Henry in 1166, he had to return to the county to put down minor rebellions in subsequent years • Henry's control of Aquitaine was always limited. His policy of installing 'northerners' as his officials was resented by the southerners and led to a series of rebellions that Henry was unable to crush entirely • The ambitions of the French king to expand his territories at the expense of the Angevin Empire meant that Henry's control, especially on the borders of Normandy, was never complete • The outbreak of rebellion in the Angevin territories in 1173–74 is a clear indication that Henry did not have complete control over his French territories. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154–74. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • William of Newburgh was an English chronicler and is likely to be partial towards the English • The purpose of William of Newburgh's chronicle was to write down the key events as a record of the history of the time. As such it is considered an accurate record • The language and tone of the extract suggests William of Newburgh's admiration for Henry II. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154–74: • It provides evidence that the king of Scotland was subordinate to Henry II for the lands he held in England ('King Malcolm received from King Henry the earldom of Huntingdon') • It provides evidence that the king of Scotland acknowledged Henry II's legal right to the disputed lands ('Wisely, remembering how the king of England had established the justice of his cause in this matter') • It suggests that Henry II was able to enforce his control over disputed border lands ('the king of Scots restored the lands in question to King Henry in their entirety'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Henry II considered himself to be a superior king to the king of Scots • In 1157 Henry II forced Malcolm IV to hand over Newcastle upon Tyne, Bamburgh and Carlisle and to restore the Solway and Tweed border, breaking the 1147 promise that the Scottish king would keep these lands • Henry II made Malcolm IV earl of Huntingdon and Malcolm did homage to Henry II as his vassal for these lands • In 1162 Henry summoned Malcolm to Woodstock to do homage again, following his concern that Malcolm had been making foreign alliances that could threaten the Angevin empire. Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • This is a legally-enforceable peace treaty • William the Lion was forced to agree to this treaty after his capture at

Question	Indicative content
	Alnwick - The terms of the treaty entirely favour Henry II as the victor. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154-74: - It provides evidence that the king of Scotland has submitted to Henry II as the higher authority ('William, king of Scots, has become the vassal of King Henry for Scotland and for all his other lands.') - It provides evidence that the king of Scotland is subject to Henry II's justice ('to submit to the judgement of his court') - It provides evidence that Henry II has established the usual safeguards to hold William the Lion to the treaty ('shall be released, but only after each one has delivered his own hostage') - It suggests that the Scottish king is the same as any vassal of Henry II ('as all the other men of King Henry are required to do'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: - When he became king of Scotland, William the Lion had attempted to make an alliance with Louis VII of France, suggesting that he was not prepared to submit to Angevin authority - During the Great Rebellion, William the Lion invaded England twice, in August 1173 when he devastated Yorkshire and at Easter 1174 when he laid siege to Carlisle - On 13 July 1174 William the Lion was captured at Alnwick and sent to Henry as his prisoner - In the Treaty of Falaise, William the Lion was forced to hand over 21 hostages including his brother, David. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: - Taken together, the two sources suggest that Henry II was able to exert his authority over the Scottish king - It is clear from Source 4 that the Scottish king had not accepted his subordinate status to the king of England as established in Source 3 - The two sources offer a view on the authority of Henry II over the Scottish king from an English point of view.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far the peace of Montmirail succeeded in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-72. Arguments and evidence that the peace of Montmirail succeeded in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The peace of Montmirail, with the division of Henry II's territory among his sons, relieved Louis VII's fears that he would be overpowered by the Angevin Empire • Louis' daughter Margaret was married to Young Henry and his daughter Alice was betrothed to Richard, thus giving Louis VII powerful connections within Henry II's family, which should have limited disputes • The peace made Richard vassal to Louis for Aquitaine and Young Henry vassal for Normandy, Anjou and Brittany. Henry II recognised Louis VII as his overlord for Brittany, which he was holding until Geoffrey was of age • After agreeing the peace of Montmirail, Louis VII attempted to settle disputes in the Angevin territories by reconciling Henry II with rebels in Brittany, Maine and Aquitaine • The peace of Montmirail settled the border disputes between Normandy and Louis' île de France that had resulted from Henry II's raids in the years 1167-68. Arguments and evidence that the peace of Montmirail did not succeed in settling the disputes between the Angevin Empire and Louis VII of France in the years 1169-73 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II had no interest in being reconciled with rebels within his territories. In the aftermath of Montmirail, he destroyed their fortifications in Brittany and Aquitaine, thus strengthening his empire in relation to France • Henry II built a new castle in Maine, purchased the castle at Montmirail and fortified the Vexin. This sent a clear message to Louis that Henry did not want any interference in his relations with his own vassals • Louis VII continued to support the exiled Archbishop Becket after the peace of Montmirail. He believed Becket's claims that Henry II could not be trusted. This was an obstacle to settling disputes. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Henry II achieved complete control over Brittany in the years 1154-72. Arguments and evidence that Henry II achieved complete control over Brittany in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1156, when Henry II removed Hoël of Nantes as its ruler, he installed his brother Geoffrey as its count • When Conan attempted to seize Brittany in 1158, after the death of Geoffrey, Henry II brought a large army of Norman knights and forced his submission. Although Conan was the count, in reality Henry II had control • The extent of Henry II's control of Brittany was demonstrated by his authority to appoint the archbishop of Dol, arrange Conan's marriage and manipulate the inheritance customs of Breton noble to his advantage • Henry II crushed a baronial rebellion in Brittany in 1166 and deposed Conan in favour of his own son Geoffrey, who was betrothed to Conan's daughter. Henry II then took control as the betrothed couple were children. Arguments and evidence that Henry II did not achieve complete control over Brittany in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • When Geoffrey became count of Brittany in 1156, it was he who took control of the county rather than Henry II • In order to make the claim to Brittany in 1158, Henry II had to seek the permission of Louis VII of France. Louis recognised Henry's claim and made him seneschal. Henry II was, therefore, subordinate to the King of France • Eleanor of Aquitaine, representing Henry II in his continental territories in 1165, was unable to crush a rebellion by the Breton nobility who forged a league against Henry II with rebel barons from Maine • In 1169, in the Treaty of Montmirail, Geoffrey was granted Brittany as a vassal of Henry the Young King, who in turn held it as the vassal of Louis VII of France. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Henry II succeeded in achieving complete control over Ireland in the years 1154-72. Arguments and evidence that Henry II succeeded in achieving complete control over Ireland in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1155, Henry II was authorised by Pope Adrian IV to invade Ireland and establish control. In 1169 he ordered 'Strongbow' to lead an invasion and restore MacMurrough, who had appealed for help, to the kingship of Leinster • In 1171, as a prelude to invasion, Henry II placed an embargo on shipping between England and Ireland, and confiscated Strongbow's English lands to force him to submit to Henry's authority in Ireland • In 1171 Henry invaded Ireland with a force of 500 knights, and forced the Norman barons to submit to him and took homage from the Irish kings as their overlord • Henry was successful in curbing Strongbow's power and established Henry de Lacy as Lord of Meath and first governor of Ireland • The Irish Church accepted Henry and in September 1172 Pope Alexander II confirmed Henry as the overlord of Ireland. Further conquests in Ireland were carried out in Henry's name by his vassals. Arguments and evidence that Henry II did not succeed in achieving complete control over Ireland in the years 1154-72, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry showed no interest in extending his control in the years 1155-66 and hence power lay in the hands of the kings of Ireland; the strongest of these, the king of Connacht, drove out the king of Leinster in 1166 • Strongbow married the daughter of the king of Leinster and seized power there in 1171 after the death of its king; Henry's embargo had no success in bringing him back under control • Henry's conquest was incomplete in 1172. He cancelled a planned campaign to return to France to receive absolution for his role in the death of Becket. Other relevant material must be credited.

5	17–20	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.
----------	--------------	---

Section B

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	- Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. - Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. - The overall judgement is missing or asserted. - There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	- There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. - An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. - The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	- There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. - Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. - Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. - The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. - The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	- Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. - Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. - Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. - The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
1	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06. Source 1 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • This was a personal letter from the Pope to Queen Matilda and expresses his opinion on the conflict candidly • As the head of the Church, Pope Paschal would naturally side with Anselm in the conflict as he sought to maintain and extend the authority of the Church over secular rulers • The purpose of the letter was to encourage Queen Matilda to put pressure on her husband to concede to the Church • The language and tone of the source make it clear that the Pope was prepared to use threats to enforce his authority on the conflict. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06: • It provides evidence that the investiture of bishops was a key issue in the conflict ('King has taken over the churches through investitures.', 'those who wrongfully take possession of churches through him.') • It implies that power had corrupted Henry I and that this had shaped the conflict ('Now that he has been placed in the fullness of power, he does not fear to provoke the anger of Almighty God') • It suggests that Anselm had fuelled the conflict by his attitude to the authority of the Church in the state ('Archbishop Anselm ... opposed King Henry's wicked deeds.') • It provides evidence that the Pope used threats of damnation to try and enforce obedience in the conflict ('fear greatly for King Henry's salvation.', 'We shall excommunicate the King and his counsellors'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Secular rulers had been accustomed to investing bishops and abbots with the symbols of their office. The Gregorian reform movement attempted to end this and assert the supremacy of the Papacy over kings and princes • Anselm refused to do homage to Henry I and warned him that the Church would not recognise new bishops if they were invested by the King and not by the Church • In 1103, Henry I attempted to force Anselm to pay him homage and accept lay investiture; Anselm refused and went into self-imposed exile • In 1105, Pope Paschal excommunicated Henry's chief adviser, Robert of Meulan, for encouraging lay investiture and made it clear that the King would be next.



Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • As a churchman and a supporter of Anselm, Eadmer was very likely to give an account of the conflict that was favourable to the Church's position • Eadmer was a supporter of Anselm during the conflict and, as a theologian and churchman, he had a keen interest in the issues raised by the conflict. He was in an excellent position to give an informed account of events • The language and tone of the account give a reasonably balanced view of the settlement to the conflict • The purpose of the account was to create a record of 'recent events' and the account should be accurate. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06: • It provides evidence that the question of investitures was the key issue in the conflict and in reaching a settlement ('investitures of churches was discussed', 'Pope ... standing firm on the matter of investitures') • It suggests that the Church was divided on the issue of lay investiture ('Some of the bishops tried hard to encourage the King to continue to perform investitures') • It provides evidence that the two sides were able to reach a compromise to settle the conflict ('no one should in England ever again be invested ... by the King... homage to the King.') • It suggests that the settlement had very little impact on the power of the King ('King was now able to appoint priests to almost all the churches in England'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Bishops and abbots were major landowners in England and owed homage to the King in the feudal system as barons • Henry I and Anselm were personally reconciled at the abbey at Bec in August 1106, and this paved the way for a settlement of the conflict • The settlement allowed Henry to take homage from churchmen for their secular possessions and hence did not have a negative impact on his exercise of power. His influence over appointments was undiminished. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources emphasise the importance of lay investitures in shaping and developing the conflict • The threats made in Source 1 appear to have been effective as demonstrated by the settlement reached in Source 2 • The sources both originate from the Church but differ in the writer's influence, with Source 1 penned by the Pope whilst Source 2 is from a subject of Henry I with an interest in a settlement between his superiors.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the importance of the Chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Richard fitzNigel was Treasurer of the Exchequer and worked closely with the Chancellor, which gave him a unique insight into the role and importance of the Chancellor in the government • The essay was written as an instruction to clerks and, as such, it was accurate in outlining the importance of the Chancellor in government • The content and tone of the essay are objective with a focus on the role of the Chancellor as a government official and not focusing on the characters of individual Chancellors. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the importance of the chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England: • It implies that the Chancellor held the second most important position in the Exchequer ('The head of the Exchequer is the most important member of that court. The Chancellor sits next to him.') • It suggests that the King relied on the Chancellor to provide good government ('Nothing of importance is done... without the consent and advice of the Chancellor', 'as important ... as ... in the King's Court') • It indicates that the Chancellor played a key role in the issuing of orders by the King ('Chancellor has the custody of the royal seal', 'When the royal seal is needed, it is presented to the Chancellor') • It indicates that the Chancellor played a key role in the management of the finances of the realm ('Chancellor also has custody of the roll', 'Chancellor and the Treasurer write together'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • The Chancellor was responsible for running the chancery, where writs and charters were drawn up. He controlled the King's seal, which was necessary to seal all official documents • The Chancellor could attend all the meetings of the King's Court without invitation • The Chancellor dealt with all the petitions and pleas that were sent to the King and played a key role in the judicial system • When Becket became Chancellor, he began attending sessions of the Exchequer, where he had the task of identifying and challenging any mistakes or anomalies in the records.



Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: - As clerk to Becket, and one who had carried out duties on Becket's behalf, FitzStephen was able to provide a valuable insight into the way Becket carried out the duties of Chancellor - The content and tone of FitzStephen's account is very flattering and reflects his close relationship with, and his admiration for, Becket - FitzStephen wrote this account after Becket's murder and subsequent veneration as a martyr and thus provides a subjective assessment of Becket's role as Chancellor. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the importance of the chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England: - It suggests that the Chancellor was the most significant person in the King's government ('The Chancellor of England is considered second in the realm only to the King.') - It indicates that the Chancellor had an important role in government in both domestic and foreign affairs ('useful to the King - in peace or in war?', 'decided to ask the King of France ... Chancellor ... chosen') - It claims that Becket was effective as Henry's Chancellor ('Through the hard work and counsel of the Chancellor, King Henry prospered') - It suggests that the behaviour of the Chancellor enhanced the position and authority of the King ('If this is how the Chancellor proceeds, how great must the English King be!'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: - The Chancellor was a member of the <i>Curia Regis</i>. He heard cases brought before the King's Court and also travelled the country as an itinerant justice - As Chancellor, Becket was responsible for negotiating the marriage deal that led to the betrothal of Young Henry and Margaret of France - As Chancellor, Becket oversaw the revival of scutage as a flat rate of 20 shillings from each tenant-in-chief, which significantly increased Henry's income. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: - Both sources agree that the Chancellor played a significant role in the functioning of the King's government, especially in the legal and financial systems - The sources offer differing perspectives on his importance. Source 3 is focusing on his role in the Exchequer, whereas Source 4 addresses his wider role in government, as well as focusing on a particular individual - Whilst Source 4 was written in reaction to Becket's death, shortly after his murder, Source 3 takes a wider perspective of the role of the Chancellor encompassing the whole of Henry II's reign.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that castle building was more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87. Arguments and evidence that castle building was more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The building of castles created both a physical and psychological symbol of control. Castles emphasised that the Anglo-Saxons were a conquered people, forced to obey the Normans • William demolished parts of towns and cities to construct castles, thus demonstrating the complete subjugation of the local population to Norman rule, e.g. Lincoln castle occupied the space of 166 houses • William built castles at strategic points, e.g. the Welsh Marches, the Scottish border, in order to prevent attacks on his realm by outsiders • Rebels needed to storm the castles successfully and their structure made this very difficult to achieve, e.g. Eadric the Wild failed in his attacks on the castles at Hereford and Shrewsbury, and he submitted to the Normans • Castles housed knights who could be despatched very quickly to dispel unrest in their vicinity • Changes in land tenure were often a destabilising factor rather than enforcing Norman control. Illegal seizure of land by Normans destabilised the realm, causing frequent and sometimes violent disputes. Arguments and evidence that castle building was not more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the immediate aftermath of the conquest, William granted huge, consolidated blocks of land to his most loyal supporters which secured control in key areas, e.g. Shropshire was granted to Roger of Montgomery • The oaths sworn to William I by the Norman tenants-in-chief secured William's control over England by confirming the principle that he was the ultimate source of land and power • The purpose of changes in land tenure was to increase security and control. In the second decade of the conquest, William created rapes in both north and south in which control was enforced by leading magnates • The changes in land tenure ushered in the feudal system, which enforced William's control by the introduction of the <i>servitium debitum</i> that enabled him to call upon up to 5000 knights to defend his kingdom • Changes in land tenure placed the English population under the control of the Normans within the feudal system. Those who had been free tenants in Anglo-Saxon England became villeins, tied to the land and their lord • The construction of the first motte and bailey castle at York provoked the northern rebellion of 1068-70. Rebels attacked and burned down the castle, aided by a Danish army invited by the rebels. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
4	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the problems faced by Duke Robert Curthose in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were very similar to the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87. Arguments and evidence that the problems faced by Duke Robert Curthose in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were very similar to the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: - Both faced challenges to their control of Normandy by family members, e.g. William I's control was challenged by Robert Curthose himself at Gerberoy; Robert faced challenges from William Rufus and from Henry - Both William I and Duke Robert faced challenges to their control from Maine. William I's control was challenged in 1068-73 by Geoffrey of Mayenne and Fulk Le Rech in and Robert's control was challenged by Elias who claimed the title of count that Robert believed was his own - The Count of Anjou created significant problems for both Norman dukes. Anjou was a powerful enemy on the Norman border who claimed rights over Maine. Fulk of Anjou's marriage of his son to Elias of Maine's daughter meant Anjou would be able to claim Maine through marriage - Both Normans faced challenges from the French king over control of the Vexin. William I died fighting for control of the Vexin in 1087 and Robert lost control of it before going on crusade. Arguments and evidence that the problems faced by Duke Robert in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were different from the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: - Whilst William I's control of Normandy was challenged by King Philip of France, e.g. at Dol in 1076, Philip intervened to support Duke Robert in 1094 against William II's army - Whilst William I was challenged by Robert Curthose in Normandy in reaction to what Robert perceived as humiliating treatment by his brothers, Duke Robert was challenged by William Rufus who was determined to depose him as Duke - Whilst William I proved equal to the challenges of Maine, defeating Fulk Le Rech in's siege in 1077, Robert Curthose lost control of Maine before departing on crusade - William I's principal problems in Normandy stemmed from challenges by hostile neighbours, whereas Duke Robert had to contend with internal opposition from those who supported his rival claimant to the dukedom itself - William I's problems in Normandy often stemmed from his absence whilst he was ruling England; Robert Curthose's problems arose even though he was present in Normandy throughout the period 1087-95. Other relevant material must be credited.



Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
5	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France changed in the years 1154-72. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France changed in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's control over Brittany changed. He took Nantes in 1158 and forced Conan to submit to him. In 1166, he betrothed Geoffrey to Conan's daughter and assumed control until Geoffrey was of age • Henry extended his control in Normandy. He strengthened its bureaucracy and increased his access to its wealth by establishing an Exchequer. Land tenure investigations led to a doubling of his income by 1171 • Henry's military strength improved by restoring the Vexin, which had been lost to Louis in 1150. In 1158, the Vexin was included as part of the dowry, and handed over on the marriage of Young Henry and Margaret • Henry's control over Anjou, Maine and Touraine was extended after performing homage to Louis VII in 1156. He was able to use the feudal system to defeat his brother and secure his control over these territories • Henry acquired Aquitaine through marriage. During Eleanor's childbearing years, Aquitaine was largely ruled by Henry. This changed after the birth of John. From 1168, Eleanor oversaw her own court and issued writs • Henry's control changed because of the Peace of Montmirail in 1169. The settlement of lands on Henry's sons and their marriages to Louis' daughters placed limitations on the extent of Henry's territorial control. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France did not change in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Throughout the period, Henry's continental lands remained a disparate collection of territories where rival claims of vassals challenged the control of their Angevin overlord • Throughout the period, Henry's control was limited by his position as Louis' vassal. His subjects could appeal against Henry to Louis as their overlord. Henry did homage in 1156 and renewed it in 1168 • Henry's control of the Vexin was not secure. Louis raided it in 1167 and forced Henry into battle. Peace was settled at Montmirail in 1169 • Henry's control over Brittany continued to face challenges after 1166. In 1168, Henry had to deal with Breton rebels, who tried to do homage directly to Louis • Henry had no intention of allowing the Peace of Montmirail to reduce his authority. Young Henry was given the title of Duke of Normandy but no power, Richard did not wed Alice, and Henry continued to rule Brittany. Other relevant material must be credited.

2	3–5	• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions.
----------	------------	---



Question	Indicative content
2a	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the relationship between Henry II and Philip Augustus of France in 1180. - The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: - It provides evidence that Henry II and Philip Augustus sought to establish a peaceful relationship ('avoid any possibility of disagreement between Us', 'agreed to abide by their decision in good faith.') - It indicates that there remained obstacles to the achievement of lasting peace ('agreement excludes Auvergne, concerning which there is now a dispute', 'excludes the small fees and divisions of the lands of Berry.') - It suggests that Henry II and Philip Augustus felt the need to sign a peace immediately, without waiting for negotiations to settle the areas of dispute. - The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: - The purpose of the Peace of Gisors was to ensure that the peace between England and France was maintained as the French crown transitioned from Louis VII to Philip II - The Peace was a legally binding agreement that was made on oath and outlined the intentions of the two monarchs - The content and tone of the source emphasises the authority of both monarchs, in spite of the differences in age and experience. - Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: - When Aquitaine was acquired by Henry, Berry became a matter of dispute between England and France. Henry claimed it as part of his domain - Philip Augustus wanted to ensure that he had the support of the King of England to give him time to consolidate his position in France. When Louis died (September 1180), Philip expected baronial challenges - The relationship between Henry II and Philip Augustus got off to a good start. Henry assisted Philip in subduing his rebellious vassals.

Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

Question	Indicative content
2b	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reasons why Henry II was able to extend his authority within the Angevin territories in the 1150s. 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: • The chronicle was started at the end of Henry II's reign, giving the writer time to reflect upon its events • Roger admitted that he selected the events from materials that he considered to be worthy of use and this may have impacted on the content of his chronicle • The content is focused on a narrative of key events with limited use of opinion. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: • It indicates that Henry extended his control using a mixture of military force and feudal obligations ('a long siege', 'Malcolm of Scotland restored ... Henry returned', 'reduced the Welsh to submission') • It suggests that Henry was obliged to reach an expensive compromise to remove a threat posed by his brother ('made peace ... receive yearly a thousand pounds of English money, and two thousand of ... Anjou.') • It suggests that Henry succeeded in extending control by moving rapidly amongst his territory ('1156 ... crossed into Normandy', '1157 ... crossed into England.', 'prepared to attack Wales by sea and land'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: • Henry invaded Wales in 1157 to defend the rights of his vassal Cadwaladr and to force Owain Gwynedd into submission. He succeeded in forcing Owain to do homage in 1157 and Rhys of Deheubarth in 1158 • Malcolm of Scotland was only 16 years old when he met with Henry in 1157. He was not strong enough to hold on to English territories taken during the anarchy and restored them in return for his earldom • Henry expelled Hoël of Nantes from Brittany and installed his brother Geoffrey as its count. When Geoffrey died in 1158, Henry claimed his lands, but control of Brittany went to Conan.

Section B: indicative content**Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106**

Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate is it to say that Henry II was personally responsible for the Great Rebellion of 1173-4. Arguments and evidence that Henry II was personally accurate for the Great Rebellion of 1173-4 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry was responsible for crowning Young Henry and bestowing upon him titles but not wealth or power • It was Henry's decision to promise three of Young Henry's castles to Count Humbert when he organised John's betrothal to the daughter of Count Humbert of Maurienne and Savoy • Henry was responsible for inciting Eleanor's enmity by his affair with Rosamund Clifford, and his decision to rule Aquitaine without consulting her on policy. Arguments and evidence that other factors were responsible for the Great Rebellion of 1173-4 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Young Henry and his brothers Richard and Geoffrey were eager to exercise real power in their own rights. They seized the opportunity of John's betrothal to foment rebellion against their father • Queen Eleanor was ambitious to rule Aquitaine in her own right and encouraged her sons in rebellion in order to gain revenge on Henry II • Louis VII desired to expand the territory of the French crown at the expense of the Angevin Empire in France. He encouraged his son-in-law, Young Henry, to rebel and gave him refuge at court in Paris • The earls of Chester, Leicester and Norfolk, and the king of Scotland, took advantage of the family quarrel to rebel against the king and seize territory that they had long desired, which expanded the size of the rebellion. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • The writer was a member of Henry II's court and will have received information from members of the court who were acquainted with the Great Rebellion • The first-hand accounts were likely to have been related some years after the event. Gerald of Wales joined the court ten years after the rebellion • As a member of Henry's court, the account was likely to reflect well on the role of the king. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74: • It provides evidence that Henry the young king was responsible for the rebellion ('Henry, the younger king of England, was no longer able to conceal the wickedness he had long planned against his father') • It implies that the rebellion was encouraged by Young Henry's father-in-law, Louis VII, king of France ('hoped, with his father-in-law's assistance, to replace his father, King Henry II before his father died') • It provides evidence that Young Henry's brothers and some nobility supported the rebellion ('took with him his two brothers, Richard, earl of Poitiers and Geoffrey of Brittany', 'many accomplices among the nobles') • It indicates that Henry II's sons found support for their rebellion within the king's own household ('Nearly every night, some of them would disloyally join his sons'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Young Henry was angry that he had been given a title but not real power or money to maintain his court • Henry II could be regarded as responsible for inciting rebellion in his family; his promise of three castles to John as part of a betrothal agreement, drove the older sons to rebel • The French King Louis VII had ambitions to expand the royal demesne at the expense of the Angevin empire. He was looking for an opportunity to turn his son-in-law, Young Henry, and his brothers against their father • Certain nobility sought to increase their power within the kingdom. In England there were revolts led by the Earls of Chester, Leicester and Norfolk and William the Lion, King of the Scots, invaded.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Peter of Blois's letter provides the perspective of a representative of the Church on the Great Rebellion • As Peter of Blois was Henry's subject and writing at his request, the tone of the letter is naturally favourable to the king • The purpose of the source is to persuade Eleanor to accept that she is the transgressor and to submit to her husband. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74: • It indicates that Peter of Blois regarded Eleanor as playing a key role in the rebellion ('you will be the cause of widespread disaster') • It claims that Eleanor was responsible for inciting her sons to rebellion ('you have opened the way for your children to rise up against their father') • It implies that Henry was completely innocent in the cause of the rebellion ('the woman... is the one at fault'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Eleanor was angered by Henry II's relationship with Rosamund Clifford and this prompted her involvement in the rebellion • Eleanor was angered by the lack of political power in her own lands. She had expected to be able to rule Aquitaine in her own right but Henry had not allowed this • Eleanor favoured the claims of Young Henry for greater power. She encouraged Geoffrey and Richard to join him at the French court. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The two sources take a different view on the roles of the family members in the rebellion; while Source 3 places greater emphasis on the role of Young Henry, Source 4 blames Eleanor alone • There is a contrast in the dates of the sources. Source 3 is produced 10 years after the rebellion thus providing a wider perspective whilst Source 4 was written during the rebellion • Both sources favour the role of the king and present him as the injured party.

Section B: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106



Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how successful Henry II was in extending royal power in the years after the Great Rebellion (1173-74). Arguments and evidence that Henry II was successful in extending royal power in the years after the Great Rebellion (1173-74) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry captured the Scottish king at Alnwick during the Great Rebellion and in the Peace of Falaise he was able to secure his northern border by forcing William the Lion to swear fealty thus extending royal authority over Scotland • Henry strengthened royal authority in the 1176 Assize of Northampton, which increased punishments on disloyal barons and forced all those who wanted to remain in the kingdom to swear oaths of loyalty • Henry used the eyre of 1176 to demolish illegal castles and to enforce the forest laws. The latter brought £12000 in fines to the royal treasury, which provided the funding to enforce strong government • The Assize of Arms 1181 established who was allowed to bear arms, how many and of what type. Severe penalties were enforced for those who breached the rules. Arguments and evidence Henry II was not successful in extending royal power in the years after the Great Rebellion (1173-74) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The exchequer became so burdened by the financial business generated by the eyres after 1176 and often left business unfinished when its justices moved on to the next shire, reducing the collection of fines for the Crown • Henry made no further progress in extending royal control over the Church in these years. The benefit of clergy was retained and in 1176 he had to agree that anyone who murdered a clergyman should be disinherited • Henry's treatment of his sons led them into opposition against him and this meant he did not effectively extend his authority over the royal family • The cost of wars in the Angevin Empire was a significant burden to the Crown and depleted the wealth of the kingdom thus harming royal authority. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 had similar causes but very different results. Arguments and evidence that the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 had similar causes but very different results should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The root cause of both the Great Rebellion and Richard's rebellion was Henry II's refusal to give his sons real power to rule their territories • Both rebellions were driven by suspicions about Henry's favourable treatment of John. In 1173 Henry gave castles to John from Young Henry's territory; in 1189 Richard feared England would be left to John • Both rebellions were made possible by the support of the French king for the sons rebelling against their father • In 1174 Henry completely destroyed the rebels without ceding any territory and forgave Young Henry; in 1189 Henry II was forced to cede territory and vowed revenge against Richard. Arguments and evidence that the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 did not have similar causes and very different results should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Young Henry was driven to revolt because he had not been given the power to rule as a king; Richard revolted in 1189 because Henry had not crowned him king and he suspected Henry did not intend him to be king • In 1173 Louis VII's support for Young Henry encouraged him to rebel whereas in 1189 it was Richard who joined Philip Augustus in his attack on Henry's territories • Eleanor of Aquitaine's opposition to Henry was a key reason for rebellion in 1173. She played no role in 1189 • In both revolts the Angevin Empire was weakened. In 1173–74 Henry's decision not to act against Louis enhanced French control in the region whilst in 1189 Henry was forced to cede three castles in Anjou or the Vexin to Philip II. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the power of Eleanor of Aquitaine declined in the years 1154–74. Arguments and evidence that the power of Eleanor of Aquitaine declined in the years 1154–74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Eleanor had expected to have a full role in the governing of Aquitaine. In 1156 Henry did homage to Louis for the duchy and signalled that he intended to rule the duchy • In the early years of Henry's reign, Eleanor had acted as co-regent in England while Henry was absent in his other territories. Her role in this regard declined and from 1168 she was herself absent in Poitou • As Duchess of Aquitaine, Eleanor had asserted her rights over Toulouse; in 1173 when Raymond of Toulouse did homage to Henry and Young Henry it was a signal that Aquitaine had been subsumed into Henry II's territories • Eleanor was captured by Henry II in the Great Rebellion and imprisoned for the rest of his reign; she was unable to exercise power from this point. Arguments and evidence that the power of Eleanor of Aquitaine did not decline in the years 1154–74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Eleanor retained her position as Queen of England and Duchess of Aquitaine and the authority attached to the titles throughout the period • Throughout the period, all of Aquitaine's revenues were paid to Henry II and he controlled the armies that were used to quell trouble in the duchy; Eleanor did not have the finances and the authority to rule in her own right • Eleanor's authority as Duchess increased in the years 1167–73 when she returned to the Duchy to rule; she issued charters and writs in her own name • Eleanor's authority was exercised through her sons, especially Young Henry, over whom she had great influence as shown in her role in encouraging the Great Rebellion. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that, in the years 1180–89, Philip Augustus played the most significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1180–89 Philip Augustus played the most significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The French crown lands were considerably smaller than the Angevin Empire; Philip Augustus' determination to expand his territory at the expense of the Empire made him the most formidable enemy • Philip Augustus exploited the disputes between Henry II's sons to extend his control, e.g. he made Geoffrey a seneschal, in 1186 he took homage for Brittany and, after Geoffrey's death, he claimed wardship of his heir • Philip Augustus used the dispute over the Vexin and the marital status of his sister, Alice, to attack Henry II in 1187 in Berry • Philip Augustus formed an alliance with Richard in the summer of 1189. This enabled an attack on Maine and Anjou in the heartland of the Angevin Empire and led to Henry II having to cede territory. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1180–89 Philip Augustus did not play the most significant role and/or there were other more significant factors in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II played a significant role in the collapse of his power by the mismanagement of his sons, e.g. his refusal to announce his successor after Young Henry's death encouraged both Richard and John to rebel • Richard's arrogant management of Aquitaine provoked conflict in the Duchy and gave Philip Augustus the pretext to intervene as the overlord • The size of the Angevin Empire with its long frontier and disparate nature meant that it was going to be difficult to control and likely to collapse • By the 1180s Henry II was ageing and less able to maintain the empire with the same energy and vigour that he had shown in his younger years. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether, in the years 1180-89, the main cause of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire was the ambitions of his sons Richard and John. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1180-89, the main cause of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire was the ambitions of his sons Richard and John should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Richard had ambitions to rule Aquitaine alone. He refused to do homage to Young Henry for Aquitaine in 1182 and strengthened his castles on the borders of Anjou and Aquitaine, which provoked war in 1183 • Richard had ambitions to inherit the whole Angevin Empire after the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey • Richard launched an attack on Henry's lands in France in 1189 because he wanted to force Henry to recognise him as heir to the whole Angevin Empire • John joined Richard and Philip II of France against Henry II because he feared that he would not receive any lands on Henry's death if he did not support Richard. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1180-89, there were other, more important causes of the collapse of Henry II's power over the Angevin Empire than the ambitions of his sons Richard and John should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II's refusal to nominate his successor after the death of Young Henry fuelled the quarrels between Henry II and his sons, which were indicative of the complete lack of trust within the family, destabilising the Empire • By 1189, Henry II was less able to crush uprisings. The whole structure of the Angevin Empire rested on the ability and vigour of the ruler; Henry was too ill to fight on and Richard and Philip were militarily stronger • Philip Augustus was determined to expand France at the expense of the Angevin Empire. His anger with Henry was further provoked by his failure to return the Vexin. He entered into an alliance with Richard in 1189 • The Angevin Empire was a vast and disparate land mass of different cultures, language and feudal relationships. Its eventual collapse was very likely. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey weakened, rather than strengthened, Henry II's control of the Angevin Empire in the years 1183-89. Arguments and evidence that the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey weakened, rather than strengthened, Henry II's control of the Angevin Empire in the years 1183-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Conflict within Henry II's family increased after the death of Young Henry because Henry II refused to nominate and crown his successor. Deep divisions and jealousies developed among his remaining sons • Henry's control was weakened when Philip II demanded the return of the Vexin and the castles ceded to the Angevins in Margaret's dowry after the death of Young Henry • Conflict was intensified following the death of Young Henry after the agreement over the Vexin was undermined by Henry II's treatment of Alice, failing to arrange her marriage to Richard, and possibly seducing her • Henry's authority as Duke of Normandy was undermined by Philip II who made Geoffrey seneschal of France and secured Geoffrey's homage for Brittany • Henry's control was weakened by the quarrel over the wardship of Geoffrey's children after his death in 1186. Although Henry II and Philip II agreed a truce in the matter, the question of wardship was not settled • The deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey left Henry with only two heirs, who would hold great expanses of territory. Henry's attempt to give Aquitaine to John alienated Richard and drove him towards Philip II. Arguments and evidence that the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey strengthened, rather than weakened, Henry II's control of the Angevin Empire in the years 1183-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The death of Young Henry, in 1183, ended his rebellion against Henry II. The death of Geoffrey, in 1186, removed him from Philip II's court where Geoffrey had been actively supporting opposition to his father • Henry II kept control of the Vexin after Young Henry's death, in return for an annual payment of £2,700 to Margaret and the promise to arrange the marriage of Alice to one of his sons. He did not arrange the marriage • Philip's strategy to weaken Henry's control of the Empire, by encouraging Henry's sons to rebel against their father, was undermined by the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey. Philip did not ally with Richard till 1189 • Henry II's relationship with Richard was strengthened when he fought with Richard and John in 1187 to stop Philip II's encroachment into Berry. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire changed from June 1183 until his death in 1189. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire changed from June 1183 until his death in 1189 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II's authority over Brittany diminished over the period. In 1186, Philip II gained the ascendancy, firstly with Geoffrey's act of homage and secondly with Philip's claim to wardship over Geoffrey's heirs • Henry II's control of the southern territories was undermined by Richard, who attacked Toulouse in 1186. Philip II used Henry's inaction to launch attacks into Berry in 1187 • Although Richard and John joined forces with Henry II to protect the Empire against Philip II in 1187, this changed in 1189 when both sons joined Philip II against their father and inflicted a devastating defeat on him at Tours • Henry II's power in the Empire was considerably diminished by the peace agreement of July 1189. Henry was to do homage for his French lands, pay a fine of 20,000 marks and hand over castles in Anjou and the Vexin. Arguments and evidence that Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire did not change from June 1183 until his death in 1189 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry II refused to crown Richard or name him as his heir. Throughout the period, Henry II held the power and authority of the King of England • Throughout the period, Henry II retained overall control of the continental territories, including the finances of each region. This limited the authority of Richard in Aquitaine. Vassals continued to appeal to Henry as the overlord • Throughout the period, Henry II retained control of the Vexin, neither organising Alice's marriage to Richard, nor returning the territory, and Alice, to France • Henry II's international prestige, which emanated from the Angevin Empire, remained constant throughout the period, e.g. the Patriarch of Jerusalem travelled to England in 1185 to offer him the kingship. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
8	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate is it to say that the main reason for the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 was the weakness of those rebelling against the king. Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 was the weakness of those rebelling against the king should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Young Henry was an inexperienced commander and Louis VII was an inept commander, which meant that the rebel forces lacked coordination, cohesion and their resources were not managed effectively • Eleanor was unable to persuade all the lords of Aquitaine to support the rebellion; the lords of La Marche, Limousin and Gascony refused to get involved • Eleanor was captured in November 1173 and unable to play any further part in the rebellion • The rebels were divided in their aims; in 1174 Louis, who had failed to weaken Henry II in the north, sued for peace, which undermined Richard's attempts to take control in Aquitaine. Arguments and evidence that there were other more important reasons for the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 than the weakness of those rebelling against the king should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry had a large income that he was able to use to hire mercenaries, which allowed him to coordinate fighting in different regions; mercenaries played a key role in defeating the Bretons in 1173 and Louis in Rouen in 1174 • The strength of Henry's defences in Normandy prevented the rebels from taking Rouen in 1174 and meant they were obliged to sue for peace • Henry had important allies including the Welsh, the judiciary, the Church, the population of London and merchant classes across the empire; he could count on their support • Henry was an effective commander who was able to move swiftly between England and the empire and defeat the rebels by catching them by surprise. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than were the feuds within Henry's own family. Arguments and evidence that the opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than were the feuds within Henry's own family should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Many English barons resented Henry's reforms that reduced their independence and power, e.g. the destruction of their castles and the removal of their lands. They rose in rebellion to address this • Some English barons were greatly aggrieved by the increased powers awarded to sheriffs at their expense, resulting from the Assizes of Clarendon 1166 and the 1170 Inquest of the Sheriffs • The great barons rebelled because Henry had denied them possession of significant lands. Chester did not receive his full lands when he achieved his majority and Norfolk was denied the possession of Norwich • Barons rebelled against Henry's enforcement of his feudal rights, e.g. Leicester opposed Henry's demands for scutage and resented the amercement of £333 for breaches of the peace. Arguments and evidence that the feuds within Henry's own family were a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than was the opposition by the English barons to Henry's reforms should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's eldest three sons resented that they had been given lands and titles but not the authority to rule independently of their father. There is little evidence that the Rebellion would have occurred without their role • Eleanor and Richard were angered when Henry II and Young Henry took homage from their vassal, Raymond of Toulouse, thus implying that Toulouse was held by Normandy and England and not Aquitaine • Young Henry was driven to rebellion by his anger over his lack of control over his household and his finances. Henry II's decision to grant three castles to John from Young Henry's lands was the catalyst to rebellion • The feuds within Henry's family were fostered by Louis VII who encouraged Young Henry to demand his inheritance. Young Henry would be able to rely upon the French King's support in a rebellion • Richard joined Young Henry in his rebellion. His resources in Aquitaine, financial and military, were still controlled by Henry II. Eleanor encouraged him to flee to Young Henry in Paris and rebel • Geoffrey joined the Great Rebellion with the expectation that the size of the rebellion would result in the defeat of his father and his own opportunity to take control of Brittany. Other relevant material must be credited.



Question	Indicative content
7	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of the capture of William the Lion in the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74. Arguments and evidence that the capture of William the Lion was significant in the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • William the Lion's invasions of England in August 1173 and Easter 1174 devastated the northern counties as far south as Yorkshire and encouraged rebellion in the Midlands. His capture was significant in ending the Rebellion • In July 1174, William the Lion was captured at Alnwick. This event marked the beginning of the end of the Great Rebellion. William's castle in his fief of Huntingdon fell to Henry II and the rebellion in the Midlands was crushed • In the Treaty of Falaise, William the Lion paid homage and swore an oath to Henry II. He ceded five key castles to England that defended the Anglo-Scottish border. Henry had asserted control over the north. Arguments and evidence that the capture of William the Lion was not significant/there were other more significant factors in the defeat of the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Rebellion continued in France after the defeat of William the Lion. His capture had limited impact on the actions of Henry's sons and Louis VII • Eleanor of Aquitaine was captured in November 1173. She had played a key role in instigating her sons' rebellion and her imprisonment meant that she could no longer provide support for them • The capture of the Earl of Leicester by Richard de Lucy in October 1174 was significant. He had spearheaded rebellion in the Midlands. After his capture, rebellion in the Midlands and the south of England faltered • The defeat of Louis VII and Young Henry in the siege of Rouen in September 1174 was significant. It forced Louis and Young Henry to sue for peace and effectively ended the Great Rebellion • Henry II's storming of Saintes gave him the military advantage in Aquitaine. Young Henry's submission forced Duke Richard to sue for peace. This marked the complete end of the Great Rebellion. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74. Source 3 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • William of Newburgh had access to documents and oral accounts on which to base his <i>History</i>, as well as his own experience of the impact of the Great Rebellion, putting him in a good position to comment on events • William of Newburgh did not have any personal contacts with Henry II or his family and could therefore be regarded as a relatively impartial recorder of events • The language and tone of the source suggest that William of Newburgh disapproved of Young Henry's actions. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74: • It indicates that Henry II's throne was threatened ('some people whispered to Young Henry that, after his coronation, his father's reign had ended, so Young Henry now had the right to reign alone.') • It provides evidence that Young Henry had powerful supporters who would assist him in overthrowing his father ('King Louis', 'count of Flanders', 'earl of Leicester, the earl of Chester', 'the men of Aquitaine and Brittany') • It claims that the greatest threat came from Scotland ('a more ferocious enemy, the King of Scots.') • It suggests that, while most of the English barons joined the rebellion against Henry II ('many and great barons deserted the elder king'), Henry II was not entirely without support ('remained a few ... loyal'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Young Henry aimed to force Henry II to cede control of England to him, allowing Henry II to retain control of Normandy and Anjou, his paternal inheritance, while Richard held Aquitaine and Geoffrey held Brittany • Young Henry was joined by powerful English barons, including the earls of Leicester and Chester, discontented by Henry II's reforms, and by French supporters, including Louis VII and the Count of Flanders • Eleanor encouraged Young Henry and secured the support of his brothers, Richard and Geoffrey for his cause. In Aquitaine, she enlisted the support of the Poitevins, the counts of Angoulême and the Lusignans • Henry II had powerful supporters, including Richard de Lucy, the barons of the Exchequer, the merchant classes, London and the Judiciary and the Welsh. By May 1173, Henry II had captured Eleanor.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Fantosme based his <i>Chronicle</i> on his own observations and those of his bishop, which placed him in a good position to comment on events • Fantosme's bishop was a supporter of Henry II, and this is likely to have impacted on how Fantosme recorded events • Fantosme's <i>Chronicle</i> was written for minstrels to perform and may therefore have been embellished for the purposes of entertainment. • 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74: • It suggests that Henry II feared he may be defeated in the north ('King Henry was anxious... King of Scotland, who had acted madly, And Roger of Mowbray, ... laying waste his land by night and day.') • It suggests that Henry II regarded William the Lion to be a formidable enemy ('the King of Scotland entered Richmond? Has Newcastle-upon-Tyne been seized, and the fortifications? And all my barons expelled') • It provides evidence that Henry II was able to defeat his enemies and end the rebellion ('King of Scotland is captured and all his barons too.', 'Now is the war ended, and your kingdom in peace.'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • The King of Scotland had an historic claim to lands in Northumbria and Cumbria. It was common practice to invade the north of England when unrest weakened the English king's control of the kingdom • In August 1173, William the Lion laid waste the northern counties en route to Yorkshire. At Easter 1174, he besieged Carlisle. In the Midlands and East Anglia, Nottingham and Norwich fell to the English rebels • Richard de Lucy proved an effective general for Henry II, defeating Leicester in the South by October 1173. Ranulf de Glanvill captured William the Lion at Alnwick on 13 July 1174 • William the Lion was made to swear homage to Henry II and to recognise Henry II as his liege lord. The earls of Leicester and Chester and Eleanor of Aquitaine were all imprisoned for their roles in the rebellion. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The language and tone of both Sources 3 and 4 are sympathetic to Henry II • While Source 3 focuses more on the threat of a range of enemies to Henry II, Source 4 is focused on Henry's success in defeating his enemies • While Source 3 is based on records and oral accounts compiled by William of Newburgh in his abbey, Source 4 is based on eyewitness accounts of the events.

Section B: indicative content

Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106

