



A-level HISTORY 7042/2A

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154-1216

Mark scheme

June 2025

Version: 1.0 Final



2 5 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 2 A / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](https://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Supporting Marking Guidance

A separate Supporting Marking Guidance document has been created for use in this series and any future series.

It has been written by the senior examining team. It applies to all A-level History options. The purpose of the guidance is to clarify key aspects of the mark scheme and further ensure consistency of approach across all options. The guidance does not reflect a change in the standard applied, but clarification and amplification of the standard. We hope that the guidance document will aid you in your understanding of how the standard should be applied and deepen your understanding of how the key aspects of the mark scheme work. The Supporting Marking Guidance should always be used in conjunction with the mark scheme, and any relevant examiner standardising and teacher training material.

Examiners can find the Supporting Marking Guidance on the associate extranet.

Teachers can find the Supporting Marking Guidance alongside the current mark scheme on Centre Services on results day. It will also be published with any future assessment materials on the public website.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the relationship between King John and his barons.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as John was the author (he dictated the document to a clerk), he was well-placed to know the reasons for his conflict with this particular baron. However, he also had a reason to try and cover up his own role and might be seeking to place any blame elsewhere – thus limiting the value of the document
- this document dates from the year in which de Briouze fled to France and so is a valuable contemporary source, which is not negatively affected by knowledge of any later events (eg Magna Carta/the Barons' War)
- this type of document is quite rare and the fact that John felt the need to write it at all suggests that he was concerned about his reputation and about how other barons would perceive his role. This is very valuable in showing John's relations with his barons by 1210
- the tone/emphasis is clearly trying to show John as reasonable and abiding by the law, where de Briouze and his wife do not keep the promises they made. This might increase the value as John famously exploited the letter of the law in this way in many cases and this was a definite cause of conflict with the barons.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that debts to the Crown were a reason for baronial disputes with the Crown. This is very valuable as de Briouze is just one example from many barons who found themselves in excessive debt to the Exchequer. That this was a key cause of a breakdown in the relationship with the King is demonstrated by the number of clauses of Magna Carta which deal with such issues
- this source suggests that William continually made promises to John and that John was only acting within the letter of the law when William failed to keep them. To an extent, this is valuable. John exploited the legal and feudal systems to raise high sums of money and this led to disputes with his barons. The amounts detailed here are high and give a clear indication of why there were problems
- the source suggests that John held Matilda as a hostage whilst William was sent to raise the funds required – this is valuable as the treatment of wives and families was another reason why many of the barons became dissatisfied with John – his treatment of hostages was often unkind and might lead men to promise to pay extortionate amounts which they could not possibly afford
- the source has limitations as it only considers the behaviour of one baron – this problem seems to be isolated when, in fact, it was much more widespread and William's behaviour needs to be considered in this context.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author is anonymous which could reduce the value, but does not seem to have had a particular political agenda. However, as a monk, it is likely that he would criticise the Interdict which John had been responsible for, so there might be some criticism here of John which might slightly reduce the value
- as a chronicle this is an account of contemporary happenings – it is unlikely to be based upon direct eyewitness testimony, but many monastic chroniclers did have access to good sources of information. This source does not seem to be negatively affected by any hindsight of later events
- as this source was written in 1212 it might be very valuable as the author may have been able to appreciate the levels of uncertainty between the King and his barons in this particular time period. It is widely believed that one of John's reasons for becoming a Papal vassal in 1213 was due to the paranoia he felt after the events of 1212
- the source appears to take a balanced and factual approach to events, using fairly neutral language throughout and by showing positive and negative actions from the King – this increases its value.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that John became very paranoid about his barons and suspected their loyalty. Certainly this seems to be true as he had extracted oaths of loyalty from them on regular occasions and used hostages/debts as leverage to maintain loyalty
- this source suggests that John faced open threats to his position from his barons and this does seem to be valuable. The Fitzwalter mentioned here would go on to become the 'Marshal of the Army of God' during the later war
- there is a suggestion that the Interdict played a role in some of the baronial hostility towards John. This is less valuable as many of the barons had supported John's stance against Papal interference in England. Perhaps this is the monastic author's own viewpoint here – although rebels did use the excuse of the Interdict in their actions against the King
- the source discusses John's hanging of hostages – this is valuable as such behaviour was a key reason behind baronial distrust of the King – John often demanded hostages for good behaviour and it is clear that increasingly the barons did not trust John with their sons.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the Magna Carta was drafted by moderates, but was based upon grievances identified in the 'Articles of the Barons'. In this sense, this source is very valuable in giving us insight into the fractured relationship and the lack of trust between the King and some of his leading men
- the charter was agreed upon in the summer of 1215 and thus provides a valuable insight into the current feelings of the barons – especially as they were consulted as to the content
- however, historians need to be aware that, whilst this source looks like it has been written by John (the use of the royal 'we' and 'our'), in fact this document was essentially demanded from him and he took little effort to have it copied and circulated beyond vague promises. This might limit the value somewhat in suggesting that the relationship between the King and the barons would improve from this point on
- the tone is placatory and seems as if John is chastened and willing to conform to the barons' wishes. However, given his actions almost immediately afterward, this must be used with caution, as must the legalistic language deployed.

Content and argument

- this source suggests that the reason for discord has been due to arguments between the King and the barons. Peace and liberties are referred to, as are promises from the King to observe these. This is valuable as the clauses of Magna Carta give great insight into the problems the barons had with John's style of kingship. That such promises needed to be made is very indicative of the situation
- the source indicates that there is a lack of trust between the barons and the King – it references what should happen if John transgresses against the promises made. This is very valuable as a lack of trust on both sides helped to define John's relations with his barons
- the charter gives some of the barons powers which they can use to constrain the King's behaviour – this suggests that they have not had this in the past, which is valuable in telling us why they are angry with him
- the content does have some limitations. The suggestion is that this 'council of 25' is entirely reasonable. However, in reality this would never be acceptable to a medieval monarch. Thus, in trying to suggest that John would not be able to have the charter annulled, it has limitations.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent was Henry II successful in achieving control over the English Church during his reign?

[25 marks]*Target: AO1*

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Henry II was successful in achieving control over the English Church during his reign might include:

- throughout his reign, Henry was able to appoint his own Bishops and Archbishops – even though he promised free elections at Avranches in 1172, his choices were clear in the appointments of Richard of Dover and Baldwin of Forde to Canterbury and of his bastard son Geoffrey to Lincoln
- Henry wanted to ensure that the English prelates would support him due to their position as landholders and tenants in chief. He retained the support of the Bishops and Abbots across his whole reign – even during the Becket dispute, the other Bishops remained in England and they took his side during the Great Rebellion
- Henry was able to use the Church to crown his son, Young Henry, during his lifetime. This was not really an English custom (Theobald had refused Stephen's earlier request on these grounds), but the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Salisbury and London acquiesced in 1170
- Henry was able to keep interference from the Papacy at arm's length. Despite accepting certain conditions in 1172, Henry largely continued to dominate the English Church – for example, he was able to avoid going on crusade despite promising that he would go and he also kept numerous bishoprics vacant (in order to benefit financially), despite having promised the Pope that he wouldn't
- Henry aimed to have a cooperative relationship with his archbishops and he largely managed this outside of the period 1162–70. For example, he worked well with Theobald at the start of his reign.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II was successful in achieving control over the English Church during his reign might include:

- Henry disputed with Becket over the punishments for criminal clerics and this was one issue where he backed down when reaching an agreement with the Papacy – clerics accused of forest offences could be dealt with in secular courts after 1176, but otherwise the ecclesiastical courts retained jurisdiction in this area
- in 1164 Henry aimed to codify the relationship between Crown and Church in a document known as the Constitutions of Clarendon. These clauses were formally abandoned by Henry after Avranches in 1172, thus meaning that 'grey areas' were maintained which did not appeal to Henry's sense of control
- during the Becket controversy Henry struggled to impose his wishes on the Church: for example, Becket refused to accept Henry's beliefs that all appeals to Rome had to be approved by the King first: Becket himself appealed to Rome when he decided to go into exile in 1164. This was internationally humiliating to Henry
- at Avranches, in 1172, Henry had to do public penance and accept some guilt for the death of Becket. The new Archbishop, Richard of Dover, seems to have implemented many Papal directives in England – which suggests that the English Church was not as independent as Henry would have liked.

Students could argue persuasively in either direction with this question. Good answers will consider the situation across Henry's reign – and not just talk about the dispute with Becket. Very good answers might point out that the Constitutions of Clarendon were developed by Henry in response to Becket's intransigence and so giving them up in 1172 was probably not a big issue now that Becket was dead.

0 3 'Henry II failed in his dealings with the French Crown.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Henry II failed in his dealings with the French Crown might include:

- Henry died in 1189 having been effectively defeated by Philip of France, acting in concert with his eldest surviving son, Richard. Henry had to concede territory to Philip and accept Richard as heir to all of his lands, which is not what he had wanted
- in the aftermath of the death of Geoffrey of Brittany, Henry was unable to press his claims to control over Brittany and the infant Arthur. This is because Philip had accepted Geoffrey's oath of fealty before his death – and this helped to weaken Henry on the continent
- throughout Henry's reign he faced almost constant interference from the French Crown in disputes which were internal to Henry's own territories, thus increasing the scale of the problems. Louis, for example, joined both Geoffrey of Anjou and Young Henry in their rebellions and Philip equally encouraged Geoffrey of Brittany and Richard to take action against their father
- some of Henry's territorial ambitions were prevented by the interference of the French king. For example, he was forced to back down from his attempted invasion of Toulouse in 1159 which was an expensive climb-down for Henry. Louis also backed Becket during the conflict with Henry.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II failed in his dealings with the French Crown might include:

- besides the final campaign in 1188–9, Henry seems to have been the victor in conflicts with the French kings. Most notably, Louis' involvement in the Great Rebellion was a costly failure for the French king and led to Henry arguably becoming more powerful
- Henry was quite astute in his diplomatic dealings with the French kings and managed to secure beneficial agreements such as the marriage of Young Henry and Margaret and the Treaty of Ivry
- Henry often outwitted the French kings, particularly Louis. For example, Henry took the Vexin in 1160 through a legal loophole and he was able to marry Eleanor of Aquitaine without asking for Louis' permission as he knew this would not be forthcoming
- in the early years of his reign, Philip faced domestic threats from his uncles, and it was Henry who he turned to for advice – this saw a reaffirmation of the Treaty of Ivry
- the Treaty of Montmirail (1169) allowed Henry to end a border dispute with Louis, by promising to split his territories amongst his sons. Henry probably wanted this anyway but had now also gained the betrothal of Louis' other daughter, Alys, to Richard. This meant that Henry could legitimately keep the Vexin in 1170 after Young Henry's death.

Students are likely to argue that Henry ultimately failed in this area due to the nature of his death and the events at the time. However, the best answers will consider Henry's performance more holistically and reach a judgement based on the entire reign. Any supported judgement will be rewarded but there should be mention of both Louis and Philip in good answers.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 0 | 4 |
|---|---|
- 'The loss of Normandy in 1204 was more the result of Richard's legacy than the failings of John.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the loss of Normandy in 1204 was more the result of Richard's legacy than the failings of John might include:

- Richard left an unfinished war in Normandy for John to tackle. Despite having regained most of what Philip had taken since 1193, this was agreed in a truce in 1198. This meant that, once Richard had died, Philip might aim to restart the war on better terms for himself
- Richard's behaviour had alienated key supporters such as the Norman Church. Equally, he had not really tackled the issue that many Norman barons had land in both Richard's territory and Philip's – this is something that Philip had exploited in the past and would do in 1202–4 during the war with John
- John really struggled to raise the funds required and this perhaps explains his absence in England in 1204. This was undoubtedly a legacy of the financially exploitative reign of Richard
- Richard had left a questionable succession due to his naming of both Arthur (1191) and John (1199) as his heir – this was an opportunity which Philip was able to exploit at Le Goulet.

Arguments challenging the view that the loss of Normandy in 1204 was more the result of Richard's legacy than the failings of John might include:

- by 1199, Richard had regained most of what had been lost in Normandy in terms of land and castles – this meant that John was in a strong position moving forwards
- the cause of the war from 1202 was John's own behaviour – his treatment of the Lusignans and his refusal to attend Philip's court which led to him being declared a 'contumacious vassal'
- John alienated key supporters, like William des Roches, due to the treatment of the prisoners of Mirebeau and the alleged murder of Arthur. This led to defections in Anjou and the invasion of Normandy from Brittany, which strengthened Philip's position at the same time as weakening John's
- many castles and towns in Normandy surrendered easily and this seems partly to be the result of a lack of faith in John who seemed to be avoiding the fighting in England – his attempts to relieve Chateau Gaillard were minimal and he offered no help to Rouen. This meant that Philip was able to conquer the Duchy at a rapid speed.

Students could argue convincingly for either of these key factors and will be rewarded for any supported judgement. They should restrict their answers to the two key factors given in the question and not spend lots of time introducing a range of possible alternative factors, unless these can be clearly linked to either John's failings or Richard's legacy. In their evaluation of the different strands of argument, students might refer to the fact that many of the problems faced by Richard were actually of John's making (his plotting with Philip in 1192–4) in the first place. Good answers might appreciate that the loss of the 'empire' and the loss of 'Normandy' are subtly different issues – and will show understanding of how one affected the other.