
A-level
HISTORY
7042/2A

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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 Assessment Writer.

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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, i.e. 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.

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

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying King John's relationship with the Church. **[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 a monk, Wendover is unlikely to write positively about John and his conflict with the Church, which might lead to a limit in value through exaggeration of John's behaviour
- Wendover had the benefit of hindsight and so knew that the dispute would accelerate and become very serious – with John ignoring both Interdict and excommunication for years – which might affect value
- however, Wendover was probably relying on an earlier chronicle which was written at the time of events – thus should have been well-placed to comment upon events
- the tone of the source is very derogatory and negative towards John, whereas the bishops are portrayed much more favourably. This might affect value.

Content and argument

- John's behaviour is portrayed as very inflammatory, which could be supported by own knowledge as John did get very angry when he realised that the Pope was attempting to interfere in the election of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is true that John refused to allow Stephen Langton into the country – and he only backed down on this in 1213
- there are a series of angry letters written by John – and replies from the Pope – which indicate that John was in a rage about the events from 1205–8, as described here
- there is a limitation, as this source suggests that John was behaving entirely unreasonably, when in fact the choice of Stephen Langton would have been very problematic for him. This would have set a dangerous precedent in suggesting that the Pope could interfere in such a way and Langton's own theological leanings and contacts in Paris made him an unattractive candidate for the King
- although the bishops did leave the country, there is no concrete evidence that John did harm clerics who remained in the country. In fact, John continued to donate money to the Church throughout the Interdict.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a senior Canterbury monk, Gervase was well-placed to observe the events as they unfolded. However, he would undoubtedly take the side of Canterbury in his recording of the dispute, which might lead him to exaggerate the negatives about John
- as Gervase was writing a monastic chronicle, it is intended to be read by a clerical audience. This might lead to an over-emphasis on the potential negatives of the Interdict

- Gervase was unlikely to know how the Interdict affected the whole of England. It was unlikely to have had a uniform effect and may have affected Canterbury much more than in other areas, given Canterbury's central role in the dispute
- the tone is quite dramatic and places much blame on John for the dreadful conditions which ensued in England. There seems to be some element of exaggeration in what Gervase writes.

Content and argument

- Gervase describes the negatives of an Interdict and focuses on how the people of England were affected by the sacraments being withdrawn. There would certainly be concern as religion was so central to people's lives and they relied upon the Church to intercede with God on their behalf
- there were definitely great financial implications during the Interdict, although this was mainly felt by the Church (e.g. John exploited vacant bishoprics) – the financial burden on laymen seems to be exaggerated. Any financial exactions John made from laymen came as a result of his other policies (e.g. justice) and were not really connected to the Interdict
- the Interdict was not implemented consistently across the whole country and these examples provided by Gervase were not typical for the whole country. There was no popular or baronial uprising as a result of the Interdict, which one might expect if the conditions were really this bad
- Gervase correctly identifies that some people left England, but this was mainly the senior prelates. There was no mass exodus and many of the tenants-in-chief actually supported John in his stance against the Papacy.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this letter was written by the Pope and so he was well-placed to comment upon John's relationship with the Church – having dealt with John as King over a number of years and throughout the dispute and reconciliation
- as an open letter this was intended to be read by the barons and Churchmen in England, as well as John himself. The purpose was to make it clear that Innocent did not support Magna Carta and was thus absolving John from the agreement he had made with the barons. This might lead to exaggeration of the closeness of John and Innocent's relationship but does show that John had fully recovered from his earlier poor relations with the Church
- the tone is very complimentary and praising towards John as a loyal vassal of the Pope and is negative about the barons.

Content and argument

- Innocent accurately records John's reconciliation with Rome – he became a papal vassal and offered to repay the money he had extorted during the Interdict, as well as an annual payment to the Pope. John was very obedient and accepted Stephen Langton as Archbishop
- Innocent is right in saying that John had taken the Cross, but is maybe exaggerating John's commitment to the cause of a Crusade in order to give his letter more weight. In reality, John had made little progress in any preparations as he had been focused on the dispute with the barons
- Innocent did give John his full backing in the quarrel with the barons over Magna Carta and even recalled Langton to Rome over the incident
- Innocent suggests that it was Satan who had stirred up the barons against John. In reality, many of John's own actions had led to the dispute, but Innocent is sidestepping this as he would not talk about his own vassal in such negative terms.

Section B

- 02** 'By 1166, Henry II had solved the problems of justice and the law that he had inherited at his accession.'

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/factors suggesting that, by 1166, Henry II had solved the problems of justice and the law that he had inherited at his accession might include:

- the 1166 Assize of Clarendon laid down measures of uniformity in the law in England (such as the use of juries of presentment and Trials by Water). The fact that Henry felt he could impose this would suggest that he was in much better control than he had been in 1154
- in the 1166 Assize of Clarendon, sheriffs were given wider powers to enable them to more effectively pursue criminals, allowing them access to baronial lands which helped to increase royal control
- Inquests of the Sheriffs, in 1155 and 1162, had replaced a lot of the corrupt sheriffs/baronial appointees and meant that the King's law was more likely to be dispensed in the localities than regional baronial justice
- as justiciars, Richard de Lucy and Robert Beaumont provided stability and acted as the chief justice when Henry was absent from the country – this prevented a return to the loss of centralised control under Stephen
- Forest Law was revived and implemented rigorously across the country
- Richard de Lucy and Geoffrey de Mandeville conducted a 'general eyre' in 1166 which re-established the principle of royal judges visiting the localities to hear cases and check on the sheriffs. Again, this re-imposed royal authority.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that, by 1166, Henry II had solved the problems of justice and the law that he had inherited at his accession might include:

- there were many land disputes outstanding from Stephen's reign and Henry was only making a start on dealing with these at the Assize of Clarendon in 1166
- the question of where the Church fitted into the legal system and the issue of criminous clerks was still outstanding. Arguably, this problem had worsened by 1166 as Becket was still in exile, with the problem unresolved
- Henry would feel the need to conduct a Grand Inquest of Sheriffs in 1170, which suggests that his control over his royal appointees to the shires was not as complete as he would like. The problem was not as serious as it had been in 1154, but was not solved
- the findings of the 1166 General Eyre demonstrated great irregularities in the dispensing of royal justice across the country – this would lead to the development of the 'justices in eyre' system after 1166 and so clearly there was still a lot of work to be done.

Students may argue that Henry had successfully addressed many of the problems that he had faced at his coronation in 1154, but that some were outstanding – most notably in his quarrels with Becket over Church jurisdiction. However, any supported argument will be rewarded.

03 'The aftermath of the Becket dispute was damaging for Henry II.'

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/factors suggesting that the aftermath of the Becket dispute was damaging for Henry II might include:

- Henry was forced into humiliating public penances at Avranches and Canterbury and would be seen as a tyrannical King across Europe. The treatment of Becket may have helped the rebel cause in 1173
- Henry was forced to abandon the Constitutions of Clarendon – this would have cleared up many grey areas in Church-State relations
- Henry agreed that criminous clerks would be dealt with by the Ecclesiastical Courts, apart from in a few exceptions – this shows him as backing down on one of his major principles
- Financially, Henry lost out as he had to return Church property which had been seized and had to send money for the defence of Outremer
- Henry had to agree to the principle of Appeals to Rome. Under the new Archbishop, Richard of Dover, the number of Papal letters sent to England increased significantly.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the aftermath of the Becket dispute was damaging for Henry II might include:

- undertaking penance at Becket's tomb in 1174 ensured Henry II of the Church's support during the Great Rebellion. This was further enhanced by the fortuitous timing of the capture of the King of Scotland, which was viewed to be an act of God on the side of Henry
- despite promising free elections, Henry managed to get many former royal clerks appointed to high ecclesiastical office in the years after 1170. He had a positive and effective working relationship with his next two Archbishops of Canterbury
- Henry managed to get his promise to go on Crusade commuted to donations of money and the founding of monasteries instead
- the vague wording of the agreement of Avranches meant that Henry could still exploit vacant bishoprics for money (e.g. York after the death of Roger in 1182)
- royal permission was required before any of the King's Tenants-in-Chief or officials could be excommunicated.

Students might argue that, initially, it appeared that the Crown had lost a great deal but that Henry managed to manipulate the situation and the wording of any agreements so that, in reality he lost little. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

- 04** How far was crusading zeal the reason for the increase in anti-Semitism in Richard I's 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/factors suggesting that crusading zeal was the reason for the increase in anti-Semitism in Richard I's reign might include:

- there had been Jews in England since the Norman Conquest and their population had been steadily increasing through Henry II's reign. However, the sheer scale of the increased violence perpetrated in 1189–90 suggests that the crusade must have been a motivating factor
- the first outbreak of violence against the Jews came at Richard's coronation in London in 1189. It was widely known that Richard would be departing on crusade in the near future and crusading fervour was high
- the crusade had been preached widely across England since 1188 and thus there was much focus on religious 'others'. It was not unusual for anti-Semitic violence to combine with such preaching – as had been seen in Germany at the times of the First and Second Crusades
- in order to pay for a crusade Henry II had implemented the Saladin Tithe across England in 1188. There was some resentment from people about paying this to fight Muslims in the East when there were wealthy Jews who could be targeted at home
- many of the anti-Semitic attacks in England took place once the King had left for the crusade. Many ordinary people had not been able to afford to travel to the Holy Land (as Richard was going by ship) and so the Jews took the brunt of their frustrations as religious 'others'.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that crusading zeal was the reason for the increase in anti-Semitism in Richard I's reign might include:

- during the pogrom in York, the ringleaders burnt the records of their debts to the Jewish moneylenders. This suggests an economic aspect to the attack
- the Jews were also disliked as they were viewed as the 'King's Jews' – they were seen to have special legal privileges and the protection of the King. It is possible that the attacks on Jewish communities were a backlash against royal authority – an attack on the King's possessions whilst he was absent and neglecting his country
- as usury was prohibited by the Catholic Church, Jews became synonymous with moneylending. Attacks may have been caused by envy of the obvious wealth of many within the Jewish community
- there was a long-term dislike and mistrust of the Jews as 'Christ-killers' and the Blood Libel had been circulating around Europe since the 1150s. The anti-Semitism in Richard's reign could be seen as a long-term issue, exacerbated by a lack of royal authority during the absence of the King.

Students might argue that the reasons for the attacks on the Jews were numerous, but that the catalyst for the scale and regularity of the violence in 1189 and 1190 was the crusade. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.