



A-level HISTORY 7042/2A

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

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 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.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from 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 © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 instability in England during King Richard's absences.

[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 Richard was writing at the time of events in his monastery, it is likely that he had access to regular updates and news from visitors
- the monastic chronicle often sought to provide a narrative account of events as perceived by the author – which might increase value, although certain religious bias may be present
- William Longchamp was disliked by many clerics, especially monks, as he was viewed as a man who enriched himself and his family at the expense of others, eg appointing family members to lucrative church posts
- it is clear that Richard dislikes Longchamp – he is described as ‘arrogant’ and a ‘tyrant’ – whether he was or not would very much depend upon who you were – Longchamp had run-ins with Prince John and Archbishop Geoffrey – but King Richard clearly trusted him, even after his fall from grace in England in 1191.

Content and argument

- the source argues that Longchamp acted tyrannically and that everyone suffered. This has some value as the pogrom of the Jews in York would attest to. Equally, the justiciar had Geoffrey of York arrested and treated violently
- the source argues that the absence of the King led to disorder and the barons to begin acting disloyally. There is some value in this – Prince John seized a number of royal castles and men like Gerard de Camville (Lincoln) joined him
- the problem of Longchamp’s pre-eminent position is reinforced by the fact that he was justiciar, chancellor, Bishop of Ely, Papal Legate and warden of the Tower of London. He placed many of his friends and family in key positions. This would make him seem like a ‘tyrant’ and there were certainly plots to remove him
- there seems to be some exaggeration as to the extent of instability in Richard’s account – many of the day to day jobs of government continued (eg the justices in eyre continued to travel to hear legal cases). The disloyalty of John was arguably more of an issue (reinforced by his later actions in 1193) – Longchamp merely provided John with an excuse for behaving in a disloyal fashion.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a monk, William may have a natural bias against the Jews, but he was also based in the North, so was fairly close to one of the events he relates – the York pogrom
- the monastic chronicle often sought to provide a narrative account of events as perceived by the author – which might increase value, although certain religious bias may be present
- as King, Richard was a crusader king, William is likely to write about him positively and deflect any blame for loss of royal control elsewhere
- William clearly dislikes the Jews (calling them ‘dishonest’ and ‘impious usurers’). However, he also describes those committing the attack as ‘greedy’. William speaks with great praise when he talks about the King.

Content and argument

- William suggests that the anti-Semitic attacks which blighted England in Richard’s absence had a number of causes. This has great value as the Jews were disliked due to the fact that they were different (and were accused of killing Christ), but their relative wealth did make them a target. This was an especial problem in the reign of Richard as the financial demands made to fund the crusade had left many in more debt than ever
- that the King was angry at the loss of control is valuable – Richard had condemned the anti-Semitic violence which had taken place at his coronation in 1189. The Jews were considered to be the ‘King’s Jews’ and any attack on them was an attack on royal authority – hence his anger. Steps were taken to prevent any similar attacks in the future through the establishment of the Exchequer of the Jews in 1194
- William does lose some value in his attempt to completely remove the King from any blame for the events. In reality, the loss of control in York was partly the result of a power vacuum. This could have been anticipated by Richard’s arrangements for the government of England in his absence, when he allowed too much power to be placed in the hands of William Longchamp. Equally, despite his anger, Richard had not done anything to punish those responsible for the London attacks of 1189
- William’s own anti-Jewish bias reduces his value somewhat – seen in the way that he describes the Jews as ‘impious usurers’.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Roger was potentially well placed to write about this as he had been a royal clerk for Henry II. This would mean that he would have high level contacts and a good understanding of the workings of government
- as Roger will have lived through these events, he may have been a witness to some of the happenings as they were very public. He would also be able to discuss the situation with others and so provide a valuable insight into attitudes during the absence of the King
- Roger’s annals were a contemporary account of Richard’s reign and so do not seem to have a specific agenda. However, as a loyal servant of Henry II, it is likely that Roger would write positively about his son – which can be seen with the tone used
- as a cleric, it is possible that Roger shared the view with the Canterbury monks and some of the other prelates of being quite critical of the Justiciar and Archbishop, Hubert Walter – this is suggested by the way he speaks about Walter and the negative way he writes about the situation in England under Walter’s leadership.

Content and argument

- Roger discusses the financial exactions which have been placed upon England. This is very valuable as England paid huge sums for the crusade, the ransom and the wars in France. By 1196, there was increasing tension over the sums being extracted and the view that this was unfairly hitting the poor was prevalent – Hubert Walter was viewed quite negatively as he was the mastermind of new money raising methods such as the carucage which was a new land tax
- Roger implies that there was social discontent between the rich and the poor and this does seem valuable. Although the nobility and the bishops disliked the financial exactions, there were no open rebellions from the top levels of society and the only real outbreaks of trouble were thus at the lower level. Richard's reputation remained good (as implied here – fitz-Osbert was appealing for his protection) and men like Hubert Walter faced the brunt of the complaints
- Roger emphasises that Hubert Walter played a key role in decision making and dealing with problems. This is definitely valuable – Richard did not return to England after Easter 1194 and it was Walter who ruled in his stead until 1198. He dealt with a whole range of issues including a Welsh revolt, changes to government and administration etc
- Roger also alludes to tensions between Walter and the Canterbury monks which has value – the monks did not like the Archbishop as they felt that he was too focused on his secular role. They were also disputing with him over a new foundation that he planned to establish.

Section B

- 0 2** How important were religious motives in causing the English interventions in Ireland in the years 1169 to 1171?

[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 religious motives were important in causing the English interventions in Ireland in the years 1169 to 1171 might include:

- Henry II personally went to Ireland in 1171 – in the aftermath of the death of Thomas Becket in December 1170. He was much praised by Pope Alexander III for this, and seems to have been important in enabling Henry to reach a reconciliation with the Papacy in 1172
- when Henry heard that the Papal Legates were willing to discuss the terms of his reconciliation, he left Ireland and headed straight for Avranches. He did not return, despite the fact that there was much still to be done. This might indicate that he was merely using the expedition as a way of appealing to the Papacy
- contemporary accounts spoke of the corruption within the Irish Church – practices such as incest and divorce were allowed, and there was a desire for reform from Rome
- in 1155 it is possible that Henry was sent a Papal Bull (Laudabiliter) encouraging him to invade Ireland for the purposes of implementing religious reforms
- one of the actions taken by Henry in 1172 was to hold a Church Synod at Cashel, which began to implement various church reforms.

Arguments challenging the view that religious motives were important in causing the English interventions in Ireland in the years 1169 to 1171 might include:

- Henry may have involved himself in Ireland for dynastic reasons, eg to provide an inheritance for John who was made Lord of Ireland in 1185. This might explain why Henry left matters unfinished – he was leaving something for John to do
- the initial English intervention in Ireland was prompted by a request for help from Dermot Macmurrough – Henry was not actually that interested in involving himself and merely gave his agreement to relatively independent actions from certain Anglo-Norman barons from S Wales
- Henry may have been interested in building a larger 'empire' for himself and enhancing his own reputation – this is perhaps explained by the fact that he was not bothered about direct control over much of Ireland – he was happy with nominal overlordship (eg Treaty of Windsor)
- the timing of Henry's personal intervention might be explained by Strongbow's marriage to Aoife and his accession to become ruler of Leinster – Henry used trade embargos when he found out – Henry was concerned to ensure that Strongbow was primarily loyal to him and was not an independent threat across the Irish Sea
- there were some economic advantages for Henry and the barons involved – Henry was especially concerned with directly controlling key ports such as Dublin and Waterford.

Students could reach various independent judgements about this question. Some may suggest that the timing makes it likely that Henry had religious motives on his mind, where the barons were probably acting more out of self-interest. Some may even debate the authenticity of the Bull Laudabiliter. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.

0 3 'The dynastic ambitions of his sons were the greatest threat to Henry II's authority in the 1180s.'

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 dynastic ambitions of his sons were the greatest threat to Henry II's authority in the 1180s might include:

- in 1183, Young Henry rebelled against his father and brother Richard, causing a serious threat to control in the more southern areas of Henry's lands. He plotted with the barons of Aquitaine, and Geoffrey, which meant lasting problems, even after Young Henry's own death
- Richard's refusal to accede Aquitaine to his brother, John, in the years after 1183, caused serious issues for Henry's succession plans. Henry was unable to ensure the partible inheritance which he had long desired
- Geoffrey's desire to increase his power as Duke of Brittany led him to swear direct fealty to the French king. This meant that, after Geoffrey's death in 1186, Henry would struggle to direct events in Brittany or take possession of the infant heir to the dukedom (Arthur)
- Henry died during a war with the King of France – a war in which he was rapidly losing territory and support. It is unlikely that the defections to Philip would have been as high, if Richard had not switched sides in 1188.

Arguments challenging the view that the dynastic ambitions of his sons were the greatest threat to Henry II's authority in the 1180s might include:

- Philip II of France posed a bigger threat to Henry's authority. The ambitions of Henry's sons would have not been too troubling if they had not been encouraged by Philip's scheming, eg he made Geoffrey Seneschal of France
- Henry seems to have encouraged the dynastic squabbling between his sons (eg suggesting that John invade Aquitaine in 1184) as this meant that they were arguing with each other and not threatening him
- in his final campaign it seems that it was Philip's military ability that Henry underestimated – he had been able to deal with Louis VII throughout his reign, but was unable to deal with Philip so effectively
- in England, Henry does not seem to have been concerned about any serious threats to his royal authority. This can be seen by his leaving Ranulf Glanville in charge, whilst Henry focused upon issues on the continent – clearly his sons were not a threat here
- the English Church (and the Papacy) could still pose a threat to Henry – in the aftermath of Becket's death, Henry had been forced to compromise at Avranches and he hadn't managed to achieve his aims in the Constitutions of Clarendon. This meant that he was potentially storing up trouble for the future.

Students might conclude that, by the late 1180s, Henry's biggest problem was the dynastic ambitions of his sons – namely Richard. However, before this, Henry had been able to cope decisively with the threat they posed. It is probable that many students will look to the development of Philip's power as being somewhat of a watershed – it was Philip's skill and cunning which made the sons' ambitions especially dangerous. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.

0 4 'The monarchy was in an extremely weak position at the time of the death of King John in 1216.'

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 monarchy was in an extremely weak position at the time of the death of King John in 1216 might include:

- Prince Louis of France had invaded England and had support of many of the English barons – including some notable figures like the Earl of Salisbury. He also controlled much of the South East and the city of London
- John was so unpopular with many of the barons as a result of his style of rule and his failure to stick to the agreements promised in Magna Carta – this meant that the barons were keen to change how the King would rule and had demanded a ‘Committee of 25’ which would have greatly curtailed the King’s abilities to rule without baronial support
- John was losing in the civil war at the time of his death, eg he had lost Rochester thus nullifying his victory there in 1215 – and this reinforced the view of him as a military failure (‘Softsword’). His cruelty during the campaign of 1215–16 had not endeared his subjects to him (eg Berwick)
- John’s heir was an inexperienced child – who would struggle to impose himself vs. the French prince. Louis himself had a claim to the throne through his wife, Blanche of Castille.

Arguments challenging the view that the monarchy was in an extremely weak position at the time of the death of King John in 1216 might include:

- key nobles remained as committed loyalists to the very end of John’s reign, eg the Earls of Pembroke and Chester
- the English Church was largely supportive of John during the civil war, and he had the Papacy onside (a result of his position as a Papal Vassal and sworn Crusader). This meant that Louis was unable to get himself crowned and the legate Guala could crown Henry III
- John had key loyal supporters in important regional positions, eg Hubert de Burgh (Dover) and Nicola de la Haye (Lincoln) which meant that the war was not a foregone conclusion and could be continued after his death
- as a young boy, the future Henry III could be presented as untainted by his father’s rule – the reissuing of a revised Magna Carta helped to bring key rebels back to the royalist side
- many of the barons had supported Prince Louis out of desperation at John’s style of rule – now that John was dead, rule by a Capetian was unpalatable to them.

Students could argue persuasively in either direction about this question, but may conclude that the monarchy looked very weak, when, in reality, the support of men like William Marshal and Guala made it actually very strong once the personality of John was removed as an obstacle. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.