



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History
(8HI0) Paper 2A

Paper 2: Depth study

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

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

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks **if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.**
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a **candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.**
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- For questions targeting AO2, candidates must not be credited for citing information in the preamble.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a **'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer.** Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

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

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the uppermiddle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark.

To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

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

Generic Level Descriptors

Section A: Questions 1a/2a

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little if any substantiation. Concepts of utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of utility is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.

Section A: Questions 1b/2b

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	6–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Section B

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	11–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<p>1a</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the reasons for Harold Godwinson's succession to the earldom of Wessex in 1053.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that Harold had a birth right to succeed to his father's earldom ('His son Harold, eldest in birth') • It provides evidence that Harold was the choice of Edward the Confessor ('appointed by the king's favour to the earldom') • It suggests that Harold Godwinson had the qualities to manage the affairs of the most important earldom in Anglo-Saxon England ('stood forth among the people,; 'champion of the law'). 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writer cannot be considered as impartial when writing about Harold's accession in a book dedicated to Queen Edith, Harold's sister • The book was written in the years 1065-7; Harold was King in 1066, which may have prompted a favourable description of his qualities • The writer did have access to information from the royal court so should be well informed about the circumstances of Harold's succession to Wessex 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wessex had been held by Godwin; it was regarded as the most important earldom in the kingdom because it had originally been land held by the king • Harold already had experience as an earl; he had been appointed to the earldom of East Anglia on the return of the Godwin family to the king's favour in 1052. He relinquished this for Wessex in 1053 • The Godwin family was very influential in Anglo-Saxon politics; Edith, Harold's sister was queen • Harold's promotion to Wessex allowed Edward to strengthen the power of the Mercian family at the expense of the Godwins; Aeflgar of Mercia was made Earl of East Anglia and there was no land for Tostig.

Question	Indicative content
1b	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the basis of Duke William's claim to the throne of England in 1066.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William of Jumièges had close connections to Duke William and to Robert of Jumièges, former archbishop of Canterbury and will have had access to information about the Duke's claim to the throne • William of Jumièges wrote his account of Duke William's claim after the conquest and dedicated it to the Conqueror. He is not an impartial witness • The purpose of this source may be seen as a justification for the conquest. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that the throne had been previously promised to William by Edward the Confessor (Edward.. had sent [the] archbishop of Canterbury to Duke William to nominate him as the heir') • It provides evidence that Harold had been sent to William to confirm the promise of the throne ('Edward afterward sent Harold to Duke William.. that [he] should swear fealty to him concerning Edward's crown') • It provides evidence that Harold was rescued from captivity by William and swore to help William accede to the throne ('Harold ..swore fealty concerning the kingdom with many oaths'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edward the Confessor had no heir; some writers claim that he deliberately remained celibate to prevent a Godwin heir from succeeding to the throne • William was Edward's cousin. He knew him from the time he spent in Normandy and had favoured Normans in his court. In choosing William he would be choosing a member of his own family • Some chroniclers claim that Harold's oath of fealty was made under duress and was not valid • Edward's decision over the succession is not clear. There is evidence that he chose Harold on his deathbed while the presence of Edgar Aetheling in the English court indicates that Edgar was being groomed as heir.

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

Question	Indicative content
<p>2a</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into Henry II's reaction to Becket's decision to go into exile in 1164.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that Henry II intended to punish Becket by seizing his wealth ('seize into your own hands all the revenues and possessions of the archbishop of Canterbury') • It provides evidence that Henry intended to punish Becket's supporters ('to arrest the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, nephew and nieces of all the clerks who are with the archbishop') • It suggests that Henry did not accept that he was answerable to papal authority ('if any one ... appeals to the court of Rome, then you are to have him arrested') • It indicates that Henry was reserving judgement on the final reaction and that this would place pressure on Becket and his supporters to submit ('until my pleasure shall be known'). 2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was issued by Henry and demonstrates his personal reaction to Becket's decision to go into exile in December 1164 • This is a direct command from Henry to his sheriffs, which they were bound to implement and thus is no idle threat • The purpose of this command is to threaten Becket and his supporters and frighten them back into obedience. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry II's reaction to Becket's exile was particularly harsh because he had expected the Archbishop to support his plan to extend control over the church • Becket initially fled to the court of Louis VII, King of France and Henry's enemy. This antagonised Henry further • Henry ordered the deportation of Becket's entire family, household and anyone who supported Becket • Henry's threats were ineffective; Becket remained in exile for six years.

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

Question	Indicative content
2b	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into Henry II's extension of control in Ireland in 1172.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gerald of Wales was a clerk in Henry II's court from 1184 and the nephew of Fitz-Stephen. He would have been in a good position to gather information about the King's expedition to Ireland in 1172 • Gerald of Wales was not present in court or in Ireland in 1172. He is likely to have been given an account of that expedition favourable to Henry's views • The purpose of this source was clearly to praise Henry's achievements and to emphasise the ease with which Henry extended control in Ireland about which Gerald of Wales makes sweeping claims. 2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that Henry himself was responsible for the extension of control and he would not tolerate subordinates acting without his authorisation ('Fitz-Stephen ... had set the others a bad example') • It suggests that Henry II conquered Ireland with ease with the Irish kings submitting freely to his control ('Dermotus, king of Cork, came of his own free will and made his submission to the King of England') • It indicates that threat of force was used to persuade the Irish to submit ('The King of England thence marched to Cashel'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry II launched his invasion in Ireland in 1171 taking with him a large army of conquest including at least 500 knights and 4,000 foot soldiers • The Norman lords who had been fighting for control of Ireland since 1170 submitted to Henry and kept the lands they had conquered as fiefs. Dublin, Wexford and Waterford were declared crown lands • The Irish kings submitted to Henry in 1172 because they wanted to curb the incursion of the Norman lords into their lands • Rory O'Connor and the kings of Meath and Ulster did not submit to Henry and remained outside of his control when Henry returned to England in April 1172.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how far the harsh response of the Normans to the rebellions in England of 1067-75 can be explained by the involvement of the Vikings</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the harsh response was caused by the involvement of the Vikings should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Vikings threatened William's fledgling kingship and rebels were treated more harshly when there was Viking involvement in a rebellion • There was no Viking presence in the Exeter rebellion in 1068 and the rebels were not treated harshly. The 18 day siege laid by William ended with favourable terms granted to the rebels and taxes were not increased • The 'Harrying of the North' was prompted by the arrival of a Viking fleet in summer 1069. The Vikings had been invited to take control by the Anglo-Saxons • Vikings had supported the cause of the rebels in East Anglia in 1070. William led the troops to quash the rebels and imprison Earl Morcar for life, while other rebels were mutilated. • Vikings were invited to support the rebellion of the Norman barons in 1075. The Breton rebels were blinded and murdered and Waltheof, the Anglo-Saxon earl of Northumbria was executed. <p>Arguments and evidence that the harsh treatment can be explained by factors other than the involvement of the Vikings should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglo-Saxons who rebelled against William were committing treason and were harshly treated for this reason • The northern rebels killed the Norman earl Robert of Commines and his knights. William led an army that harried the countryside in Warwickshire, Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire before the Vikings arrived • The presence of the former earls, Edwin and Morcar, and Edgar Aetheling in the north and East Anglia may have prompted a harsh response because they represented an alternative Anglo-Saxon leadership for England • William was able to deal with the Vikings using diplomacy. They were bought off at East Anglia and arrived too late in the revolt of the Norman barons. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far William I's problems in controlling his French territories in 1067-87 can be explained by the actions of hostile neighbours</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that William I's problems in controlling his French territories in 1067-87 were caused by the actions of hostile neighbours should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Count Fulk le Rechin of Anjou seized control of Maine in 1072. William was occupied with Scotland and could not restore control till March 1073. Fulk attacked Maine gain in 1076-7 to undermine William's control • King Philip I of France opposed Norman dominance in the region. He gave support to Edgar Aetheling to harass the Norman border and shelter to Ralph de Gael after the failure of the Norman baron's revolt in 1075 • King Philip joined forces with the Fulk of Anjou in 1076 to lay siege to Dol and defeated William causing him to lose men and horses • In 1077 Philip occupied the Vexin which placed a hostile neighbour on William's border • In 1087 Philip I began raiding Normandy. William died as a result of the injuries he sustained fighting in Mantes. <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors played a more important role in William I's problems in controlling his French territories in 1067-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of Maine was precarious; in 1067 it revolted and fell under the control of one of its own lords Geoffrey of Mayne, which challenged William's authority at a time when he was unable to respond • In 1077 William's eldest son, Robert Curthose, demanded more autonomy in ruling Normandy. This coincided with William's increased presence in Normandy. An argument broke out and Robert fled into exile signalling the start of a revolt • Robert had a magnetic personality and found supporters among the sons of many of the great families and from Philip I. He built up a powerful entourage of knights and took possession of a castle at Gerberoy • In 1077-8 Robert launched raids into Normandy. He defeated William's forces at Gerberoy in 1078. The defeat humiliated William • William was forced to confirm Robert's inheritance in 1080 in order to subdue his rebellion. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far the Anglo-Norman kingdom in 1106 was different from the Anglo-Saxon kingdom before the Conquest.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Anglo-Norman kingdom in 1106 was different from the Anglo-Saxon kingdom before the Conquest should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kingship – England now had an itinerant king. He was known to the people through his image on coins and through regular crown-wearing ceremonies. He issued a coronation charter and his barons swore fealty to him • Feudalism and a Norman aristocracy – The Anglo-Saxon earldoms were replaced by Norman fiefs held by Norman barons who spoke French. Lands were controlled by a steward in their absences • Military control - Anglo-Saxon huscarls and the fyrd were replaced by an army of knights owing 40 days a year as knight service. Castles were built across England to control the population in the surrounding regions • Legal system – New laws were introduced including fine of murdrum and forest laws which restricted Anglo-Saxons use of the forests and imposed harsh penalties for disturbing and shooting deer • The Church - Anglo-Saxon archbishops and bishops were replaced by Normans and Church reforms introduced by Archbishop Lanfranc brought the English church into line with the continental system. <p>Arguments and evidence that the Anglo-Norman kingdom in 1106 was similar to the Anglo-Saxon kingdom before the Conquest should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central and local government – the Normans used the same chancery for administrative tasks and the royal writ for governing. Sheriffs were appointed to manage local government • Legal system – the same system of the shire and hundred courts was used to enforce justice across England and deal with local disputes • Finances and taxes – the king exercised the same control over minting the coinage and he collected the danegeld • Ordinary lives – the bulk of the population lived and worked in the same type of villages with the vast majority working on the land to produce food for their immediate family • The Church –at the lower levels of the Church there was little difference; English priests, monks and nuns had the same roles. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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

Question	Indicative content
<p>6</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that extension of Angevin territories in France in the years 1154-72 was achieved mainly by Henry II's skill in diplomacy.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II extended the Angevin territories in France mainly through diplomacy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry negotiated an agreement with Louis VII that enabled him to inherit Brittany as the brother of its previous count (Geoffrey). Henry II was appointed as Louis's seneschal for Brittany • Henry negotiated a marriage between Young Henry and Margaret of France in 1158. He secured the support of Pope Alexander III. The Vexin was ceded to Henry as the dowry • The Peace of Montmirail 1169 was a negotiated settlement with Louis VII securing control over Henry's French lands including the Vexin and Brittany. <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II extended Angevin territories in France by other means should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry used force to defeat rival nobles in Brittany in 1156 and install his brother Geoffrey as Count, and again in 1166 to expel Conan of Brittany and install his son Geoffrey who was betrothed to Conan's daughter • Henry used force in 1156 to defeat his brother Geoffrey's attempt to take control of Anjou, Maine and Touraine and Normandy • Henry campaigned for 18 years in the County of Toulouse and forced its count, Raymond V into submission in 1171. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
7	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which kingship changed in the reign of Henry II.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that kingship did change in the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The growing political power of the king, e.g. the barons were brought under control through the destruction of illegal castles, expansion of royal castles, through Cartae Baronum and the increased importance of the sheriff • The growing economic power of the king, e.g. royal finances restored through financial reforms including reforms of the coinage in 1158 and 1180; the revival of taxes (geld) and new taxes (tallage); enforcing feudal rights • The development of bureaucratic government under men chosen for their skills rather than feudal power, including Richard Fitznigel at the Exchequer and Richard de Lucy as justiciar • The enforcement of the king's justice through the itinerant justices in eyre and the increased royal supervision through Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton. <p>Arguments and evidence that kingship did not change during the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Itinerant kingship continued to be the basis of kingship as it had since the reign of William I, although Henry II was absent for longer periods • Personal kingship meant the government was still dependent on the personality and actions of the monarch • The role of the barons - they continued to be key figures in the king's government and the king continued to travel the country forging relations with local lords and nobles • The system of government relying on curia regis, chancery and exchequer was well established and continued under Henry II. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
8	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the greatest threat to Henry II's control of the Angevin lands in the years 1180-89 was the ambition of Philip Augustus to extend his territory.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the greatest threat to Henry II's control of the Angevin lands was the ambition of Philip Augustus should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The French crown lands were smaller than the Angevin lands on the continent. Philip Augustus had ambitions to increase the lands and authority of the French monarchy which could only be at the expense of Henry II • The French king was the overlord for the continental lands of the Angevin empire; discontented vassals could appeal over Henry II's head to the French king, e.g. count of Toulouse in 1186 • There was a dispute over the Vexin after the death of Young Henry in 1183. Philip wanted the lands returned or fulfilment of a marriage between his sister Alice and Richard • Philip Augustus took advantage of the quarrels between Henry II and his sons to fuel conflict and seize land e.g. Philip joined forces with Richard and forced Henry to cede land to France shortly before his death in 1189 • Philip Augustus was a vigorous warrior in contrast to his father, Louis VII, and he had the advantage of youth on his side. <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were a greater threat to Henry II's control of the Angevin lands in the years 1180-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size and disparate nature of the Angevin Empire meant that the continental lands would always be difficult to control; differences in language and customs and relationship between the barons and the overlord led to conflict • The threat caused by Henry II's treatment of his sons, e.g. his refusal to allow Young Henry the right to exercise the authority of a king led to second rebellion in 1182 • Henry's breach with Eleanor over the control of Aquitaine and his relationship with Rosamund Clifford had led to her support for her sons' rebellions and her long-term imprisonment • Rivalries between Henry II's sons led to conflict, e.g. Henry II and Richard's war against Young Henry and Geoffrey in 1182-83; John and Geoffrey's raids into Poitou in 1184 • Henry's age and health; by 1189 he was 56 years old and a life spent in dealing with conflict had taken a toll on his health meaning that he was no longer able to fight with the vigour that he had in his youth. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>