



Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (9HI0)

Paper 2: Depth study

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

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

November 2021

Question Paper Log Number P67596

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_rms_20211216

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- 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.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- 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.

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<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. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<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 utility 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 but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<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, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • 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 be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

Target: A01: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<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	4–7	<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 focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<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	13–16	<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.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	<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 sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the relationship between William I and the Church.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orderic Vitalis wrote his <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> based on information that he received whilst residing in his monastery • The content and tone of the source indicates that Orderic Vitalis supported William's reforms and admired his achievements in reforming the Church • The account was written in the years 1110-42, giving Orderic Vitalis the opportunity to reflect on the relationship between William I and the Church. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the relationship between William I and the Church:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that William drove reform in the English Church ('justly admired for his enthusiasm for reform') • It indicates that William I introduced reforms to deal with clerical abuses in the English Church ('heresy of simony was detestable to the King') • It suggests that William exercised considerable control over the Church in England ('the wise King appointed...as administrator and ruler of the abbey or bishopric He followed this course for all the years that he ruled') • It indicates that William listened to advice from leading churchmen ('summoned his bishops and abbots and other good counsellors, and with their advice'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William I was given papal support for the conquest of England because he promised to reform the Church in England • William was a renowned builder of monasteries in Normandy and he continued to show this support for monasticism by building monasteries in England • William deposed Stigand, who was guilty of the clerical crime of pluralism, and replaced him with Lanfranc of Bec who was a renowned cleric • With William's support, Lanfranc introduced a wide range of reforms into England, including forbidding simony, imposing clerical celibacy, the reorganisation of dioceses and parishes and the revival of monasticism.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 2</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pope Gregory's letter has the full force of papal authority behind it • The content and tone of the letter make it clear that Pope Gregory expects his wishes to be obeyed • The letter is from private correspondence between the Pope and the King of England and is candid in its views • The letter gives an immediate reaction to an issue arising in the relationship between the papacy and the King of England in 1080. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the relationship between William I and the Church:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that the Pope regards his authority as superior to that of a king ('Almighty God has provided that royal power shall be governed by the care and authority of the papacy.') • It provides evidence that the Pope is demanding obedience from William ('submit and show obedience to me') • It suggests that William has not been obedient to the papacy prior to this letter ('you should now, without delay') • It implies that William will suffer divine punishment if he does not obey the papacy ('you are well aware that, for your salvation', 'Take care ... to love God and place His honour before your own'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William I refused to do homage to the papacy because his predecessor had not been made to do homage • William I was prepared to pay Peter's Pence for the upkeep of the papacy but would not recognise that the papacy held any secular authority over him • William I wanted to appoint his own bishops and abbots because they were major barons within the feudal system • The relationship between the papacy and William I was generally good. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source 1 suggests that there was a good relationship between William I and the Church, whereas Source 2 suggests that the relationship was strained • The two sources offer different aspects on the relationship between William I and the Church; Source 1 focuses on the introduction of reforms in England, whilst Source 2 focuses on the relationship with the papacy • The two sources offer a view from different time periods. Source 2 is a reaction to an immediate problem, whereas Source 1 takes an overview of the relationship several decades after the death of William I.

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<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 sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the quarrels between Henry II and his sons in the years 1180-89.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roger of Howden was connected to Henry II's court in this period and was able to write with some authority about the quarrel • The source was recorded during the period and is unlikely to have been affected by hindsight • The content and tone of the source are relatively neutral, reflecting a vassal's relationship with his overlord and his sons. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the quarrels between Henry II and his sons in the years 1180-89:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that the doing of homage was a major issue behind the quarrel ('ordered Young King Henry to receive homage', 'Richard refused to do homage', 'Young Henry refused to receive it') • It provides evidence that the fortification of castles was a cause of conflict ('fortified the old ones', 'entered into an agreement ... against Richard because Richard had fortified the castle of Clairvaux') • It suggests that the major quarrel was between Young King Henry and Richard ('Young Henry ... entered into an agreement with the barons of Aquitaine against Richard') • It implies that there was an underlying quarrel between Henry II and the Young King ('Young Henry ... withdrew from the court of King Henry II.', 'Young Henry pleaded with his father'). <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry II's decision to crown Young Henry had been resented by the younger sons. In 1182, Young Henry was angered by his father's refusal to hand the control of Normandy over to him • The complex feudal relationship in the Angevin territories meant that Richard held the lands of Poitou and Aquitaine from the French and not the English King • Clairvaux was on the border of Anjou, part of Young Henry's inheritance. He regarded the fortification of Clairvaux as provocation and evidence that Richard was preparing for war against him • Richard's heavy-handed rule in Aquitaine led to a number of discontented Aquitaine lords offering to recognise Young Henry as their Duke if he removed Richard.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an official source outlining the terms agreed for peace and clearly represents Richard's grievances The purpose of the source is to settle the quarrel The treaty was forced upon Henry II as a consequence of his defeat The treaty is clearly weighted towards Richard and does not reveal Henry II's grievances. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the quarrels between Henry II and his sons in the years 1180-89: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It suggests that the question of who would marry Alice of France was an issue in the quarrel ('Alice... shall be surrendered and handed over ... safe-conduct for her marriage to Earl Richard on his return from Jerusalem') It suggests that the question of succession to the throne of England was a major reason for the quarrel ('Earl Richard shall have the fealty of the men of his father's lands both on this side of the Channel and beyond.') It provides evidence that Richard had won over some of Henry II's barons to his side ('the barons or knights, who have withdrawn their allegiance from the King of England') It suggests that the King of France played a major role in the quarrel to reduce Henry II's authority ('All the barons of the King of England shall swear to stand by the King of France ... against King Henry of England.') Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philip II of France was determined to extend the authority of the French King over the Angevin territory Richard was frustrated that Henry II had not named him as his principal heir. He resisted Henry II's attempts to take Aquitaine from him and give it to John Richard feared that Henry intended to marry Alice to John and name John as his successor as King of England and Duke of Normandy Richard and Philip joined forces in 1189 and attacked Henry's territory. The arbitration of Whitsun 1189 failed to end the quarrel when Henry II refused the demands, including sending John on crusade. <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taken together, the two sources suggest that the quarrel of 1182-83 was not settled and issues of succession continued to cause conflict in 1189 Taken together, the two sources show the changing nature of the quarrels, with Richard getting support from his father in 1183 but rebelling against Henry II in 1189 Both sources suggest that the quarrels were fuelled by discontented barons who played off one side against the other.

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 the suggestion that the greatest threat to Norman control in the north of England, in the years 1066-93, was the role of King Malcolm III of Scotland.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the greatest threat to Norman control in the north of England, in the years 1066-93, was the role of King Malcolm III of Scotland should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malcolm III had a claim to Cumbria and a vested interest in destabilising the north of England • Malcolm III had a history of supporting rebels against the English king, e.g. in 1066, he had supported Hardrada's and Tostig's invasion • In 1069, during the northern rebellion, Malcolm III invaded Northumbria and sacked Durham and Cleveland • Malcolm III provided safe haven for Edgar Atheling after the defeat of the northern rebellion. He married Edgar's sister and established a bloodline claim to the English throne for his children • Malcolm III continued to raid the north in the 1070s and 1080s. He did not consider the oath made at Abernethy in 1072 as recognising William's authority over him, but only as a settlement over Cumbria • In 1090, Malcolm raided the north of England, forcing William II to lead an expedition north to deal with the problem. <p>Arguments and evidence that the role of King Malcolm III of Scotland was not the greatest threat/there were other greater threats to the Norman control in the north of England should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malcolm was always reluctant to engage the Normans in battle and reached agreements rather than fighting. He did not send military support to assist the rebels in 1068-69 • In 1093, Malcolm and his son were ambushed and killed. This created a succession crisis in Scotland and removed the threat on the Anglo-Scottish border • There was a long tradition of separatism in the north. Edward the Confessor had struggled to control the north and the 1068-69 rebellion was evidence that northerners would not easily accept Norman rule • William's appointment of Robert de Comines as earl of Northumbria in 1068 threatened the stability of the north. His brutal treatment of the inhabitants of Durham sparked the northern rebellion • Edgar Atheling was recognised as king by the northerners when he fled from court in 1068. William I failed to capture him when the rebellion was defeated • Swein Estrithson had a claim to the English throne as cousin to Harthacnut. He sent 240 ships to support the northern rebels. In York, the Anglo-Danish force inflicted the worst defeat on the Normans in England. <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 about the suggestion that the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon kings and their earls was very different from the relationship between the Anglo-Norman kings and their aristocracy.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that that the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon kings and their earls was very different from the relationship between the Anglo-Norman kings and their aristocracy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The power of the Anglo-Saxon earls challenged that of the king, e.g. the Godwin family held four earldoms. In contrast, the 11 major Norman tenants-in-chief held only a quarter of the land, scattered across the kingdom so none of them could rival the power of the king • The wealth of the Anglo-Saxon earls rivalled that of the king, e.g. Harold, as Earl of Wessex, had an annual income of £5,000 – the same as the king. In contrast, William I's income of £12,000 outstripped the income of all of his barons • The Anglo-Saxon king granted land to his earls by charter. The title of earl and the possession of the land were separate. In contrast, the Anglo-Norman king granted land in return for service. Land was forfeit if the service was not performed • Anglo-Saxon earls held land only from the king of England. The relationship between the Anglo-Norman barons and the king was more complex. English land was held from the king, but Norman lands were held from the duke. This complexity was shown in the 1088 rebellion. <p>Arguments and evidence that that the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon kings and their earls was similar to the relationship between the Anglo-Norman kings and their aristocracy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Anglo-Saxon earls and Anglo-Norman barons played a significant role in the government of the realm. They advised the king in the witan or <i>Curia Regis</i> and heard cases in the law courts • Both Anglo-Saxon earls and Anglo-Norman barons played key roles in supplying soldiers for the King's army. Anglo-Saxon earls summoned the fyrd and Anglo-Norman barons called up the feudal levy • Both Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman kings relied on members of their aristocracy to play the role of viceroy. Edward the Confessor used Harold as his military leader and ambassador. William I used Odo of Bayeux and William fitzOsbern to rule in his absence • Both Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman kings faced challenges from discontented nobility, e.g. Ælfgar rebelled in 1056 over Edward's appointment of Tostig while Ralf de Gael and Roger de Breteuil rebelled in 1075 because they did not succeed to their late fathers' full powers • Both Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman kings used exile as a way of punishing disobedient nobles, e.g. Edward exiled Tostig in 1065 and Henry I exiled Robert of Bellême in 1102. <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
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 about the suggestion that, in the years 1154-72, Henry II extended complete control over Wales but only achieved limited control over Ireland.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1154-72, Henry II extended complete control over Wales but only achieved limited control over Ireland should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1157, Henry II managed to bring Owain of Gwynedd to do homage to him in return for Gwynedd. This extended the authority of the King of England in north Wales • In 1163, Henry II captured Rhys of Deheubarth. He summoned all the Welsh princes to Woodstock in 1163 and made them do public acts of homage. Rhys was forced to hand over hostages • In 1171, Rhys of Deheubarth met Henry II at Pembroke and submitted to him. Henry II recognised Rhys' rights to his lands and released his son. In 1172, Rhys became justiciar in southern Wales • Ireland was a 'wild' territory, divided into warring tribal kingdoms and with a difficult terrain that made successful invasion and control hard to achieve • After Dermot MacMurrough's death in 1171, 'Strongbow' claimed Leinster as his successor. Henry II was furious because his own vassal now challenged the King's authority in Ireland • In 1172, Rory O'Connor refused to submit to Henry II. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1154-72, Henry II did not extend complete control over Wales and had achieved significant control over Ireland should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control over Owain of Gwynedd was only temporary. He rebelled in 1165 and joined forces with Rhys of Deheubarth and the Prince of Powys. Henry was forced to retreat and the Welsh princes captured Rhuddlan castle • 'Strongbow's' Anglo-Norman army achieved a decisive victory in Ireland over the forces of Rory O'Connor and captured Waterford and Dublin in 1170 • Henry dealt with 'Strongbow's' claims to Leinster by confiscating his English lands and putting a trade embargo on Ireland. 'Strongbow' was forced to seek terms with Henry • In 1172, 'Strongbow' submitted to Henry as his vassal for Leinster. Henry established English garrisons in Dublin, Waterford and Wexford and made plans for a royal administration in Dublin to oversee his vassals. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<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 whether the reforms of the coinage were the most significant measures in the strengthening of royal finances in England in the years 1154-89.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the reforms of the coinage were the most significant measures in the strengthening of royal finances in England in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reform of the coinage was important because Henry II abandoned the practice of regularly recalling and reminting coins. The quality of the circulating coinage was vital to maintain confidence in the currency • The new penny introduced in 1158 weighed more than its predecessor. It was lucrative for the royal coffers because the moneymen who were dismissed were charged high fines for low-weight coins • New moneymen, appointed in 1158, had to pay a high fee on entry to their office • Henry enforced the reform of the coinage by taking ruthless action in punishing counterfeiting. In the Assizes of Northampton (1176), forgery became a capital offence • The 1158 recoinage began the process of reorganising the royal mints. Ecclesiastical mints were phased out and, over the next two decades, the number of royal mints was reduced to ten • In the 1180 reform, the role of moneymen was restricted to minting the coins, and new exchangers were appointed to control the administration of mints and boost their profits. <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other, more significant, measures in the strengthening of royal finances in England than the reforms of the coinage in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spite of rigorous monitoring, the practice of clipping coins continued and this reduced the effectiveness of the 1158 reform of the coinage • The introduction and regular use of the tallage enabled Henry to extract large sums of money, not only from land tenants but also from towns and boroughs • The introduction of <i>Cartae Baronum</i> in 1166 was a significant measure in ensuring Henry had a complete picture of <i>servitium debitum</i> owed by his vassals. It enabled him to extract large sums in scutage • Henry II made effective use of feudal dues such as wardship and demanded <i>dona</i>, even where the reasons for calling for this aid did not exist. He gained substantial income from these measures • Henry II significantly increased the sums of money he drew from the farm and from the forest. He vigorously enforced his rights as King, which boosted royal revenues • Henry's appointment of Richard fitzNigel to run the Exchequer was a key factor in strengthening royal finances. His expertise in auditing, record keeping and managing the coinage was central to the revival of finances. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>