



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (9HI0/2A)
Advanced

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Summer 2024

Question Paper P75759A

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_2406_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. 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 the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding 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.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

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 upper-middle 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.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

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: 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	1–3	<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 nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06.</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"> • This was a personal letter from the Pope to Queen Matilda and expresses his opinion on the conflict candidly • As the head of the Church, Pope Paschal would naturally side with Anselm in the conflict as he sought to maintain and extend the authority of the Church over secular rulers • The purpose of the letter was to encourage Queen Matilda to put pressure on her husband to concede to the Church • The language and tone of the source make it clear that the Pope was prepared to use threats to enforce his authority on the conflict. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that the investiture of bishops was a key issue in the conflict ('King has taken over the churches through investitures.', 'those who wrongfully take possession of churches through him.') • It implies that power had corrupted Henry I and that this had shaped the conflict ('Now that he has been placed in the fullness of power, he does not fear to provoke the anger of Almighty God') • It suggests that Anselm had fuelled the conflict by his attitude to the authority of the Church in the state ('Archbishop Anselm ... opposed King Henry's wicked deeds.') • It provides evidence that the Pope used threats of damnation to try and enforce obedience in the conflict ('fear greatly for King Henry's salvation.', 'We shall excommunicate the King and his counsellors'). <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"> • Secular rulers had been accustomed to investing bishops and abbots with the symbols of their office. The Gregorian reform movement attempted to end this and assert the supremacy of the Papacy over kings and princes • Anselm refused to do homage to Henry I and warned him that the Church would not recognise new bishops if they were invested by the King and not by the Church • In 1103, Henry I attempted to force Anselm to pay him homage and accept lay investiture; Anselm refused and went into self-imposed exile • In 1105, Pope Paschal excommunicated Henry's chief adviser, Robert of Meulan, for encouraging lay investiture and made it clear that the King would be next.

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"> • As a churchman and a supporter of Anselm, Eadmer was very likely to give an account of the conflict that was favourable to the Church's position • Eadmer was a supporter of Anselm during the conflict and, as a theologian and churchman, he had a keen interest in the issues raised by the conflict. He was in an excellent position to give an informed account of events • The language and tone of the account give a reasonably balanced view of the settlement to the conflict • The purpose of the account was to create a record of 'recent events' and the account should be accurate. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the Church in the years 1100-06:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that the question of investitures was the key issue in the conflict and in reaching a settlement ('investitures of churches was discussed', 'Pope ... standing firm on the matter of investitures') • It suggests that the Church was divided on the issue of lay investiture ('Some of the bishops tried hard to encourage the King to continue to perform investitures') • It provides evidence that the two sides were able to reach a compromise to settle the conflict ('no one should in England ever again be invested ... by the King... homage to the King.') • It suggests that the settlement had very little impact on the power of the King ('King was now able to appoint priests to almost all the churches in England'). <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"> • Bishops and abbots were major landowners in England and owed homage to the King in the feudal system as barons • Henry I and Anselm were personally reconciled at the abbey at Bec in August 1106, and this paved the way for a settlement of the conflict • The settlement allowed Henry to take homage from churchmen for their secular possessions and hence did not have a negative impact on his exercise of power. His influence over appointments was undiminished. <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"> • Both sources emphasise the importance of lay investitures in shaping and developing the conflict • The threats made in Source 1 appear to have been effective as demonstrated by the settlement reached in Source 2 • The sources both originate from the Church but differ in the writer's influence, with Source 1 penned by the Pope whilst Source 2 is from a subject of Henry I with an interest in a settlement between his superiors.

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 importance of the Chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England.</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"> • Richard fitzNigel was Treasurer of the Exchequer and worked closely with the Chancellor, which gave him a unique insight into the role and importance of the Chancellor in the government • The essay was written as an instruction to clerks and, as such, it was accurate in outlining the importance of the Chancellor in government • The content and tone of the essay are objective with a focus on the role of the Chancellor as a government official and not focusing on the characters of individual Chancellors. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the importance of the chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It implies that the Chancellor held the second most important position in the Exchequer ('The head of the Exchequer is the most important member of that court. The Chancellor sits next to him.') • It suggests that the King relied on the Chancellor to provide good government ('Nothing of importance is done... without the consent and advice of the Chancellor', 'as important ... as ... in the King's Court') • It indicates that the Chancellor played a key role in the issuing of orders by the King ('Chancellor has the custody of the royal seal', 'When the royal seal is needed, it is presented to the Chancellor') • It indicates that the Chancellor played a key role in the management of the finances of the realm ('Chancellor also has custody of the roll', 'Chancellor and the Treasurer write together'). <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"> • The Chancellor was responsible for running the chancery, where writs and charters were drawn up. He controlled the King's seal, which was necessary to seal all official documents • The Chancellor could attend all the meetings of the King's Court without invitation • The Chancellor dealt with all the petitions and pleas that were sent to the King and played a key role in the judicial system • When Becket became Chancellor, he began attending sessions of the Exchequer, where he had the task of identifying and challenging any mistakes or anomalies in the records.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Source 4</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"> • As clerk to Becket, and one who had carried out duties on Becket's behalf, FitzStephen was able to provide a valuable insight into the way Becket carried out the duties of Chancellor • The content and tone of FitzStephen's account is very flattering and reflects his close relationship with, and his admiration for, Becket • FitzStephen wrote this account after Becket's murder and subsequent veneration as a martyr and thus provides a subjective assessment of Becket's role as Chancellor. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the importance of the chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that the Chancellor was the most significant person in the King's government ('The Chancellor of England is considered second in the realm only to the King.') • It indicates that the Chancellor had an important role in government in both domestic and foreign affairs ('useful to the King - in peace or in war?', 'decided to ask the King of France ... Chancellor ... chosen') • It claims that Becket was effective as Henry's Chancellor ('Through the hard work and counsel of the Chancellor, King Henry prospered') • It suggests that the behaviour of the Chancellor enhanced the position and authority of the King ('If this is how the Chancellor proceeds, how great must the English King be!'). <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"> • The Chancellor was a member of the <i>Curia Regis</i>. He heard cases brought before the King's Court and also travelled the country as an itinerant justice • As Chancellor, Becket was responsible for negotiating the marriage deal that led to the betrothal of Young Henry and Margaret of France • As Chancellor, Becket oversaw the revival of scutage as a flat rate of 20 shillings from each tenant-in-chief, which significantly increased Henry's income. <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"> • Both sources agree that the Chancellor played a significant role in the functioning of the King's government, especially in the legal and financial systems • The sources offer differing perspectives on his importance. Source 3 is focusing on his role in the Exchequer, whereas Source 4 addresses his wider role in government, as well as focusing on a particular individual • Whilst Source 4 was written in reaction to Becket's death, shortly after his murder, Source 3 takes a wider perspective of the role of the Chancellor encompassing the whole of Henry II's reign.

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 castle building was more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that castle building was more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building of castles created both a physical and psychological symbol of control. Castles emphasised that the Anglo-Saxons were a conquered people, forced to obey the Normans • William demolished parts of towns and cities to construct castles, thus demonstrating the complete subjugation of the local population to Norman rule, e.g. Lincoln castle occupied the space of 166 houses • William built castles at strategic points, e.g. the Welsh Marches, the Scottish border, in order to prevent attacks on his realm by outsiders • Rebels needed to storm the castles successfully and their structure made this very difficult to achieve, e.g. Eadric the Wild failed in his attacks on the castles at Hereford and Shrewsbury, and he submitted to the Normans • Castles housed knights who could be despatched very quickly to dispel unrest in their vicinity • Changes in land tenure were often a destabilising factor rather than enforcing Norman control. Illegal seizure of land by Normans destabilised the realm, causing frequent and sometimes violent disputes. <p>Arguments and evidence that castle building was not more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control over England in the years 1066-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the immediate aftermath of the conquest, William granted huge, consolidated blocks of land to his most loyal supporters which secured control in key areas, e.g. Shropshire was granted to Roger of Montgomery • The oaths sworn to William I by the Norman tenants-in-chief secured William's control over England by confirming the principle that he was the ultimate source of land and power • The purpose of changes in land tenure was to increase security and control. In the second decade of the conquest, William created rapes in both north and south in which control was enforced by leading magnates • The changes in land tenure ushered in the feudal system, which enforced William's control by the introduction of the <i>servitium debitum</i> that enabled him to call upon up to 5000 knights to defend his kingdom • Changes in land tenure placed the English population under the control of the Normans within the feudal system. Those who had been free tenants in Anglo-Saxon England became villeins, tied to the land and their lord • The construction of the first motte and bailey castle at York provoked the northern rebellion of 1068-70. Rebels attacked and burned down the castle, aided by a Danish army invited by the rebels. <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 problems faced by Duke Robert Curthose in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were very similar to the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the problems faced by Duke Robert Curthose in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were very similar to the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both faced challenges to their control of Normandy by family members, e.g. William I's control was challenged by Robert Curthose himself at Gerberoy; Robert faced challenges from William Rufus and from Henry • Both William I and Duke Robert faced challenges to their control from Maine. William I's control was challenged in 1068-73 by Geoffrey of Mayenne and Fulk Le Rechin and Robert's control was challenged by Elias who claimed the title of count that Robert believed was his own • The Count of Anjou created significant problems for both Norman dukes. Anjou was a powerful enemy on the Norman border who claimed rights over Maine. Fulk of Anjou's marriage of his son to Elias of Maine's daughter meant Anjou would be able to claim Maine through marriage • Both Normans faced challenges from the French king over control of the Vexin. William I died fighting for control of the Vexin in 1087 and Robert lost control of it before going on crusade. <p>Arguments and evidence that the problems faced by Duke Robert in Normandy in the years 1087-95 were different from the problems faced by William I in Normandy in the years 1067-87 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst William I's control of Normandy was challenged by King Philip of France, e.g. at Dol in 1076, Philip intervened to support Duke Robert in 1094 against William II's army • Whilst William I was challenged by Robert Curthose in Normandy in reaction to what Robert perceived as humiliating treatment by his brothers, Duke Robert was challenged by William Rufus who was determined to depose him as Duke • Whilst William I proved equal to the challenges of Maine, defeating Fulk Le Rechin's siege in 1077, Robert Curthose lost control of Maine before departing on crusade • William I's principal problems in Normandy stemmed from challenges by hostile neighbours, whereas Duke Robert had to contend with internal opposition from those who supported his rival claimant to the dukedom itself • William I's problems in Normandy often stemmed from his absence whilst he was ruling England; Robert Curthose's problems arose even though he was present in Normandy throughout the period 1087-95. <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 how far Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France changed in the years 1154-72.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France changed in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry's control over Brittany changed. He took Nantes in 1158 and forced Conan to submit to him. In 1166, he betrothed Geoffrey to Conan's daughter and assumed control until Geoffrey was of age • Henry extended his control in Normandy. He strengthened its bureaucracy and increased his access to its wealth by establishing an Exchequer. Land tenure investigations led to a doubling of his income by 1171 • Henry's military strength improved by restoring the Vexin, which had been lost to Louis in 1150. In 1158, the Vexin was included as part of the dowry, and handed over on the marriage of Young Henry and Margaret • Henry's control over Anjou, Maine and Touraine was extended after performing homage to Louis VII in 1156. He was able to use the feudal system to defeat his brother and secure his control over these territories • Henry acquired Aquitaine through marriage. During Eleanor's childbearing years, Aquitaine was largely ruled by Henry. This changed after the birth of John. From 1168, Eleanor oversaw her own court and issued writs • Henry's control changed because of the Peace of Montmirail in 1169. The settlement of lands on Henry's sons and their marriages to Louis' daughters placed limitations on the extent of Henry's territorial control. <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's control over the Angevin lands in France did not change in the years 1154-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout the period, Henry's continental lands remained a disparate collection of territories where rival claims of vassals challenged the control of their Angevin overlord • Throughout the period, Henry's control was limited by his position as Louis' vassal. His subjects could appeal against Henry to Louis as their overlord. Henry did homage in 1156 and renewed it in 1168 • Henry's control of the Vexin was not secure. Louis raided it in 1167 and forced Henry into battle. Peace was settled at Montmirail in 1169 • Henry's control over Brittany continued to face challenges after 1166. In 1168, Henry had to deal with Breton rebels, who tried to do homage directly to Louis • Henry had no intention of allowing the Peace of Montmirail to reduce his authority. Young Henry was given the title of Duke of Normandy but no power, Richard did not wed Alice, and Henry continued to rule Brittany. <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 the suggestion that opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than were the feuds within Henry's own family.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than were the feuds within Henry's own family should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many English barons resented Henry's reforms that reduced their independence and power, e.g. the destruction of their castles and the removal of their lands. They rose in rebellion to address this • Some English barons were greatly aggrieved by the increased powers awarded to sheriffs at their expense, resulting from the Assizes of Clarendon 1166 and the 1170 Inquest of the Sheriffs • The great barons rebelled because Henry had denied them possession of significant lands. Chester did not receive his full lands when he achieved his majority and Norfolk was denied the possession of Norwich • Barons rebelled against Henry's enforcement of his feudal rights, e.g. Leicester opposed Henry's demands for scutage and resented the amercement of £333 for breaches of the peace. <p>Arguments and evidence that the feuds within Henry's own family were a more significant cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74) than was the opposition by the English barons to Henry's reforms should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry's eldest three sons resented that they had been given lands and titles but not the authority to rule independently of their father. There is little evidence that the Rebellion would have occurred without their role • Eleanor and Richard were angered when Henry II and Young Henry took homage from their vassal, Raymond of Toulouse, thus implying that Toulouse was held by Normandy and England and not Aquitaine • Young Henry was driven to rebellion by his anger over his lack of control over his household and his finances. Henry II's decision to grant three castles to John from Young Henry's lands was the catalyst to rebellion • The feuds within Henry's family were fostered by Louis VII who encouraged Young Henry to demand his inheritance. Young Henry would be able to rely upon the French King's support in a rebellion • Richard joined Young Henry in his rebellion. His resources in Aquitaine, financial and military, were still controlled by Henry II. Eleanor encouraged him to flee to Young Henry in Paris and rebel • Geoffrey joined the Great Rebellion with the expectation that the size of the rebellion would result in the defeat of his father and his own opportunity to take control of Brittany. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>