



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2025

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

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

Summer 2025

Question Paper P76436A

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_2506_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the defeat of Harold Godwinson at the Battle of Hastings in 1066. Source 1 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: • Simeon of Durham was a Norman, but entered an English monastery towards the end of his childhood where he would have been exposed to an English perspective on the events of 1066 • Simeon had access to many documents available in the writing room at Durham that he could draw upon to write his <i>History</i>. His account was written with the benefit of hindsight • The content and tone of the account is relatively neutral, reflecting Simeon's English and Norman links. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences the reasons for the defeat of Harold Godwinson at the Battle of Hastings in 1066: • It implies that Harold's absence when the Normans landed in England was a reason for his defeat ('thought that all his enemies were crushed', 'marched his army south') • It provides evidence that the Anglo-Saxon army was weakened by the battles against the Vikings in the north ('some of the bravest English warriors had fallen... half of his army had not arrived') • It implies that Harold was too hasty in engaging the Normans in battle ('he hurried to meet the enemy as quickly as he could.', 'met... in battle ... before a large part of his army had joined him.') • It claims that the English army lacked the courage to fight the Normans effectively ('many left their positions, and very few of those who stayed with Harold remained courageous.'). 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: • Harold had crushed the Viking army at Stamford Bridge and had assumed that the fighting season was over for that year. The news of the Norman landing caught him by surprise • Harold returned to London almost immediately after Stamford Bridge. The speed at which he marched meant that he left his archers behind. The Anglo-Saxons had to fight at Hastings, without aerial defence • Harold did not wait to muster the whole of the southern fyrd before marching from London to Hastings. Although, his army was comparable in size to William's, it could have been larger if he had been prepared to wait • Harold fought successfully while the shield wall held. In the late afternoon, however, the English fyrd was lured out of the wall, weakening it, and ultimately leading to Harold's defeat.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 - 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: - William of Poitiers had access to eyewitness accounts from Normans who participated in the battle and to William I with whom he would have met regularly. This placed him in an excellent position to comment on events - William of Poitiers was chaplain to William I and his subjects. His biography of William's deeds was naturally flattering to William and provided a justification for William's invasion of England - William of Poitiers's account of the battle was written up within a decade of the events described. It offered the immediacy of eyewitness accounts and the chance to reflect on the outcome - The language and the tone of the account are very critical of Harold Godwinson and the English army ('a cruel murderer and an enemy of the good and the just.') and propagandistic in nature. - The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the defeat of Harold Godwinson at the Battle of Hastings in 1066: - It provides evidence that William was able to land unopposed ('Normans landed ... without having to fight a battle. In fact, Harold was in Yorkshire') - It claims that Harold's defeat was retribution because he had offended God ('wore the relics whose protection Harold had forfeited', 'as if confessing their guilt, suffered the punishment') - It claims that William was favoured by God ('Duke William advanced behind the papal banner.') - It suggests that William was the superior general ('rode with the strongest force... direct operations on all sides.') and the Normans used more effective tactics ('deliberately feigning flight... English began to weaken.'). - 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: - Harold was obliged to march north and confront Hardrada after the English were defeated at Gate Fulford. His absence allowed William to land the Norman army at Pevensey without facing opposition - The Normans had presented Harold as a usurper and oath breaker and that this justified the invasion. Harold's defeat was regarded as the inevitable result of divine retribution - William had a superior army. His crossbowmen and longbowmen used the double volley to weaken the shield wall and his cavalry, using the feigned retreat, cut down the members of the fyrd that had rushed down the hill - The Anglo-Saxons were better positioned but had no cavalry and the housecarls using the double-handed axe were too slow to attack the Norman cavalry, which had the advantages of height and speed. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: - Neither of the writers of the sources was present at the Battle of Hastings and their accounts relied upon reports that they gathered from elsewhere - Both sources agree that Harold's absence in the north when the Normans landed had a profound impact on the outcome of the battle - Whilst Source 1 claims that Harold fought valiantly and was unfortunately vanquished, Source 2 claims that Harold was inevitably defeated because he had offended God.

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74. Source 3 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: • William of Newburgh had access to documents and oral accounts on which to base his <i>History</i>, as well as his own experience of the impact of the Great Rebellion, putting him in a good position to comment on events • William of Newburgh did not have any personal contacts with Henry II or his family and could therefore be regarded as a relatively impartial recorder of events • The language and tone of the source suggest that William of Newburgh disapproved of Young Henry's actions. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74: • It indicates that Henry II's throne was threatened ('some people whispered to Young Henry that, after his coronation, his father's reign had ended, so Young Henry now had the right to reign alone.') • It provides evidence that Young Henry had powerful supporters who would assist him in overthrowing his father ('King Louis', 'count of Flanders', 'earl of Leicester, the earl of Chester', 'the men of Aquitaine and Brittany') • It claims that the greatest threat came from Scotland ('a more ferocious enemy, the King of Scots.') • It suggests that, while most of the English barons joined the rebellion against Henry II ('many and great barons deserted the elder king'), Henry II was not entirely without support ('remained a few ... loyal'). 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: • Young Henry aimed to force Henry II to cede control of England to him, allowing Henry II to retain control of Normandy and Anjou, his paternal inheritance, while Richard held Aquitaine and Geoffrey held Brittany • Young Henry was joined by powerful English barons, including the earls of Leicester and Chester, discontented by Henry II's reforms, and by French supporters, including Louis VII and the Count of Flanders • Eleanor encouraged Young Henry and secured the support of his brothers, Richard and Geoffrey for his cause. In Aquitaine, she enlisted the support of the Poitevins, the counts of Angoulême and the Lusignans • Henry II had powerful supporters, including Richard de Lucy, the barons of the Exchequer, the merchant classes, London and the Judiciary and the Welsh. By May 1173, Henry II had captured Eleanor.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 4 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: • Fantosme based his <i>Chronicle</i> on his own observations and those of his bishop, which placed him in a good position to comment on events • Fantosme's bishop was a supporter of Henry II, and this is likely to have impacted on how Fantosme recorded events • Fantosme's <i>Chronicle</i> was written for minstrels to perform and may therefore have been embellished for the purposes of entertainment. • 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the seriousness of the Great Rebellion against Henry II in the years 1173-74: • It suggests that Henry II feared he may be defeated in the north ('King Henry was anxious... King of Scotland, who had acted madly, And Roger of Mowbray, ... laying waste his land by night and day.') • It suggests that Henry II regarded William the Lion to be a formidable enemy ('the King of Scotland entered Richmond? Has Newcastle-upon-Tyne been seized, and the fortifications? And all my barons expelled') • It provides evidence that Henry II was able to defeat his enemies and end the rebellion ('King of Scotland is captured and all his barons too.', 'Now is the war ended, and your kingdom in peace.'). 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: • The King of Scotland had an historic claim to lands in Northumbria and Cumbria. It was common practice to invade the north of England when unrest weakened the English king's control of the kingdom • In August 1173, William the Lion laid waste the northern counties en route to Yorkshire. At Easter 1174, he besieged Carlisle. In the Midlands and East Anglia, Nottingham and Norwich fell to the English rebels • Richard de Lucy proved an effective general for Henry II, defeating Leicester in the South by October 1173. Ranulf de Glanvill captured William the Lion at Alnwick on 13 July 1174 • William the Lion was made to swear homage to Henry II and to recognise Henry II as his liege lord. The earls of Leicester and Chester and Eleanor of Aquitaine were all imprisoned for their roles in the rebellion. Sources 3 and 4 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • The language and tone of both Sources 3 and 4 are sympathetic to Henry II • While Source 3 focuses more on the threat of a range of enemies to Henry II, Source 4 is focused on Henry's success in defeating his enemies • While Source 3 is based on records and oral accounts compiled by William of Newburgh in his abbey, Source 4 is based on eyewitness accounts of the events.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the main reason why Anglo-Saxon England was so strong during the reign of Edward the Confessor was because of its flourishing economy. Arguments and evidence that the main reason why Anglo-Saxon England was so strong during the reign of Edward the Confessor was because of its flourishing economy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • England's strength was built on its stable, national currency. Coins could only be produced by royally-licensed moneyers in 60 mints spread across the country. Coins were recalled every five years to prevent debasement • The growth of towns was a reason for England's strength. The towns encouraged the growth of internal trade, which generated tax revenues. By 1066, England had over 20 towns with a population over 1000 people • The development of ports at Southampton, London, Lincoln, Cambridge, Norwich and York facilitated trade with Europe and Scandinavia. Strong trading links generated duties that funded strong government • The growth of trade enriched England as exports exceeded imports and Anglo-Saxon England became a net importer of silver coins, which provided wealth for the King, earls and thegns • The economy was underpinned by a sophisticated taxation system, which enabled the King to collect large sums of money. Taxes provided the funds that enabled effective government, e.g. rewards for earls, defences. Arguments and evidence that the flourishing economy was not the main reason/there were other, more important reasons why Anglo-Saxon England was so strong during the reign of Edward the Confessor should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The centralisation of the powers of the Anglo-Saxon king explains England's strength. Edward was the supreme decision maker, the ultimate lawgiver and the only one with power to raise an army • England had a very effective and efficient system of central and local government. The King's authority was transmitted via the earls through the shires and down to the hundreds. Sheriffs and reeves kept the peace • England had a well-developed legal system. The King presided over the most important trials. Shire courts were held twice yearly to judge on significant cases. Hundred courts met monthly to settle disputes • The role played by the earls was important in strengthening England during Edward's reign. Harold and Tostig Godwinson were responsible for defeating the Welsh prince and securing England's western border in 1163 • Edward the Confessor maintained peace within England. Rebellions, such as Godwin's in 1051 and Tostig's in 1165, ended relatively swiftly. Peaceful conditions allowed England to become prosperous • There were no invasions of England attempted during Edward the Confessor's reign. This provided the stable conditions in which the political, social and economic structures could develop and mature. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that William I's relationship with the Church was completely different from William Rufus' relationship with the Church. Arguments and evidence that William I's relationship with the Church was completely different from William Rufus' relationship with the Church should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • William I was regarded as a pious king, whereas William Rufus was regarded as irreligious • William I was able to depose Archbishop Stigand and replace him with Lanfranc, whereas William Rufus was unable to remove Anselm from his office • William I favoured the reform of the Church in England and appointed Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury to push forward reform. William Rufus had little interest in reform and left the office of Archbishop vacant for four years, while he collected the revenues • William I permitted Lanfranc to go to Rome to be invested by the Pope with the symbol of his office, whereas William Rufus refused to give permission to Anselm to receive his office regalia from the Pope • William I permitted Archbishop Lanfranc to hold a series of Church councils to address the reform of the Church, whereas William Rufus refused to allow Archbishop Anselm to organise reforming councils • William I worked together with Archbishop Lanfranc, whereas William Rufus ignored Lanfranc and quarrelled with Archbishop Anselm, finally driving him into exile. Arguments and evidence that William I's relationship with the Church was very similar to William Rufus' relationship with the Church should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both William I and William Rufus opposed the Gregorian reform movement that they believed undermined their authority as kings • Both William I and William Rufus opposed the Pope's demands that English bishops should make regular attendance at Rome • Both William I and William Rufus recognised the Pope over the anti-pope; William I maintained this stance throughout his reign; William Rufus recognised Urban II in 1095 after assurances that papal legates would need the king's permission to enter England • Both William I and William Rufus endowed monasteries and distributed money to churches. They both paid Peter's Pence to the Papacy • Both William I and William Rufus taxed the Church in England and used church positions to reward supporters. Other relevant material must be credited.

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

Question	Indicative content
5	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89. Arguments and evidence that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Assize of Clarendon was significant because it developed a more systematic approach to law and order in the kingdom and particularly in the localities • The powers of the sheriff were significantly enhanced by the Assize of Clarendon. Sheriffs were empowered to enter any land in pursuit of criminals, which decreased the powers of barons to protect vassals • The Assize of Clarendon introduced juries of presentment, which strengthened the legal system by enabling juries to draw upon local knowledge in building a court case • The Assize of Clarendon strengthened the king's powers by boosting his revenue. The accused was made to hand over all chattels before the trial. If found guilty, the chattels were sold and the proceeds given to the king. Arguments and evidence that the Assize of Clarendon was not the most significant reform /there were other more significant reforms introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The introduction of the Inquest of the Sheriffs was a significant legal reform. It removed sheriffs who had taken bribes and replaced them with royal officials who were accountable to the crown in enforcing the law • The Assize of Northampton was significant because it strengthened royal authority by requiring every man to make an oath of fealty to the king. It also deterred crime by making punishments for lesser crimes harsher • <i>Novel disseisin</i> and <i>mort d'ancestor</i> were significant reforms that dealt with property disputes that dominated legal cases. They generated a caseload that led to five members of the Curia Regis sitting permanently • The development of standardised writs was a significant development in the legal system. They were mass produced and made justice faster and accessible to many more people because they could be bought for 6d • The Court of the King's Bench became a permanent court. It developed the idea that the king was a permanent source of justice, because the court sat whether he was present in the country or not • Henry II extended the role of itinerant justices and the general eyres. Visitations were frequent and, by 1170, eyres were lasting several weeks. Judgements were recorded in Westminster, thus establishing precedents. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that in the years 1162-74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was a complete failure. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1162-74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Henry's attempt to bring the Church under royal control by judging secular crimes failed. The Constitutions of Clarendon were rejected by Becket and not enforced after his death. Church courts continued to try clerics • Henry II's appointment of Becket as Archbishop, believing that this would make it easier to extend royal control over the Church, failed. The quarrel between Henry and Becket culminated in Becket's murder in 1170 • Henry's decision to present Becket with a written version of the ancient customs of the realm in the Constitutions of Clarendon caused Becket to reject them • In attempting to end the quarrel with Becket, Henry II agreed to allow papal legates to reach a judgement. This went against one of the key clauses in the Constitutions of Clarendon • Becket won the support of the Papacy when he went into exile. This prevented Henry from pushing forward his reforms. After his murder, all of Becket's excommunications were upheld by the Pope • In order to atone for Becket's murder, Henry was obliged to submit to a public scourging by the clergy. He agreed to abolish the 'evil customs' that he had introduced with regard to the English Church. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1162-74, Henry II's attempt to extend his control over the Church was successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • During the quarrel with Becket, Henry II retained the loyalty of most English bishops and clergy, indicating that he had extended control over the Church • In 1170, the Archbishop of York crowned Young Henry on Henry II's orders and in flagrant violation of Canterbury's traditional rights. Young Henry's kingship was never denied, thus confirming Henry II's authority • Within two years of Becket's murder, the Pope had lifted the suspensions and excommunications imposed by Becket • Pope Alexander was keen to restore good relations with Henry II. He allowed Henry to exert his authority over the bishops by taking securities from them before they were allowed to travel to Rome • In the Compromise of Avranches, Henry was able to assert the principle that the Crown had the right to defend itself if the Church encroached on its authority or on royal government • In theory, Henry II was to observe free elections to bishoprics but, in practice, the results were only confirmed after Henry had approved, e.g. the election of Richard of Dover as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1173. Other relevant material must be credited.

