



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel  
GCE In History (9HI02) Paper 2A  
Advanced

Unit 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 9H10\_2A\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## 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.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="402 197 1362 310">• 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.</li><li data-bbox="402 321 1362 468">• 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.</li><li data-bbox="402 478 1362 619">• 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.</li></ul>

## 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"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="402 197 1279 249">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## 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 shed light on the reasons for the success of Duke William of Normandy's campaign in 1066.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></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"><li>• The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was written in an English monastery by an Anglo-Saxon monk and reflects the views of the Anglo-Saxons</li><li>• The purpose of the Chronicle was to produce a record of the important events of the year</li><li>• The writer will have based his record of events upon reports, many of which came from eyewitnesses that were received by the writer based in the monastery.</li></ul> <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 success of Duke William of Normandy's campaign in 1066:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It suggests that William was able to land in England unopposed by the Anglo-Saxons ('Duke William came from Normandy to Pevensey and built a castle at Hastings. King Harold was informed of this')</li><li>• It provides evidence that William's victory was achieved by taking Harold by surprise ('And William came against him by surprise before King Harold's army was ready for battle')</li><li>• It provides evidence that William's victory was achieved by defeating Harold and his army in battle ('There King Harold was killed, and his brothers, the earls Leofwine and Gyrth his brothers, and many other good men also died')</li><li>• It suggests that William's actions forced the northern earls to submit to him ('and ravaged the entire region that he overran', 'earls Edwin and Morcar, and all the chief men from London. And they submitted to him').</li></ul> <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"><li>• Harold was absent in the north fighting the Vikings when William landed unopposed on the south coast</li><li>• Harold was obliged to march his troops back at considerable speed, which exhausted them. His army was further weakened because he left his archers in York</li><li>• Harold met William in battle before waiting for the whole of the southern fyrd to assemble. He was killed by an arrow to the eye when he entered the fighting after he had lost control of the fyrd in the late afternoon</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the battle, William conducted a march through the southeast, subduing the key towns on the way. In spite of the Witan's nomination of Edgar Aethling as king, the witan and the earls submitted to William.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Carmen is written from the Norman point of view and is one of the earliest accounts of the battle</li> <li>• The writer was well-known to William and his court and will have received first-hand information of the battle from his connections at court</li> <li>• The purpose of the Carmen is to flatter William by glorifying his achievements in the Battle of Hastings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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 success of Duke William of Normandy's campaign in 1066: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that the Anglo-Saxon army had a strong defensive position and were difficult to defeat ('The helmeted English hurry to lock shield to shield', 'None can penetrate the dense English shield wall')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that the Normans were able to break the shield wall by using a feigned retreat ('The Franks, expert in war, prepare a feint, They falsely act as if decisively defeated and flee')</li> <li>• It suggests that William's expert military skills kept control of his army when his forces began to retreat ('Do you ... allow yourselves to be defeated? He spoke and immediately shame spread over faces').</li> </ul> </li> <li>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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• William used the tactic of ravaging the lands around Pevensey to lure Harold into battle before Harold was ready to engage from a position of strength</li> <li>• William was an expert military commander and was able to exert control over his troops in the field. He used the feigned retreat to lure the Anglo-Saxon fyrd down the hill where they were cut down by the cavalry</li> <li>• William prevented his troops from fleeing when the rumour circulated that he had fallen; he acted quickly by riding in front of them and revealing his face by lifting his helmet</li> <li>• William acted quickly to secure his control over the south of England by taking Dover and Canterbury before moving on to London. He cut off the English opposition from any support and guaranteed his coronation.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sources offer accounts of events from two different perspectives</li> <li>• Taken together, the sources enable the historian to trace events from the battles against the Vikings to the submission of the English aristocracy to William</li> <li>• The sources have contrasting purposes; Source 1 was written to record the significant events of the day while Source 2 was intended to flatter the king and earn a reward.</li> </ul>

**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 shed light on the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></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"><li>• The writer was a member of Henry II's court and will have received information from members of the court who were acquainted with the Great Rebellion</li><li>• The first-hand accounts were likely to have been related some years after the event. Gerald of Wales joined the court ten years after the rebellion</li><li>• As a member of Henry's court, the account was likely to reflect well on the role of the king.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that Henry the young king was responsible for the rebellion ('Henry, the younger king of England, was no longer able to conceal the wickedness he had long planned against his father')</li><li>• It implies that the rebellion was encouraged by Young Henry's father-in-law, Louis VII, king of France ('hoped, with his father-in-law's assistance, to replace his father, King Henry II before his father died')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Young Henry's brothers and some nobility supported the rebellion ('took with him his two brothers, Richard, earl of Poitiers and Geoffrey of Brittany', 'many accomplices among the nobles')</li><li>• It indicates that Henry II's sons found support for their rebellion within the king's own household ('Nearly every night, some of them would disloyally join his sons').</li></ul> <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"><li>• Young Henry was angry that he had been given a title but not real power or money to maintain his court</li><li>• Henry II could be regarded as responsible for inciting rebellion in his family; his promise of three castles to John as part of a betrothal agreement, drove the older sons to rebel</li><li>• The French King Louis VII had ambitions to expand the royal demesne at the expense of the Angevin empire. He was looking for an opportunity to turn his son-in-law, Young Henry, and his brothers against their father</li><li>• Certain nobility sought to increase their power within the kingdom. In England there were revolts led by the Earls of Chester, Leicester and Norfolk and William the Lion, King of the Scots, invaded.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 4</b></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"> <li>• Peter of Blois's letter provides the perspective of a representative of the Church on the Great Rebellion</li> <li>• As Peter of Blois was Henry's subject and writing at his request, the tone of the letter is naturally favourable to the king</li> <li>• The purpose of the source is to persuade Eleanor to accept that she is the transgressor and to submit to her husband.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that Peter of Blois regarded Eleanor as playing a key role in the rebellion ('you will be the cause of widespread disaster')</li> <li>• It claims that Eleanor was responsible for inciting her sons to rebellion ('you have opened the way for your children to rise up against their father')</li> <li>• It implies that Henry was completely innocent in the cause of the rebellion ('the woman... is the one at fault').</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Eleanor was angered by Henry II's relationship with Rosamund Clifford and this prompted her involvement in the rebellion</li> <li>• Eleanor was angered by the lack of political power in her own lands. She had expected to be able to rule Aquitaine in her own right but Henry had not allowed this</li> <li>• Eleanor favoured the claims of Young Henry for greater power. She encouraged Geoffrey and Richard to join him at the French court.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two sources take a different view on the roles of the family members in the rebellion; while Source 3 places greater emphasis on the role of Young Henry, Source 4 blames Eleanor alone</li> <li>• There is a contrast in the dates of the sources. Source 3 is produced 10 years after the rebellion thus providing a wider perspective whilst Source 4 was written during the rebellion</li> <li>• Both sources favour the role of the king and present him as the injured party.</li> </ul>

## 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 most significant problem facing the monarchy in the reign of Edward the Confessor was the power and influence of the Godwin family.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant problem facing the monarchy in the reign of Edward the Confessor was the power and influence of the Godwin family should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Godwin family exercised considerable influence over Edward the Confessor through his marriage to Edith. In 1053 there was still the possibility of a Godwin heir to the throne</li><li>• The Godwin family dominated the throne through their control of earldoms; Harold succeeded to the earldom of Wessex in 1053, Tostig held Northumbria from 1055 and Gyrth and Leofwine became earls of East Anglia and Kent</li><li>• The Godwin family became vastly wealthy. The family estates generated an income of £7000, greater than the king's £5000. They used this wealth to fund large armies of huscarls and buy support</li><li>• Harold's ambitions to expand his lands in Herefordshire threatened the kingdom by causing conflict with Aelfgar of Mercia and the Welsh king in 1055</li><li>• Tostig was accused of mismanaging his earldom of Northumbria. His expulsion in 1065 left the north in the hands of the teenage Morcar and vulnerable to attack.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other more significant problems facing the monarchy in the reign of Edward the Confessor than the power and influence of the Godwin family should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The greatest problem facing the English monarchy was the uncertainty over the succession to the throne. Whether through deliberate celibacy or as a result of infertility, Edward had no bloodline heir to succeed him</li><li>• In 1053 the House of Mercia was dominant. East Anglia was given to Aeflegar, Leofric of Mercia's son. The House of Mercia thus controlled two earldoms</li><li>• England was attacked by the Welsh king Gruffudd ap Llywelyn in 1055. It was Harold and Tostig who finally defeated the Welsh king in 1062-3 on Edward's behalf</li><li>• The House of Mercia was behind the plot against Tostig in 1065. Gospatric led the revolt on behalf of the sons of the late Aeflgar, Edwin of Mercia and Morcar</li><li>• The possibility of a Viking invasion was an ongoing threat as a consequence of Harthacanute's agreement with Magnus of Norway that they should be each other's heirs</li></ul> <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 conflict with the Church, in the years 1100-06, is explained more by Henry I's attitude and actions than by those of Anselm and the papacy.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the conflict with the Church, in the years 1100-06, was Henry I's attitude and actions rather than those of Anselm and the papacy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry I regarded the investiture dispute as an attack on the monarchy's rights over the Church because bishops and abbots had a role to play in the feudal system which required both sides to swear oaths</li> <li>• Anselm was loyal to Henry I and did not seek a quarrel. He supported him in his conflict with Robert Curthose by persuading the nobility to support Henry in 1101 when Duke Robert landed in England with a large army</li> <li>• In 1103 Henry I put pressure on Anselm to pay him homage. This led to Anselm going into exile again and Henry I refused him permission to return</li> <li>• In 1105 Henry I invested two bishops and took their homage in spite of opposition from the papacy</li> <li>• Even when Henry reached an agreement with Anselm and the papacy in August 1106, he still refused to compromise on the right to receive homage from his churchmen.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main reason for the conflict with the Church, in the years 1100-06, was the attitude and actions of Anselm and the papacy rather than those of Henry I should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lay investiture had been condemned by the papal councils of Clermont and Bari in 1098 and at Rome in 1099. It was this that was at the heart of the dispute</li> <li>• When Anselm returned from exile in 1100, he brought with him the new idea that lay investiture was unacceptable to the Church because it implied that a bishop was dependent on a king for his office and power</li> <li>• In September 1100, Anselm refused to perform submission to Henry I (even though he had done homage to Rufus) and told him that the Church would not recognise any bishops that Henry had invested</li> <li>• Henry I did not want a bitter dispute with the church; he wanted a united church behind him especially as he feared an attack by Robert Curthose</li> <li>• Pope Pascal threatened Henry I with excommunication; in March 1105 he had excommunicated Henry's chief adviser Robert of Meulan and it was made clear that the king would be next.</li> </ul> <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 whether Henry II's aim to control the Church was responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's aim to control the Church was responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Henry pursued traditional aims with regard to the Church. Since the Conquest, English kings had reacted by defending their rights to rule the Church in their dominions against the Church's claim of superiority</li><li>• Henry aimed to prevent the evasion of proper punishment by clerical criminals, stop the Church punishing laymen too harshly in church courts and reassert the traditional boundaries between Church and state</li><li>• Henry intended to achieve his assertion of control over the Church by appointing his chancellor Thomas Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162. He believed that Becket would favour the king not the Church</li><li>• Henry's aims for the Church were laid out in the Constitutions of Clarendon. His decision to have the 'ancient customs' written down was a major cause of conflict as they were all phrased in favour of the king</li><li>• Henry's decision to have Young Henry crowned by the archbishop of York and his outburst against Becket is evidence of his determination to control the Church.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons that were more responsible for the conflict in Church-State relations in the years 1162-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Becket's character played a major role in the conflict: After his appointment, he embraced the clerical life in a manner that Henry had not expected and undermined Henry's achievement of his aims</li><li>• Becket's determination to defend the Church against Henry's claims fueled the conflict. At Woodstock Becket refused to pay sheriff's aid and, at Westminster, he insisted that the king's laws had to be validated in terms of canon law</li></ul> <p>In 1164 Becket instructed the clergy to seal the Constitutions of Clarendon but subsequently refused to seal them himself. This provoked Henry into accusing him of embezzlement and led to Becket's exile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Becket's actions in exile and on his return enflamed the conflict. His support from the papacy and his excommunication of Henry's clerical supporters escalated the quarrel to the final murder</li><li>• The clergy contributed to the quarrel. Many supported Henry against Becket after Clarendon. They had no loyalty to Becket who had only been ordained the day before his investiture.</li></ul> <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 Henry II's financial reforms were more important than legal reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's financial reforms were more important than legal reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry restored finances by introducing payments called gifts and aids, imposing scutage and tallage, increasing feudal fines and seizing lost royal estates which restored the authority of the crown after the civil war</li> <li>• The reforms of the coinage in 1158 and 1180 secured the value of the silver penny, with severe penalties for forgers and moneyers producing substandard coins, which enforced Henry's control over the money supply</li> <li>• Henry strengthened royal finances and hence his authority by introducing an effective system of auditing the accounts, including those of the sheriffs, by experienced treasurers in the exchequer</li> <li>• The Cartae Baronum 1166, investigated the fiefs held by his tenants-in-chief, what they owed him in feudal dues and the number of knights they retained. This enforced his control over his great vassals</li> <li>• In the Inquest of the Sheriffs of 1170, Henry investigated malpractice in local government. This enhanced his authority by replacing of almost all the sheriffs with new sheriffs chosen by, and loyal to, the king</li> <li>• Royal income increased from £10,300 in 1155 to £22,000 by the end of Henry's reign which strengthened royal authority because it meant the king had the money he needed e.g. to build castles and wage wars.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II's legal reforms were more important than financial reforms in strengthening royal authority in the years 1154-80 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry's legal reforms, including the development of a mass produced writ, had financial benefit. Justice was available for a price and the profits of justice swelled the king's coffers and enhanced his powers</li> <li>• The assizes of Clarendon and Northampton made testifying under oath the standard procedure and serious crimes could be tried by the ordeal of trial by water. Uniformity strengthened the authority of the king</li> <li>• The introduction of itinerant justices in eyre led to the number of convictions rising significantly in the counties that they visited. This enhanced the authority of the king by ensuring felons were punished</li> <li>• The Court of the King's Bench at Westminster became the headquarters of the itinerant justices. Records of judgements were kept so that precedents could be established which ensured uniform justice</li> <li>• The introduction of <i>Novel disseisin</i> and <i>Mort d'ancestor</i> played an important role in settling the many disputes over land after the civil war which prevented conflicts that would have unsettled the kingdom</li> <li>• The introduction of the Grand Assize offered trial by a jury of 12 knights in the royal court as an alternative to trial by duel which developed the provision of justice away from violence as a method of settling disputes.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

