



Pearson

## **Mark scheme**

Pearson Edexcel  
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](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 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_1806\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<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>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>• 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>• 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.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<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>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<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>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<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>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<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>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<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> <li>• 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
<b>1</b>	<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 seriousness of the rising against Tostig Godwinson in 1065.</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>• Version D of <i>The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> was written in Worcester in Mercia where there was rebellious activity and it should therefore be well-informed on events</li><li>• The monks recording the chronicle had been assigned the task of recording the important events of the year and had an incentive to provide as true a record as they could</li><li>• Worcester was in Mercia, the earldom that formerly belonged to Aelfgar, the father of Morcar and Edwin, who had been defeated by the Godwinsons, which may affect the impartiality of the source.</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 seriousness of the rising against Tostig Godwinson in 1065:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It suggests that Tostig had no support in Northumbria ('All the thegns of Yorkshire and Northumberland gathered together')</li><li>• It suggests that the rebels were motivated by greed ('They seized all his ... gold and silver, and all his monies')</li><li>• It provides evidence that the rebellion was accompanied by great violence ('they killed men and burned houses and corn, and seized the many thousands of cattle that they could find.')</li><li>• It implies that Morcar and Edwin were behind the rebellion ('Morcar went south with men of the shire', 'There his brother Edwin came to meet him with the men who were in his earldom').</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>• Tostig Godwinson was a southerner and resented by the northerners as an outsider to the region. He was not a popular earl of Northumbria</li><li>• Tostig had enforced the collection of taxes and laws that were standard in the south but had been resisted in the north up to this point</li><li>• Gospatric was a key figure in the rebellion. He wanted revenge on Tostig for allowing Malcolm of Scotland to take Cumbria in 1061 while Tostig was on pilgrimage. Cumbria had belonged to Gospatric</li><li>• The Godwinsons had defeated Edwin and Morcar's father, Aelfgar, in 1055 which led to his temporary banishment from the kingdom. This had left a legacy of bad blood between the Godwinsons and the house of Mercia.</li></ul> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source</p>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biography was written based upon knowledge gained from the royal court and can be regarded as reasonably accurate</li> <li>• The book was written for Queen Edith and was therefore likely to treat her brothers and husband favourably</li> <li>• The comments on Harold suggest an attempt to appear impartial.</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 seriousness of the rising against Tostig Godwinson in 1065:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that Harold played a role in the rebellion against his brother ('It was said, if it be true', 'Harold, rather too generous with his oaths (alas!')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that Edward was unable to crush the rebels because of a lack of support ('they did not so much divert the King from his desire to march, as wrongfully and, against the King's will, desert him')</li> <li>• It indicates that this was a great crisis in Edward's reign ('and because the people felt horror at what seemed civil war').</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>• At King Edward's court, Tostig accused Harold of having been behind the rebellion and of being in league with the rebels</li> <li>• Harold refused to commit his men to fight against the rebels and this meant that Edward had to agree to the rebels terms</li> <li>• On 27 October 1065, Harold informed the rebels at Oxford that their terms had been accepted and that Morcar was the new earl of Northumbria</li> <li>• Tostig blamed Harold for his banishment, became a bitter enemy of Harold and sought help from Harold's enemies, most notably Harald Hardrada.</li> </ul> <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>• Taken together, the two sources offer contrasting views on the ways in which the rising could be regarded as serious: Source 1 focuses on the threat from the House of Mercia, whilst Source 2 hints at Harold's involvement</li> <li>• The sources offer views from two different perspectives, an Anglo-Saxon monk and a monk from Flanders</li> <li>• The sources have contrasting purposes; Source 1 was written as a record of the most significant events of the day while Source 2 was written for the queen and to flatter her family.</li> </ul>

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>2</b>	<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 failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70.</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>• Becket is the author of this letter and is giving a highly subjective account of the nature of the quarrel</li><li>• This is a private letter to the Pope written while Becket was in exile and Becket is able to express his true feelings with less fear that his correspondence would be intercepted</li><li>• The tone of the letter explicitly reveals the depth of Becket's anger towards Henry II.</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 failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It implies that the Constitutions of Clarendon were a major reason why a compromise could not be reached ('I have publicly condemned these wicked, I will not say customs, but perversions or corruptions')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Becket was not prepared to reach a compromise in the quarrel with Henry II ('I shall not delay to excommunicate him if he does not speedily recover his senses')</li><li>• It suggests that Becket expected Henry to give way entirely to his demands ('I have many times called upon him, and have frequently invited him to settle this dispute').</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>• Becket's refusal to seal the Constitutions of Clarendon had led to an open quarrel with Henry and prompted Henry to charge Becket with embezzlement which had resulted in Becket's decision to go into exile</li><li>• While in exile, Becket had sought and gained the support of the papacy and King Louis of France which had further infuriated Henry II</li><li>• Henry II had escalated the quarrel by seizing the property of Becket's family and clerks and by allowing the Archbishop of York to crown Young Henry which encroached on the rights of the Archbishop of Canterbury</li><li>• In 1166 Becket intensified the quarrel by excommunicating Henry's justiciar together with other leading barons involved in the Constitutions of Clarendon.</li></ul> <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>• Edward Grim was an eyewitness to Becket's murder in the Cathedral</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tone of the source demonstrates that he was a highly subjective witness in his support for Becket and in his animosity towards Henry II</li> <li>• The account was published in 1180 after Becket had been canonised.</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 failure of Henry II and Thomas Becket to reach a compromise in their quarrel in the years 1164–70:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that Becket’s excommunication of Henry’s men was a key reason why a compromise had not been reached (‘restore to communion those whom you have excommunicated’)</li> <li>• It implies that the knights had come with the intention of murdering Becket (‘thirsting rather for blood’, ‘the most eager for crime’)</li> <li>• It portrays Becket’s actions as courageous (‘he did not forget his promise not to flee from his murderers from fear of death, and refused to go’)</li> <li>• It implies that Becket was murdered on the King’s orders (‘“In the King's name we order you, both clerk and monk, that you should take and hold that man.”’).</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>• Becket’s return to England in early December did not end the quarrel; Henry did not invite him to court for Christmas in spite of a previous promise that he would meet Becket in Rouen or England very soon</li> <li>• On his return Becket carried out a visitation in his archbishopric during which he excommunicated Henry’s supporters including Robert de Broc</li> <li>• Henry II is reputed to have lost his temper over the excommunications and expressed a desire to be rid of Becket which led to the despatch of the four knights</li> <li>• The knights did not have their weapons in their original encounter with Becket; he had the opportunity to flee while they returned to their horses to collect them, but he chose martyrdom instead.</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>• Both sources emphasise the responsibility of Henry II in escalating the quarrel whilst implying that Becket’s own actions played a key role in the failure to reach a compromise</li> <li>• There is a clear contrast in the dates of the sources that impacts upon their content – Source 1 is private correspondence that was produced during the quarrel whilst Source 2 was written in the hindsight of Becket’s murder and canonisation</li> <li>• There is a clear contrast in the purpose of the sources with Source 1 designed to emphasise the justice of Becket’s position while Source 2 is written to glorify his actions as a martyr to the Church.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<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 it was King Harold's mistakes rather than Duke William's skills that were responsible for the Norman victory at Hastings in October 1066.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that it was King Harold's mistakes rather than Duke William's skills that were responsible for the Norman victory at Hastings in October 1066 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Harold made a mistake in not seeking the support of the Pope. Papal support for William allowed him to spread the rumour in Europe that Harold was a usurper, which helped William recruit a large army</li><li>• Harold made the mistake of summoning the fyrd too early. As it owed only 2 months' service he had to disband it on 8 September 1066 before the Normans arrived</li><li>• Harold marched his army very rapidly up to York and then rapidly back because of the Norman landing. His troops were exhausted and he had to leave his archers behind. This reduced his strength in battle</li><li>• Harold made the mistake of being lured into battle by the Normans before he had recruited his army to full strength</li><li>• Harold made the mistake of being over-confident. His success against Hardrada led him to believe that he would be able to surprise the Normans and defeat them as well</li><li>• Harold lost control of the fyrd in the Battle of Hastings. His failure to maintain the shield wall enabled the Norman to cut down his army and draw him into battle where he was killed.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that it was Duke William's skills rather than King Harold's mistakes that were responsible for the Norman victory at Hastings in October 1066 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• William proved himself to be a skilled propagandist in enlisting the support of the Church. The permission to use the papal banner allowed him to present the invasion as a Holy War and to gain support</li><li>• William's skills in preparing for battle by building a large fleet, ensuring three horses per knight and in building a castle at Pevensey when he landed to control the region meant he was thoroughly prepared</li><li>• William was a skilled military tactician; his use of the double volley from his archers using long bows and cross bows helped to weaken the Anglo-Saxon shield wall</li><li>• William was a skilled military general and able to take advantage of Harold's loss of control of the fyrd by adopting the tactic of the feigned retreat.</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 Norman rule in England had very little impact on the Anglo-Saxon population who lived in the villages.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Norman rule in England had very little impact on the Anglo-Saxon population who lived in the villages should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lives of the Anglo-Saxon peasants continued to be governed by the agricultural calendar that determined what activities they carried out and the type of land that determined the nature of their farming activity</li> <li>• The position of the peasants in the social hierarchy remained unchanged by the introduction of feudalism; essentially they remained at the bottom of the social system</li> <li>• The nucleated village remained the system that predominated across the South and Midlands</li> <li>• The work in the countryside remained hard, conditions were harsh and life expectancy was short.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Norman rule in England had a significant impact on the Anglo-Saxon population who lived in the villages should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole communities of Anglo-Saxons were displaced by the Norman invasion in Sussex where William's men had burned down villages to lure Harold into battle</li> <li>• The lives of Anglo-Saxons living in Yorkshire and Northumbria were devastated by the 'harrying of the north'. The Domesday Book records that large swathes of land remained waste land as late as 1086</li> <li>• The Anglo-Saxon aristocracy was replaced by Norman barons</li> <li>• Anglo-Saxons who had previously been tenant farmers declined in status as their lands were given to Norman lords and they became landless labourers or villeins</li> <li>• The Normans demanded higher rents and more obligations from the peasants who were brought into the feudal system</li> <li>• The Forest Laws were a symbol of oppression, forbidding the Anglo-Saxon population to farm, forage or hunt in designated areas, and more than 20 villages were destroyed to create the royal forest.</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
<b>5</b>	<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 succeeded in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II succeeded in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In 1166 Henry II asserted control over Brittany by deposing Conan and betrothing his son, Geoffrey, to Conan's daughter. In the autumn, the Breton barons did homage to Henry</li><li>• Henry campaigned for 20 years to take control of Toulouse. In 1171 he took homage from Count Raymond V</li><li>• Henry strengthened his control over Normandy by investigating land holdings and taxes and by enforcing his feudal rights. The return of the Vexin as part of Margaret's dowry strengthened Normandy's defences</li><li>• In the Peace of Montmirail in 1169, Henry II settled the quarrel with Louis VII over disputes on Normandy's border as well as the succession to his dominions. The barons were obliged to swear fealty to his sons</li><li>• Henry strengthened his control over his southern lands by negotiating the betrothal of John to the daughter of Count Humbert of Maurienne in 1172.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Henry II did not succeed in establishing complete control over the Angevin lands in France by 1172 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Even though the Breton barons had paid homage to Henry in 1166, he had to return to the county to put down minor rebellions in subsequent years</li><li>• Henry's control of Aquitaine was always limited. His policy of installing 'northerners' as his officials was resented by the southerners and led to a series of rebellions that Henry was unable to crush entirely</li><li>• The ambitions of the French king to expand his territories at the expense of the Angevin Empire meant that Henry's control, especially on the borders of Normandy, was never complete</li><li>• The outbreak of rebellion in the Angevin territories in 1173–74 is a clear indication that Henry did not have complete control over his French territories.</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 the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 had similar causes but very different results.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 had similar causes but very different results should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The root cause of both the Great Rebellion and Richard's rebellion was Henry II's refusal to give his sons real power to rule their territories</li> <li>• Both rebellions were driven by suspicions about Henry's favourable treatment of John. In 1173 Henry gave castles to John from Young Henry's territory; in 1189 Richard feared England would be left to John</li> <li>• Both rebellions were made possible by the support of the French king for the sons rebelling against their father</li> <li>• In 1174 Henry completely destroyed the rebels without ceding any territory and forgave Young Henry; in 1189 Henry II was forced to cede territory and vowed revenge against Richard.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 and Duke Richard's rebellion of 1189 did not have similar causes and very different results should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young Henry was driven to revolt because he had not been given the power to rule as a king; Richard revolted in 1189 because Henry had not crowned him king and he suspected Henry did not intend him to be king</li> <li>• In 1173 Louis VII's support for Young Henry encouraged him to rebel whereas in 1189 it was Richard who joined Philip Augustus in his attack on Henry's territories</li> <li>• Eleanor of Aquitaine's opposition to Henry was a key reason for rebellion in 1173. She played no role in 1189</li> <li>• In both revolts the Angevin Empire was weakened. In 1173–74 Henry's decision not to act against Louis enhanced French control in the region whilst in 1189 Henry was forced to cede three castles in Anjou or the Vexin to Philip II.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>