

**A-level
HISTORY
7042/2A**

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154-1216

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the conflict between Henry II and Thomas Becket.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as this letter was written by Becket it has great value in showing what he believed to be the causes of the conflict, however, we must remember that he would seek to emphasise his point of view and was unlikely to seek to blame himself for the conflict
- the letter was written at the height of the dispute and so has value in showing the intransigence from both sides and also the activities of Becket whilst in France – which were often seen to be quite provocative towards the King
- Becket was trying to justify his own actions in 1166 and to gain support across Europe, hence there are limitations in this letter as he was not as obedient a subject as he suggests here
- the tone and emphasis has an undercurrent to it – Becket threatens Henry towards the end of the letter, despite much of the letter seeking to sound conciliatory. This is quite valuable as it hints as to why Henry felt increasingly angry and frustrated with Becket.

Content and argument

- Becket seeks to explain the relative position of secular and ecclesiastical authority. This is valuable as this was a key reason for the conflict between the two men – the Constitutions of Clarendon had sought to clarify this position and Becket had taken great offence to the clauses contained within it as he saw the document as an attempt to limit the power of the Church
- Becket talks about his belief that the King cannot subject clerks to secular trials. This is valuable in explaining the conflict as the issue of criminal clerks was one which had caused rifts between Henry and Becket since the King first raised the issue in 1163. Becket might also be talking about his own trial at Northampton in 1164 which he had rejected as contrary to canon law
- Becket talks about the treatment of Canterbury particularly and this is valuable in telling us about the conflict as Becket believed that Henry was trying to reduce the power of the archbishop – Henry on the other hand claimed that he was trying to re-establish Church-State relations to how they had been in Henry I's reign
- Becket threatens Henry with divine judgement and this is valuable in showing us reasons for the conflict – Becket's behaviour seemed to provoke Henry from the outset and led to the King retaliating and, for example, confiscating Canterbury's possessions.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Edward Grim was an eyewitness to the events, which has great value for historians. However, as a clerk, it is likely that he will take the side of the Church in this dispute, which might be a limitation
- Edward Grim included this account in a hagiography – he is unlikely, as a churchman, to talk negatively about a confirmed saint and thus he might emphasise the blame on the knights for the murder
- Edward Grim is writing with knowledge of the agreement Henry made with the Papacy in 1172 and the knowledge that the cult of St Thomas became very popular very quickly. This hindsight might have affected his recollections in his writing
- the words used to describe the knights are vitriolic and suggest that the murder of Becket was pre-planned. This excessive tone might limit the value, as might the portrayal of Becket as almost completely blameless.

Content and argument

- Grim argues that the knights were intent on murder from the outset. In reality it seems that they wanted to arrest Becket, but he resisted them and provoked them through name calling – this might limit the value as the source seeks to almost completely absolve Becket of any blame for this escalation of events
- the source is clear to distance the knights from the King which is partially valuable. Henry always insisted that he did not order the death of Becket, but he did admit that his ‘unguarded words’ might have precipitated the knights’ actions – so Grim needs to be handled with caution on this issue. Perhaps he is aiming to avoid any repercussions which would ensue if he did openly blame the King
- Grim argues that Becket had sought martyrdom for a long time. It is not clear how accurate this statement is due to the hindsight which Grim has. However, the hair shirt found on Becket’s corpse does suggest that he had become increasingly pious by the time of his death so there might be some value in this
- Grim does mention that some of the King’s officials had been excommunicated. Although he does not explore this further, this is quite valuable in telling us about the conflict as Becket insisted on excommunications of Henry’s officials and other bishops and this was a key reason for Henry becoming increasingly angry with Becket.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Arnulf was a proponent for the King in the aftermath of the dispute with Becket and so would seek to portray the King’s role in the conflict in a positive fashion – thus he has value as an intimate of the King but should also be handled with care given his objective
- Arnulf is writing to the Pope almost immediately as the news of Becket’s death was spreading around Europe and thus is likely to try to downplay the King’s role in events as it was not clear at this stage what the papal reaction would be. Henry potentially faced excommunication, which could be very problematic for him
- as a private letter, this might have value as it is not seeking to persuade a wider audience as to the sequence of events. Arnulf was obviously a churchman himself and so his stance on Henry’s lack of involvement in the Archbishop’s death is quite interesting and perhaps increases its value
- the tone is calm and measured and seeks to placate the Pope, hence the references to submission to the Pope’s judgement – the portrayal of Henry is of one entirely innocent of the death of Becket, which might limit the value as it is unlikely that this letter would admit any involvement, given its ultimate objective.

Content and argument

- Arnulf describes the King as shocked and upset upon hearing of the death of Becket. This has some value as wider sources describe Henry's reaction and it is true that he sought to seek the forgiveness of the Papacy – he did penance in 1172 and 1174 for example
- Arnulf claims that the murderers had no orders from Henry and that he was not aware of what they had gone to do. This has some value as there is no evidence to suggest that Henry ordered the death of the Archbishop. However, even Henry would later accept that his 'unguarded words' caused Becket's death and so this letter has some limitations
- there is mention of the King's 'old enmity' with the Archbishop – this should be treated with caution as the implication is that the argument has been over for a while and has been forgotten about. In reality, although Becket was allowed back to England, the conflict was not really resolved, and Henry became very angry when he heard about Becket's activities upon arriving back in England
- Arnulf talks about the fact that Becket had provoked certain enemies – there is value to this as Becket began excommunicating certain individuals upon his return to England, despite knowing that this had been forbidden by the King in the past.

Section B

0 2 'Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession in 1154.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession in 1154 might include:

- Henry had the support of the Church and the barons of England through the Treaty of Winchester and had been crowned by the Archbishop of Canterbury and so would be difficult to remove
- as Duke of Normandy and Count of Anjou, as well as being married to the heiress of Aquitaine, Henry had plenty of resources in order to be able to firmly establish his position in England
- Stephen had formally accepted Henry as his heir in 1153 – this gave Henry the time to make alliances and determine how he would go about ruling England once Stephen died
- Henry already had a male heir in 1154 so could offer stability
- many of the barons in England had lost authority and power during the civil war and so looked forward to a period of peace and stability that Henry would bring. The alternative was more years of expensive civil war as Henry was unlikely to relinquish his claim easily.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession in 1154 might include:

- Stephen's son, William fitzStephen, was still alive and in possession of extensive wealthy territories. Any rebellion to replace Henry as king could be focused around this rival
- Henry faced the potential of invasion of his French territories by the King of France and his younger brother Geoffrey of Anjou. Louis was angry about Henry's marriage to Eleanor and Geoffrey wanted lands for himself. This would be a distraction which could destabilise Henry in England
- royal authority had been greatly damaged in Stephen's reign and overmighty barons, like William of Aumale and Hugh Mortimer, had emerged. They would resent any reduction to their power and they had built castles to help protect themselves
- the English treasury was much depleted as a result of the civil war and incoming revenue was much depleted as a consequence of alienation of the royal demesne and the fact that royal control over justice had been much eroded.

Students are likely to argue that, whilst Henry did face some serious problems with regards to royal authority that would require his immediate attention, he was overall in a fairly strong position. What was most notable was the fact that he had been crowned by the Church and would thus be difficult to remove as the Church was unlikely to withdraw their support as it would undermine their own position. However, the alternative conclusion is also valid and any supported judgement will be credited. Answers should focus on Henry's position in 1154 and not go into lengthy discussions about his activities in 1155 and beyond.

- 0 3** To what extent, by 1199, had Richard fully recovered from the problems that he had faced upon his return from captivity in 1194?

[25 marks]

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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that by 1199, Richard had fully recovered from the problems that he faced upon his return from captivity in 1194 might include:

- Richard had successfully retaken much of the land in his French territories which had been taken by Philip in 1193–4. These lands included large parts of the Vexin and key fortresses like Loches
- Richard had secured the loyalty of his brother, John, by forgiving him in 1194. This was important as John had played such a key role in the loss of the territories in the first place. John proved his loyalty by assisting with the recapture of Evreux
- Richard managed to turn a negative position in France, where Philip had more allies than him, into a much more favourable position. For example, he secured the support of the Counts of Toulouse (marriage alliance) and Flanders (trade embargo)
- Richard managed to deal with the potential financial problems in England by appointing the very capable Hubert Walter as justiciar. This meant that England's wealth could be carefully exploited by Hubert Walter through innovative schemes (e.g. the carucage) without causing too much open resistance. Hubert Walter proved to be an effective mediator in dealing with the small outbursts of opposition towards the end of the reign
- Richard held a commanding position with regards to future conflict with Philip after 1199 as he had built the imposing Chateau Gaillard which protected the route between Paris and Rouen.

Arguments challenging the view that by 1199, Richard had fully recovered from the problems that he faced upon his return from captivity in 1194 might include:

- the war with Philip was not completed in 1199 – there was a truce, but hostilities could reopen in the future. Richard had not been able to re-take the key castle of Gisors which was seen to be vital for the security of the Vexin region
- Richard had failed to effectively deal with the rebellious barons of Aquitaine who had been encouraged by Philip and Richard's absence to try to achieve greater independence from ducal authority. Richard was killed attempting to deal with this rebellion at the castle of Chalus-Chabrol
- Richard had potentially drained England's treasury to pay for his crusade and the ransom and was pushed into further 'short term' money raising initiatives in order to pay for his war with France. This did lead to protests in England – most notably from fitz Osbert in London and complaints from the Bishop of Lincoln over scutage
- Richard had not ensured a clear succession in 1194, and actually made this less clear by 1199. Arthur had been named as heir in 1191, but John was named upon Richard's deathbed. This caused a level of instability which the French king would be able to exploit effectively moving forwards.

Students can argue in favour of either proposition here and will be rewarded for any supported judgement. They do need to compare problems in 1194 with solutions (or lack of) by 1199, but there are a range of areas which they can consider. Some students might wish to look at the early years of John's reign and point to some of the problems which he faced (e.g. lack of money, dispute with Arthur) as evidence that Richard failed, but the bulk of the answer should deal with Richard's reign and the situation at the time of his death. Lengthy descriptions about Richard's provisions for England at the time of the crusade are probably not very relevant.

- 0 4** 'John's failures in Normandy, in the years 1204 to 1214, were more the result of his own incompetence than Philip II's strength.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that John's failures in Normandy, in the years 1204 to 1214, were more the result of his own incompetence rather than Philip II's strength might include:

- John did not provide much effective support for the besieged towns and castles in Normandy in the war of 1203–4 particularly. Chateau Gaillard and Rouen were both advised by John that he would not be arriving with a relief force and thus capitulated to Philip – Rouen did not put up much effective resistance at all once they had received this news from John
- Philip was able to start a war against John in 1202 as John had refused the summons to the French court which Philip had issued due to John's tactless treatment of the Lusignans. Under the terms of the Treaty of Le Goulet, Philip could now declare John to be a 'contumacious vassal'
- John suffered from a number of defections in Normandy (e.g. at Alencon and Vaudreuil). One reason for this was a lack of trust which the barons had in John after his treatment of the prisoners from Mirebeau and his nephew, Arthur
- John was not able to convince enough of the English barons to help him in 1204 and for his subsequent attempts to regain his continental possessions. This meant that he was over-reliant on unreliable allies in 1214, such as Otto and the Lusignans.

Arguments challenging the view that John's failures in Normandy, in the years 1204 to 1214, were more the result of his own incompetence rather than Philip II's strength might include:

- Philip was a very capable king with good military capability. This was especially demonstrated during the siege of Chateau Gaillard and in the way he isolated Rouen in 1204. Philip also fought bravely at Bouvines in 1214
- Philip had worked to reorganise the taxation system within France. This meant that he found it much easier than John to raise the revenues required in the war, especially in 1202–4
- Philip demonstrated good diplomatic skills when dealing with the Norman barons and towns. He was able to convince many to switch sides by emphasising the benefits such as favourable charters for the towns
- Philip had been in the weaker position at the end of 1199 as John had been able to take control of all of the Angevin 'empire', but he was able to exploit John's insecurities about Arthur to extract the favourable Treaty of Le Goulet which would prove to be so useful later on.

Students can argue in favour of either factor and any supported judgement will be rewarded. They should restrict their answers to the two key factors given in the question and not spend lots of time introducing a range of possible alternative factors, unless these can be clearly linked to either John's incompetence or Philip's strength. The mark scheme has given examples which are for illustration only. Students could obviously include examples where John was not incompetent or where Philip was weak, in order to reach their judgement.