



AS

History

Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

7041/2A The Reign of Henry II, 1154–1189

Mark scheme

7041

June 2016

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 Assessment Writer.

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.

June 2016

Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

AS History Component 2A The Reign of Henry II, 1154–1189

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining attitudes towards Henry II? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- William of Newburgh was a contemporary chronicler, and so lived through the reign of Henry II, and can be viewed as fairly authoritative. However, he does not seem to have travelled from his monastery in the North, and so is a rather distant commentator
- the tone is extremely positive in its portrayal of Henry, e.g. ‘most diligent’, ‘true servant of God’.

Content and argument

- that Henry was a good king because he protected the peace of the realm. Henry produced widespread reforms to the legal system
- that Henry was a good king because he had a good relationship with the Church, being a defender of Church liberties. However, he did quarrel with Becket and retained a controlling hand after Avranches
- that Henry was not excessively greedy as a king (‘grievous burden’) but he managed to exploit England financially by utilising feudal dues and by energetic use of fines and the Royal demesne. He only levied the geld twice in his entire 35 year reign
- that Henry would use force if necessary, but that he preferred other, more diplomatic methods. He tended to negotiate with the barons and rewarded those who proved their loyalty.

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

Provenance and tone

- Gerald was a Court Chaplain at Henry II’s court and so was well-placed to provide an accurate eyewitness account of Henry as king
- Gerald had fallen out with Henry and so this might cause a more negative view
- the tone is emotive and seeking to portray Henry in a very negative and almost tyrannical manner.

Content and argument

- that Henry was an ambitious and energetic ruler, who had a desire to expand his power exponentially. Henry, as well as being King of England, also had a large 'Angevin Empire' to rule over. He aggressively pushed his borders. However, there is little evidence to suggest that he genuinely desired to control the Roman Empire
- that Henry 'oppressed' the nobility of England and ruled effectively like a tyrant. Henry did deal decisively with the nobility who opposed his authority in 1154–55. However, he generally had quite a positive relationship with his barons
- that Henry would often break oaths he had taken – notably ones made with David of Scotland before his accession or with Louis over the Vexin
- that Henry did not have a good relationship with the Church and that he was punished by God as a result. Henry had a poor relationship with Becket, but the other bishops remained loyal. Once Becket was removed, Henry was largely happy for the Church to retain many of its freedoms, so long as he could control elections.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that Source B is more subjective than Source A and the motivation of the writer is known from the provenance, which reflects the very negative picture of Henry. Source A seems to be more balanced and better fits the contextual evidence. However, any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- 02** ‘Henry II successfully asserted royal control over the English Church after Thomas Becket’s death.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Henry II successfully asserted royal control over the English Church after Thomas Becket's death might include:

- despite making promises about Vacant bishoprics, Henry continued to exploit the Church financially in this way
- Henry continued to be able to make his own appointments to ecclesiastical office. Becket's successors were largely malleable to Henry's wishes
- the wording of the Treaty of Avranches was important. Henry agreed to renounce any 'new customs' which were detrimental to the Church. Whilst this meant that the Constitutions of Clarendon were abandoned, many of the clauses remained in reality as Henry had always viewed them as 'ancient customs'
- Henry retained episcopal support during the Great Rebellion.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II successfully asserted royal control over the English Church after Thomas Becket's death might include:

- Henry admitted that his 'unguarded words' might have led to the death of Becket. This meant that he was submitting himself to punishment by the Church
- Henry had to abandon the Constitutions of Clarendon. This meant that, in the future, further conflict over Church/State relations might erupt
- Henry largely backed down over the issue of criminous clerks
- the canonisation of Becket damaged the King's authority and helped to portray him as a tyrant.

Students are likely to conclude that, whilst on the face of it Henry failed to achieve his aim of asserting royal authority, in reality he could still dominate the Church in England, which is all he had wanted in 1162. The biggest failure was probably the abandonment of the Constitutions, but it is important to note that, initially, Henry had not aimed to codify Church/State relations in such a fixed manner. It was only Becket's behaviour in 1163/64 which forced the King's hand. Once Becket was removed from the picture, Henry could afford a less rigid approach. Students may argue the opposite and should be rewarded for any supported judgement.

- 03** ‘Henry II’s actions to restore royal authority in England in the years 1155 to 1166 were primarily caused by a desire for money.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Henry II's actions to restore royal authority in England in the years 1155 to 1166 were primarily caused by a desire for money might include:

- Henry reinvigorated the Exchequer by bringing Bishop Nigel out of retirement. Notably, any sheriffs with unsatisfactory accounts would be dealt with by the King directly. The revenue being collected in the shires was thus examined more closely
- Henry's approach towards the barons in the early years included the destruction of illegal castles and the return of many former Crown lands which had been lost under Stephen. This would have undoubtedly had a financial benefit for Henry
- in 1166 the Cartae Baronum provided the Exchequer with details of servitum debitum, to enable the effective exploitation of scutage
- Henry made wide improvements to the justice system. A more efficient and effective system would allow for better exploitation of the fines commonly imposed as punishments

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II's actions to restore royal authority in England in the years 1155 to 1166 were primarily caused by a desire for money might include:

- the office of justiciar became extremely important under Henry due to the nature of his rule; his continental possessions would require him to be absent for prolonged periods of time and he needed the country to run effectively despite this
- Henry's coronation oath saw him swearing to enact and observe good laws and that he would forbid robbery and unjust judgements. Henry does seem to have been genuinely interested in a fair legal system and many of his changes can be viewed in light of this
- the wide extension of the use of juries in theory provided a more efficient and fairer system of justice for the people. Justices in eyre also meant that the law should be coherent across the country
- writs like that of novel disseisin allowed all freemen the opportunity to reclaim property which had been unlawfully taken. In the light of Stephen's reign this was an important tool for restoring peace and settling disputes.

Students are likely to argue that raising money was an important motive for Henry, but that it was not the sole (or even primary) cause of his changes. Indeed, Henry seems to have been content to raise revenue by exploiting other avenues (e.g. feudal rights and the Jews) and he does seem to have been genuinely committed to fair and efficient government. However, any supported judgement should be credited.