

AS

# History

Paper 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1189  
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

---

---

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1189

#### Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why the Great Rebellion of 1173–74 occurred?

[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 of 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

- The 'Great Chronicle' was written by Roger of Hoveden, a royal clerk. As a royal clerk he was well-placed to gather information from members of the royal court and he also included many documents, especially letters, into his history.
- Given his close association with the royal court of Henry II it is unsurprising that he is careful to avoid directly criticising Henry II. He is inclined to support Henry II.
- Although the 'Great Chronicle' was written about twenty years after the event related Roger was a contemporary to the events of the Great Rebellion and his work is based on his earlier account *Gesta Regis Henrici II* and *Gesta Regis Ricardi*.

### Content and argument

- The narrative of events focuses on the dissension of Young Henry, Henry II's eldest son. He is presented as the obstacle to a settlement and the account presents him as seeking an opportunity to use this issue in an intended act of defiance of his father.
- The context for the argument was Henry II's intention to give his youngest son, John, the castles of Chinon, Loudon and Mirabel so that he might be suitably endowed to marry the earl of Maurienne's daughter.
- The account also presents the king of France, Louis VII, as a behind the scenes perpetrator of the subsequent Great Rebellion by claiming that the requests Young Henry made to Henry II were at his suggestion.
- The barons of England and Normandy who disliked Henry II are also implicated in encouraging rebellion.
- There is, at least, an implied acknowledgement that Henry II contributed to the problem by his refusal to assign Young Henry any territories to rule.

---

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- the relationship between Young Henry and Louis VII
- the degree to which Henry II faced baronial opposition and the composition of it
- the previous treatment of Young Henry by Henry II and its impact on Young Henry's expectations.

**Source B: In assessing the usefulness of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:**

**Provenance and tone**

- The letter was written by Peter of Blois, a highly educated French priest. He was in the service of Henry II and was a diplomat and propagandist for the English king. He was also involved in negotiations with Louis VII on Henry II's behalf.
- Rotrou, the archbishop of Rouen, who encouraged Peter to write the letter, was also a loyal subject of Henry II. He was later the chief negotiator for the marriage of Henry and Eleanor's daughter, Joan, to William II of Sicily.
- The tone is clearly sympathetic to the 'wrongs' perpetrated upon Henry II.
- The tone is also clearly preaching in nature and portrays what the author (and no doubt his patron) regards as the unnatural opposition of Eleanor of Aquitaine to her husband, Henry II.
- It is claimed that Eleanor has acted against the interests of all women and from childish counsel. The letter therefore reflects contemporary male attitudes to women.

**Content and argument**

- The letter was written to Eleanor after the rebellion had already begun, but before her capture, and seeks to put pressure on her to make her sons faithful to Henry II and therefore end the rebellion.
- Eleanor is presented as the main problem – she inspired her sons to rebel against their father. Her influence over her sons is emphasised.
- As a leading churchman Peter of Blois finds the rebellion of a woman (in this case Eleanor of Aquitaine) against her husband, regardless of provocation, to be unnatural and a threat to the natural order.
- Peter in some way agrees with the argument in Source A in that he admits the involvement of Henry's sons and that they have not been obedient and respectful to their father. But unlike the first source the reference to sons includes not just Young Henry but also Richard and Geoffrey.
- Peter and through him his patron, Rotrou of Rouen, threatens Eleanor with spiritual penalties if she does not obey Henry II.

**Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:**

- the influence that Eleanor had over her sons, especially Richard
- the position of Eleanor as a very powerful woman in her own right
- Henry II's affairs and mistresses as well as their alleged impact on Eleanor
- the nature of Eleanor's eventual capture and what it revealed about her complicity
- the fate of Eleanor after the Great Rebellion and what that reveals about her importance.

---

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that Source B provides a much narrower explanation for the rebellion than Source A and in many ways reflects both the Church and wider societal view about the accepted role of women. Source A is more useful in that it provides a range of linked explanations including Henry II's actions, the frustration of Young Henry and the involvement of Louis VII.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Henry II was in a strong position as King of England by the end of 1154.'

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 supporting the view that Henry II was in a strong position as King of England by the end of 1154, might include:**

- many of the most powerful and independent earls in the period of civil war in Stephen's reign died in the early 1150s before Henry II became king of England
- Eustace of Boulogne, Stephen's elder son and heir, had died in 1153
- King Stephen had agreed to the succession of Henry II by the Treaty of Wallingford and Henry II had been able to establish himself unopposed after Stephen's death
- Henry II was in a position to distance himself from the unpopularity of his mother Matilda
- the new king of Scotland, Malcolm IV, was a twelve year old boy
- prominent and respected supporters of Stephen were eager to serve Henry II including Robert de Beaumont and Richard de Lacy
- Henry II's dynastic claim was one that combined descent from the Norman kings but also, through his maternal grandmother, the pre-Conquest English kings of the house of Wessex
- Theobald of Bec, the Archbishop of Canterbury had supported the Angevin succession and the English Church was a willing partner of the new king.

**Arguments challenging the view that Henry II was in a strong position as King of England by the end of 1154, might include:**

- the exchequer system, upon which royal finance rested, had been undermined
- the justice-in-eyre system developed by Henry I had broken down
- Stephen's remaining family were potential threats. His younger son William of Boulogne was a potential claimant to the throne and his brother Henry of Blois was the richest and most powerful bishop in England
- the barons had encroached on the royal demesne during Stephen's reign
- Sheriffs were in danger of becoming the hereditary positions of nobles rather than removable royal officials and some were even held in plurality by some powerful barons
- many adulterine castles had been built without royal consent and powerful barons including William of Aumale, Roger of Hereford and Hugh Mortimer initially refused to surrender them to Henry II
- due to the lack of royal authority during Stephen's reign the English Church had circumvented many of the customs that the Norman kings had enjoyed over it
- Owain Gwynedd was at the height of his power in North Wales and the Earl of Chester was only a boy, this put the North West of England at considerable risk.

In summary, students may suggest that Henry II was in an inherently strong position as a consequence of the general weariness in England from several decades of civil strife. He was recognised as the heir of both Matilda and Stephen. However, it is fair to say that England was in a poor state and that this did weaken royal authority to begin with.



**0 3** 'Threats to Henry II's control of Angevin France between 1183 and 1189 were a consequence of his own actions.'

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 supporting the view that threats to Henry II's control of Angevin France between 1183 and 1189 were a consequence of his own actions, might include:**

- by providing Richard with Aquitaine he had set up problems for himself in the long term
- as head, Henry II bore much responsibility for the dysfunction of his dynasty – certainly his long-term treatment of Eleanor after Great Rebellion demonstrates this. He had also kept Young Henry dependent on him
- Henry II used his sons against each other when it suited him. Between 1183 and 1185 he used Geoffrey and John against Richard to try to gain Aquitaine
- Henry II allegedly funded the rebellion by the Lusignans and Angouleme against Richard in 1188
- Henry II, allegedly, took Alice as his mistress; this humiliated both Richard and Philip and gave them a common cause
- Henry II suggested that Alice might marry John rather than Richard
- in November 1188 Henry II refused to acknowledge Richard as his heir
- Henry II refused the peace offered to him by Richard and John at the Whitsun conference (1189).

**Arguments challenging the view that threats to Henry II's control of Angevin France between 1183 and 1189 were a consequence of his own actions, might include:**

- young Henry rebelled against his father and attempted to take control of Aquitaine from Richard in early 1183
- Richard refused to hand Aquitaine over to his brother John in late 1183, despite becoming heir for the rest of Henry II's lands
- Eleanor continued to give Richard her unstinting support in Aquitaine at the expense of her youngest son, John
- Geoffrey flirted with an alliance with Philip between 1183 and 1186
- Richard took the cross in 1187 without the permission of Henry II
- Richard forged a very close alliance with Philip II (1187)
- Philip II's alleged 'policy' of exploiting the divisions within the Angevin family. Young Henry was used against Henry II and Richard (1183), Geoffrey was used against Henry II and Richard (1183-86) and Richard was used against Henry II (1187-89)
- Philip II placed pressure on the Angevins over the marriage of Alice (four times) and the status of the Vexin
- Philip II stirred up problems between Richard and Henry II by telling Richard that Henry II intended for Alice to marry John, with the implication of his disinheritance.

In summary, students may suggest although Henry II faced the threat of a resurgent French crown under the energetic rule of Philip II and rebellious sons he had, in many ways, provoked the situation. Henry II was not above using his sons against each other and his refusal to clarify the succession bred their suspicions in a manner that Philip II was more than willing and able to exploit.