



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/2A

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2023

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](http://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 © 2023 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, ie 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 origins of the Great Rebellion.

**[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

- the author was commissioned to write by William Marshal's family. This might mean that he is well placed to have access to information about what happened during a critical event of his subject's earlier life
- as the author was commissioned by William's family, he is unlikely to want to blame William himself for any wrongdoing in the affair of the Great Rebellion. Equally, as William and Young Henry were close, it might be likely that he would seek to remove some of the blame from the Young King as well
- this source was produced 50 years after the events that the author describes. All of the main protagonists were dead, which might allow the author to be more honest, but, equally, this could lead to some editing of the facts, especially as he had the hindsight of knowing how the rebellion turned out, what happened to Young Henry and also what William's later career would be like
- the tone of the source seeks to be measured, but the suggestion that 'the Devil' was responsible highlights that the author is trying to skip over unpalatable details which might reflect badly upon his subject, which might affect value.

### Content and argument

- the source suggests that the costs of Young Henry's lifestyle were a bone of contention leading to the Great Rebellion. This is valuable because, as he had been crowned king, Young Henry had a certain lifestyle that it was expected he would maintain. However, because he wasn't given any lands to rule over independently, he had limited income. The Pipe Rolls indicate that Young Henry borrowed extensively from the Jews in this period
- the source suggests that those around Young Henry encouraged him to oppose his father. This is valuable, as we know that the King of France was keen to sow seeds of discord. We also know that Henry II removed some of Young Henry's close advisors from his side in 1172–3, suggesting that such rumours had reached the King
- the source suggests that Young Henry enjoyed fighting on the tournament circuit. This is certainly true, and, following the rebellion's failure, this is what Young Henry spent much of his time doing. It could be suggested that this was exactly why Henry II hadn't given his son much power and influence – as he thought that he was irresponsible with money and responsibilities
- the source seeks to downplay Young Henry's own role in the outbreak of rebellion which might reduce its value. Young Henry was very active in encouraging rebellious barons over to his side, by promising them lands and money. The fact that he would rebel again, in 1183, suggests that it was not just the fact that he was poorly advised, as the source intimates.

**Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:****Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- Gerald of Wales had been present in the royal court in the 1180s, so he would have had access to official documents and records, as well as high ranking individuals from the time of the Great Rebellion
- Gerald's career ambitions were frustrated by the Angevin Kings, and he became very critical of Henry II following the King's death, which might make his account rather partisan
- Gerald chose to write about this event in a text called 'Instructions for a Prince'. Here, he is giving information about the type of rule that he perceived to be bad, thus again, hindering the source's value
- the tone of the source is vehement and highly critical of Henry II, suggesting that he deserved the bad things that happened due to the death of Becket. This makes Gerald's source less objective.

**Content and argument**

- Gerald suggests that the murder of Becket, which he describes as 'detestable wickedness' was to blame for all of Henry's misfortunes. It is possible that one of the reasons for the rebellion of Young Henry was the treatment of his former tutor, and Young Henry could use Henry's role in the murder as another piece of propaganda against his father
- Gerald suggests that, once they had reached adulthood, the sons would inevitably rebel and cause trouble. To an extent this is valuable, as Henry faced several rebellions from his sons across his lifetime. However, Gerald was writing his account with the hindsight of this, and this might not have been the case in 1173
- Gerald highlights the importance of the great nobles who were 'accomplices' during the rebellion. This is very valuable; without the barons of England's involvement, the rebellion would not have been so serious a problem. Again, Gerald is right in suggesting that Young Henry gained the affections of the nobles. Henry's rule over the nobles had been quite oppressive (adulterine castles, Cartae Baronum, strict enforcement of feudal rights etc) and so it makes sense that Young Henry would be able to make attractive offers to them
- Gerald seems to overexaggerate the consequences of the death of Becket. By 1172, Henry was fully reconciled with the Church, and the English clergy remained loyal throughout the rebellion itself.

**Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:****Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- the Chronicle was compiled around the time of the events it is describing. This means that the monks lived through the events, which could increase value, especially as some of these events happened locally to where they were situated. Monks often had access to up-to-date information via visitors to their monasteries
- the purpose of a chronicle is to detail events as they happen, which might increase value, though it is likely that the focus here will be on local events, rather than necessarily having a great deal of information about events much further afield
- as the Scottish borders were ravaged by the Scottish army, this might reduce the value as the monks would view the rebels negatively and Henry II more positively, as he put the rebellion down and ended the upheaval
- the tone of the source makes it clear that rebellions of sons are a bad thing, and that the consequences of war are bad for the inhabitants of a country thus affected. This might affect value, as the source is likely to criticise those who have started such a war.

### **Content and argument**

- the Chronicle suggests that it was ‘annoyances and injuries’ that caused Young Henry’s rebellion. This is valuable as Young Henry was greatly offended that Henry wouldn’t grant him real authority in any of the lands. The final nail in the coffin was the handing over of three strategically important castles in Anjou (to be inherited by Young Henry) as part of a marriage agreement involving Prince John
- the Chronicle suggests that Eleanor had advised her son to rebel. Again, this is valuable as Eleanor seems to have played a critical role – she was captured fleeing to the French King’s court and imprisoned for the rest of Henry II’s life, thus suggesting a key role. She was also probably responsible for persuading Richard to join the rebellion
- the Chronicle suggests that William of Scotland involved himself in order to ‘remedy old injuries’ and this does seem to be the case. At the start of his reign, Henry II had failed to keep promises made to King David of Scotland, and had repossessed swathes of territory in the north of England that William was now claiming
- the Chronicle is very opaque about Henry II’s own role in provoking so many to rebel against him and suggests that ‘evil counsels’ were involved. In reality, Henry’s own behaviour had been rather provocative.

**Section B**

- 0 2** To what extent was the dispute between King Henry II and Thomas Becket, in the years 1162 to 1170, a clash of principles rather than personalities?

**[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 the dispute between King Henry II and Thomas Becket, in the years 1162 to 1170, was a clash of principles rather than personalities might include:**

- from the outset of his reign, Henry wanted to restore royal authority in England. The Church was a key area which had assumed much freedom from royal control in Stephen's reign, and the actual appointment of Becket can be viewed as Henry's attempt to place someone pliable in control of the English Church
- the Constitutions of Clarendon were a clear attempt to enforce royal authority over the Church and define its position within the wider feudal structure. Thus, key clauses concerned the appeals to Rome, excommunications of barons and how criminous clerks should be dealt with. These were all areas which Henry, on principle, felt that he needed to be able to control
- throughout the dispute Becket claimed that he was acting as a guardian of the Church's rights. He refused to accept Henry's demands over criminous clerks based upon his belief that 'God does not try twice'
- Henry felt quite strongly that the King should be able to appoint churchmen in his realm, and he continued to do this after Becket's death and Henry's own reconciliation with the Papacy. This suggests that Henry only acted against the Church when his rights and authority were threatened.

**Arguments challenging the view that the dispute between King Henry II and Thomas Becket, in the years 1162 to 1170, was a clash of principles rather than personalities might include:**

- Henry was a famously angry man, and he himself accepted that the outcome of the dispute (death of Becket) was because Henry had spoken angry words against the Archbishop
- Becket was seemingly very stubborn and refused to even meet the King half way during their various arguments. Other Churchmen, and even the Pope, advised Becket to agree to the Constitutions of Clarendon, but he refused to append his seal at the last minute, thus incurring Henry's wrath
- Becket's exile was brought on by a mixture of Henry's clear determination to see him punished (trumped up charges of extortion at his trial) and Becket's own stubborn grandstanding and refusal to back down
- during the years of exile both men acted in a provocative manner – Becket sending angry letters all around Europe; Henry banished Becket's household and threatened the Cistercian order.

Students may conclude that the dispute began over a matter of principles, but soon descended into a personal dispute. The fact that Henry cooperated well with all of the other archbishops across his long reign, might suggest that he was not able to work effectively with Becket in particular. However, it is quite easy to argue that the issue was more about principles and any valid lines of argument will be rewarded. Stronger answers will cover the full range of the dispute, and not just focus on the events of 1163 and 1164.

- 0 3** How far was King John's loss of Normandy in 1204 due to the legacy of King Richard's conflict with King Philip II of France?

**[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 King John’s loss of Normandy in 1204 was due to the legacy of King Richard’s conflict with King Philip II of France might include:**

- Richard left an unfinished war in Normandy for John to tackle. Despite having regained most of what Philip had taken since 1193, there was a temporary cessation of hostilities agreed in 1198. This meant that, once Richard had died, Philip might aim to restart the war on better terms for himself
- Richard’s behaviour during the conflict had alienated key supporters such as the Norman Church. Equally, he had not really tackled the issue that many Norman barons had land in both Richard’s territory and Philip’s – this is something that Philip had exploited in the past and would do in 1202–04 during the war with John
- John struggled to raise the funds required for the campaign in Normandy and this, in part, explains his absence in England in 1204. This was undoubtedly a legacy of the financially exploitative reign of Richard, especially as many of the English barons were unhappy at how their money was being used to fund a war in Normandy which did not really benefit them
- Richard had left a questionable succession due to his naming of both Arthur (1191) and John (1199) as his heir – this was an opportunity which Philip was able to exploit at Le Goulet.

**Arguments challenging the view that King John’s loss of Normandy in 1204 was due to the legacy of King Richard’s conflict with King Philip II of France might include:**

- by 1199, Richard had regained most of what had been lost in Normandy in terms of land and castles – this meant that John was in a strong position moving forwards
- the cause of the war from 1202 was John’s own behaviour – his treatment of the Lusignans and his refusal to attend Philip’s court which led to him being declared a ‘contumacious vassal’
- John alienated key supporters like William des Roches due to the treatment of the prisoners of Mirebeau and the alleged murder of Arthur. This led to defections in Anjou and the invasion of Normandy from Brittany, which strengthened Philip’s position at the same time as weakening John’s
- many castles and towns in Normandy surrendered easily and this seems partly to be the result of a lack of faith in John who seemed to be avoiding the fighting in England – his attempts to relieve Chateau Gaillard were minimal and he offered no help to Rouen. This meant that Philip was able to conquer the Duchy at a rapid speed.

Students might argue that, whilst Richard did leave John a difficult legacy, the war with Philip had been going very much in Richard’s favour by his death in 1199. John’s mishandling of so many of his key barons in the first few years was critical in the loss of Normandy in 1204. However, it is entirely possible to argue that Richard’s war was to blame, or possibly that Philip’s strengths should be taken into account. Any supported answer will be rewarded.

**0 4** 'King John's dispute with the Papacy resulted in a humiliating defeat for royal authority.'

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 King John's dispute with the Papacy resulted in a humiliating defeat for royal authority might include:**

- in 1213 John offered to swear fealty to the Papacy. This meant that England became a Papal fief. In theory the Pope could now intervene in affairs in England, not just those directly involving the Church, which was something that John had been resisting when the dispute arose in the first place – the barons had even supported him over his stance, and now he had completely backed down
- John had argued with the Papacy over its right to interfere in the appointment of the new Archbishop. John was now forced into accepting this right, and, even more significantly, he had to accept Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury. This was a man who posed a threat to royal authority due to his background and connections with Paris. Langton's later involvement in the baronial rebellion in 1215 was humiliating for the King
- John had faced baronial revolt as a result of his excommunication from the Church, and prominent barons had even plotted to assassinate him. Part of the reconciliation terms were that John had to accept these men back in England. Men like Fitzwalter and de Vesci would become key rebels in 1215
- John promised to pay back the money that he had extorted from the Church during the interdict; this at a time when his need for money was great (attempts to recapture Normandy were very expensive).

**Arguments challenging the view that King John's dispute with the Papacy resulted in a humiliating defeat for royal authority might include:**

- as a Papal Vassal, John now had the unconditional support of the Papacy. This would become critical during the Civil War with the barons and the Magna Carta negotiations
- John was able to influence the elections of all of the bishops appointed after 1213 – these jobs went to loyal royal clerks like Peter des Roches
- Philip was unable to launch an invasion of England under the guise of a 'crusade' as soon as John was reconciled with Innocent
- John only paid back a fraction of the 100 000 marks that he had taken from the Church during the Interdict and Excommunication. Overall, the King was financially much better off than he had been pre-dispute
- many of John's barons had actually supported him in his attempt to keep the Papacy out of England's affairs – he does not seem to have suffered much in terms of lack of stability whilst he was excommunicated. The barons who did plot against him would probably have done so, regardless of his relationship with the Church.

Students are likely to argue that John's dispute with the Papacy was potentially very humiliating, but, in reality was not too troubling for the King. He seems to have granted away much by becoming a vassal of the Church. But this was actually to change little in reality as John remained in control of the government in England. Indeed, the Pope's support over Magna Carta was very important for John. However, they may argue the opposite and any supported line of argument will be rewarded.