



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel AS Level
In History (8HI0) Paper 2A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_2A_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see many well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on AS Paper 2A which covers the options: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053-1106 (2A.1), and England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154-1189 (2A.2). The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A more candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation this year. The detailed knowledge base required in this section to be able to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources was also more in evidence this series. However, a significant minority of candidates used their contextual knowledge in isolation, rather than to illuminate what was in the sources. Some candidates are still writing about limitations in question a and this did impact on the length of part b for some candidates.

In Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted.

It remains important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1(a)

Candidates generally understood the source although some seemed to think that William was levying taxes rather than dispensing justice. Some candidates were aware that William's authority was strengthened twice over – legally and financially. Some candidates did show some knowledge, referencing, for example the Forest Laws, but many did not and many did not draw inferences. Some candidates made the point that the source itself was evidence of William's authority – the fact that he could commission Domesday Book demonstrating the level of his power. However, the evaluation of provenance in many cases, consisted of stereotypical comments and there are still candidates who devote a large proportion of the answer to limitations which cannot be rewarded in part a. Those candidates who focused on the value of the source and developed and supported inferences achieved level 3.

Exemplar 1

This is a secure L3 response. It has inferences supported from the source and developed from the candidate's knowledge. There are some valid comments about the provenance of the source, although these could have been developed further.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

SecA a

SecA b

(This is for part (a)) Source one is valuable ~~for~~ ^{for} an enquiry into the authority William I had over the Anglo-Saxon population after 1066 because it sets out in detail laws for punishment. It states that, should a person cause the King's public way to be "narrowed", they will be liable to a 100 shilling fine. As well as this, it also says that a "fine of £8" shall be paid to the King if anyone commits a "breach of the peace." This provides an insight into the wider issue of how law was maintained during the Anglo-Norman age. We know that William was harsh when it came to punishments and that this reflected the more brutal Anglo-Norman age. For example more serious crimes would be punished by means such as castration or mutilation. Though extreme, it helps put into context the previously mentioned fines, no doubt extortionate. The source goes on to say that the King "has the right to seize possessions for three offences" and he also has the right to "have the possessions of the thief who has been condemned to death." This mention of "rights" does a great deal to show the modern historian William's authority. Most importantly, ~~the~~ Source one says that the men of Kent "agree to these laws." Surely the now telling phrase of the

(This is for part (a)) Source, it ~~has~~ shows that William was fully in control of the population by 1087, when the Domesday book was written. Indeed, after 1071, England, other than three border regions, enjoyed such peace, no doubt due to William's rule and authority. At the time, many Englishmen were inherently loyal to the Crown, no matter the writer, and the simple phrase goes a long way to prove that, even if the first outlined seem harsh. Hushmore was a step of William's rule.

The source is from the Domesday Book. Completed in 1087 and written by a native Englishman, it is not a source pure to base in any way. It sets out to establish essentially who owned what land and where, although its ultimate purpose is debated among historians.

Overall, Source one is valuable because it provides as small insight into the way William maintained law and order and in turn tells us that the authority he held was significant given that the English people "agree" to these, and many other seemingly unfair laws, the most hated being forest law. It is also valuable due to the source's reliable and trustworthy nature and would therefore be instrumental for an enquiry into William's authority over the population of England after 1066.

Question 1 (b)

The source material was understood and candidates were able to select from it to address the question. Responses to 1b tended to be supported by well-selected knowledge, although answers where the knowledge was not integrated with the source material and used to support inferences and consider the weight that could be ascribed to the source struggle to access level 3. The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Candidates often used accurate contextual knowledge but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some candidates here did not discuss limitations of the source. A small number of candidates saw weight in terms of content, i.e. crediting the source with weight where it indicated that the revolt was a threat and arguing that parts of the source which suggested that it was not a threat with less weight.

Exemplar 2

This is a secure L4 response. The response has reasoned inferences and shows an awareness of the context and values of Norman society. There are some perceptive comments on the seriousness of the threat and an attempt to ascribe weight to the source.

(This is for part (b)) I place some weight on source 2 for ascertaining into the extent to which William 1's control in England was threatened by the revolt of the earls in 1075.

The source mentions that ^{the} "plot was soon revealed". This of course is referencing the fact that the English earl Wulfstan, who was part of this revolt, told of the plan before it was initiated. Despite his confession, he was killed the following year. The fact that the source tells us that William was "in Normandy" is telling of how threatened William ~~feels~~ felt. In previous rebellions, for example in Exeter in early 1068, he left from the front only if he ~~so~~ thought the threat was severe. Otherwise, he would leave ~~as~~ his magnates in charge of restoring order as he did for the southern rebellion in 1069 whilst he was busy in the North. In 1075, Lanfranc was acting as regent and William left it to him to quell the rebellion, ^{surely telling of its unthreatening nature.}

The ~~earl~~ source describes a "fleet" of "vikings" coming to assist the rebels. Usually, when the Danes were making, William deemed it a serious threat, however, on his last two dealings with them he was able to buy them off. As well as this, the "two hundred ships" described only actually materialised after the rebellion was over. Evidently this was not a huge threat. Moreover, source 2 says that Earl ~~of~~ Roger was "seized" and Ralph "escaped". Earl Ralph de ~~of~~ Gael escaped to a castle at

(This is for part (b)) Dou after returning home to Brittany. This would later be the sight of William's greatest defeat. Finally, Source 2 states that Bretons who had been "part of the plot" were punished. ~~Source~~ Many were mutilated and this is in accordance with William's ruthless streak.

The Source is an extract from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. This source is famous for its impartiality despite its English writer. Few examples ~~or~~ ~~of~~ bias are found within it and it is for this reason that I judge it to be reliable. ~~The~~ The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was also written at the time of the events. Whilst this may sometimes restrict the writer from voicing criticism of William, it also means that the writer may well be an eye-witness account. In terms of its content, it, too, seems reliable and in accordance with accepted facts. Frustratingly brief, nonetheless it provides a valuable insight into the extent to which William I's control in England was threatened by the revolt in 1075 despite negotiating to mention Lanfranc or ~~interring~~ ~~how~~ ~~threats~~ William's policy of facing the most threatening revolts himself.

Overall, I place some weight on Source two for the aforementioned enquiry. Historically factual, it comes from a generally reliable source and is in line with other sources of the time, including that of Orderic Vitalis' 'ecclesiastical history'. ~~As~~ I am sure an

(This is for part (b)) enquiry into the cause in conjunction with another would be hugely useful, but as it stands alone, it lacks some detail and therefore I can only place some weight on it though it remains useful to compare to William's previous actions against rebels.

Question 2 (a)

There were a number of good answers and this year more candidates focused specifically on 'value'. Good answers developed inferences from the source material and there were effective answers where candidates integrated the source with their knowledge to argue for example that the existence of Cartae Baronum could be regarded as evidence of Henry's determination to exert control over the nobility. Some candidates were able to place Cartae Baronum in the context of a series of measures Henry took to control his nobility. Where candidates did not reach Level 3, it was often the result of undeveloped inferences. Although Source 3 was generally understood some responses lacked development from the candidates' own knowledge and lacked inferences. There were many examples of candidates arguing that the source had value because it agreed with their own knowledge, but without the specific knowledge to support the argument.

Exemplar 3

This is a good level 3 response. The candidate has a good understanding of the purpose of Cartae Baronum and supports inferences from the source with well selected knowledge. Valid comments are made on the value of the source.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

(This is for part (a)) ~~The source~~ Source 3 is valuable to the historian for an enquiry into Henry's control over the nobility because it shows what Henry wanted to know of his vassals through the issuing of Cartae Baronum. The source states that Henry wanted to know "how many knights does each ~~vassal~~ possess from the time of ... Henry?" ~~which suggests~~ among a number of other ~~as well as~~ as other statistics concerning the number of knights vassals had. This is useful as it shows that Henry wanted to gauge an understanding of what the nobility had that they could make use of (i.e. military resources). ~~By~~ Knowing this through Cartae Baronum enabled Henry to understand how powerful his tenant-in-chiefs were and so allowed him to extend Scutage, shield tax and other such ~~public~~ policies so that nobles paid for what they had, not what they owed. It is also useful because it shows how ~~powerful~~ much power Henry had over at least one ~~area~~ area, York, ~~and so he knew how powerful they~~ and so shows that he had a fair amount of power over his vassals in York as they had "more knights than ... necessary for that service", meaning they had more knights than the knights' quota required. This

(This is for part (a)) meant Henry could exploit this when it came to collecting taxes and raising armies.

The source is made more useful for an enquiry by its provenance. It comes directly from the Cartae Baronum of 1166 itself, which allows the historian to see exactly what was asked of Henry's ~~vassals~~ vassals, and so allows the analysis of what Henry wanted from his nobles. The fact that this is a letter because it shows a vassal's reply suggests that he had ~~extensive~~ power over nobility as he managed to ~~get~~ get answers from them when he needed information. Overall, the source has quite a lot of use into an enquiry because it shows ~~that Henry was~~ the power ~~was~~ Henry already had over the nobility, ~~as well as~~ as well as the ~~power~~ power he sought to achieve.

Question 2 (b)

There were some good candidate responses combining reasoned inferences about Henry's extension of control in Brittany, with contextual knowledge and a good overall evaluation of provenance. However, most candidates failed to reach Level 4 because answers tended to lack specific knowledge. Some candidates had very specific knowledge of the provenance of the source. However, there were candidates here who asserted that the evidence must be reliable as it was written by a clergyman, who, as a representative of God, would not lie. Candidates need to develop a greater appreciation of the values of the medieval period to assess the weight that can be ascribed to source material.

Exemplar 4

This is a secure level 4 response. It is underpinned by a knowledge of Henry's control in Brittany which is used to interrogate the source material and interpret it in context. There are sufficient valid points made on the weight of the source to achieve level 4 for evaluation.

(This is for part (b)) ~~During his reign, Henry managed to extend his control over many lands, which included France. Brittany was a key area of France over which Henry had control by the end of his reign, however he first had to establish control in the area. The source suggests that he had a long way to go, as at the beginning "he had not yet subdued Brittany" which was somewhat true. He did not have control of Brittany, however he did have vassals who had a claim to Brittany, such as Conan. The source suggests that a big way in which Henry gained control was by responding to the people when they "called upon the king of England for help". This adds weight to the source as Henry did indeed come to the help of the people of Brittany, who hated the power that people like Hoel, Count of Nantes, held in Brittany. The fact that this is mentioned in the source contributes to its weight and usefulness, as it shows how Henry was able to begin gaining access to and control over Brittany. The source also shows the bigger picture in how Henry was able to establish control by stating that Henry "took all of her rights under his own control", her being Conan's daughter Constance to whom his son Geoffrey had married. Indeed because the Countess~~

(This is for part (b)) Underage Henry was able to take the land under his own control and possession until they were able to rule, which again shows the multitude of ways in which he expanded his control over Brittany. This adds weight to the source as a whole because it mentions a lot of the events that occurred in his battle to gain control.

However there are a few things the source misses out which reduce its weight. It does not mention the brief role that Eleanor of Aquitaine played in his control. Whilst Henry was away in England Eleanor took control of his French lands but her orders for Normans to take Comburg were ignored, suggesting that ~~from~~ Henry's absence caused a reversal in the power he held in the land. Henry responded by deposing ~~Conan~~ Conan and replacing him with Geoffrey. ~~The source's purpose~~

The provenance of the source can also help to determine how much weight it holds. It is from William of Newbury and his history of English affairs. Immediately this somewhat diminishes its weight as it suggests that the ~~source's~~ ~~information~~ information he gave was not focused on ~~the~~ specifically Angerish history, meaning it is less likely to be in great detail. However, William was a monk and ~~alive~~ ~~at~~ alive during the event in 1166, which means that he may ~~possibly~~ have ~~experienced~~ ^{heard about it} it himself, ~~with~~ ~~the~~ knowledge

(This is for part (b)) That would be backed up by ~~the~~ what he found from travellers and abbey. ~~the~~ This helps to give the source more weight. His position as a monk also helps ~~to~~ because it means he was less likely to be ~~subjective~~ subjective against the king. ~~the~~ Clergy were also the most literate in society so he would have been able ~~to~~ to read other accounts for himself. A limitation exists in the fact that it doesn't state his relation to Henry. ~~with~~ If he had been ~~either~~ a close person to Henry it may ~~have~~ have reduced its weight, as it could have been subjective. However it means he was less likely to get the full story, as whilst he may have been able to gain information from travellers he ~~could not~~ ~~also~~ may not have had information from people who were actually there.

In conclusion the source has a ~~fair amount~~ lot of weight because of its content, which highlights the key parts of Henry's control, ~~power~~ ~~is~~ ~~highlighted~~ by and the fact that the source is not likely to be subjective.

SECTION B

In option 2A.1 all but four candidates answered Question 3. In option 2A.2 the most popular question was Question 8. Overall, a clear majority of candidates were able to produce analytical responses and therefore achieved at least Level 3. Most candidates demonstrated accurate and relevant knowledge.

Most answers were clearly structured, with an introduction, a main body of several paragraphs and a conclusion. Most candidates also avoided mixing up major points in a single paragraph. This allowed them to develop clear arguments and the presence of a conclusion promoted judgment/evaluation. However, a noticeable minority of candidates avoided judgement by concluding that all factors were equally important (though the word equal/equally was rarely used) and sometimes this was also indicated in rather non-committal phrases at the start of answers, such as "Henry was most definitely somewhat responsible..." [Q8].

Question 3

This was the most popular question, with more than two-thirds of the answers scoring at Level 3 and Level 4, though Level 4 responses were not common. There were some very good responses displaying strong analysis of the key features and the links between them, some candidates also prioritised the factors they discussed in order to reach a clear and justified conclusion. This was mainly supported by detailed knowledge. Those who did not reach level 4 failed to do so mainly due to lack of depth on the issues discussed and some tendency towards description rather than analysis. Knowledge was strongest in this answer, with a range of factors discussed, such as the professionalism of the Norman army, the effects of the battle of Stamford Bridge, and the feigned retreat(s). Some candidates did not access the higher levels because they did not focus on the wording of the question or because they wrote more generally about the various battles of 1066.

Exemplar 5

This is a level 4 response. The candidate has a good knowledge of the events and applies this effectively to address the question. The given factor is addressed in some detail and additional factors including the quality of the armies, Harold's mistake and luck are discussed in order to reach a judgement. Criteria are established and applied to reach the judgement and the answer is well-organised and coherent throughout.

The success of Duke William in the Battle of Hastings can partly be explained by his superior military skills but there were other factors involved that led to William's victory. For example, William made good preparations and Harold was unlucky but I believe that the main reason William won the Battle of Hastings was due to unequal armies.

William had a large amount of military skill. He saw his first battle in 1047, at the age of 18, at Val-es-Dunes and 20 years of military success followed.

Furthermore, William's Duchy of Normandy was in a threatened position which meant he had to be able to defend it from his hostile neighbours of Maine and Anjou. Not only was William a fighter but he was an efficient leader. At the Battle of Hastings, 14th October 1066, William commanded his army with assurance due

to his use of horseback to travel allowing him to move between the three sections of his army, the Bretons, Normans and French. Even before the battle of Hastings William had to command his army and keep them waiting so that they could cross the English Channel. To some this would have been impossible but for William and his superior military skill he was able to hold the army so that they could cross over to England. During the battle William's military skill really came through as he led many feigned retreats after the Breton retreat that could have caused a large amount of panic and unsurity in William's army. This therefore shows ~~the~~ William's superior military skill, however I do not believe it is the main reason for his success.

During the battle of Hastings Harold and William had significantly unequal armies and I believe this to be the main reason for William's victory. Harold's army was formed from fyrdmen and peasant fighters. The fyrd was the Anglo-saxon army and

could amass to 30,000 men with additional housecarls however Harold did not have this many men at the battle of Hastings. After the events of the battle of Stamford Bridge Harold had a significantly smaller army than usual. After hearing of William's landing at Pevensey on the 28th September, Harold forced marched his army 305 km in 8 days to reach London but he did not wait to assemble the ~~fyrd~~ fyrd and faced William with a force of around 7,000 - 8,000. If Harold had waited for the fyrd he would have had an overwhelming force that would have most likely defeated the French. William's army, much similar in size, 7,000 - 8,000, it was comprised of much more experienced fighters, ~~with~~ but also a varied force. This combination meant that William had the better army at Hastings. William had archers at the front of this army which would fire high over the Saxon shield wall, then the infantry were behind the archers who would fight Harold's men in hand-to-

hand combat. Finally, the jewel in the crown of the Norman army was the cavalry. This was experienced fighters on horseback that would charge at the shield wall and eventually broke it. Furthermore, the archers were fundamental in William's victory as it was an arrow that hit Harold which caused his death.

There are also other factors that come into play like luck, and the luck tended to fall in William's favour. Firstly it was unlucky for Harold that he was invaded twice in the space of a few weeks. An attack from the North by Hardrada and Tostig meant that the south was left defenseless and allowed for William to get to England. Furthermore it was unlucky for Harold that the wind changed direction for William to cross the English channel and reach England when he did. If the wind had not changed at that moment then Harold might have reached the south before William had crossed the channel and prepared the fyrd for battle.

Finally, the last stroke of bad luck came when Harold was killed in the battle and thus concluded the battle. If Harold had not died the battle may have ended very differently.

In my opinion, I believe that it was the fact that Harold and William had unequal armies that led to William's success in the battle. Although other factors contributed, I think that the army that William formed was far more effective and beat the English fyrdmen rather than William's superior military skills.

Question 4

There were only two responses to this question and they were weak answers. The key issue was the limited focus upon towns and trade and a more generic response on changes introduced by the Normans.

Question 5

There were only two responses to this question. Although candidates knew something about the division of the Anglo-Norman territories, candidates struggled to keep the answer within the time frame of 1087-95 and included the conflict between Robert Curthose and Henry I and the Battle of Tinchebrai which was out of period.

Question 6

Fewer candidates answered this question than the other essays on Henry II but the majority of those who did accessed level 3. Candidates used valid knowledge, particularly with regard to Henry's policies and campaigns in Wales. Many candidates did struggle with the second order concept similarity/difference and wrote two standalone accounts with limited comparison. This type of question does benefit from planning before writing.

Exemplar 6

This is a mid L3 response. The answer benefits from some good knowledge and focus on Henry's policies. The comparison is more limited and it is not until the second part of the answer that the second order concept is addressed, hence this achieves L3 but does not access L4.

~~In both~~

Henry tried to assert his dominance over his land which was lost under the reign of King Stephen. He used both political and military techniques to become overlord in his lands.

In this essay I am going to explore how he used similar policies in both his excursions to Wales and Scotland.

Wales had two rival leaders Owain and Rhys who wanted to be king of Wales. This made it very difficult for Henry to assert dominance over Wales while there was infighting. Many Lords paid homage to him such as those in Gwynedd. This was after the first military campaign into Wales. Henry used the strength of his military to persuade Lords to pay homage to him in a political feudal system fashion. However not all Lords paid homage and rebelled against English overlordship. A further two English campaigns into Wales occurred, one ending in failure due to a Welsh ambush. However the unrest ended with the death of Owain in 1170. This left Wales with a key leader (Rhys) with little to no rival claims. Rhys accepted Henry's overlordship and Henry had succeeded in his campaign. Henry used his military power to cohes

Lords into homage. However ~~it was the homage (political)~~ Henry only gained true overlordship by political means, the death of Owain secured a Welsh king, this secured political stability which meant homage could be paid. Homage was mainly paid because the Welsh had no hope of militarily outmatching Henry.

Through Henry II Scotland campaigns he dealt with three ~~major~~ kings of Scotland in a political manner. The Scottish had already been made aware of the English military power and knew they were in no position to question it. Henry had used political backing from the Scottish to get the throne of England in return for him giving Scotland more land. Henry had overbrought through political means giving Scotland financial incentives. However the Scottish king died and his 12 year old son took control. Henry refused to give the land he promised and got the king to pay homage to him at Woodstock along with Welsh lords and princes. Sadly the 12 year old died and his brother became king. The new king hated the English and sided with the French. However Henry improved his French relations thus improving his relationship with Scotland. Through this political means of friendship Henry was able to improve Scottish relations and assert his overlordship.

Both Henry II ~~Scott~~ Wales and Scotland campaigns show both similarities and differences. In his Welsh campaign he led three military campaigns to gain power and

influence. Henry didn't lead any Military campaigns against Scotland. However ~~both~~ his policies for both Wales and Scotland used political means. Both policies involved homage being paid to Henry at Woodstock. ~~also~~ ~~The~~ Both involved relations with key leaders improving. Henry's relationship with Rhys improved as Owain died. Henry's relationship with the king of Scotland improved as English and French relations improved. Relationship had a big role in obtaining Henry's overlordship.

Overall Henry II Welsh and Scottish policies were very different. Military campaigns played no role in his Scottish policies but did in his Welsh. It is only by the death of ~~the~~ Owain, the rival claim to the Welsh throne that ~~the~~ Henry's overlordship could occur. His Scottish policies were all political with trade for land, dominance of military and improved relations with France. The policies used were vastly different but both included them paying homage to him at Woodstock. They share similarities and differences but the policies implemented were mostly different.

Question 7

Although there were some well-focused responses to this question, many candidates did not achieve above level 2 because they addressed this as a causation question and discussed who was to blame for the breakdown in relations between church and state. To achieve highly on this question candidates needed to concentrate on the success/failure of Henry's policies and reach judgements about how accurate it is to say that Henry's policies were a complete failure in respect of the Church.

Exemplar 7

This is a low L3 response. The candidate does attempt to focus on consequence and makes some valid points about the relationship between Henry and the Pope, the lack of control over church courts and the coronation of Young Henry in the process of coming to a judgement. However, the consequences of the quarrel with Becket are not developed meaning that this lacks the range necessary for level 4.

During the years of 1162-74, Henry II's policy towards the English Church, was not a complete failure, meaning that it is not very accurate to say it was a complete failure, as Henry II maintained a good relationship with the Church and the Pope, got the approval needed to invade Ireland despite the policy, and also how successful the implementation of Henry's policy was.

If firstly, looking at the relationship Henry II had with the Church and the clergy despite his policy was still a good one overall. Even though he had an evidently turbulent relationship with Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, he still managed to maintain a healthy disposition with the Pope. In the situation of seeking approval to invade Ireland of Pope Adrian IV, it was later approved by Pope Alexander III, which is very significant indeed as the Irish were also Christians, so in the regular scenario of Christians spilling blood of fellow Christians, it would be seen as scandalous, so the fact that Henry II was able to obtain the approval from the head of the Church himself to do so, only highlights the good standing that Henry II was able to upkeep with the Pope despite his policy. Furthermore, the Bishop of London in particular was a stalwart supporter of Henry II, even of Henry's limitations he put on the clergy, so it shows he kept supporters of the English Church even

Though it essentially restricted the powers of the clergy, this was likely due to how Henry II kept reminding the Church at how it is God who decides on if someone is eligible to be king, and the clergy would not want to go against the king, as that is equivalent to disobeying the will of God which clergy members wouldn't dare do. So, because how Henry II managed to uphold good relations with the Church, it shows that his policy was not a complete failure in that diplomacy and communication didn't break down, and were generally still on good terms with each other.

Another reason why the policy towards the English Church was not a complete failure, was how he actually got some meaningful changes made, for example the 'benefit of the clergy' meant that members of the clergy would be treated less harshly when it came to being charged in courts or even let off completely for serious crimes such as rape, so these criminals clerics ~~would~~ were eventually dealt with when Henry II pushed to have the benefit removed as part of his more fairer legal reforms. Moreover, he also proclaimed how clergy members should be prosecuted in secular courts and not church courts, this not only would've helped combat the corruption within the Church, but also gave more power to the secular courts over the Church courts, giving Henry II a greater control over the law and the ~~operation~~ operating of the English Church in the courts. More power and control for Henry II meant that policy was not a ~~complete~~ complete failure, instead shows it to be a success in this aspect.

One final point to be made is how despite the policy, he still managed to get his heir, Young Henry, crowned through the Archbishop of York and the eventual approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury. This is very significant indeed, as it was the crowning of his heir which meant a lot to Henry, evidently so when his arguments with Thomas Becket eventually calmed down ~~had~~ after having been so.

This is because ensuring an heir is crowned consolidates power and secures the bloodline and legacy of the Plantagenets, so by Henry II getting his heir crowned whilst this passing policy against the Church, was definitely a success for him, as not only did he consolidate power with greater secular control over the church, he now had an heir secured in line to continue the family bloodline, meaning it is not accurate to say his policy against the English Church was a complete failure.

To conclude, Henry II's policy towards the English Church was not a complete failure between 1162-74, as he maintained a good relationship with the Church and this helped him go on to invade Ireland, but despite there being a papal schism at the time it only made the Pope need the support of Henry II even more anyway, and he was able to introduce his policy successfully so that he consolidated his power and had a greater control over the Church, meaning that it is not very accurate to say that Henry II's policy towards the English Church was a complete failure.

Question 8

This was the most popular question in 2A.2 and more than two-thirds of candidates achieved marks within L3 and L4. Candidates displayed a range of knowledge with most discussing Henry's bestowal of titles, though not authority, on his sons and the roles of Eleanor of Aquitaine and Louis VII. The role of particular English nobles and the King of Scots was rarely discussed. A number of answers mentioned, in a general fashion, the ways in which Henry's actions through the years had alienated the barons, but without mentioning particular individuals and their specific motives. The most effective answers debated the responsibility of Henry II against the alternative reasons and developed valid criteria which were used to reach a supported judgement.

Exemplar 8

This is a secure level 4 response. The answer has precise focus on the question and the second order concept. A range of detailed knowledge is applied effectively to discuss the key issues and reach a supported judgement. There is a logical argument running throughout the answer.

Despite Henry's many successes ~~and~~ during his reign to bring ~~and~~ more control in his realm and to bring greater justice to the people ~~and~~ of his "empire", Henry ~~remained~~ there remained a lot of opposition to him towards the later part of his reign. He had managed to please many people in his realm, however he had not managed to satisfy the needs of those closest to him, such as his son and wife, and he had created great opposition to him in other powerful monarchs, ~~particularly~~ particularly Louis VII of France. Whilst each of these groups of people played a big role in the rebellion and its causes, it was indeed Henry that arguably played the greatest role, despite the rebellion being against him. This is because of the attitude he ~~held~~ held towards others and the way in which he ~~opposed~~ treated them. However the blame was not solely ~~to~~ on the king of ~~the~~ England.

Henry had been a ~~powerful~~ powerful and relatively successful ruler for many years, having become the duke of Normandy by ~~the~~ ~~age~~ age 16 and king of England by age 19. ~~It~~ Despite this being the

Case for his own life however, it was not something he extended to his closest family. ~~He~~ in 1170 he had crowned ~~the~~ his young son, also Henry, as the Young King of England and gave his other sons many titles over the years, such as ~~the~~ the position of duke in his French lands. However this was largely just ~~an~~ an exercise in him bestowing titles ~~to~~ upon his children - their actual power was very limited. For example, whilst Henry was away from England (which was very frequently) it was Richard de Lucy, his ~~chief~~ Chief Justice, who was left in charge of ~~the~~ England, not the Young King. This was something that greatly troubled the young monarch as he essentially had nothing ~~to~~ to do, and no real power, despite ~~being~~ being King. ~~What~~ He was of a similar age to ~~his~~ what his father had been when he gained immense power, so the fact that ~~the~~ Henry II did not ~~seem~~ allow the time for his children was seen as greatly hypocritical, and was loathed by the Young Henry.

However ~~it~~ it was not just his eldest son whom he had managed to upset. Henry had also ~~seem~~ denied his other sons, ~~like~~ Richard, Geoffrey and John, the land and power they so desired. Whilst this was not such a massive problem for John (he was only ~~the~~ six at the time of the Great Rebellion) it was a ~~big~~ big reason for the hatred

his other sons had, as again they had titles but no power. The agreements made at Mortimer's were not forthcoming and so they were left in a position where their father and King still held the greater power over their rightful lands. This was a major ~~reason~~ part of Henry's blame for the Great Rebellion, as his reluctance to part with his lands and ~~riches~~ riches meant he was greatly opposed by those close to him leading to their rebellion. His treatment of his wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, also compounded matters as Henry II greatly limited her power and betrayed her by having numerous affairs, especially with Rosamund Clifford. Whilst it was quite normal for medieval monarchs to have mistresses, the personal upset that Henry caused by having affairs meant that his wife was bound to hate him, ~~and so~~ and so this ~~is~~ is another factor in which Henry is to blame for his actions leading to the Rebellion.

However Henry is not entirely to blame; the rebellion was against him after all and so to suggest that he was the only ~~one~~ one responsible would be incorrect. A large portion of the ~~the~~ responsibility lies with his sons and wife, and the actions ~~they~~ they took leading up to and during the rebellion which worsened matters. A major event was the fact that they all, except ~~for~~ John, tried to

reach Louis VIII in Paris and join his fight against Henry. Eleanor was captured en route, but ~~Richard~~ Richard the Young King and Geoffrey all made it to Paris and began to help Louis. This clearly shows that they held partial blame to the Great Rebellion as ~~the~~ they were actively pursuing a path that would create tension between them and the King of England. The more tension that grew the more closer the rebellion came, as it was ultimately due to the hatred and conflict between the two sides that led to the outbreak of rebellion. ~~Richard~~ Henry's sons also made matters worse in other ways. The Young King challenged Henry at Limoges in 1173 over his inheritance and power over his lands. ~~Richard~~ ~~Richard~~ This shows that more blame could be put on at least the Young King, as he was potentially pushing his luck with his demands and so was fueling the tension. ~~As well as this~~ As well as this, ~~Richard~~ Richard also had a big part to play, as he began to issue his own writ alongside his mother in Aquitaine, which shows that he was deliberately trying to create a more powerful ~~power~~ position for himself, at the expense of his father, and was ~~potentially causing~~ ~~causing~~ deeply provoking. Richard's desire to have power and his hatred of the way Henry treated Eleanor meant that ~~Henry~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ everything eventually ~~became~~ became rebellion eventually ensued, with him ~~not~~ attacking Henry's

murders at Normandy, along with his brothers and other opponents of the King. This was something he continued to do until the Young King and Louis sued for peace in 1174, showing he was adamant in having revenge against Henry II.

Whilst Eleanor was captured before the proper outbreak of the rebellion in spring 1173, her role cannot be excluded. She actively encouraged her sons to join Louis in Paris, and tried to get there herself. She also made relations with French barons and encouraged them to rise up against her husband. This ~~show~~ animosity, spurred by the hatred she felt for Henry ~~due~~ (due to him limiting her power as Duchess of Aquitaine and having many affairs with others) shows that she had a big responsibility for the lead up to the rebellion, as she ~~was~~ was trying to gather ~~as the~~ an immense opposition to Henry. She may not have been an active part of the rebellion itself, but she ~~was~~ had a big part in its lead up.

Finally another ~~very~~ key player that holds much responsibility is Louis III, King of France. He was greatly in opposition to Henry, because the King of England was a very powerful vassal of the French King, meaning Louis couldn't enforce dominance over him. He

had a great motive in this, as well as the fact that Henry married Eleanor ^{soon} after her divorce from Louis (8 weeks later in fact) and married without her permission. ~~Henry did not express~~ His responsibility to the rebellion itself is shown in how he treated other opponents to Henry, especially his sons. St. Louis ~~welcomed~~ welcomed the Henry's sons when they came to Paris, and actively helped them in ~~their~~ their fight against Henry. He acknowledged the Young King as the true king of England, and dismissed delegations from Henry as he was not the "true king". Louis also helped provide many troops and resources for the physical rebellion, showing that he had a great responsibility because of how he ~~he~~ helped to fuel the rebellion. ~~The~~ The fact that he encouraged Henry's sons to push Henry for land and inheritance shows even more that he held ~~the~~ responsibility, as he was ~~using~~ effectively using others to ~~of~~ make the situation worse and provoke an actual ~~rebell~~ rebellion. He managed to use his position as someone who was willing to help against the powerful ruler, meaning ^{Henry's} sons and ~~other~~ other opponents were also more likely to rebel if they had a monarch leading them.

Based on the performance of this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source
- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a and 2a do not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

