



Pearson

Examiners' Report  
June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 2A

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### 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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2017

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the new A Level paper 2A which deals with 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 question which is based on two linked sources. 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 and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out reasoned inferences developed from the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the question on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important that candidates appreciate that weight is not necessarily established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were aware of this instruction and achieved it using a variety of different approaches.

Candidates are more familiar with the essay section of Paper 2 and in section B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; many candidates lacked any counter argument at all. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

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

## Question 1

There were nearly twice as many responses to Question 1 compared with Question 2 but in general the answers to question 2 were of a higher quality. Candidates struggled to focus on the question and a significant number investigated the reasons for Duke William's success rather than addressing the question of how far the historian could make use of the sources. A small minority of candidates answered the question based on own knowledge. In the section B question, distribution was uneven with very many more candidates attempting Question 3 than Question 4; for questions 5 and 6 the distribution was slightly more balanced although the answers for Question 6 were of a generally higher calibre.

This is a very familiar topic and candidates were able to draw on a wealth of knowledge to set the sources in context. The best responses stood back from the sources and evaluated them in the light of their contextual knowledge and weight that could be attached to the sources to reach a reasoned judgement. However, for some candidates the question seemed to present difficulties. The main problem was a tendency to misinterpret the question to focus on the degree of Duke Williams's success and the number of mistakes made by King Harold and to answer the inquiry itself rather than the question which asks candidates to address how far the historian could make use of the sources in the investigation. In some instances, the reference to sources was cursory and much dependence placed on own knowledge. Too many responses focused too much attention to what was not in the sources and used this as the basis of their evaluation. Unless candidates can show that omissions are deliberate, this line of argument is of little value. Candidates are asked to evaluate what is there rather than what is not. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some understanding of the source material and in most cases provenance of the sources was noted. In particular, candidates frequently identified the nature and purpose of source 2 influencing its utility and to a lesser extent its weight. Most answers were level 3 and low level 4 and few candidates were able to interpret source material in the context of values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.

Together, source 1 and source 2 would be useful for a historian to study why William I's 1066 campaign was successful. This is as the two sources are written from opposing points of view and as such can be used to cross reference each other. This means that although source 2 is alone, not very useful as a bias representation to prove William it is, together made useful in reference with source 1 - which is itself useful as it reliably fits with many details of the battle.

Above, source 1 would be more useful than source 2 for a historian investigating the reasons for William's success. This is firstly because it is from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. This could mean that the source is less biased towards the Anglo-Saxons, and would hence present the battle favourably, but this does not seem to be the case as it blames 'the sins of the people' (the people being Saxons) for the defeat, showing any bias is balanced out. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was furthermore kept with the intention of being a historical record of Saxon life (having been founded with that intent by Alfred the Great in 890) and as such is likely to be looking to keep an as close to accurate record of events, making it reliable. The content of the source is also very useful. It says the 'English had fought two pitched battles... within five ~~to~~ nights', this is both accurate as the Saxons had fought at Gate Fulford and Stamford bridge on the 20th and 25th of September (respectively) and is useful as it infers a reason for the defeat was tiredness. That 'Duke William came from Normandy to Peversey' is also accurate and is further useful as it explains why King Harold rushed down to stop William; as it is known William landed around Peversey. Thus the source both provides evidence that William did indeed go to Peversey as well as inferring that this became a reason for Harold's defeat as the fact Harold rushed upon hearing where William was means the above mentioned tiredness had an impact and that William was able to catch Harold 'by surprise'. That the source also notes the 'heavy casualties' is also useful as those casualties that the source is giving evidence of allowed William to take England

as many of the Saxon's best warriors were killed at the battle, as the source suggests when it says 'many other good men also died'. Finally, the source explains the use of terror tactics that William used after Hastings when it says 'he reconquered the entire region'. This provides evidence for the tactics William used at Ramsey and then in Sussex and Hampshire (to get London to surrender); this makes the source useful as it then links the terror to the surrender by ending that 'they submitted to [William]'.

Source 2 is, on the other hand, not useful as a skeleton source. It is written by 'Bishop Guy of Amiens' who was a member of the William's court and was written for the express purpose of praising William. This all means the source has considerable bias for bias alone would not necessarily

be an issue in a general investigation, it could for instance show Norman propaganda, but for a specific investigation into the reasons for William's success it may mislead us. This is also reflected in the source's content. It talks of the tactical retreat that the Normans used, for instance, but explains the tactical one as a prepared 'feint' and presents it as 'cunning'. But, the issue of the retreat is a controversial one as it is believed that ~~that~~ the tactical retreat was an actual retreat that was then seen as a good tactic when it had the knock on effect of leading some Saxon's away. Hence, by painting all the retreats as purposeful the source is more biased. Its bias is also shown in the way that it discusses the English as it calls them a 'mob' and 'peasants'.

and though there are ways it also praises the English ('wisdom war') this praise at only comes to state the death emphasise the success of the Normans that the source is then looking up to. Finally, the source is unreliable as it puts a large amount of emphasis on William, with him being his 'head of his helmet' and giving an impression of a place, all of which seems unlikely to have happened (especially involving a helmet when on a horse with arrows flying around) and as such undermines the source's credibility.

Nevertheless, the sources are together useful as the more reliable Source 1 acts as a foundation with which to cross reference Source 2. On top of this, there are some events that Source 2 is (alone) useful that means they are together useful. For example it talks about the shield wall ('back shield to shield') which was a wall worn Saxon tactic that had been used against the Vikings at Stamford bridge for instance - which had lasted that battle into a stalemate for a day. It also references the housecarls, those 'wisdom war', who were the personal care of the Saxon army and part of the Royal Household. This means these are parts of Source 2 which can be used with Source 1 to investigate why William was successful. It tells us, first of all, that it was not a completely one-sided battle as Source 1 states 'the king and his men most hard fought hard' and source 2 also notes the initial strength of the Saxons with 'None can penetrate the dense English shield wall'. They also both express the scale of the losses, which as explained before either meant that the Saxons lost the

best defenders. Source 1 does this by noting the 'heavy casualties on both sides' which is an accurate statement as even William lost men (Henry came with 10,000 and Henry with around 8,000). Source 2 also backs this up by saying 'ten thousand have suffered slaughter' which may be exaggerated but shows the scale that (in reference to source 1) seems to have been true.

To conclude, the sources would be useful to a historian investigating the reasons for William's success in 1066. Though they may each have some bias (source 2 especially) in the end this is outweighed by the use ability to cross reference the two. This then makes them useful as together they tell us of the how hard fought the battle was, <sup>and</sup> of the impact of the scale of the losses, ~~and~~ that occurred at Hastings. As well as the trust tactics and weakness source 1 gives as reasons.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. The candidate interrogates the two sources together, using contextual understanding and the weight that can be attached to the provenance of the sources to draw a judgement about how far they could be used by the historian.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When answering source questions, you should attempt to stand back from the sources and consider what use an historian could make of them for answering the inquiry.



## Question 2

Candidates were very familiar with this topic and most were able to set their answers in context. In answering this question most candidates focused mainly on the sources rather than describing from their own knowledge. Most candidates clearly identified that source 3 focused on Henry the Young King and source 4 on Queen Eleanor. Although some candidates also struggled to demonstrate their ability to interpret source material in the context of values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn, it is interesting to note that many of the candidates who were able to do so focused on source 4 and considered the letter to Eleanor in the context of 12th century attitudes to women as both wives and rulers. As with question 1, candidates tended to focus on answering the inquiry itself rather than the question which asks candidates to address how far the historian could make use of the sources in the investigation. There was also a large number who focused on the omissions rather than the content of the sources. All sources cannot be comprehensive and candidates do need to focus on what they have rather than to argue that they need different sources.

~~the role of Henry II's family in the Great~~ The role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 was mixed. The sons of Henry II, Henry the Young King, Geoffrey and Richard were involved in the rebellion against their father. Their mother, Eleanor of Aquitaine, ~~was~~ separated physically from her husband, residing in Aquitaine and supporting her sons, particularly Richard who shared her leadership in Aquitaine.

Source 3 is written by Gerald of Wales. The significance of this is that Wales were loyal to the English crown and thus Henry II, having had previous rebellions in the 1160's from Owain and Rhys, their loyalty was now held by the crown at the time of the Great Rebellion. ~~therefore~~ In addition to this Gerald was a chaplain and royal clerk to Henry II's court. This would again suggest loyalty to the crown and the honour of the church. A historian could make use of source ~~three~~ 3

to investigate the role of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion because of the time it was written, which is 1189, not too long after the events occurred and in addition to this is the closeness that Gerald of Wales had to Henry II and this would suggest that the information displayed is potentially historically accurate. However it can also be suggested that the source is not overly useful as it can ~~be~~ be argued that the closeness <sup>and loyalty</sup> to the king, leads to limitations of the source. These consist of the potential that the source does not include objective factual awareness of the events that occurred, the source is written in a manner which defends the king and does not give reasons for the rebellions on behalf of the sons. Thus rendering this source less useful in investigating the role of Henry II's family due to a loyal relationship between the writer of the source and the crown. ~~Source 3~~ In source 3 it states that Henry the younger king couldn't hide his 'wickedness' that he planned against Henry II. The use of the term 'wickedness' suggests a very subjective view to the events, rather than reasoning to why Henry the younger ~~was~~ was against his father at this time. The conflict between the two, and in turn Henry II's other sons was down to the lack of power the sons had and the territory they were supposedly ~~entitled~~ entitled to after the Peace of Mortimer, where Henry the younger king was provided with Normandy, England and Anjou,

and importantly also Richard who was to rule Aquitaine. However Henry II retained control over Aquitaine and the other French territories and Richard de Lucy was the regent for Henry the Younger, meaning that despite Henry the Younger being crowned king, Henry II's sons had little authority over their inheritance. This is arguably <sup>not</sup> useful for historians in their investigation into the role of Henry's family as it suggests elements of bias and also lack of knowledge as to why the young king acted in such a way. In addition the rebellion is described as 'unnatural', suggesting again an overan loyalty to the crown. Source 3 can be argued to be useful to the historian investigating the family's roles in the Great Rebellion as it demonstrates the conflict between the sons, ~~who~~ 'hoped to replace his father' ~~suggests~~ shows ~~the~~ the aims of the sons, Henry, Richard and Geoffrey. Thus this is useful as it shows that the sons roles would have been those of leaders in the Great Rebellion. With the 'secret accomplices', it would lead ~~to~~ a historian to believe there was a weak family bond within the ~~the~~ Plantagenet family and thus is useful to a historian as it ~~acquires~~ makes evident the role of the family, with the sons leading the rebellion and Henry II despite 'divine providence' at initial success is alone amongst disloyal men. The source is also limited as it does not include an account of Eleanor of Aquitaine's role in

the Great Rebellion, thus this is arguably not useful to a historian.

Source 4 was written by Peter of Blois in 1173. At this time Peter was Archbishop of Rouen and a subject to Henry II, the source is useful because of the time it was written which is during the events of the rebellion so potentially as a primary source can be used, however it is again based on someone who is loyal to Henry II.

Source 4 is a letter written to Eleanor of Aquitaine, urging her to return to her husband with her sons.

It is thought to have been written at the request of Henry II, suggesting it is not useful as it does not necessarily reflect

the behaviour and ~~role~~<sup>was</sup> role of Eleanor of Aquitaine in the Great Rebellion. The source states that Eleanor has broken the bond of marriage and its promise by leaving Henry II and returning to Aquitaine, 'you have opened the way for your children to rise up against their father', this would suggest the Eleanor of Aquitaine's role in the rebellion was to encourage her sons to go against their father.

This is useful to a historian because it states the role of Eleanor clearly and coincides with source 3 in that the sons are against their father, thus this source is useful in displaying the roles of Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion. In addition however it can be argued that this source is not useful as it is written by a member of the church

who would argue that her lack of action in just simply leaving Henry was enough for her role to be against him and an attempt to encourage their children to side against him rather than evaluating her actions, as the church had put great importance in the vows of marriage.

In conclusion together both the sources can be useful in ~~examining~~ investigating the role of Henry II's family in the great rebellion as source 3 provides evidence of the actions of the sons of Henry II and source 4 the actions of Eleanor. Thus, his families roles are marginally accounted for and with that establishing their roles to a reasonable extent. However, ~~it~~ it can be argued that from the evidence displayed, that source 3 is more useful for historians investigating the role of the family as it accounts for the three sons and Henry himself and displays potentially more trustworthy information that coincides with other contextual information, whereas source 4 is aimed directly at just Eleanor of Aquitaine and its focus is mostly on her leaving Henry II, no actions are shown to present her role and thus this source is rendered less useful. However together both sources ~~can~~ ~~do~~ ~~can~~ go reasonably far in <sup>investigating the</sup> ~~examining~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~roles~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~family~~ ~~due~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~members~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~family~~ ~~being~~ ~~accounted~~ ~~for~~ ~~and~~ ~~reasonable~~ ~~evidence~~ ~~of~~ ~~their~~ ~~actions~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~effect~~ ~~they~~ ~~had~~ ~~on~~ ~~Henry~~ ~~II~~.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a good level 4 response. It is stronger on assessing the value of source 3 and devoted time to writing about omissions rather than focusing on what is in the sources. It makes a range of valid point about source 3 and develops some reasoned inferences.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

When addressing source questions, focus on what the historian could draw from the sources rather than considering what is not there.

### Question 3

This was an extremely popular question and, although there were some level 5 and high level 4 answers, there were also a level 1 and some level 2s. A number of candidates ignored the exact question and focused instead on the problems caused by Edward the Confessor's failure to produce an heir and focused much of their answer on the period after Edward's death. Candidates were knowledgeable about the power of the Godwin family in terms of their wealth and control of most earldoms and most contrasted their power with Harold's and Tostig's support for the monarchy in fighting the Welsh prince in the 1050s and 1060s. In general, the candidates found it easy to identify other problems faced by Edward later in his reign and there were many clear explanations of the impact of the Welsh Wars and Tostig's problems in Northumbria. A few candidates were unable to consider other problems and instead described a range of features in the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom that were not problems. Most candidates found it possible to reach an overall judgement although not always well substantiated but relatively few candidates were able to establish valid criteria which could be applied to reach a judgement. Some conclusions summarised the points made but did not reach a judgement.

The power and influence of the Godwin family was a significant factor facing the monarchy in the reign of Edward the Confessor. However, there are other factors to consider as well such as the Welsh wars and the Northumbria uprising.

The Godwin family ~~is~~ was a significant problem to a high degree because they had many supporters throughout the kingdom and most of the earldoms was all ruled by them. For example, the earldoms <sup>were</sup> ~~at~~ shared among all 5 members such as Tostig, Harold Godwinson and Gytha. This was a huge problem because whatever the king did that didn't favour them could result in the annihilation of the monarchy because their combined had more wealth and larger force than the king alone. The level of influence they had was shown when Godwin family returned from exile in 1056.

and they were able to gather lay support so quickly that it caused Edward to raise his own army to fight. However, the significance of Godwin's family shown when the king's men didn't even want to fight them which explains the threat level of them they were. In addition to this the marriage to Edith in 1054 consolidated the power and influence the Godwins had because now they had ~~access~~ more access to King's power and increase influence through their daughters. However, the reason why it is ~~is~~ important Godwin's family is important to high degree only is at a time, the fact that Edward was able to replace ~~the~~ Godwin supporters with Normans before they were exiled shows that the level of threat they posed ~~is~~ was smaller to a smaller degree.

The Welsh was ~~still~~ moderate significance to the problem ~~was~~ ~~mainly~~ because Gruffydd declared himself king and was expanding through north and Harold was becoming a formidable leader through each campaign. For example, in 1062 Harold led a small army to kill Gruffydd because of the accumulation of times he broke peace deals and led raids into the kingdom. In the end Harold and Tostig was able to retrieve Gruffydd



head because his men was tired of running. This shows that the Godwin family undepined any factor and that this allowed Harold to be praised by many as a strong leader and capable of protecting the kingdom. The reason for it being of moderate significance is due to the indirect way it was a problem to the

monarch. Harold did remove the problem faced by the monarch but also created another problem that he had an increasing track record of great leadership.

In comparison to the Godwin family, it still holds a higher level of significance because they are the ones who deal with the problems facing the monarchy but at the same time making the crown look and become stronger through campaigns which they would have recovered wealth and men through plunder.

The Northumbrian uprising in 1065 showed limited significance because it was only a small revolt that happened due to the type of governance being tried to impose on them and the fact that they didn't like how a southerner is trying to rule the north. The real problem facing the monarchy was when Harold dealt with the problem. Instead of following orders of Edward to raise an army and put down the revolt, he realised it would cause civil war and lead to defences weakened by

foreign mission. Therefore, Harold used diplomacy by 'deposing' Tostig replacing the position with a new earl and sent Tostig into exile. The reason why this shows limited significance is due to the fact that despite Harold showing another set of leadership skills and though diplomacy and gaining more supporters,

he sent Tostig away which eliminated an ally by opposition for Edward because Tostig was second in command and richest. In comparison to the factor of Godwin family, the family still holds the title of being the most significant problem because the figures who dealt with the problem was Harold again and it is argued that instead of removing a threat to the monarchy it increased it because Harold now controls the wealth and men of Tostig under one command.

In conclusion after looking at all sides of the arguments the Godwinson family was highly significant because of the level of wealth and men and men they had that was entrenched. The rebellion was of moderate significance because it was led by Godwin who declared himself king and after 6 years was put down by Harold with force. The Northumbrian Uprising 1065 had limited

significance because it was dealt with diplomatically and not force and didn't last as long as the Welsh war did. It is completely accurate to say that the most significant problem facing the monarchy in the reign of Edward the Confessor was the power and influence of the Godwin family because it undermined all other factors and their power and influence was clearly shown when they returned from exile and forced Edward to reconfirm their ~~land~~ interference and to banish all Norman supporters from England.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. It explores three key factors in depth and established good criteria to allow a judgement.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This question focuses on significance. You need to develop criteria by which to judge significance and use them to weigh up the relative significance of the problems facing the English monarchy.

## Question 4

There were a number of very good answers to this question, but a number of candidates did struggle with the concept of lay investiture and very few had any awareness of the situation of the papacy and how this might influence the question. Although there were relatively few answers to this question, most avoided the temptation to write narrative explanations and analysis was usually attempted. Some candidates did not have enough material to address this question and so wrote at length about the problems in the reigns of William I and William Rufus. Some candidates found it possible to reach an overall judgement, although not always well substantiated, but relatively few candidates were able to establish valid criteria which could be applied to reach judgement. Many judgements were merely summaries.

Henry I ~~is~~ rose to the English throne with the intention of improving papal relations following his brother's disdainful approach to the Church. However the resulting conflict <sup>troublesome</sup> despite these intentions ~~was~~ occurred due to a combination of several factors, stemming from the actions of both parties.

Henry maintained an attitude to papal reform which was ~~of a similar~~ essentially in line with his father's; he was open to moral reform, so long as this did not compromise his power and authority as king. ~~These~~ ~~attitudes~~ ~~seen~~ These sentiments had allowed William I to enjoy good relations with the papacy, as he and Lanfranc were able to politely refuse to profess allegiance, however, in striking contrast, Henry was faced with a much more vigorous and assertive papacy, as well as a rigid principled archbishop.

The source of Henry's conflict with the Church was concerned his refusal to stop practicing lay investiture and his insistence of making ecclesiastical figures give homage to him as the king. Anselm, having been invited back in 1100 after going into self-imposed exile, had a huge problem with this. Despite warnings from Anselm and even Pope paschal were ignored, and as Henry consolidated his position in England he felt able to exert increasing pressure on Anselm to give homage to him. This is evidence of how Henry I's attitude and actions perturbed Anselm and exacerbated their relative conflicts of interest, and in this case an entirely deliberate terms which again pushed Anselm into self-imposed exile.

The irony here lies behind the fact that Anselm himself had been installed in Canterbury by an act of lay investiture<sup>in 1093</sup>, and so his vident moral opposition to the practice is seen as irrational by many historians. ~~However~~ His reservations about lay investiture were entirely prompted by the developing enthusiasm of papal reform, showing how the attitudes of the papacy as well as Anselm led to the conflict of interest which explains the perturbed relations between church and

English state in the period 1100-06.

Despite this, papal actions did in fact resolve the situation. After some of Henry's advisers were actually excommunicated by the Pope for encouraging the king to practise lay investiture, it became clear that Henry would soon be next and provoked a realisation that something needed to be done. In addition, the settlement reached in 1106 between Henry and Anselm was constructed by the papacy, as earlier in the period pope ~~Paschal~~ Paschal had sent ~~William~~ Harold a letter of intermentia, condemning his ~~practising~~ practical lay investiture yet making no reference to the issue of homage, which was Anselm's other prerogative. ~~Based on this~~ Based on this, the terms of the agreement between Anselm and Lanfranc stated that the king had to give up lay investiture, yet he retained the right to receive homage from ecclesiastical vassals. #

On this premise, Anselm was ~~not~~ numbered, and thus a case develops which implicates him as the main source of conflict. 'Anselm and the papacy' are often lumped together when considering

the conflict between Henry I and the state, however, in reality, on this crucial issue his attitude and actions were the sole cause of conflict. Pope Paschal was evidently not as

impassioned as Anselm on the issue of ecclesiastical vassals giving homage to a lay lord, however, his refusal to give homage to Henry was not ascertained by the Church at this time.

Whether this was to neutralize conflict or stemmed from genuine disinterest is <sup>in</sup> clear, yet what is clear is that Anselm had to concede his views on this particular issue.

In ~~addition~~, addition, the agreement reached did not have a significant impact on Henry's ability to appoint bishops. He was still able to put his men forward, rendering the central power of the king which characterised Norman rule in England undiminished, even in the face of Anselm and the papacy. Here a comparison with ~~the~~ Henry's father is valid in investigating the source of conflict, as their attitudes were clearly in tune ~~and~~. The ~~one~~ difference between them was the fact that William had a reforming archbishop who agreed with his avoidance of diminishing his own power, and faced a papacy

which conceded to this with relative ease, as well as not being concerned with lay investiture. Henry's papacy, ~~was~~ in contrast, did push the issue of lay investiture, and even used excommunication as a tool of protest. Beyond this, Anselm's attitudes and intentions superseded even those of the Pope.

In conclusion, in order to investigate the explanation of church conflict in this period, we must avoid considering ~~Henry and~~ Anselm and the papacy as one entity, since (as Paschal's letter demonstrates) they did not always <sup>prioritise</sup> ~~represent~~ the same ideas. On this tenet, the source of the conflict can be blamed on Henry's provocations and Anselm's persistence, which was finally resolved by the papacy's terms in 1106.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 response. It has an understanding of the investiture debate and its role in the conflict between Church and state in the reign of Henry I. It focuses on the roles of both Henry and Anselm. In places, it is a little descriptive. The conclusion tends to summarise rather than judge.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

To reach the highest levels, it is important to reach a judgement in relation to the question. In this case, you need to consider whether Henry is more responsible than Anselm and the Church.



## Question 5

This is a popular topic and most candidates who addressed the question had a good knowledge of the topic. The best responses were able to assess the importance of Henry's aims in causing the conflict in comparison to other chosen causes such as Becket's attitude and actions. However, some candidates struggled with the focus of the question and a number of answers related a history of Henry's relationship with Becket leading up to the murder rather than focusing fully on the issue of Henry's aims and the role they played in the conflict. This limited access to levels 4 and 5 for those candidates. Many candidates reached an overall judgement, although not always well-substantiated, and relatively few candidates were able to establish valid criteria which could be applied in order to reach judgement. A number of judgements focused on the personalities of Becket and Henry with some even introducing psychological "profiles" based largely on assertion. Again this approach is limited in accessing the higher levels.

Plan:

Henry was responsible

1- self-interested motives to get Becket as Archbishop

2- wanted to restore power to crown like it was in 1135, strict policies, Westminster in 1163 and contribution in 1164

3- took it further by contempt at court and embezzlement charge & coronation with York

Becket was responsible:

1- theatrical, overexaggerative

2- ran to Louis VII and Pope - exactly against what Henry wanted

Role of Pope:

- sided with Becket

Conclusion: ultimately Henry's policy toward the church caused the conflict and Becket simply fuelled the fire

## Essay:

There are many reasons why the conflict with the Church escalated <sup>as</sup> far as to the death of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury and it is clear that the desire of King Henry II to control the Church was the main factor. However, it is also important to consider the other ways Henry caused a ~~decline~~ <sup>decline</sup> in relations and the role Becket himself played when understanding the overall conflict.

Henry II began his reign by implementing financial and legal reforms to increase his authority and reduce the ~~author~~ authority of his subjects. One other key aspect that he was desperate to change was the role of the Church. The main aim was to restore ~~papal~~ church authority to the way it was in 1135, when most power resided with the king. Some key points he wanted to ~~implemen~~ <sup>implement</sup> were: no communication with <sup>the</sup> pope unless the king approved, there could be no papal appeals to Rome without his approval and papal legates were not to enter England without permission. These three points were the key causes of conflict, which led to a decline in church-state relations. Henry had previously encouraged Thomas Becket to become the archbishop of Canterbury as Becket had been a legal chancellor to Henry and it gave him the opportunity to impose crown authority over the Church. The key point of error here was the fact that when Becket was ~~given~~ awarded this prestigious role, he took it extremely seriously by becoming devout and giving up his drinking and womanising ways. This was the initial trigger for Henry as he would not be able to assert ~~author~~ authority over Becket. Disaster struck at Westminster in 1163 when Henry proposed his new reforms, which were immediately rejected by the new archbishop. ~~Henry~~ One ~~to~~ reform Becket opposed completely was that the king thought clergy members should be ~~test~~ put on trial in front of the Church but then taken by his officers for sentencing, there would be no more benefit of the clergy: where church members would receive lesser punishment, usually only penance.

Becket argued that God 'does not judge twice' so Henry didn't have a leg to stand on. Tensions were increased when Henry removed him from the archbishop's household and confiscated his castles, thus showing that the initial aim to assert ~~author~~ authority over the Church caused conflict with the state.

Another example of Henry asserting authority over the Church was in 1164 with the Constitutions of Clarendon. This was an article, which essentially diluted the church power and placed it all in the king's hands. There were only 2 clauses which protected the rights of the church, thus angering Becket even further. This was the initial trigger for Becket to flee to the arms of the Pope. Henry confiscated land and money held by Becket in addition to the 400 people he deported for being related to Becket or having some kind of relationship with him. The other trigger for Becket's flee into exile was when Henry called the former Chancellor to court on ~~the~~ the basis of contempt and embezzlement. By now it was obvious that the relations between the church and state had almost completely declined as there was no real need for these charges other than the fact that Henry wanted ~~Becket~~ Becket's resignation. This point partly links to other reasons for ~~a desire~~ <sup>conflict</sup> as it is an example of how Henry was imposing authority directly over Becket after he refused to give his seal on the constitutions of Clarendon as it was far too legally binding. Therefore, the desire to control ~~Becket~~ ~~Becket~~ Becket directly led to more conflict, though not directly causing church-state conflict; this was more personal.

The actual role of Becket himself and the Pope are both key points to consider. ~~Becket~~ Becket fled directly to Pope Alexander III, which was exactly what Henry was trying to change, this was a direct ignoral of the Crown and demonstrated strained relations. The conflict escalated further after he went to

visit Louis XII of France, a direct enemy to Henry and another example of Becket being a disobedient subject. Finally, ~~the~~ the fact that the Pope chose to side with Becket after his rather theatrical performance upon his arrival showed a clear ~~power~~<sup>power</sup> struggle between the Church and state and this openly showed the public that relations were extremely unstable. This ultimately caused conflict as well, although not as significant ~~as~~<sup>as</sup> the role that Henry played.

Overall, it seems obvious that Henry's ~~desire to~~<sup>desire to</sup> control the Church was responsible for the conflict in church state relations as he was far too demanding and left the clergy feeling undermined ~~and astonished at~~<sup>and astonished at</sup> how adamant ~~Henry~~<sup>he</sup> seemed to be to dilute their ~~author~~<sup>authority</sup>. It is also fair to say that the role that Becket played was like adding fuel to the fire in the sense that he was so stubborn as well, causing Henry to become ~~and~~ vindictive and this led to the murder of the archbishop but the king controlling the Church was the main cause for a decline in relations.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. It has a good focus on Henry's aims and supported by a range of well-selected knowledge. It reaches a judgement based upon valid criteria.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This is a causation question. In these questions, you need to look at the given reason and consider alternatives in order to reach a judgement in relation to the question.

## Question 6

This question seemed to attract some of the most effective answers in section B. Although some candidates struggled to identify the specific financial reforms referred to, far more were able to explain both financial and legal reforms in some detail. Candidates drew on a wealth of knowledge to address the question including various taxes, re-coinages, Mort D'Ancestor, Assizes of Clarendon, the Inquest of Sheriffs etc., and used this knowledge to consider the strengthening of royal power. Candidates who described reforms without addressing the impact on royal authority struggled to achieve above low level 4. This question provoked some of the most effective examples of the ability to establish valid criteria.

When ascending to the throne of England in 1154, Henry II was faced with a country in ruin. In the aftermath of the Anarchy of Stephen's reign, the country's financial, legislative and indeed political institutions were all desperately in need of rebuild and reform when Henry II became king. It is beyond doubt that the financial and legal reforms that Henry made during his reign were sweeping and comprehensive, all with the ultimate goal of establishing the crown as the supreme authority in England in the face of growing baronial power that had ~~been~~ taken place under Stephen. However, with Henry's reforms to both the finance and legal sectors being so comprehensive, it is often disputed just which one had the greatest effect on re-establishing his power as monarch.

One thing that cannot be disputed is the huge effect that Henry's financial reforms had on establishing his authority, with the flagship financial reform undertaken by Henry during his reign the recoinages. The recoinages occurring in 1158 and later again in 1180

were massive operations, aiming to centralise the currency under the crown once more, important due to the huge amounts of coin being taken place under Stephen,

weakening the currency as a whole. These reforms involved minting a new design of coin bearing Henry II's image, establishing that as the sole currency used in England with harsh penalties for forgers and the moneys Comptrol in this forger, despite their responsibility to regulate this currency. These reforms were hugely important, as it meant that Henry now controlled near single-handedly the newly established economy he had created with these reforms, surely ending baronial authority by delegitimising their own currency they relied on for under Stephen, noting that this financial reform was hugely influential at establishing royal authority.

As aforementioned, one of the key ways to re-establish royal authority is to curb the power enjoyed by the Barons, and another financial reforms that Henry introduced went to great lengths seeking to achieve this. Henry upon taking the throne established a new series of taxes aimed at stopping the flow of money to the barons, such new taxes as the Dane geld and Scutage. Although short-lived, the dane geld was one of the first financial reforms that Henry undertook during his reign, aiming to tax land owned by the barons and henceforth, limit the

expansion that occurred under Stephen. Scutage however, was more effective. Originally aimed at knights who did not want to go to war, scutage was adopted under Henry II,

now levied against barons who refused to provide men-at-arms for royal use. In doing this Henry effectively rewarded loyalty to him amongst barons by relieving them of tax and establishing a loyal sect of barons, and also punished disloyalty, meaning that those loyal to him experienced economic benefits whereas those who refused to work with him were hurt by this, exemplifying the importance of financial reforms in curbing baronial power and establishing a baronial base loyal to Henry, therefore proving financial reforms absolutely essential in establishing Henry's royal authority once more.

However, a case could be made that reforms to the legal system did far more to curb baronial authority, and in turn strengthen royal authority, than financial reform ever did. For instance, the Cartae Baronum was seized in the shifting of power towards Henry during this time. Occurring in 1166, the Cartae Baronum meant that all barons had to declare the amount of men at arms they had, their land, and also declare their incomes to the king, meaning that the king was now acutely aware of just how powerful each baron was, and Henry could adjust his approach

Accordingly, *Quarta pars* compounded with the Assize of Arms in 1167, wherein Barons now had to declare how much weaponry they possessed in addition to the

reforms brought in by the *Carta Baronum*, this meant that the Barons ~~now~~ could not hope anything from the King, meaning that royal authority was extended into every facet of the Baronial operation, exemplifying just how much Henry was strengthened by these legal reforms, exponentially expanding his authority over the nation.

However, many legal reforms extended beyond the Barons, and into wider society as a whole, such as the 1166 Assize of Clarendon. This assize meant that

Sheriffs could now enter any lands they so pleased in search of a suspect, cutting down on potential Baronial obstruction of justice and indeed exerting royal authority over the Church too, as the Assize of Clarendon also brought in harsher penalties for harbouring strangers (which the Church often did to help suspects avoid justice) and demanding that Clergy members be tried in State rather than ecclesiastical courts (bringing the entirety of the justice system under Henry's control). This is clear evidence of Henry's legal reforms strengthening and expanding his royal authority into all sections of society, even the



Church and baronial lands). In addition to this, the 1170 Inquest of Sheriffs purged all corrupt officials from the judicial system, along with the oath of direct loyalty sworn to Henry in the 1176 Assize of Northampton, meant that Henry now had complete control over this newly powerful justice system, allowing him more control over the affairs of every sector of society and arguably strengthening royal authority more than ever before.

In conclusion, despite the clear influence that Henry II's financial reforms had on his reign, it is clear to see that these reforms were secondary to the sweeping reforms Henry made to the legal system. Although Henry's initial financial reforms were essential to first stabilise and establish his reign, these reforms merely paved the way for the true changes to come later on in the form of these legal reforms. With Henry now able to inquire into every sector of society, including most notably church affairs, this is exemplar of the un-precedented power that these legal reforms gave Henry, thereby proving them to be far more important than the essential, yet minimal reforms to the finance system long-term.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. The analysis is sustained throughout the answer and underpinned by an excellent range of knowledge. The argument is logical and coherent throughout.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

This question is focused on the impact of Henry II's policies in strengthening royal authority. When being asked to explore the consequences of policies, remember to address impact - don't get too focused on describing policies.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A

- Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the sources, not merely paraphrase the content of the sources.
- Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the sources.
- Candidates should focus on the content in the sources rather than what is not there, unless the omission is deliberate.
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer.
- Candidates should use the sources together at some point in the answer.

### 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.



## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

