



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In History (9HI0/2A)

Paper 2: Depth study

2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106

2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89

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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid set of exams with 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 very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. A minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting; examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together', but it is not a requirement to use them 'together' throughout the response. There was some evidence of some candidates attempting to do this. Depending on the sources, it was not always possible to do this convincingly, and some candidates engaged in some superficial argument and analysis as a result. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, it was clear that, despite Advance Information, some candidates had insufficient contextual knowledge to deal effectively with the sources.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates note in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

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

Question 1

Option 2A.1 has a larger entry than option 2A.2 and hence the majority of candidates answered this question. This question attracted a wide range of answers with many responses meriting secure level 4 and level 5. Most candidates were able to analyse Source 1 in the context of their own knowledge with many challenging the description of Tostig in the source in the light of his actions in Northumbria and the uprising they provoked. The description of Harold Godwin on the other hand was more often accepted at face value despite most candidates identifying the limitations of the source dedicated to Queen Edith. The treatment of Source 2 was much more varied. Although most candidates reiterated the provenance of the source identified in the source caption, fewer candidates were able to deploy their own knowledge to explain or support inferences or challenge matters of detail in this source. Some candidates were able to identify the previous involvement of Harold Godwin in Wales or to provide any details of the Godwins' campaign in 1063, but many did not draw upon this knowledge. Almost all candidates used the sources to address the question and there were fewer examples of candidates answering the question based entirely on their own knowledge than had been seen in previous years. On the other hand, a small but significant number of candidates were able to analyse the sources with very little contextual knowledge. Such candidates however were unable to progress beyond Level 3. In general, this question was reasonably well attempted.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Sec A 20

Source 1 is useful because it tells us the Godwin brothers were powerful Earls who had strong characters and were trusted by the King. The source shows Harold 'was appointed to the Earldom of Wessex' which shows he was the most significant lord in the country. Wessex was the Ancestral home of the English Kings and Winchester housed their treasury. Furthermore it was the closest to France so was vulnerable and had lots of trade. This tells us that Harold was a very significant man in the governing of England because he was given ~~an~~ the most important Earldom to govern. This gave him a revenue of around £5000 per annum which matched King Edward and shows he was a powerful man. Similarly, Tostig was important because he 'became Earl of Northumbria'. This Earldom was more wild, as blood pacts were used alongside law and travellers moved in groups of 30, but it was equally as important as it protected England from Scotland and Scandinavia. Because the source was written ~~in~~ for Queen Edith who was the sister of Harold and wife of Edward, it is not surprising that it claims 'Edward appreciated both brothers' when in reality he may have found them a threat to his power. He was the supreme law giver and restricted Earls by not allowing them to mint

coins and this conflict would best be shown in 1065 when Tostig was banished for riots in Northumbria. The source describes him as 'over zealous in attacking evil' but it was more likely he was unpopular due to being a southerner. The source also praises the brothers - Harold as 'strong in mind and body' which is shown in his Welsh campaigns and Tostig as 'with great self-control'. However the source here is trying to flatter the Queen as it fails to mention Harold's lack of self control illegitimate relationship with Edith Swanneke and Tostig's fighting ability - killed at Stamford bridge. The source is used to investigate the positions and characters of Godwin Earls, but through a lens of flattery.

Source 2 is useful to investigate Godwin's significance because it shows the independence and reliability of the Earls. Harold is an active and effective military commander who went from Gloucester to Rhuddlan which is a significant distance to maintain a disciplined army and he 'forced Gruffydd to flee' Wales was a hostile and mountainous land so Harold's success shows how significant he was as a military commander in England - He armed his men with leather and javelins rather than maille so they could more effectively fight the Welsh. This impressive tactics 'forced the country into submission to King Edward' which also shows the Godwins were not trying to overthrow the king. This made England stable because it allowed the king to feel secure even if the Godwins controlled all Earldoms but Mercia. Edith was not powerful enough to challenge the Godwins as they had in 1051 resulting in their exile, but source 2 suggests Edward had not need for this as they would pay great sums of money. The source suggests a harmonious relationship between Edward and his earls even stating that the Welsh 'gave hostages to King Edward and Earl Harold' implying somewhat equality. This is somewhat surprising as the source was written in Mercia which was not a Godwin.

Earldom. The Earl Edwin opposed Godwin domination until the marriage of his sister to Harold in 1066 so the source must be genuine as it has no need to flatter the Godwins. Furthermore the Welsh Wars of 63 show co-operation of the brothers against Aelfgar, the Exiled Earl of East Anglia. The family worked together to dominate English government 1053-1066 even the kingship and source text shows how independent and reliable the Earls were.

However the sources are more useful together as source 1's pro-Godwin descriptions of the Earls are corroborated by source 2's specific detail and the time difference between them. Source 1 claims that Edward 'lived his life free from care' and source 2 shows this when Harold 'brought it to King Edward' after receiving the head of King Gruffydd. This shows that Edward relied heavily on the Godwins as they were significant in the defence of the Kingdom. Source 1 claims 'Harold was well-practised in many lengthy marches' and source 2 mentions 'Earl Harold went from Gloucester to Rhuddlan' which shows this claim is not baseless flattery. This ability was crucial in 1066 as Harold marched 300km in 5 days to Stamford Bridge and without this speed Harold Hardrada would have more effectively established his power. Both sources present Harold as a popular figure as he 'has the king's favour' and 'made peace'. This is shown in January 1066 when the Witan elect Harold to be king and this popularity shows the Godwins were so significant in England's government that the English wanted them to be king. However the sources do not mention the king's attempts to curb the Godwins. In Easter 1053 Godwine checked to death and Aelfgar was given the Earldom of

East Anglia. Similarly after Tostig's rebellion in (while Harold took control of Wessex). the Earl Marcar son of Leofric was instated. This balanced Godwin power and created stability as it curbed Godwin domination. Source 1 was written to present Edward and Godwin in a good view for the Godwin Queen Edith and Source 2 happens to recount actions of Godwin done on behalf of the king so their conflict is not mentioned. However the Sources give a good view on their significance in government as neutral source 2 confirms the pro Godwin Source 1 which was written after the deaths of most people involved so could have been modified. The praise and deeds of Godwin in Source 1 is confirmed by the detail of source 2 as they are most useful together.

In conclusion you can effectively investigate importance of Godwin in Government using neutral source 2 and pro Godwin source 1 and their corresponding claims about the deeds and character regarding the English Government 1053-1066. They both show that the Godwins were crucial in defending the Kingdom but source 2 shows how this was done in more detail.

This is a top level 5 response. It interrogates the evidence and deploys contextual knowledge effectively to illuminate and discuss the limitations of the sources. There is a real sense of interpreting the sources in the light of the values and concerns of Anglo-Saxon society. The evaluation of the source material is secure and the section where the two sources are used together to corroborate the evidence and consider the claims is very well focused.

Justify comments on the reliability of the sources by drawing upon their content.

Question 2

The range of answers to this question was more limited than that of question one. Most candidates were able to analyse both Sources 3 and 4, many having useful contextual knowledge of the reasons for and consequences of, the Inquest of the Sheriffs 1170. The use of Source 3 was more varied with much emphasis on the date of the source and the nature of gossip. Most candidates however were able to use source 4 to identify the focus of the inquiry and the issues to be examined by the Inquest of Sheriffs. Fewer candidates identified the fact that the inquest's inquiries extended beyond sheriffs to include bailiffs, archbishops bishops abbots, barons etc. Most candidates were successful in using the two sources together, many using them to compare the validity of the official order in Source 4 with the court gossip in Source 3. Surprisingly, very few candidates picked up on the exaggerated language used in Source 3 and really used it to consider the validity of the claims made in the source. The best evaluations, achieving in level 4 and level 5,

commented not only on the provenance of the source but justified comments on the weight of the evidence by applying them to the evidence in the source.

~~Extract 3~~ Source 3 is from Walter Map, 'Trifles at Courtiers' which was written in the 1180s. Map was also a member of Henry II's court and was sent on missions by Henry to the French lands. In this source Map claims that Sheriffs were thieves. This claim can be ~~backed~~ supported by a quote from Map which says 'These Sheriffs take everything they lay their hands on'. This is inferring to the ~~pro~~ reports Henry had from Barons of Sheriffs stealing and committing other crimes. However, Map also says that 'Sheriffs do swear to serve God and their master faithfully and honestly' but this clearly wasn't the case as Sheriffs abused their power and used it to get what they wanted. Sheriffs were important because they were the key link between the crown and the people. They were meant to do the king's bidding, read out writs and enforce law along with collecting tax. However, Map's second claim is that they were corrupt. Map clearly states

that the Sheriffs were 'corrupted by taking bribes'. Another quote that supports this claim is when Map says 'Wrongdoers win favour from the Sheriffs by offering money as bribes'. This quote may also be interfering to the embezzlement problems they were with Sheriffs. Furthermore, Map states these Sheriffs 'punish acts that are inoffensive but permit them let true deeds of evil go unpunished'. From this quote we can infer Map was claiming the Sheriffs were not the best people for the job. This was because the position was hereditary and passed on through generations and the person who was best for the job was overlooked. These claims by Map are the reasons the Sheriffs were replaced twice before the Inquest of Sheriffs. These claims also show how the Sheriffs abused their power which could be a consequence of the assize at Clarendon in 1166 when Sheriffs authority was increased. This source holds value in the investigation into the reasons for the ~~constitution of Clarendon~~ Inquest of Sheriffs because Map was in Henry's court and would have gathered all of his

information first hand and would have understood Henry's thought process behind why he introduced the inquest of Sheriffs. In stark contrast, Map wrote this in the 1180's which was ten years after the inquest of Sheriffs which could hinder the accuracy of his information. Also, he recorded a series of tales and gossip which wouldn't have been as accurate as possible.

Finally, Map may have had his bias towards Henry because he was so close to him which means his description of the Sheriffs would be painting them in a bad light as they were a problem for Henry.

Source 4 is directly from the inquest of Sheriffs in 1170, made by Henry II after he returned from his continental lands. This source is a section that outlines the nature of the inquest. The first claim of this source is that the Sheriffs had been stealing money from the people of England who had been 'oppressed' during Henry's leave. This claim can be supported by the quote 'What and how much ~~Sheriffs~~ have received from each hundred and from each village and from

each man. This quote is clearly referencing the embezzlement that occurred with the sheriffs and how they took some of the money that was going from the people to the crown for themselves. Throughout his source there are references to sheriffs stealing money, for example 'what payments the sheriffs have received in giving judgments in the courts of the county or the hundred'. This quote is from an inquiry which meant Henry wanted to know how much money had been taken by the sheriffs before punishing them or replacing them. The second claim made in his source is that sheriffs bought land with the illegal money they took. This is supported by the quote 'how much land the sheriffs... have bought or mortgaged'. From this quote we can infer sheriffs used the money they had taken through embezzlement and bought property which increased their power further. This source holds value in explaining the reasons for the inquest of sheriffs because it comes straight from the inquest of sheriffs and was made by Henry and shows the inquiries made into certain areas that were the reason for the inquest of sheriffs like taking money and abusing power. However,

because it is from the inquest of sheriffs it is hard to find reasons for it's cause.

After analysing both sources, source 3 is undoubtedly better at explaining the reasons for the inquest of sheriffs because it was written by Map who was in Henry's court and he gives clear reasons as to why sheriffs were cunning men who abused their power and eventually got replaced.

Source 4 on the other hand comes straight from the Inquest of Sheriffs and straight from Henry, proving it's accuracy, yet source 3 is written ten years later and may have some bias and is made up of tales and gossip. However, source 4 doesn't give any previous context or state clear reasons why sheriffs had abused their power. Therefore, source three would be more useful in explaining the reasons for the inquest of sheriffs because it gives us context from before to inquest and tells us why sheriffs needed to be replaced.

This is a level 4 response. It analyses the source material and is very clear over the claims made by the writer of source 3 and the more factual details that can be drawn from Source 4. The candidate has developed a number of reasoned inferences that are developed by well-selected contextual knowledge. Good examples of this can be seen on p.2. One area for improvement that would help to move this response into level 5 would be to reach a judgement on the weight that can be placed on the sources. It does consider the pros and cons of Source 3 but does not reach a judgement on the weight that can be placed on it, and the evaluation of Source 4 is limited.

TIP

Remember to use the sources to explore the claims being made by the writer and to consider how valid they are.

Question 3

This question, the most popular for option 2A. 1, produced a number of excellent answers which examined the impact of forest laws together with the harrying of the north, the feudal system and changes in land ownership and the manorial system, nucleated villages and the reduction of slavery. The majority of candidates focused on forest laws and castles. There was some excellent knowledge of the forest laws and their impact displayed, but also many answers where knowledge of this change was limited and answers relied more on exploring alternative features. In addition, some higher achieving responses focused their comments on the building of castles on the question, identifying the significant psychological impact of castles on the Anglo Saxon population in the surrounding areas and the role of castles as both protectors and controllers of that same population. Most answers on castles however ignored the fact that the majority were built in towns not villages and simply described their construction. Changing patterns of trade following the Norman conquest were discussed by a number of candidates but fewer were able to relate these comments to the question. The issue of slavery demonstrated the greatest confusion and there were some significant examples of anachronism. A significant number of candidates were uncertain of the nature of 11th century slavery and argued that the return of slaves to villages would lead to increased racial tensions and others referenced the slave trade in Bristol. There were some issues in selecting castles as a change to investigate where some candidates demonstrated a poor understanding of the geography of 11th century England, adopting a very London centric view in which significant centres of population such as Exeter, Lincoln and even York were regarded as villages. The most frequently mentioned evidence which candidates used to demonstrate the impact of castles on villages was the often-repeated statement that a large number [estimates varied from 120 to 230] of houses were demolished in Lincoln to build a castle while claiming that Lincoln [one of the four largest cities in the Domesday survey with a population of over 5000 in 1087] was a village. It would be helpful to candidates in studying this aspect of the course to have very clear definitions of towns, villages

and hamlets. Although some candidates used the feudal system effectively to consider significant changes, many showed an extremely limited knowledge of the feudal system. This did limit opportunities for insightful analysis and evaluation. It should also be noted that the question focus was on changes introduced by the Normans. Answers that focused heavily on the continuities were not well focused.

Village life in England was influenced significantly by the Norman Conquest. The forest laws affected the most people widely, but the changing aristocracy and the plundering of large areas also had significant impact.

The legal changes affected the entire country and therefore had the most significant impact on village life. Up to 200 acres of public land was turned into Royal Forest and hunting ground ~~area~~ across the country. From Sherwood Forest in Nottingham to New Forest in Sussex land for the people was restricted to hunting ground. If you scared a deer on the hunting ground you were blinded so the village people would stay clear of large areas they were once allowed to farm or raise cattle on. Although the monarchs agree that the land was unsuitable for agriculture, in the New Forest 12 villages and 2000 residents were evicted which

shows forest law had a direct and significant impact on village life. In addition, freeholding was gradually replaced by serfdom which restricted the civilian's life even more. The transformation of free public land held by locals to forbidden royal land not only divided the locals from their foreign overlords, but it also made their lives harder. From 1066-1100 there were 11 years of bad harvest which meant the villagers would have benefitted from that extra land to ~~aff~~ farm or herd in. Similarly, every village needed firewood and fresh water and many of these supplies were now restricted which was a significant change to the ~~case~~ of village life. The setting up of Forest Law Courts meant the punishments were brutal and absolute, so you could not escape if you had been caught. The idea that the Anglo-Saxon's land was now prohibited for them created much resentment ~~and~~ shown by the Mordrum Fire introduced to counter the Guerilla tactics of men hiding in the forest by marking their communities ~~pay~~. This shows that the ~~biggest~~ biggest impact on village life was ~~change with the~~ the Forest law as it turned many people to desperation.

Another significant change to village life was the erasure of Anglo-Saxon nobility. Although the average person was unlikely to come into contact with a great Earl, there was a possibility as the king's court was itinerant. The dismantling of the Great Earldoms meant there was only one English Earl, by 1075 so the new Earls with foreign language and customs would have been a ~~significant~~ noticeable change. Similarly but more impactful was the replacing of English Sheriffs with Normans. They represented the king in the hundred courts, would collect taxes and would lead the fyrd in war so it is likely the villagers would know their sheriff well. This new culture eradicated the ~5000 English Thengs on whose manors many people would have worked. This would also have an impact on village life as freeholders and slaves alike would become tenants to Norman Lords or knights. We see this in Essex as slaves fell by 25% 1066-1087 but this just resulted in them being forced to pay extortionate rent in

return for their freedom. Only 10% of the top 8000 subtenants to the king were English, so villagers would likely find themselves paying more money to new lords. However, local priests as well as monks or nuns often remained English meaning there was little change in religious life for the villagers despite by 1086 both Archbishops and 9/15 bishops were now Norman. Similarly church reform of Lanfranc mostly effected the church aristocracy by tackling simony and pluralism. Thus the change in the aristocracy had more impact than the change to the clergy, but both were less significant to village life than the Forest Law as rents and lords were always changing and -we see before the conquest in 1066 Northumbrians were just as unhappy with their Earl. Furthermore Forest Law had an impact on aristocracy too as William Rufus was killed hunting in 1100 which plunged the country into turmoil. Therefore Forest Law had a greater impact on village life than change in aristocracy.

The constant plundering and harrying between 1066-1071 and the harsh norman rule also had an impact on village life. In 1066 Tostig's army plundered the south coast before sailing to Northumbria and later that year Duke William led raids across Sussex to tempt Harold out of London. As a result by 1086 the value of manors in Sussex had decreased by 40% since King Edward's reign. The people who lived and worked in the manors and villages were still not able to recover their livelihoods by after an entire generation which shows it had a significant impact on them. Likewise, the value of Yorkshire manors decreased by 60% as a result of the harrying of the north. This act was specifically ordered by William and resulted in the death of approximately 150,000 English. The Normans also burnt crops and livestock to create starvation and these changes had a huge impact on village life as it eradicated some communities entirely. It could be argued the burning of York by the Vikings in 1066 had a similar effect but the normans were more extreme as they were specifically ordered to split into groups and burn everything to put down the Northern rebellion of 1068-1071. Although these

changes completely decimated some communities. It was not as widespread as the forest law. Some ^{important} places like Canterbury and towns with good connections to Normandy like Leves on the ~~South~~ ^{South} Coast benefited financially from the Norman Conquest rather than suffer from harrying. Forest law however was universal and impacted the whole country from Sherwood, to Forest of Dean to New Forest to Peveril. The restriction of large swathes of land and new laws to govern it affect village life more than harrying of some locations.

In conclusion the Forest Law was had the most significant impact on village life as it strained agriculture and created an obvious division between Normans and English. It also resulted in new legal codes and the death of a king. Village life was affected by the replacing of English lords with Normans and the introduction of feudalism as more money was paid to different masters but most of the changes were at the top level, not village level. Finally plundering had a massive impact on some villages, but no impact on others so the forest law was the most significant change.

This is a secure level 5 response. It has sustained analysis and does consider the relative significance of factors. It establishes valid criteria for judgement. It does occasionally wander into pre-Norman material but has a good range and depth of factors which it explores and reaches a well-supported judgement in the conclusion.

Tip

This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

Question 4

Question 4 was probably the question which received the most effective answers, receiving the largest proportion of level 5 answers. Even the weaker candidates displayed a secure grasp of mostly accurate and relevant knowledge to support their understanding of the question. Most candidates considered the rebellions in Maine, Robert Curthose's actions and Philip I's ambitions to expand his territory and his support for rebels against William I. Many candidates were able to identify criteria by which to arrive at a judgement and a significant number were able to achieve a sustained judgement. A small number of weaker answers focused entirely on the actions of William I in completing his conquest of England in particular the harrying of the north, only a few of whom were able to relate their comments to the question. Overall, this question was very well answered.

William I's control over his continental lands was challenged multiple times however Philip I did pose as the main reason to William's control being challenged. However conflict in Maine and his son, Robert Curthose both posed as challenges to William's continental lands however these were dealt with more efficiently.

King Philip I posed a challenge for two reasons. Firstly he was continually helping the enemies of William, he put Edgar Atheling an offer of his crown at Montevill ~~at~~ sur mer, he also gave Ralph de Gael, an escaped rebellious earl of William, a crown at Orléans which became hugely significant as William's first defeat. Lastly Philip married Robert of Flanders' sister Bertha who William believed Robert killed William's firstborn his most trusted magnate. However the real challenge to William's control came from William's defeat at Orléans when Philip surprised William.

When he arrived at head of the army which led William into retreat, this was William's first ever major defeat! Secondly his major challenge came in 1077 when Simon of Crepi retired as leader of the Vexin and Philip rushed to occupy the Vexin ~~was~~ with no severe opposition from William. This was a huge challenge as this was a crucial border region between France and Normandy, leading to the two being hostile neighbours on the River Epte. This was the main reason for challenge to William's continental lands as he never regained control of the Vexin and died fighting here, he also lost the battle of Doy which was a huge defeat for William. William was never able to deal fully with the threats posed by Philip and therefore was the main reason why Normandy was challenged.

Despite not being the main reason, conflict in Maine was a challenge to William's continental lands despite not being ever a significant threat. William left the threat for five years before acting on it due to being preoccupied with the East Anglian rebellion.

in England at the time. In 1070 Le Mans had fallen to the possession of Count Fulk of Anjou (taken over from Geoffrey of Mayenne) Later in 1072 the whole of Maine fell to Fulk of Anjou, however William still seemed not bothered about this, after East Angles was dealt with he sailed to Maine and attacked key strongholds at Freney, Beaumont and Sille and by 30th of march he was able to return to England, having secured control of Maine back. Despite William's control of Cotentin and land being challenged, unlike with Philip, William was able to get rid of the threat with ease, eliminating any challenge to Normandy or Maine with minimal effort. The fact William left it so long without acting shows how it clearly wasn't a major concern to him, and certainly wasn't the main reason that his external lands were challenged. William was able to effectively extinguish the threat of Fulk of Anjou ~~and~~, however Philip remained a threat until his final days and was a reoccurring threat, this threat was a stand alone threat.

The last challenge which William faced to his continental lands was from his own son Robert Curthose. Despite this again not being the main reason, this was a threat which continued to resound throughout the end of his reign. In 1077 Robert demanded more power and following an agreement with his brother he launched a failed siege attempt of Rouen Castle. Following this incident, ~~William~~ Robert joined forces with Robert Breusiel (William Fitzbern's son) in an attempt to fight at Grestory. This dynamic was a generational divide between the nephew and William who had conquered England together and their troubled sons who felt shut out of power. Grestory ended in Robert having to rescue William after he fell from his horse, leading to Robert having successfully secured a defeat at Grestory! In 1080 William welcomed Robert back into court, ~~however~~ and even sent him to Scotland on his behalf to deal with matters most prevalent. However in 1084 he was back in exile and he failed to make an appearance at William's death bed, showing how matters remained unresolved right until the end. Robert was

Certainly a threat to William however he never posed as a major threat in relation to challenging William's continental lands as Robert never posed a threat to Normandy in fact he was Count of Normandy and upon William's death became the Duke. Robert never posed a serious challenge to William's lands as it was his father and although disagreements were never resolved Philip's opposition was the main reason for challenge to William's lands as it was a sustained threat of someone who seemed more powerful. Robert it could be argued just wanted the approval and attention of his father.

Overall, the opposition posed by King Philip of France remained the main reason for William's control of continental lands to be challenged as not only did he provide systematic problems in terms of helping William's enemies, he also proved very eager to show his military dominance over William, with the defeat at Dd1 and the loss of the Vexin, it shows how in comparison to conflict in Maine which William was able to eliminate the threat with ease and

Robert Curthose who never had pure intentions of taking William's continental lands, Philip remains the one recurring main reason for challenges faced by William in relation to control of continental lands being at risk, Philip was never dealt with and he passed as a threat to William's control over lands until his final days as he died fighting in the Vexin.

This is a top level 5 response. It has good range and excellent depth of knowledge that is deployed effectively to address the question and reach judgements. The criteria developed is valid and the relative significance of the different causes is established.

Tip -

In causation questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept and reach supported judgements.

Question 5

This was the most popular question in option 2A. There were a range of answers to this question, but most candidates were able to identify the significance of the Constitutions of Clarendon and Becket's rejection of them. Many candidates evidenced a clear understanding of

the events leading up to and consequences of, the Constitutions of Clarendon, a small number however focused almost exclusively on the clash of personalities between Becket and Henry II, basing their arguments entirely on their opinions of the characters. Most candidates however were able to examine the reasons for and the actions of both the king and the archbishop. Several particularly impressive level 5 answers were able to contextualise the disputes between Henry and Becket within the ongoing challenging relations between church and state in 12th century England. This question was generally well answered.

Although the Constitutions of Clarendon significantly changed the relationship between Becket and Henry II, as it is the reason the two grew further apart and why Henry II could be argued to have acted harshly in the lead up to Becket's death; it is significant to note that the Constitutions of Clarendon weren't seen as the main reason for conflict. It could be argued that conflict between Church and Crown arose from Becket's transformation after becoming Archbishop as it infuriated Henry. Equally, it could be said that the stubborn, harsh personality of Henry II is the reason for the conflict, due to his want of a centralised system as well as at times being seen as power hungry over the Church. So it is mostly accurate to say that the Constitutions of Clarendon caused conflict between Crown ~~and~~ and Church.

One reason the Constitutions of Clarendon could be argued to be the reason for conflict to arise between Church and Crown is the affects this had on both Becket and Henry II. This is suggestive as both want to be further away from each other. Becket, due to lack of support after Bishops agreeing to the Constitutions, wanted to leave England, whereas Henry II wanted Becket gone either by being punished or leaving. This is

incident as ~~the~~ Henry II tries to accuse Becket of crimes so he could be tried in a Crown Court and be punished, seeing as the conditions of the Constitution ^{of Clarendon} allowed him to do this, it can be interpreted as a way for Henry to get rid of Becket so he can rule over the Church at ease. Henry was so desperate to get rid of Becket that he tried to judge him based on actions that were irrelevant as it was during his time as Chancellor as suggested through the John Fitz Gilbert case where he was accused of embezzlement. This shows that the Constitution of Clarendon was ~~even~~ one of the main reasons for conflict between Church and Crown, as it shows how it caused the change in attitude in Henry and Becket towards each other and how the Constitution allowed Henry to find a way to get rid of Becket, whereas for Becket the Constitution caused him to become isolated and targeted which is why he chose to flee from England. However, it is important to note that the Constitution of Clarendon is not where the conflict between the two started and so it should be understood that the cause ~~for the~~ of the disagreement is the cause for the relationship to change as opposed to the Constitution of Clarendon.

The reason why the Constitution of Clarendon is not the main reason for conflict to worsen between Church and Crown is because it is not what caused the conflict to start with, rather it was a response to initial actions of disagreement between Becket and Henry. ~~The~~ The reason for conflict, therefore, is Becket's transformation after becoming Archbishop. Henry and Becket were

Henry and Becket had good knowledge of government from being chancellor and working with Archbishop Theobald at the start of Henry's reign. Therefore, he knew how ~~important~~ important centralisation was to Henry and the two planned to have a centralised system where Church and Crown were together ~~set that~~ one. Becket became Archbishop especially because he was of the clergy. However, once Becket became Archbishop, he changed and became a man of God, unwilling to change anything in the Church court. This infuriated the King as his goals of centralisation were therefore hindered. This ^{transformation} is what ultimately caused ~~the~~ the relationship of Church and Crown to change as from this came the Council at Westminister; meeting at Northampton, Northampton and the Constitutions of Clarendon. The transformation was the main reason for the relationship between Crown and Church to change and was the starting for the views of Becket and Henry to change towards each other, which is why it could be argued that the Constitutions of Clarendon is not the main reason ~~however~~ it is ~~not~~ for ~~the~~ conflict between Church and Crown.

However, it could be argued that the stubborn personalities of Becket and Henry is the main cause for conflict as this stubborn personality is why the two could never negotiate. Becket could be seen as stubborn due to his constant saying of 'saving our order' as seen in the

Council of Westminster and before being forced to sign the Chirograph for the Constitutions of Clarendon. Becket believed that the Church and Crown should be separate as he believed only God could judge the Clergy not the King, judge the the Clergy. This stubborn personality is what caused anger in Henry and what caused him to be harsh in the Constitutions of Clarendon for example getting rid of benefit of the Clergy, and not allowing anyone to contact the Pope else they face deportation. Becket's stubborn personality therefore gave justification to the king to act harshly as his ambition of Centralisation was not being fulfilled which angered him. Furthermore, Henry could be seen equally as ~~st~~ stubborn as Becket as he was unwilling to reach peace unless Becket were to negotiate with him agree to his terms of centralisation which is why peace was never made between the two at Montmirail in 1169. This shows that Becket and Henry's stubborn personalities is what caused conflict to increase between the two especially after Montmirail as Henry launched the Autumn Decrees whilst Becket threatened the king with Anathema and excommunicated members of the Clergy and of Henry's government.

Overall, the Constitutions of Clarendon was not the main reason why conflict began between Church and Crown rather ~~the~~ ^{the} stubborn behaviour of Henry and Becket after Becket became Archbishop. The two were more inclined to their honour which is why they never reached peace and why they acted harshly towards each other. Although the Constitutions of Clarendon were significant in the sense that it shows Henry's determination as well as the threat

on Becket's likelihood from the Constitutions, it is the actions and personal beliefs and goals of Becket and Henry that caused conflict to worsen as they were unwilling to compromise unless they agreed the other agreed to the other terms rather than meeting at a mutual level. Therefore the Constitution of Clarendon was not the main reason ^{for} conflict ~~was~~ between Church and Crown.

This is a level 5 entry response. It has explicit focus on the question and sufficient support. It establishes a line of reasoning which is valid. The section on the Constitutions of Clarendon is not as effective as the exploration of other reasons.

Tip

This is a causation question. The most effective answers consider the given cause in some depth and compare it to alternatives to reach a judgement on whether it is the main, and therefore most important, reason.

Question 6

This question prompted a number of effective answers. Some candidates took a broad approach and surveyed the reasons for determining Philip's culpability while others went into very impressive detail on each occurrence of hostility with Philip, Henry the Younger, Richard, Geoffrey and John. A very popular counter argument was that Henry caused his own downfall by his refusal to name Richard as his heir and properly authorise control of his territories to his sons. A common error was to regard this as a causation question rather than a consequence question and to focus analysis on the most important reason rather than evaluate the relative significance of the consequences of the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey in explaining the collapse of power in the Angevin Empire. It is also important to note the date range in the question. Some candidates devoted much space in their answers to the Great Rebellion which was not relevant to this question and could not be rewarded.

The statement that the deaths of Henry the "Young King" and Geoffrey weakened rather than strengthened Henry II's control over the Angevin empire is accurate. Whilst their deaths meant that Henry II had fewer sons to inherit the Angevin empire and indeed the 1182-~~1186~~¹¹⁸³ rebellion, their deaths had ~~some~~^{severe} political and territorial consequences.

Following Geoffrey's death of being trampled by a horse in 1186 and the Young King's demise at the Siege of St. Malo on the 26th May 1183, Philip II enforced his rights as overlord. The French king demanded the return of Margaret's dowry as her husband was dead, the return of the Vexin which had been seized through the Young King's marriage and that Brittany was rightfully his since the territory was a vassal state to the King of France ~~since~~^{as} Geoffrey had performed homage to King Philip II who was already suspicious of Henry for his

continued holding of Blaise of France with the rumour that he had seduced her and wanted to keep the Vexin. This contributed to France preparing for war in 1187 which weakened Henry II's control of his territories because he was confronting a young, energetic and estate king.

~~The~~ The deaths of the Young King and Geoffrey meant that his remaining sons would inherit more land. However this, instead of security, inspired self interest and Henry II's frustration in naming Richard his principle heir meant that he drove him into Philip II's camp through suspicion. Richard believed that he would have a greater chance in becoming his father's principle heir if ~~he~~ he allied himself with Philip, fearing that his father would force him to return his territorial acquisitions in Toulouse and give ~~the~~ Aquitaine to John. This rebellion achieved huge success, significantly weakening Henry II's control of his Angevin lands through the acquisition of Tours, a vitally strategic city. Richard and ~~the~~ Philip were both ruthless leaders and convinced themselves that they were on the winning side because they commanded

greater resources. This inspired more barons to rebel against Henry II which ~~exacerbated~~ exacerbated the rebellion and further undermined Henry II's ability to manage his empire, especially since he was growing ill. Henry II refused to delegate sufficient power to his sons so that they may govern their territories within their own rights. Therefore this weakened his control between 1183-1189 because he couldn't depend on the loyalty of his sons, or his deathbed he heard news that even his favourite son John had rebelled against him which confirms the weakness of the Angevin empire, divided by civil war and self interest since the deaths of ~~John~~ Geoffrey and Henry the Young King.

However there is an argument that their deaths strengthened the empire. Between 1176-1179 Henry the Younger was more interested in games, tournaments and entertainment than running his kingdom, his father, Henry II, had no interest financially and politically as he ran no significant debts which did not give him confidence for his sons.

ability to manage his inheritance. Also Philip II capitalised on the dysfunctional family dynamics of the Plantagenets by making Geoffrey a Seneschal at the French court. Geoffrey was richer of his grand favourite sons and therefore was not likely to receive anything other than Brittany. Geoffrey's homage to Philip^{II} for Brittany ~~was~~ which was a reasonable offer as this was traditionally performed to the ruler of Normandy (Henry I). Therefore ~~his~~^{his} death in 1186 curtailed the opportunity for Philip II to exploit Geoffrey's hatred of his father which threatened Henry's empire as it reduced another opportunity for familial rebellion. Also the death of the Young King ended the rebellion of the Aquitanian lords that had intended to remove Richard as duke for Henry^{III}. Therefore the Young King's death ended his petulance and inability to take his responsibilities seriously.

In conclusion Henry II did experience a weakening in the control of his empire, dying as a diminished king. His last words to Richard were "God I hope God may not

let me die until I have had my revenge on you". Henry II had been forced to submit to Philip and Richard through the agreement he made in 1189 which severely damaged his authority. He relinquished £20,000 and 3 castles in either the Venin or Anjou alongside restoring Richard's inheritance, releasing Aline of France and degradingly placing himself at the mercy of the French king, performing homage for his lands. Therefore the deaths of Geoffrey and Henry the Young King ~~did~~ significantly weakened his control over his Angevin lands because his sons were blinded by self interest and engaged in civil war against one another, Henry II kindly supported John's invasion of Aquitaine, which drove Richard to support Philip's campaign against him. Ultimately it is accurate to say that Henry's strength/control over his empire was weakened as he lost the loyalty of his remaining sons, significant territories due to the advances of the rebels and his authority over his Angevin Empire.

This is a level 5 response. It has a secure range and sufficient knowledge to support the argument. It considers both the ways that the deaths strengthened as well as weakened Henry's control of his empire.

Tip

Consequence questions do differ from causation questions. Remember that you are looking at impact.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources
- Candidates should read the caption carefully so that they can make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain any credit
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer but are certainly not required to do this all the way through the answer.

Section B

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally 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 rather than merely present a list of factors.