

**ADVANCED GCE
HISTORY**

2587

Historical Investigations 768–1216

TUESDAY 22 JANUARY 2008

Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional materials: Answer Booklet (12 pages)



INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name, Centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the answer book.
- Write your answer in the separate answer book provided.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

This paper contains questions on the following two Options:

- Charlemagne (pages 2–3)
- King John (pages 4–5)
- Answer on **one** Option only. In that Option, answer the question on the Passages and **one** other question.
- The number of marks for each question is given in brackets [] at the end of each question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is 90.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure of argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Passages in the one Option you have studied.
- You are advised to spend equal time on the Passages question and the essay you select.
- In answering the Passages question, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you explain and evaluate the interpretations in the Passages, as well as to inform your answers.
- In answering the essay question, you are expected to refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations to help you develop your arguments.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.

Charlemagne

If answering this Option, candidates **MUST** answer **Question 1** and **ONE** other question.

1 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Charlemagne's main problem in conquering the Saxons was that he was never able to concentrate on that task alone.

[45]

- A** From: H. Fichtenau, *The Carolingian Empire*, published in 1957. This historian believes that one problem facing Charlemagne was that he recruited his army amongst a reluctant population of free men.

We are told how the poorer people complained that they were compelled to do almost continuous military service, until they were completely impoverished and forced to surrender or sell their property. When people went so far as to kill their own relatives in order to avoid being called up, we must ask whether such an attitude did not, from the very start, make the outcome of any military expedition extremely questionable. The people towards the end of Charlemagne's reign were tired of war.

5

- B** From: P. D. King, *Charlemagne*, published in 1986. This historian is illustrating the point that international commitments often distracted Charlemagne from the conquest of Saxony.

The king led a mighty army into Saxony in 772 and was intent on conquest. He went to the Irminsul, destroyed this and plundered the shrine of its gold and silver. Undoubtedly Charlemagne intended to press ahead with his Saxon designs in 773. Circumstances demanded otherwise. Early in the year an envoy arrived from Pope Hadrian I requesting aid against Desiderius King of the Lombards. In June 774 Pavia capitulated and all the Lombards subjected themselves to the dominion of the glorious lord Charlemagne and the Franks. The price of conquest in the south was paid by the north. In 774 the Saxons ravaged deep into Hesse; it took a miracle, men believed, to prevent the burning of the church at Fritzlar. Charlemagne arrived back too late to do more than send raiding columns into Saxony, but in 775 he led a massive host across the Rhine. The campaign was a triumph.

10

15

- C** From: R. Collins, *Early Medieval Europe 300–1000*, published in 1991. This historian argues that the nature of Saxon politics and society made Charlemagne's conquest difficult.

In part the problem in subduing the Saxons was the difficulty of the terrain over which the fighting had to be conducted. But perhaps more significant still was the nature of the Saxons' social and political organisation. They had no kings or permanent institutions of central authority. Nor did they have any large settlements. The basic Saxon social units were extended families, and these occupied fortified farmsteads, rather like small villages. Thus the Saxons could not be crushed by the defeat of a single leader, nor could the destruction of key settlements lead to a rapid conquest. It was only for the purposes of making war that the various groups of Saxons banded together. The *Annals* record the different Saxon peoples submitting to or making treaties with the Franks only after large-scale battles.

20

25

- D** From: M. Becher, *Charlemagne*, published in 2003. This historian suggests that there was deep resistance in Saxon society to Charlemagne's conquest.

In 779 Charlemagne assembled his army and crossed the Rhine. There was a pitched battle at Bocholt that ended in victory for Charlemagne. After this, the way into Saxony lay open. According to the royal annals, all of the Westphalians were taken prisoner, which meant unconditional surrender. Charlemagne moved further along the River Weser. The Eastphalians swore oaths of loyalty to him and had to give hostages as well. The Franks once more believed that they had defeated the Saxons completely because in the following year, 780, they tried to organize and divide the land. A contemporary annalist reported that the Saxons surrendered and that Charlemagne received freemen as well as half-free as hostages. Despite its brevity, this report gives an important reason why the Saxons were able to maintain their intense resistance. Their struggle was supported not only by the nobles, who might be inclined towards compromise because of family and other ties with the Frankish kingdom, but also, and above all, by the free and half-free population. When these classes also appeared ready to obey in 780, Charlemagne was content and refrained in 781 from going to Saxony himself.

Answer **either**

- 2** Assess the view that the Carolingian empire was only superficially unified by the time of Charlemagne's death. [45]

or

- 3** Assess the view that Charlemagne wanted to promote learning primarily because of his Christian convictions. [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

King John

If answering this Option, candidates **MUST** answer **Question 4** and **ONE** other question.

4 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that it was King John's actions and attitudes which caused the loss of many of the Angevin lands in France in 1204.

[45]

- A** From: F. Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England*, published in 1955. This historian argues that the Treaty of Le Goulet was a fundamental reason for John's loss of the Angevin Empire.

The Treaty of Le Goulet, although superficially favourable to John, marked in fact another stage in the growth of French royal power. John was recognised as Richard's lawful heir for all his fiefs, including Anjou and Brittany and was to pay a relief of 20,000 marks sterling. The only major loss John had to accept was the county of Évreux. In return John had to abandon his hostile alliances with Flanders and Boulogne and with his nephew, the Emperor Otto IV. On the day after the treaty Arthur did homage to John. The Treaty of Le Goulet showed that Philip was making progress. By its terms, John had received possession of disputed fiefs, but in the process had to acknowledge the authority of Philip's court. However, if the balance of power continued to shift in Philip's direction there might come a moment when the French king would be able to enforce a sentence of forfeiture.

5

10

- B** From: M. T. Clanchy, *England and its Rulers 1066–1272*, published in 1983. This historian believes Philip Augustus was a key factor in winning control of Normandy.

Philip of France used a combination of persuasion and terror to win over the Normans. He went from town to town and castle to castle on a hearts-and-minds exercise, telling the Normans that they had been deserted by their lord John, and that he, Philip, was therefore taking over as overlord. He begged them in friendship to receive him as their lord since they had no other; anyone who was unwilling would be hanged or flayed alive. The policy worked well and Philip entered Rouen in triumph in 1204. It is often suggested that John lost Normandy because its inhabitants had grown progressively more French in culture and sympathies since 1066. Although a good case can be made for this, the extent of Philip's force was the immediately critical factor at the time.

15

20

- C** From: D. Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery. The Penguin History of Britain 1066–1284*, published in 2003. This historian compares the relative financial resources of the Capetians and the Angevins, showing the Capetian advantage.

John's total income from England and Normandy was £48,000 and to it should be added perhaps a thousand pounds each from Maine, Anjou, Aquitaine and Ireland. But if the combined total was much the same as that for Philip Augustus, it could not be automatically transferred to Normandy. Indeed, the revenues of Maine, Anjou and Aquitaine were probably spent locally. Only Normandy and England really mattered. The Capetians had one other advantage. Their revenue rivalled that of the Angevins, but provoked far less political dissent, largely because a much higher proportion came in from land. The French kings got rich without strain.

25

- D** From: J. Gillingham, 'John, King of England', an article published in 2004. This historian is suggesting that John's personality and his poor grasp of local factors account for the loss of the Angevin lands on the Loire and in Brittany.

By thinking and acting faster than his enemies John had achieved a stunning success at the battle of Mirebeau on 1 August 1202, and he was naturally exultant. In blatant disregard of local interests, the important nobles who had helped him win the battle (Aimery of Thouars and William des Roches) were denied any say in deciding the fate of the prisoners captured there, many of them their neighbours and kinsmen. John is said to have kept Arthur and the other prisoners in vile conditions. In September, des Roches and Thouars turned against John; in October, with Breton support, they captured Angers itself. John remained in Anjou until December 1202, but, unable to reverse this defeat, retreated to Normandy. His remarkable talent for driving families as powerful as Thouars, Lusignan, and des Roches into rebellion meant that Anjou, Maine, Touraine, and northern Poitou—the heartlands of the Angevin empire—had fallen into Philip's lap. By spring 1203 John's reputation was being further damaged by rumours of Arthur's fate—unknown, but he had almost certainly been murdered on John's orders. Indeed the *Margam Annals*, asserted that John himself carried out the murder when drunk.

Answer **either**

- 5** Examine the view that John's treatment of the de Braose family marked a turning-point in his relations with the English barons. [45]

or

- 6** To what extent was John's attempt to regain the lost Angevin territories ruined by the actions of his allies in 1214? [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Q.1 Source A	Source: H Fichtenau, <i>The Carolingian Empire</i> , p. 181, published by Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 1957.
Source B	Source: P King, <i>Charlemagne</i> , pp. 9-10, published by Methuen Publishing Ltd., 1986.
Source C	Source: R Collins, <i>Early Medieval Europe 300-1000</i> , pp. 262-3, published by Macmillan, 1991.
Source D	Source: M Becher, <i>Charlemagne</i> , p. 65, published by Yale University Press, 2003.
Q.4 Source A	Source: F Barlow, <i>The Feudal Kingdom of England</i> , 4 th edition, pp. 367-8, published by Longman, 1983.
Source B	Source: M Clanchy, <i>England and its Rulers 1066-1272</i> , 2 nd edition, p. 134, published by Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 1998.
Source C	Source: D Carpenter, <i>The Struggle for Mastery. The Penguin History of England 1066-1284</i> , p. 267, published by Lane, 2003.
Source D	Source: J Gillingham, <i>John, King of England</i> , an article in the <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> , published by Oxford University Press, 2004, www.oxforddnb.com .

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (OCR) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.