

## MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

### 9769 HISTORY

**9769/51**

Paper 5a (Special Subject: The Norman Conquest, 1051–1087), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

- 1 (a) How far are the views about loyalty to the Papacy expressed by Lanfranc in Document D corroborated by Document C? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text, but of headings and attributions.

The dates (1079, 1081) invite comment as does the tone of language used. Both documents sit in the context of Papal demands on William I in the years 1079–82. Both raise a major issue in Lanfranc's leadership of the Church, the triangular relationship of Lanfranc, William I and Pope Gregory VII, in the context of Gregorian reforms and the differences between moderate and radical Gregorianism. Papal supremacy, royal controls over the Church and its contacts with Rome, the politics of secular-spiritual relations, are all touched on here. **C** raises Lanfranc's apparent dilatoriness in going to Rome and possible reasons ('fear of the secular power': William had refused to allow bishops to go there), while **D** implies a flexible response by Lanfranc; there is reference to 'according to the canons', a proper regard for the Papal office, but the key lies in his relations with William I and deference to the latter. **D** mentions a verbal message and can be linked to the Pope's failed attempts to secure William I's fealty. The documents reflect Lanfranc's ultimate loyalty and his pre-Gregorian stance on papal-royal relations (and so on such matters as investiture and homage). Close attention to textual wording will help evaluation here; such reflects the complex and subtle triangular relationship outlined above. Ambivalence features here; Lanfranc's close working relationship with William, one that straddled political and religious arenas. **C** and **D** relate to this and **C** reflects the rather astounded responses of Gregory VII and **D** the relatively cautious response of Lanfranc, though he makes clear his ultimate loyalty.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Lanfranc's leadership of the English Church was dominated by the twin concerns of primacy and loyalty to his king? [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

A good focus on the terms of the question is required: primacy over York; loyalty to William I. The implication is that other concerns were minor and this sets up counter-argument. Candidates will need to pick up on an interest in reforms (seen in **B**, **E**) and set such, alongside contextual knowledge, against the issues of Canterbury's primacy (in **A**, **E**) and the at times uneasy Canterbury-Rome relations (in **C**, **D**, **E**). Document **E** provides a useful overview of various aspects of Lanfranc's primacy and can be linked to the other documents. All can be put into the context of Lanfranc's domestic activities, spiritual and political, and of his relationship with William I as well as the Papacy. **A** raises Lanfranc's determination to assert his primacy, especially over York, though he was prepared to support some of Archbishop Thomas' reform measures. Topic knowledge can be used here, including the lengths to which Lanfranc was prepared to go to secure that primacy. **B** is indicative of some of the reforming direction pursued and their content contextualised as well as linked to part of

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

**E.** **C** and **D** relate to the triangular relationship mentioned above and can be contextualised, mindful of the contemporary European situation with the stirrings of the investiture controversy and the developing zeal of Gregorian reforms.

Lanfranc was a key figure in the Norman takeover and settlement of England and had an extremely successful working relationship with William I, so much so that it is often hard to disentangle initiatives and actions. For example, it is likely that William's authority was necessary to hold councils – and much else besides – but Lanfranc was the one who called and convened them. His ability and skills are important to any analysis (cf. areas of **A**, **D**, **E**). He was a tough character, respected, it seems, by the Pope as well as the King, able to steer a difficult course in the potentially treacherous arena of royal-papal relations. Candidates should comment on his handling of the latter, reflected in the tones of **C** and especially **D**, commented on in **E**. Attention should also be given to the range of his activities – legal, proprietorial (lands, estates – Pinnenden Heath as an example), monastic, directive, reformist. His concern with rights can be seen in **A**, some of **B** and **E**. His pursuit of reforms is seen in **B** and **E**. There was the advancement of new bishops and abbots (in **E**); organisational and structural changes involving cathedrals and chapters (**E**); the use of Norman models; new dioceses (**B**); the developing archdeacon and parish priest roles; the place of canon law and church courts, the use of councils (**B**, **E**); his ambivalence towards English customs and saints; Norman spoliation; preservation of some English features and lower order personnel; the use of Latin, liturgical practices, endowments, new foundations via monastic importations.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

**2 'A king in nothing but name.' Discuss this view of Edward the Confessor in the period 1051–66. [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative account will need much explanation linked to the needs of the question to score tolerably well. Good analysis and evaluation are required, linked to 'king in nothing but name', with the validity of this view explored in regard to key events (alleged or certain) from 1051–52 onwards. The crisis then will merit good evaluation; so, too, that of 1065. The succession will figure and the disputes there (1064 and what may have happened, the designation of Harold, etc); also, Edward's relations with his earls, his various pursuits (truly king? no warrior?), the extent of his authority, the Welsh dimension, security, the nature of government and administration, wealth and coinage, the role of the Church (Stigand, etc). Royal patronage, the advancement of Normans, the severity of the crises above, the power, pretensions and activism of the Godwines, father and sons, especially Harold and Tostig, the possible enfeeblement of Edward, the role of Emma, all are areas of consideration.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation sets up argument and counter-argument, and there is plenty of debate over Edward's kingship, the nature of the crises, the roles of the Godwines, the Norman connections and the more general state of the late Anglo-Saxon monarchy (how English was Edward?). Consideration can be given to such issues as the King's strengths or weaknesses and the changes across the reign, the paucity of evidence at key junctures, the apparent marginalisation of the King by the early 1060s (Harold as almost an *alter rex* or King-in-waiting). Views have changed; some are more lenient towards Edward; others more critical. The events of 1066, of course, create problems of evaluation.

**AO3** [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	51

**3 To what extent was the military organisation of William I's England based on Anglo-Saxon practices? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative or description of the post-Conquest military arena will not get very far here unless there is explanation. Good analysis and evaluation are required, with a good focus on 'military organisation' (this could include naval forces) and 'Anglo-Saxon practices' (native English elements and features), set against systems introduced by the Normans ('Norman Bases'). The question is evaluative. The introduction of military feudalism can be considered but this is not a question on that *per se*. Rather, that theme needs to be blended with such areas as the mounted knight, the relative importance of cavalry and infantry, the meaning of *miles*, the castle, household troops, the issues of quotas and knights' fees and military service, the use of the *fyrð*, possible pre-1066 antecedents as well as the importation of Norman techniques, tactics and skills. Links to events and action areas beyond Hastings will matter here; there needs to be illustration of the military activism of the Normans across the reign of William I: Hastings; the crisis period of c.1068–70; 1075; expeditions in defence of frontiers; William's needs when raising forces for operations in the Duchy.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation invites evaluation and elements of argument and counter-argument. There is debate here, not least about the importance of the differences of military organisation between pre-Conquest England and Normandy. As stated in **AO1**, reference can be made to the thorny issue of the introduction of military feudalism, but this needs to be tempered in scope and nature. There has been much debate as to possible precedents in Anglo-Saxon England and carry-overs after 1066 set against prior developments in the Duchy and transferred to England after 1066.

**AO3** [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	51

**4 'The Domesday Book's greatest purpose was to record the tenurial and territorial changes of 1066–86.' Discuss. [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demand of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. An account of the making of the Domesday Book will be wide of the mark. Analysis and evaluation are required, centred on the reasons for its compilation, its purpose as a record. Broad knowledge will help but more explicit, focused knowledge – local, regional – will merit reward. There is plenty of material to debate here. Tenurial and territorial changes and upheavals need to feature here, suitably supported, but there are other key arguments: it has been viewed as a 'geld book', a fiscal record, with links to the threat of invasion and the Great Oath of Salisbury; it has been viewed as a proprietorial record of land holding; it has been seen as an expression of royal authority and power. The financial purpose can be substantiated (references to assessments, resources, etc). But its value as a register of entitlement to lands and a record of changes since 1066 and especially c.1070–72 cannot be ignored; land disputes were to be settled.

There is information about social and economic structures, Norman-French settlement patterns, colonisation, tenurial changes at all levels of society; hence the debates over continuities and changes. There is plenty of evidence in the Domesday Book for: landed wealth; the place of new tenants-in-chief and tenants; any non-Norman landlords, English survivals; land exchanges; issues over antecessorial land compacts or scattered honours (a debated area); the processes and stages of Norman settlement; royal and baronial initiatives; the need for royal knowledge about what had happened, what had been taken over; and so on. One approach could be thematic: tenurial, fiscal, administrative, social, economic.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The formulation of the question sets up argument and counter-argument. There is much debate here – for example, strongly over the fiscal or non-fiscal role of the Domesday Book. Much has been speculative, including over the exact aims behind the compilation, with a strong focus on military needs linked to financial (invasion, need of focus, etc); other views have favoured the need to record the new *status quo*, the consummation of a period of profound changes (though the financial benefits to the crown can be a factor here also).

**AO3** [not applicable to Special Subjects]

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.