A-LEVEL

History

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216
Mark scheme

7042
June 2017

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

June 2017

A-level

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

Section A

01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the loss of Normandy in 1204.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**

L4: Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**

L3: Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**

L2: The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**

L1: The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: **in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following**:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the tone seems to suggest some criticism of John's behaviour, with emphasis on his 'bitter attack' and his refusal to comply with Philip's requests. However, this is muted
- as a contemporary to the events he was recording, Ralph had access to up-to-date information which makes this source valuable
- however, he is writing from an English perspective, rather than a French based one (and he was not an eyewitness) and this might affect his view of John's continental lands and policies, thus limiting the value
- Ralph was not writing for a clearly defined audience – this is more simply an account of events, and this might make him more objective.

Content and argument

- the loss of Normandy was caused ultimately as a result of the resumption of the war in 1202 – here Ralph is clearly stating that John was the root cause and that he gave Philip the excuse to end the peace. This provides a valuable contemporary view of blame
- the argument with the Lusignans over Isabella was certainly vital in the dispute – as this gave Philip the opportunity to intervene as overlord – it was John's behaviour as a contumacious vassal which was important, and Ralph discusses this clearly
- Ralph is quite vague when he talks about 'other issues', but here he could be referring to the Treaty of Le Goulet or the position of Arthur, both of which were important – thus limiting Ralph's value as a source
- however, Ralph's account does not cover 1203–4. Philip still had to win the war against John and so this source does have its limitations.

Source B: **in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following**:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Wendover's tone is highly critical of the English king, which can be seen in the way that he describes him as 'ignoring the war' in favour of feasting
- Wendover was based in England and thus not a direct witness to the events he is describing – he is relying on hearsay. However, he would have been aware of John's presence in England whilst Normandy was under attack

- as a monastic chronicler, Wendover would be looking to explain John's failures and a common way of doing this at the time was to ascribe personality flaws on the defeated, which limits his value
- he wasn't writing for any one particular audience, this was more a chronicle of events, which might increase his objectivity.

Content and argument

- John was absent in England over the critical winter of 1203–4 when most of his Norman territories were taken by Philip. Whether he was as indifferent as is suggested here is much more debateable – he was possibly raising much needed funds. Either way, this makes the source valuable
- Philip did gain many of John's possessions through their surrender – as covered in this source
- Philip had a huge army, which he deployed extremely effectively over the war – he also won battles and successfully besieged those castles which tried to remain loyal
- this source does fail to mention other reasons for the lack of loyalty to John – such as his treatment of Arthur and the prisoners of Mirebeau, limiting its value.

Source C: **in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following**:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the tone is very flattering about the French king and critical of John's defence (or lack of)
- Rigord was writing very close to the events he is describing and so could have easily had access to eye witness testimony
- Rigord has a clear agenda to praise the French king and so is liable to exaggerate events in Philip's favour, thus limiting the value of the source.

Content and argument

- Philip took the strategically important Chateau Gaillard through brilliant siege strategy and this held the key to Rouen – this was despite the apparent impregnability of the castle
- it is true that John failed to provide reinforcements to Gaillard or its surrounding area and so Philip took Rouen without needing to fight, thus the source has real value
- it is also true that John had lost so much support in Normandy that the towns and castles surrendered very quickly – making the job of the French king very easy
- the source skims over John's actual role in events and suggests at Philip's brilliance rather than John's political mistakes or even the long-term issues he was facing – it is possible he was back in England raising money, for example – thus limiting the value of the source.

Section B

02 'Henry's treatment of his sons was a more important cause of the Great Rebellion than his baronial policy.'

Assess the validity of this view. **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**

L4: Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**

L3: Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**

L2: The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**

L1: The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Henry's treatment of his sons was a more important cause of the Great Rebellion than his baronial policy might include:

- the rebellion began as a direct result of the marriage alliance involving John. He was to have some castles in Anjou as part of this, which angered the Young King
- young Henry had been crowned in 1170 and 1172, but was not always given complete freedom of manoeuvre and he certainly struggled to fund his lavish lifestyle
- Henry angered Richard, who had been granted rule in Aquitaine, by accepting the submission of Toulouse in 1172 and by granting territory away as a dowry for his daughter, Eleanor
- it is possible that the Young King was angry about the treatment of his former tutor, Becket, and angry that he hadn't been consulted in the negotiations with the Papacy
- as Young Henry had the chief grievance against his father, he could bring into the rebellion the French king (his father-in-law) – thus increasing the scale of the threat.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Henry's treatment of his sons was a more important cause of the Great Rebellion than his baronial policy might include:

- Henry had angered significant members of the baronage through his policy towards castle-building. He took many castles from barons and even knocked some down
- the Cartae Baronum allowed Henry to exploit the barons for scutage more effectively
- Henry's legal and governmental reforms reduced baronial influence over law in their respective areas which lost them money
- Henry sometimes used his position as feudal overlord to deny barons certain inheritances. Many of those involved in 1173/4 had such history with the King
- the barons resented the increasing professionalisation of the government. Men were often appointed due to their education and were now often from middle class backgrounds, rather than baronial ones.

Students are likely to conclude that it was Henry's treatment of his sons which provided the catalyst. Many of the barons had been angry with Henry for years, but had not dared act against him – it was only because the Young King was making promises to them that they decided to act in 1173. However, they may argue otherwise and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

03 To what extent did Henry II's authority throughout his territories decline in the years 1180 to 1189? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**

L4: Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**

L3: Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**

L2: The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**

L1: The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that Henry II's authority throughout his territories declined in the years 1180 to 1189 might include:

- in the 1180s he faced further internecine rebellions against him which destabilised his grip on power
- the deaths of Young Henry and Geoffrey made the succession less obvious and increased Philip's ability to interfere in familial disputes
- Henry struggled to assert himself over the new king of France, Philip, who was much stronger and more ambitious than Louis had ever been
- Richard took the Cross in 1187 without asking for his father's permission
- when Henry died, Philip and Richard had clearly gained the upper hand in the war against him – just before his death the King agreed humiliating terms in the peace treaty they concluded.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Henry II's authority throughout his territories declined in the years 1180 to 1189 might include:

- Henry's government in England remained stable – he had recovered from the Great Rebellion and faced no major baronial threats to his reign
- England was peaceful and law and order was ensured through the Assize of Northampton and the tightening up of Forest Law
- Henry had a positive relationship with the Pope and the English Church after the Becket debacle
- financially Henry was secure and he left a lot of money in the treasury for Richard
- the Assize of Arms is indicative of Henry's power and control in the 1180s.

Students might conclude that Henry did die with diminished authority – but that these problems were mainly related to his continental territories and that his rule over England remained stable and secure until the end. This helps to explain Richard's straightforward succession to the Crown. However, they may argue the opposite and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

04 'England suffered in the years 1189 to 1194 as a result of Richard I's absence on the Third Crusade.'

Assess the validity of this view. **[25 marks]**

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5: Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**

L4: Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**

L3: Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**

L2: The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**

L1: The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments/factors suggesting that England suffered in the years 1189 to 1194 as a result of Richard's absence on the Third Crusade might include:

- Longchamps was a bad appointment – he was unpopular and overbearing and caused instability
- the failure of Richard to provide a meaningful role for John led to his attempted rebellion
- Richard extracted huge sums from England to pay for his crusade – selling offices to the highest bidder, not necessarily the best man for the job
- the anti-Semitic violence which spread across England in 1189–90 is evidence of a breakdown in law and order
- Richard's capture and Philip's subsequent capture of important French territories would damage England financially.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that England suffered in the years 1189 to 1194 as a result of Richard's absence on the Third Crusade might include:

- Richard made clear provisions for the running of the country in his absence – appointing justiciars and his mother as regent
- during Richard's absence the itinerant justices still operated, as did the Exchequer
- Richard exploited money from the rich to help pay for his crusade – by selling offices to those who could afford it and fining corrupt officials
- Scotland's neutrality was ensured through the Quit-Claim of Canterbury
- William Longchamps was an effective administrator and dealt speedily with the perpetrators of the pogrom in York.

Students may conclude that Richard made adequate provisions for the running of England – indeed, Henry's reforms had meant that such absentee kingship was quite normal. For most people life functioned as normal and it was only the plotting of John and Philip which threatened real instability and this did not amount to much in England as a result of the loyalty to Richard from Eleanor and Walter of Coutances. However, they may argue the opposite and any supported judgement should be rewarded.