

A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS3A: The Angevin Kings of England: British Monarchy, 1154–1216
Mark scheme

2041
June 2014

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

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, students will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to *'think like a historian'* and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, students will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 students will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able students.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2014

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3A: The Angevin Kings of England: British Monarchy, 1154–1216

Question 1

- 01** To what extent were Henry II's changes in government designed purely to strengthen royal authority? **[45 marks]**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed

by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

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 will need to assess and identify the aims of Henry II in relation to government during his reign in which new procedures ultimately transformed the nature of kingship, government and society. These could be placed in the wider context of the structure of the courts, Henry's insistent concern with the punishment of crime and the maintenance of order, royal financial exactions, as well as the strengthening of royal power and control over the whole community.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the premise of the question:

- as a result of changes, central government was strengthened and royal control extended by weakening baronial power. The Inquest of Sheriffs (1170) was a searching inquiry into the malpractice and replacement not just of crown officials, but also extended to landholders
- reforms weakened the barons' control over their tenants and challenged the jurisdiction of the honorial and franchisal courts by increasing royal control through the eyres and royal justices. The eyres as a centrally managed legal process were a powerful weapon in the king's drive to exert royal authority through regular and systematised use. They considered royal rights within the localities – wardship, escheat – while after the General Eyre (1175–1176) the establishment of the Exchequer as a regular court for hearing civil litigation functioned only with specific authority from the king, thus imposing royal authority after rebellion.
- no privilege could evade the police regulations of the assizes of Clarendon (1166) and Northampton (1176) which increased the powers of the sheriff to allow arrest on any property
- the petty assizes of Novel Disseisin (c1166) and Morte d'Ancestor (1176) ignored the courts of the feudal aristocracy and appeared to be aimed straight at them, while the Grand assize (1179) attacked their right to do justice by having cases transferred to the royal court
- justice among his major barons was also a form of royal patronage and Henry was accused of using it as a means of political control by selling, delaying or denying it to individuals, such as in the Anstey case or that of Hugh of Chester
- writs meant that set forms for set situations provided not only greater protection for tenants but also greater scope for royal involvement. Jurisdiction over title to land was exercised only with specific royal authority and the writ Praecipe put litigation directly in the royal court
- the Assize of Arms (1181) reconstituted the fyrd and produced a national rather than a feudal force which no longer relied wholly on baronial support.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- Henry reacted strongly to political upheaval and felt the need to guarantee peace and order for all his subjects. The Assize of Clarendon (1166) demonstrated his concern relating to the discovery and punishment of crime. The organisation of juries of presentment (1164) to try serious crimes in the localities meant that major offences (felonies) against persons and property – homicide, rape, serious theft and assault, arson, robbery – were now criminal rather than civil cases and the business of the royal courts. Rebellion (1173–4) led to

increased disorder and crime which resulted in the General Eyre (1175–6), the Assize of Northampton and the King's Bench (1178)

- rights to property were to be safeguarded for all free men through the assizes and the writs. As a result the royal/subject relationship was fostered across a wider social spectrum due to the writs being cheap
- attempts at increasing royal income undermined baronial power. Reliefs were arbitrary and often felt to be punitive while the survey of military service and the Cartae Baronum (1166) directly impinged on the servitum debitum and allowed scutages to be raised as a form of taxation. Encroachment on the royal forest, which reached its greatest extent during Henry's reign were punished by the forest eyres (1176–8) which made a vast profit from the crown, while the Assize of Woodstock (1184) increased forest legislation.

Furthermore, students may argue directly against the proposition by stating:

- no further inquiry was brought into the conduct of royal officials after the Inquest of Sheriffs
- it was made clear in the new procedures that there was a distinct line between 'free' and 'unfree'. The unfree remained within their lord's jurisdiction through the manor and the hundred courts, while royal assistance was given in the recovery of fugitives. Franchisal power over the peasantry was confirmed and increased by royal grant
- the baronage benefited from the assizes with their emphasis on speed in reaching a verdict and the fact that they depended on a jury rather than the more risky trial by battle while few were placed under any real financial pressure. The Danegeld was discontinued and Henry took only 7 scutages in 35 years.

In conclusion, students may evaluate the various reasons:

- underlying Henry's changes was the fact that the authority to summon anyone before a royal judge or to command a seigneurial court to 'do justice' or to exercise a monopoly over tenurial disputes or felonies greatly enhanced the power of the king. His actions increased judicial profits for the crown, protected and enlarged royal rights and strengthened central control in the long term. This was the beginning of 'Angevin despotism'
- Henry is regarded by both contemporaries and historians as a king who was genuinely interested in government and who worked to bring peace and justice to his subjects by safeguarding the rights of property and enforcing criminal law, especially in the light of the disordered kingdom he inherited.

Or they might consider the following:

- overall, central government was strengthened and royal control extended which weakened baronial power. The assizes maintained a direct relationship with under tenants, increased royal authority in criminal matters and asserted the power of the king over private jurisdictions.

However, all major government measures had to be issued 'with advice and assent' from the barons. The king could make no permanent change in the laws of the country without their consent. Henry managed to strike a balance between taking and giving which kept his barons mainly content and they did not oppose the growth of royal control in general.

Question 2

- 02** 'Envy of Jewish wealth was the main reason for anti-Semitism in England in the years 1154 to 1216.'
Assess the validity of this view.

[45 marks]*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)***Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

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 will need to identify the various causes for the attacks on the Jews throughout England in this period and evaluate the relative importance of the possible envy that their wealth may have caused among the population. Developments both before and after 1190, as well as a wider European context can be used to place issues in relevant context.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the key factor suggested by the question:

- a distinctive feature of the larger towns by 1154 was the presence of Jews who had come to England from Rouen after the conquest. Because they were barred either de facto or de jure from many other occupations, it was financial dealings that proved to be the main means of livelihood for them at this time due to Church rulings on usury. They had many customers at all social levels with Henry II being the first king to borrow extensively from them, until he realised that he could make more money by taxing them. As they did not fit into the usual communal and seigneurial mechanisms of security, the king offered protection – at a price. Legal rights were recorded in royal charters and their business interests were regulated by the Crown
- living humbly and apart was not compatible with the financial activities of England's Jews in this period. Their credit was desperately needed and they were criticised for the size and ostentation of their town houses, which were in major centres of population
- the initial riots and murders in London (1189) were apparently triggered by the ostentation of the gifts, which they brought to present to Richard at his coronation. These and subsequent massacres in 1189 such as Stamford, focused on plundering their property. In Lynn in 1190 the local population was joined by merchants and foreign sailors who then left with their booty
- the estate of Aaron of Lincoln was handled by its own branch of the Exchequer – the Scaccarium Aaronis – from c1185–1205 as the king was reluctant to allow his heirs access to such a vast estate
- although there were never many Jews in England – less than 5000 c1200 – the size of their contribution to taxation testifies to their assets. A minimum of 4000 marks and 1/5th of their property was taken 1186–1194; in John's reign they paid 4000 marks for their charter of 1201, 4000 marks tallage and 1/10th of the value of their debts in 1207. None of this appears to have caused any great financial hardship to the community.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- royal policy caused problems because the huge sums taken arbitrarily from the Jews by the king caused them to make good their losses by increasing their interest rates, which ranged from 44% to 66%. This put greater pressure on their Christian debtors. Henry II set a precedent for his sons by taking over the debts of Aaron of Lincoln and the result was that the barons ended up owing the king and often paying him twice – the initial sum borrowed and then the loan itself. The Exchequer of the Jews, set up c1194 was meant to protect this 'royal property' in the light of the despoiling caused by the massacres and in fact made it easier for the Crown to access records and administer such 'legacies'. Magna Carta (1215) shows how bitterly this was resented by the baronage

- there was also a religious dimension. Although the official policy of the Church was to tolerate the Jews, it was nevertheless committed to exposing their errors and working for their conversion. The Third Lateran Council (1179) stressed the dangers of spiritual contamination through contact with them. In 1141, the case of Little St William of Norwich added another dimension to this and was followed by cases of other child ‘martyrs’ – Gloucester 1168, Bury St Edmonds 1181, Bristol 1183
- these cases had a further link as they were said to be in mockery of the Crucifixion. Violent assaults were on the increase throughout Europe exacerbated by the Jews’ reputation as the ‘killers of Christ’
- growing crusading fervour furthered these feelings. By despoiling the Jews, men could make an early start on killing infidels and fund their expedition to the Holy Land. In York in 1190, local barons and knights such as Malebisse, who were heavily in debt to the Jews and often with their lands in pledge, led the massacre. After the massacre, the starrs (records of debt) were burnt.

Furthermore, students may consider the following:

- the situation of 1189–90 produced an unusual set of circumstances, which is underlined by the fact that such actions were never to be repeated in England on the same scale. They had been banned from attending Richard’s coronation, which led people to believe that the royal protection, which was promised to the Jews in charters ratified by successive kings, had been withdrawn. They possibly would not have made such an appearance, but they needed him to reissue their charter before he left. This was also why they brought rich gifts. Richard had also just massively tallaged the Jews with the consequent impact on their Christian debtors and was about to embark on the Third Crusade, with all the further religious implications of their existence as ‘infidels’ and the links to the crucifixion. For once, all the reasons seemed to coalesce to produce an extraordinary set of circumstances.

In conclusion, students may produce the following by evaluating the various causes:

- Jews suffered many forms of official discrimination, which added to the ambivalence of their situation. They were debarred from the feudal system and many occupations were closed to them so it was financial dealings that proved the main means of livelihood as usury was forbidden to Christians. As a small, exclusive and culturally distinctive group, deeply involved in a lucrative monopoly, they stirred up hostility on the part of the greater community. The bulk of the borrowing was by knights, barons and the Church – those most able to make their resentment felt
- by contrast, within 30 years of the massacre at York, the Jewish community there was one of the richest and most significant in England. They survived and flourished because the Crown protected them. The ambivalence caused by Richard’s absence from 1189 left them open to civil attacks as later removal of this protection, especially the expulsion of 1290, would show.

Question 3

- 03** How far was the loss of Normandy in 1204 the result of King John's personal failings? **[45 marks]**
Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

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 will need to assess and identify the reasons why John lost Normandy to Philip Augustus who took Rouen in 1204. They will need to consider John's personality and possible mistakes and balance this against the context in which the events took place, which affected his options and actions.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the loss of Normandy was John's fault:

- John appeared militarily inept and cowardly due to his agreement to the Treaty of Le Goulet (1200), which undermined his political and financial position. In addition he can be criticised for his failure to relieve Chateau Gaillard (1203) and his abandoning of Normandy for England (1203)
- he appeared politically naïve in his handling of the situation with the Lusignans, not only through his marriage to Isabelle of Angouleme (1200), but his treatment of Ralph Lusignan in Normandy and the fact that he provided Philip Augustus with a legal pretext to escheat his territory (1202)
- he appeared to alienate his Norman barons through his treachery and cruelty. Des Roches was disgusted enough to change sides after Mirebeau, which lost John the Loire valley, and the nobility were scandalised by the murder of Arthur. He promoted foreign mercenaries such as d'Athee and Lupescar above the hereditary nobility and turned a blind eye to their pillaging of friendly towns and non-combatants such as at Falaise
- the Norman Church contrasted John's financial exactions and interference in elections with Philip's reputation for good lordship, free elections and renunciation of regalian right.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- John suffered from a number of military problems beyond his control. An extended frontier stretched his lines of communication and supply, while the draining of the English treasury and the war-weariness of Normandy after Richard's 7-year campaign against Philip meant that the odds were not in his favour. In addition, John did display both political and military skill. The treaty of Le Goulet cost him less than the relief Richard had paid Philip for his continental lands and excluded Arthur. His strategy at Mirebeau was masterly while his defensive line of the river Touque and his plan for the relief of Chateau Gaillard using both land and amphibious troops failed due to bad luck rather than bad planning
- the Lusignans had proved themselves faithless since the reign of Henry II with the murder of the Earl of Salisbury and the Count of Poitou, rebellion and their actions against Eleanor. He could not allow them to control Isabelle's strategic territory and had the support of Adhemar of Angouleme to move against them
- he was unlucky in that he was unable to resurrect Richard's northern alliance with the counts of Flanders and Boulogne who left for the Fourth crusade so he was unable to open a second front against the French, while the Norman barons made little effort to defend themselves and readily deserted to Philip – Alencon 1203, des Roches 1202, de Glapion 1204 – which made it virtually impossible to mount effective resistance. Also, Eleanor's death in 1204 removed the legal obstacle to Philip's progress in Aquitaine.

Furthermore, students may consider the wider context:

- the rise of the Capetian monarchy in this period was a factor beyond John's control. Since 1191 new domain lands – Amiens, Arras – and more efficient government had seen an increase in revenue, while Philip exploited his position as John's suzerain and used propaganda effectively which allowed John's barons and the Church to play off one lord against another for their own profit
- the heterogeneity of the Angevin Empire can also provide a wider contextual argument
- there is also the possibility to develop the contrast between the views of chroniclers and those of historians. Contemporary views relating to 'cowardice' in the context of Richard's victories as well as the prejudice of churchmen may be contrasted with modern views to place John within the context of the issue.

In conclusion, students may argue the following:

- John was responsible. He made a poor situation even worse due to crass mistakes, lack of real military ability, paranoia and cruelty which alienated any possible support
- he did the best he could but was forced to withdraw due to circumstances largely beyond his control. He demonstrated his commitment by spending the rest of his reign attempting to regain his territory, even at the expense of alienating his baronage
- the loss of Normandy was inevitable due to its existing instability, Richard's legacy and Philip's statecraft.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion