



## Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (9HI0/2A)  
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

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

Option 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

**Target:** AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4-7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
3	8-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li></ul>
4	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li><li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li></ul>
5	17-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>of the relationships between key features of the period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="384 210 1390 322">• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li><li data-bbox="384 338 1374 450">• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li><li data-bbox="384 465 1334 528">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the purpose of the Domesday Survey in 1086.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Chronicle was recorded in an abbey based on events told to the monks by visitors to the monastery and, although details of events would have been filtered by visitors, it should be a relatively impartial record</li><li>• The tone of the source suggests that the chronicler is critical of William's behaviour</li><li>• The purpose of the Chronicle was to record the significant events of the year.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the purpose of the Domesday Survey in 1086:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that William I was concerned about a threatened invasion ('King of Denmark planned to conquer England')</li><li>• It implies that William needed to know about the value of England for the purpose of taxation ('what payments he ought to have', 'how much money it was worth')</li><li>• It suggests that one purpose of the survey was to assert control over the barons ('all submitted to the king and became his vassals. They swore oaths of allegiance to him').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There was a military crisis in 1085 with a threatened Danish invasion. William raised a massive army and billeted it in England. He needed to raise taxes to pay for it</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Domesday Survey confirmed the principle that William possessed all the land in England and that his tenants-in-chief and their vassals held land from him</li> <li>• The Oath of Salisbury was a special oath of allegiance and bound vassals to the king by personal loyalty.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domesday Book was a record of the customs, law and taxes of England and it was necessary that it should be an accurate record</li> <li>• Domesday Book was compiled by commissioners charged to investigate a region and based on accurate records from the Anglo-Saxon period</li> <li>• Source 2 is from the survey for Kent, previously in the earldom of Wessex and known to be a wealthy region.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the purpose of the Domesday Survey in 1086:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that the king could use the information to enforce the responsibilities of coastal towns in providing for the royal navy ('townsmen provided the king with 20 ships for 15 days')</li> <li>• It provides evidence of the taxes and dues that the king was entitled to collect from his subjects ('Whoever lived permanently in the town made customary payment to the king')</li> <li>• It implies that one purpose of the Domesday Survey was to inform the king of his legal rights on the highways and the fines he could demand for breaking the law ('shall pay the toll to the king').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Domesday Survey gave William an exact record of the feudal army that he could call upon</li> <li>• The Domesday Survey gave William an exact record of the local contribution to the king's geld</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There were complaints in England in 1086 about the harsh taxes imposed by the king.</li></ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The comments raised in Source 1 regarding the thoroughness of the Survey verify the content in Source 2</li><li>• Both sources indicate that rights of taxation were a key purpose in the Domesday Survey</li><li>• The sources contrast in their tone; Source 1 offers opinion on the survey and its purpose while Source 2 appears to be an impartial official record.</li></ul>

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II.</p> <p><b>Source 3</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• William of Newburgh was able to gain a wide perspective on events at this time through the variety of travellers who visited his abbey and provided information</li><li>• William of Newburgh lived through the Anarchy and will have experienced the disorder and the restoration of royal power after 1154</li><li>• William of Newburgh was not an eyewitness to events and relied on material that was selected for him by those who visited his abbey.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that Henry II restored order by expelling the mercenaries ('issued an edict against the many mercenaries ... he ordered to return to their own country')</li><li>• It suggests that men were afraid of thwarting Henry's authority ('Terror-stricken by this edict, they slipped away')</li><li>• It claims that Henry revived the legal system ('revived the strength of the laws in England', 'he appointed judges to restrain the behaviour of wicked men')</li><li>• It indicates that Henry curbed the powers of the barons ('ordered the newly-erected castles to be razed to the ground, with the exception of a few ... These castles he desired either to keep for himself').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The removal of mercenaries enhanced Henry II's authority by reducing</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>his costs and assisting in the restoration of royal finances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry began a programme of decommissioning and destroying adulterine castles at the end of 1154; he besieged three of the baron of Wigmore's castles simultaneously in 1155 and forced him to surrender</li> <li>• The royal writ was restored across the country and Henry II spent his first year in power hearing and settling grievances regarding rights and lands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source 4</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an official charter that outlines the rights granted by the king to Lincoln</li> <li>• Lincoln had been a supporter of Matilda fitzEmpress during the civil war and was therefore likely to be favoured by Henry II</li> <li>• The purpose of the charter is to restore law and order and the financial well-being of the city to Lincoln.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the restoration of royal authority in England in the early years of the reign of Henry II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that the law in Lincoln was in need of restoration ('I have granted to my citizens of Lincoln all their liberties and customs and laws which they had in the time of ... Henry I')</li> <li>• It implies that a key element of the restoration of royal authority was to restore the financial position of the city ('shall have the same rights to taxes and customs duties as ever they had')</li> <li>• It provides evidence that Henry was asserting his own authority over the city ('in my city of Lincoln as my citizen').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The restoration of the law and order in cities was a key factor in the restoration of royal authority</li> <li>• Towns were excellent sources of royal revenue through licences to hold fairs and markets and tolls to enter the town walls</li> <li>• Henry II made the most important towns, London, Lincoln, York,</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="400 163 1374 237">Winchester, Exeter, Oxford and Leicester, royal boroughs under Crown rather than baronial control.</p> <p data-bbox="304 311 533 342"><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 392 1273 427">The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul data-bbox="352 472 1358 757" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="352 472 1358 546">• The two sources together suggest that royal authority was restored in military, legal and financial terms</li><li data-bbox="352 577 1358 651">• The two sources contrast by offering a perspective of the restoration across the whole country and in a single city</li><li data-bbox="352 683 1358 757">• The two sources are contrasting in nature. Source 1 is an historical account while Source 2 is a charter of rights.</li></ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the consequence of Harold Godwinson's actions, in the years 1053-66, was to strengthen, rather than challenge, Edward the Confessor's rule.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the consequence of Harold Godwinson's actions, in the years 1053-66, was to strengthen, rather than challenge, Edward the Confessor's rule should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Harold acted as a diplomat for Edward, e.g. his involvement in the search for Edmund Ironside's descendants who were brought back to England in 1057</li><li>• Harold ended the alliance between Ælfgar of Mercia and Gruffydd ap Llywelyn in 1055 and secured the west of the kingdom by the refortification of Herefordshire after their attack</li><li>• Harold achieved a great military victory for Edward in his defeat of the Welsh king Gruffydd ap Llywelyn in 1063. This ended the encroachment of the Welsh on the English borderlands</li><li>• Harold maintained the king's peace in 1065 by refusing to go to war over the rebellion against Tostig, agreeing to Tostig's exile and supporting the elevation of Morcar of Mercia to the earldom of Northumbria.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the consequence of Harold Godwinson's actions was to challenge rather than strengthen Edward the Confessor's rule should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Harold promoted the fortunes of the Godwin family in the court and country and amassed a fortune of £7000 per annum compared to Edward's £5000</li><li>• The aggrandisement of the Godwin family in the north and the south of the kingdom meant that Edward was not in full control</li><li>• Harold, rather than Edward, was the primary beneficiary of the removal of Ælfgar and Gruffydd ap Llywelyn because he held lands on the Welsh border. He was able to reinforce his own position by marrying Ealdgyth</li><li>• Harold promoted his preferences in the church rather than Edward's, e.g.</li></ul>

the support he gave to Stigand

- Harold refused to provide the troops Edward wanted to crush the 1065 rebellion. The success of the rebellion led to Tostig's exile, putting Harold in the prime position to take the throne in 1066.

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the similarities in the key features of the Battle of Hastings of 1066 and the Battle of Tinchebrai of 1106 are outweighed by the considerable differences.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the similarities in the key features of the Battle of Hastings of 1066 and the Battle of Tinchebrai of 1106 are outweighed by the considerable differences should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The support of the Church for the protagonists differed; in 1066, papal approval was given to the Duke of Normandy, whereas, in 1106, the Church favoured the king of England</li> <li>• The tactics employed on the battlefields were different; in 1066, the Norman knights fought on horseback and the Anglo-Saxons on foot, whereas, in 1106, knights on both sides fought mainly on foot</li> <li>• The events of the battlefield differed; in 1066, the Norman duke had a clear command of his troops and prevented them from fleeing; in 1106, Robert Curthose lost control and Robert of Bellême fled with his men</li> <li>• The duration of the battles differed; the Battle of Hastings lasted all day, whereas the Battle of Tinchebrai lasted only an hour</li> <li>• The location and outcomes of the battles differed; the Battle of Hastings was fought in England and won by the Norman duke, whereas the Battle of Tinchebrai was fought in Normandy and won by the king of England.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the differences in the key features of the Battle of Hastings of 1066 and the Battle of Tinchebrai of 1106 are outweighed by their similarities should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both battles were fought by the duke of Normandy and the king of England for control over both territories</li> <li>• The Battle of Hastings and the Battle of Tinchebrai were both pitched battles</li> <li>• The role of the cavalry was decisive in both battles; in 1066, the feigned retreat lured the Anglo-Saxon fyrd down the hill where it was cut down and, in 1106, the Norman troops were routed by the Breton charge</li> <li>• The outcome of both battles was that England and Normandy came under the control of one ruler.</li> </ul>



	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---

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

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that, in the years 1154-89, Richard fitzNigel was the most significant royal official in Henry II's government.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1154-89, Richard fitzNigel was the most significant royal official in Henry II's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Richard fitzNigel improved the management of the kingdom by his development of the Exchequer and overseeing England's financial affairs that was essential for funding Henry II's government and wars</li><li>• Richard fitzNigel's influence extended beyond his own role through the development of standardised procedures in the auditing of accounts of the royal household and in local government in his <i>Dialogue of the Exchequer</i></li><li>• In 1180, Richard fitzNigel oversaw the reformation of the coinage based on procedures established by him to monitor the quality of the currency. This improved the king's control and prevented a loss of revenues</li><li>• Richard fitzNigel's oversight of the Exchequer played a key role in boosting royal revenue. Before 1160 royal revenue stood at £13,300 per annum. By 1189 it had been increased to £23,300 per annum.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that challenge the significance of Richard fitzNigel in Henry II's government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bishop Nigel developed the Exchequer before the rise of Richard fitzNigel. He was responsible for establishing the twice-yearly sessions of the Exchequer and in recording accounts on pipe rolls</li><li>• The role of the justiciar was an important point of contact between the king and the barons in the regions. He travelled in the kingdom and supervised the itinerant justices who dispensed justice in the localities</li><li>• Richard de Lucy was the sole justiciar after 1168. He was a vital figure in Henry II's government: an expert at court politics, astute at managing the church and responsible for defeating the barons in 1173-74</li><li>• The chancellor was a key member of the administration. Under Thomas Becket, the chancery developed into an efficient component in the</li></ul>

government machinery with responsibility for issuing writs and charters.

Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that relations between church and state declined continuously during the years 1162-74.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that relations between church and state declined continuously during the years 1162-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Becket's appointment as archbishop of Canterbury in 1162 led to the decline in church-state relations; his decision to resign as chancellor led to Henry's accusations of betrayal</li> <li>• Relations declined in the period 1162-64 over Henry's attempts to assert authority over the church and Becket's refusal to agree to allow clerics to be tried in royal courts</li> <li>• The relationship declined further in 1164 with Becket's refusal to accept the Constitutions of Clarendon and Henry's attempt to destroy Becket at Northampton, leading to Becket fleeing into exile</li> <li>• The decline continued in the period 1164-70: Becket found the favour of the pope and the French king; Henry attacked Becket's family and household and had Young Henry crowned by the Archbishop of York</li> <li>• Becket's return in 1170 did not improve relations and culminated in his murder in December 1170.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that relations between church and state did not decline continuously during the years 1162-74 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English bishops co-operated with the king during Becket's exile in 1164-70, e.g. the archbishop of York crowned Young Henry in 1170, which suggests it was not a church-state conflict but a Becket-Henry conflict</li> <li>• A form of settlement was achieved in 1170 when Becket and Henry exchanged a kiss of peace and Becket returned from exile</li> <li>• There was a measured response from the papacy after Becket's murder in 1170. The pope did not seek to exploit Henry's guilt but to develop opportunities for reconciliation</li> <li>• After Henry's public penance in 1172, a compromise was reached between church and state at Avranches</li> </ul>

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In 1173-74, the papacy supported Henry during the Great Rebellion and refused to allow Louis VII to launch a crusade against him.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom