



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE 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)

Summer 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_1906\_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>   |
| <b>5</b> | <b>17–20</b> | <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.   |
| <b>1</b> | <b>1–3</b>   | <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>   |
| <b>2</b> | <b>4–7</b>   | <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>   |
| <b>3</b> | <b>8–12</b>  | <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>  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>13–16</b> | <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> |
| <b>5</b> | <b>17–20</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• 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>• 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>• 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   |
|----------|--|
| <b>1</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. 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 shed light on Henry I's campaign at Tinchebrai, 1106.</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 author was chaplain to a member of Duke Robert's army and would usually be expected to favour that side</li><li>• This is a private letter from one priest to another and, as such, can be candid in the views it expresses</li><li>• The language and tone of the source make it evident that the author favoured Henry I's side</li><li>• The author met with Henry I after the battle and is likely to have gained some information about the battle from that meeting.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Henry I's campaign at Tinchebrai, 1106:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that Henry I had a very large army ('The whole army of the King may be reckoned as having consisted of about forty thousand men.')</li><li>• It implies that Henry's army was superior to Duke Robert's army ('the battle had lasted only an hour')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Duke Robert was deserted by his supporters ('Robert of Bellême turned and fled, and all his men were dispersed.')</li><li>• It provides evidence that Duke Robert and his leading barons were captured in the battle ('The Duke himself was captured, as was the Count of Mortain with his barons').</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>• Henry I had put the castle at Tinchebrai, held by Duke Robert's supporter, the Count of Mortain, under siege</li><li>• Henry I had hired a huge number of mercenaries and assembled a much larger army than Duke Robert</li><li>• Henry ordered his army to fight on foot because the terrain was unsuited to the use of mounted knights</li><li>• Robert of Bellême's decision to flee when Henry's forces inflicted heavy casualties on Robert's infantry brought the battle to an end after just an hour.</li></ul> |

| Question | Indicative content  |
|----------|---|
|          | <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>• Orderic Vitalis provides an account of the battle written on the basis of information he had compiled to write his <i>Ecclesiastical History</i></li> <li>• Orderic Vitalis' account reflects the views of the Church</li> <li>• The tone and language used make it clear that Orderic Vitalis favours Henry I's side.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Henry I's campaign at Tinchebrai, 1106:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that Duke Robert's counsellors encouraged him to fight ('Using violent language, they prevented the Duke from listening to the conditions of peace.')</li> <li>• It suggests that Duke Robert had been an ineffective ruler in Normandy ('you may enjoy feasts and sports with perfect security')</li> <li>• It indicates that Henry I gave the impression that he was offering a reasonable deal to Robert to prevent the battle ('Yield to me .... I will pay you annually out of the treasury of England.')</li> <li>• It implies that Henry's cause was favoured by the Church ('My desire is to assist the church of God').</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>• Duke Robert had mismanaged the Duchy of Normandy after his return from crusade, e.g. he had failed to assist Le Mans against the claims of the Counts of Maine and Anjou</li> <li>• Robert of Bellême had been responsible for burning down the nunnery of Almenêches and forced Duke Robert to confirm his Norman inheritance</li> <li>• Duke Robert had broken the Treaty of Alton by making peace with Robert of Bellême and this justified Henry I's invasion.</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>• Both sources agree that Henry I had assembled a huge army to fight Duke Robert</li> <li>• The sources originate from different sides, but both favour Henry I</li> <li>• Taken together, the two sources cover the whole event from the reasons for the conflict to Henry's victory.</li> </ul> |

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

| Question | Indicative content  |
|----------|---|
| <b>2</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. 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 shed light on the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154–74.</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 an English chronicler and is likely to be partial towards the English</li><li>• The purpose of William of Newburgh's chronicle was to write down the key events as a record of the history of the time. As such it is considered an accurate record</li><li>• The language and tone of the extract suggests William of Newburgh's admiration for Henry II.</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 extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154-74:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that the king of Scotland was subordinate to Henry II for the lands he held in England ('King Malcolm received from King Henry the earldom of Huntingdon')</li><li>• It provides evidence that the king of Scotland acknowledged Henry II's legal right to the disputed lands ('Wisely, remembering how the king of England had established the justice of his cause in this matter')</li><li>• It suggests that Henry II was able to enforce his control over disputed border lands ('the king of Scots restored the lands in question to King Henry in their entirety').</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>• Henry II considered himself to be a superior king to the king of Scots</li><li>• In 1157 Henry II forced Malcolm IV to hand over Newcastle upon Tyne, Bamburgh and Carlisle and to restore the Solway and Tweed border, breaking the 1147 promise that the Scottish king would keep these lands</li><li>• Henry II made Malcolm IV earl of Huntingdon and Malcolm did homage to Henry II as his vassal for these lands</li><li>• In 1162 Henry summoned Malcolm to Woodstock to do homage again, following his concern that Malcolm had been making foreign alliances that could threaten the Angevin empire.</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 a legally-enforceable peace treaty</li><li>• William the Lion was forced to agree to this treaty after his capture at</li></ul> |



| Question | Indicative content   |
|----------|--|
|          | <p data-bbox="395 154 501 183">Alnwick</p> <ul data-bbox="347 190 1225 219" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 190 1225 219">• The terms of the treaty entirely favour Henry II as the victor.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 286 1398 376">2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent to which Henry II held authority over the king of Scotland in the years 1154-74:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 421 1398 734" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 421 1398 510">• It provides evidence that the king of Scotland has submitted to Henry II as the higher authority ('William, king of Scots, has become the vassal of King Henry for Scotland and for all his other lands.')</li> <li data-bbox="347 517 1398 577">• It provides evidence that the king of Scotland is subject to Henry II's justice ('to submit to the judgement of his court')</li> <li data-bbox="347 584 1398 674">• It provides evidence that Henry II has established the usual safeguards to hold William the Lion to the treaty ('shall be released, but only after each one has delivered his own hostage')</li> <li data-bbox="347 680 1398 734">• It suggests that the Scottish king is the same as any vassal of Henry II ('as all the other men of King Henry are required to do').</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 835 1350 925">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 data-bbox="347 969 1374 1283" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 969 1374 1059">• When he became king of Scotland, William the Lion had attempted to make an alliance with Louis VII of France, suggesting that he was not prepared to submit to Angevin authority</li> <li data-bbox="347 1066 1374 1155">• During the Great Rebellion, William the Lion invaded England twice, in August 1173 when he devastated Yorkshire and at Easter 1174 when he laid siege to Carlisle</li> <li data-bbox="347 1162 1374 1223">• On 13 July 1174 William the Lion was captured at Alnwick and sent to Henry as his prisoner</li> <li data-bbox="347 1229 1374 1283">• In the Treaty of Falaise, William the Lion was forced to hand over 21 hostages including his brother, David.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 1317 539 1346"><b>Sources 3 and 4</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 1384 1246 1413">The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 1451 1406 1637" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 1451 1406 1512">• Taken together, the two sources suggest that Henry II was able to exert his authority over the Scottish king</li> <li data-bbox="347 1518 1406 1579">• It is clear from Source 4 that the Scottish king had not accepted his subordinate status to the king of England as established in Source 3</li> <li data-bbox="347 1585 1406 1637">• The two sources offer a view on the authority of Henry II over the Scottish king from an English point of view.</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 whether the rebellions of 1067–75 were a significant threat to William I's authority as king of England.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the rebellions of 1067–75 were a significant threat to William I's authority as king of England should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rebellion in Exeter in 1068 took place while William I was absent in Normandy. Its significance is suggested by the fact that William returned to England to lead the army against it</li><li>• The northern rebellion of 1068–70 was a serious threat because it was supported by Edwin and Morcar, Edgar Atheling and Malcolm of Scotland. Robert of Comines was murdered and the rebellion spread to York</li><li>• The northern rebels invited Sweyn of Denmark to send an army to support them. The significance of the threat is shown in William's reaction – the harrying of the north</li><li>• The significance of the threat posed by the East Anglian rebels is shown in their invitation to the Vikings to invade to support the rebellion. It took more than a year for William to crush the rebellion</li><li>• The Norman earls, Ralph and Roger, intended to replace William as king in 1075 and requested Viking help to assist them.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the rebellions of 1067–75 were not a significant threat to William I's authority as king of England should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Eustace of Boulogne's revolt in 1067 was easily stopped by Odo of Bayeux and the fact that Eustace later received lands from William I suggests that the revolt was not considered to be significant</li><li>• William offered generous terms to the Exeter tax rebels, which suggests he did not regard the revolt as a significant threat</li><li>• The Viking threat was easily dealt with; William paid them off in the northern and East Anglian rebellions and they arrived too late in the revolt of the Norman earls</li><li>• William could rely on the support of his leading barons, Odo of Bayeux and William fitzOsbern, to subdue revolts to his rule.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| 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 there was very little difference in the nature of Anglo-Saxon and Norman kingship.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that there was very little difference in the nature of Anglo-Saxon and Norman kingship should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman systems, kingship was personal and relied on a forceful personality to succeed</li> <li>• Both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings derived their powers from God. They were anointed with holy oils at their coronation, which bestowed divine grace on them</li> <li>• Both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings were responsible for justice in their kingdom; the king was the chief lawmaker, and had the right to impose penalties on wrongdoers</li> <li>• Both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings were expected to be warriors who were responsible for leading their troops into battle</li> <li>• Both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings presided over a hierarchical political and social system in which they relied on the support of important subordinates to administer the day-to-day governing of their kingdom</li> <li>• Both the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings ruled with the advice of their councils and used a chancery to produce the writs by which they governed.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there was a significant difference in the nature of Anglo-Saxon and Norman kingship should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Norman kingship was itinerant. William I spent significant periods out of England ruling his continental lands; late Anglo-Saxon kings spent their entire reigns in their kingdom</li> <li>• Unlike the Norman Kings, Edward the Confessor was not a warrior; he delegated leadership of the army to Harold Godwinson</li> <li>• The feudal system created a very different relationship between the Norman kings and their subjects. Vassals held land from the Norman king in return for service. Anglo-Saxon land was granted by charter and the king had less control over it</li> <li>• The Norman kings instituted the tradition of crown-wearings three times a year to show themselves as the legitimate ruler to their subjects. Anglo-Saxon kingship was legitimised by the approval by the witan.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

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

| Question | Indicative content  |
|----------|---|
| <b>5</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 whether there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Henry II introduced more regular visitations of the justices in eyre. They began to replace sheriffs and local officials and by 1170 their visits lasted several weeks. They provided a more impartial judgement in the localities</li><li>• A group of 20 professional judges developed out of the itinerant justices who became experts in the law</li><li>• Standardised writs were developed that could be used in the king's absence and meant that the justice system became faster and more accessible and tenants were better protected than ever before</li><li>• Significant changes were introduced with the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, which increased the powers of sheriffs, introduced juries of presentment and developed <i>novel disseisin</i> and <i>mort d'ancestor</i></li><li>• The Court of the Kings Bench was established in 1178 and it became the most important court in the land</li><li>• Ranulf Glanville's <i>Treatise on Laws and Customs in England</i> laid down a standardised system of common law for the first time.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were not considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Justices in eyre had existed before Henry II's reign, their visits became more regular but their role had not really changed</li><li>• The sheriff continued to be the key local law official</li><li>• Villeins continued to receive justice at the hands of their lord</li><li>• Trial by ordeal continued to be the main way of determining guilt.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| 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, in the years 1180–89, Philip Augustus played the most significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1180–89 Philip Augustus played the most significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The French crown lands were considerably smaller than the Angevin Empire; Philip Augustus' determination to expand his territory at the expense of the Empire made him the most formidable enemy</li> <li>• Philip Augustus exploited the disputes between Henry II's sons to extend his control, e.g. he made Geoffrey a seneschal, in 1186 he took homage for Brittany and, after Geoffrey's death, he claimed wardship of his heir</li> <li>• Philip Augustus used the dispute over the Vexin and the marital status of his sister, Alice, to attack Henry II in 1187 in Berry</li> <li>• Philip Augustus formed an alliance with Richard in the summer of 1189. This enabled an attack on Maine and Anjou in the heartland of the Angevin Empire and led to Henry II having to cede territory.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1180–89 Philip Augustus did not play the most significant role and/or there were other more significant factors in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin Empire should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henry II played a significant role in the collapse of his power by the mismanagement of his sons, e.g. his refusal to announce his successor after Young Henry's death encouraged both Richard and John to rebel</li> <li>• Richard's arrogant management of Aquitaine provoked conflict in the Duchy and gave Philip Augustus the pretext to intervene as the overlord</li> <li>• The size of the Angevin Empire with its long frontier and disparate nature meant that it was going to be difficult to control and likely to collapse</li> <li>• By the 1180s Henry II was ageing and less able to maintain the empire with the same energy and vigour that he had shown in his younger years.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |