



# Examiners' Report

## June 2019

### GCE History 9HI0 2A

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### 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).

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

# Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to engage effectively across the ability range in paper 2A.1, Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053-1106 and paper 2A.2 England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154-1189.

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. A significant minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge which was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this time of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and discuss the source. This resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates often engaged in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. It continues to be the case that not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates continue to explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

## **Question 1**

Option 2A.1 has a larger entry than option 2A.2 and hence the majority of candidates answered this question. This question was in general answered very well with many responses meriting secure level 4 and level 5. The two sources were analysed by candidates and some very good reasoned inferences were seen. A significant number of candidates inferred that Henry made his knights' dismount; some candidates attributed this to the terrain, and some attributed this to Henry not wanting them to flee. A large number of candidates drew inferences with regard to the size of Henry's army and its superiority compared to Robert's forces and many questioned the reliability of the claim that Henry had forty thousand men. Some candidates drew inferences that Robert was not well liked in Normandy and this may have contributed to his losing of the battle. A lot of candidates also commented on the timescale of the battle and how it lasted only a short time with the significance of Robert of Bellême. Many candidates spoke about the authors of the sources and some highlighted that one source was from a Norman and one from an Anglo-Norman perspective, although both seemed to paint Henry I positively. Some candidates made effective use of contextual knowledge to probe the two sources to verify if they were telling the truth and were thus able to consider the different ways in which the sources might be used by historians. The most effective responses drove the answer from a secure analysis of the source evidence, interrogated by secure knowledge and evaluated to establish the weight the sources bear in an enquiry. The most successful evaluation of the sources moved beyond a discussion of the provenance and used the evidence within the source to justify judgements.

Source 1 and 2 offer a historian a key insight, not only to the events of the battle of Tichebrow, but also the ~~leading~~ errors of judgement from that of Duke Robert leading up to it. Source 1 offers a standpoint that aims to take a less subjective side, whereas source 2 reflects more keenly on the pro favour of Curthose. This essay will ~~assess~~ their usefulness by themselves and with one-another.

Source one, written shortly after the events of the battle in 1106 offers a clear description of the battle. ~~Being~~ Coming from a Norman priest, his accounts show an even objective representation of both leaders, who were also Normans. However, being a chamberlain of the Lord Robert Estouteville, his account puts less blame on that of Curthose than is arguably fair. ~~While~~ <sup>he puts</sup> ~~putting~~ the Norman <sup>Anglo-</sup> ~~king~~ in favour for his efforts on the battle field, suggesting that only 2 men died in the conflict. This is likely referring to knights rather than the rank and file. This possible exaggeration could be due to

the fact that Henry was his new lord, speaking ill of him may not have been in the Norman priests best interests. Instead he puts the blame at feet of Belleme, suggesting <sup>negatively</sup> that 'he burned and fled'. This is likely because of the chaos Belleme had caused in Normandy over the previous years. This gives evidence into the resentment that was felt to him, as it was his break of the treaty of Alton that caused Henry's campaign into Normandy in the first place.

Source 2 offers a very different perspective, instead focusing on the events leading up to battle. It was written by Orderic Vitalius who takes a very disfavoured stance against Robert Curthose - using like 'unhesitatingly rejected. Using violent language...' This is likely to do with the ~~stark~~ moodiness at which Vitalius was writing as he had been poorly treated by Curthose during his Dukedom. This means a Historian should take Vitalis's usually objective remarks, less literally. Here, ~~Robert is painted~~ as the sole dictator of the conflict, though ~~Henry is painted as an extremely merciful King, offering his brother a large and well~~

fortuned estate of half of Normandy has his surrender. This has importance as it suggests that Henry's original intent of the campaign was not to destroy his brother and reunite England and Normandy, but instead offer his assistance of ruling. This is evident in the line 'without the trouble of ruling'. However, once again this may have been an exaggeration in order to make King Henry look merciful and religiously pious - 'I come here not despite you or your... Dutchy, my desire is to assist the church of God.' The fact it is written far after the events ~~also~~ <sup>also</sup> lessens its credibility and most likely

When taken together, sources 1 and 2 offer a key detail outcome of the Anglo campaign in Normandy. Both sources offer a positive outlook to their new lord, Henry 'when I met the king, he received me graciously at Caen' as well as Vitalis' descriptive, most likely imagined merciful speech. This has importance as it shows the attitudes of the Anglo-Norman elite towards the reunification of the empire since its break up in 1086 following the death of William. This had huge effect as it meant, finally, the lords were able to

just one person - King Henry - without fear of lands being confiscated by the other. This fear is most clearly evident in Belleme's retreat to Normandy after his failed revolt against Henry at Arundel. With 2 lords against him, due to the death of Alton, his lands were at risk. With the reunification of the Anglo-Norman empire the leading magnates could fulfil their serving duties. This was the most prominent feature of the Thirdebrai campaign as restored the internal unrest that had been plaguing both sides of the channel since William's death.

To conclude, it is ~~is~~ clear that source 1 offers great detail into the battle itself and suggesting that had it not been for Belleme, ~~either side~~ the battle would have been much finer. Source 2's much more scathing account of Carlhose's injustice against his brother puts the blame for more on his side. However, when taken together - seeing how both are favourable to the new king, it is clear that the Anglo-Norman elite were mainly concerned about reunification, than loyalty to either side - especially Robert Carlhose.



This is a very good level 4 response. It has a number of reasoned inferences and considers the evidence of the source with regard to what is factual and what is opinion, and how far claims are exaggerated. The contextual knowledge is relevant and shows a clear awareness of the values of the time. The response is more limited in the weighing of the sources and this prevents it entering level 5.



Justify comments on the reliability of the sources by drawing upon their content.

## **Question 2**

Overall this question was answered well by candidates. The best responses showed a clear awareness that the sources were drawn from different time periods and were able to use this to discuss the changing relationship between Henry II and the King of Scotland and relate it to an overall judgment about the extent of Henry's authority.

Many candidates drew on their knowledge of the agreement with David I prior to Henry taking the English throne and used this to interrogate the claim in the source that Malcolm was defrauding the King of England of a large part of his realm. Contextual knowledge tended to be applied more effectively for Malcolm IV and some candidates had limited knowledge that they could apply to the source evidence to assess the relationship between Henry II and William the Lion. Most candidates mentioned William in the context of the Great Rebellion with his capture and submission. This was contrasted to Malcolm who submitted relatively peacefully.

Most candidates were successful in using the two sources together, many using them to trace the changing relations and many to discuss the differing nature of the sources and the impact that has on attributing weight. The best evaluations, achieving level 4 and level 5, commented not only on the provenance of the source but justified comments on the weight of the evidence by applying them to the evidence in the source.

Henry II's relationship with Scotland was ~~not~~<sup>almost</sup> never one in which one power held greater ~~authority~~<sup>control</sup> over the other as they were two separate Kingdoms. However, early in his reign Henry had been able to gain some influence over Scotland due to its lack of ability during the time of a new king. By a certain period Henry had gained legitimate authority over Scotland, and later in his reign, control of the King. Source ~~three~~<sup>3</sup> documents Henry's early relationship with Scotland and the development into the Scottish King becoming under Henry II's authority. Source 4 on the other hand is from the <sup>Great</sup> Rebellion, where Henry managed to gain far more control ~~over~~<sup>and authority over</sup> Scotland and its King. By using both sources one can analyse the development of Henry's authority, and the causes of ~~the~~ the change.

Source 3 firmly mentions Malcolm IV 'treating the northern counties of England E. J as his own property'. There is contrasting evidence that prior to Malcolm IV's coronation, in 1149, Henry II pledged to give lands to David I in the north of England when he would become King. The waters may have muddied as to who would own the lands when Malcolm IV was crowned in 1153, but this statement of the lands being Henry's shows a clear bias in the source as there is no consideration of other factors. When Malcolm returns the land, the source notes that it was due to the 'established' justice

of Henry II's cause. Whether ~~Malcolm~~<sup>Henry</sup> threatened or only persuaded Malcolm is not the case. Malcolm IV did not have the strength to face England due to internecine struggles after the death of David I; Malcolm had to suppress his vicer. One can see that Henry does have influence here due to military might, but it develops into authority.

The source mentions that Henry II gave Malcolm IV lands in Huntingdon, which was during the Toulouse campaign in 1159. Henry had gone from having influence to holding authority over Malcolm, although not as the Scottish King, but as his vassal. It is noted at the end that 'England enjoyed, for a time, peace and security'. This was due to his authority over Malcolm seen by his calling him to Woodstock in 1163 and taking David II hostage, but it's important in the mention of 'for a time'. It is important, as in 1165 William I became King of Scotland and changed Scotland's attitude towards Henry. Henry's authority had diminished and there was a greater threat coming from Scotland.

The source's author may have some bias as mentioned due to him being an English priest. Although, it is a clear account of Henry's transition from influence into authority over the Scottish King.

Source 4, discusses the period when William I was King.

As mentioned prior, there was a change in attitude, and Scotland was supporting the French King Louis VII after their declaration to do so in 1168. This hostile front towards Henry II led to William I joining the Great Rebellion. After this Scotland lost much power, and the treaty states a source 4 ~~states~~ <sup>are</sup> the terms of the loss of power.

It is stated that William I became 'the vassal for King Henry for Scotland'. Due to the treaty of Falaise, Scotland had become a gift for England and now had to completely obey Henry's authority. When the source mentions that all ~~peasants~~ and barons holding land from William 'shall also do homage' it is a sign of not only authority, Henry I exercised that, but complete control. The note that William must 'submit to the judgement of his court' for harbouring fugitives only accentuates the control, as now Henry can turn Scotland into a pacified nation that is not an enemy.

Henry even gains financially from the treaty, taking Roxburgh, Berwick, Jedburgh, Edinburgh and Stirling with William paying for them. Henry now has land in Scotland and control over parts of it. It also mentions hostages at the end. Henry took 21 hostages during the treaty of Falaise. He could not stop rebellions by damaging hostages and holding castles. This source holds high validity for its use as it shows unaltered terms of agreement and shows how Henry

gained control.

To conclude, the sources are useful for an historian as they depict two stages of Henry's relationship with Scotland and have almost ~~no~~ <sup>no</sup> biases or incorrect details. They accurately discuss Henry's transition from neighbourly king to ~~govern~~ having control over the Scottish king. The Treaty of Falaise is especially useful as it shows the height of Henry's authority over Scotland, and it is a document that William signed, an agreement with Henry II's power over him. Source 3 with holds usefulness, but less so than 4 as it is a brief history of ~~the~~ the peaceful relationship <sup>between</sup> with the two kings with no specific detail, and ~~it makes~~ <sup>it makes</sup> leaps, only showing the best moments of Henry II and England.



This is a level 5 response. It demonstrates a secure understanding of the importance of the different dates of the sources in using them to consider the extent of Henry's authority over the King of Scotland. The quality of the argument is underpinned by a genuine understanding of the context, which is well-selected and demonstrates an understanding of the values and concerns of the time. There is a final judgment in which the two sources are weighed and relative value established.



Remember to use the sources to explore the claims being made by the writer and to consider how valid they are.

### **Question 3**

This was the most popular essay question and, in general, it was answered well.

Most candidates could write confidently about the rebellions against William. Some candidates surveyed the rebellions while others went into detail about specifics relating to each rebellion. The vast majority of responses considered the northern rebellion and William's response in the harrying of the North which they used to establish criteria for 'significant threat'. A large number of candidates mentioned Odo of Bayeux and his role in responding to various rebellions in England. Most candidates also referred to the East Anglian rebellion and to the revolt of the earls.

The most effective answers were tightly focused on significance and were able to establish criteria to discuss the relative significance of the threats. In some cases the quality of the argument was affected by a very poor sense of geography, with candidates claiming, for example, that castle building in Norwich was effective in defending the Scottish border and that storming the Isle of Ely was effective in putting down Eadric's rising in the west. The most common error was to treat this as a multifactor response and contrast the threat from Scotland, Wales and even within Normandy. It is important that candidates read the question carefully and plan accordingly. This question required a tight focus on significant or not significant threat.

William the Conqueror secured control over England after the battle of Hastings in 1066. However, ~~William wasn't welcomed as the King of England with little resistance.~~ <sup>this did not come without fierce resistance from the English people</sup> Historians have widely disagreed whether or not the rebellions of 1067-75 were a significant threat to William I's authority as King.

If these threats were significant, then they would be big enough for William to get personally involved <sup>have strong and well-organised leadership</sup> and ~~they would have~~ <sup>they would</sup> have changed or <sup>sign</sup> impacted the way that William ruled <sup>and had control</sup> over England.

This essay will discuss the rebellions in the North, <sup>and South,</sup> East Anglia and the <sup>revolt of the Ears</sup> Ears to argue that the threats were big but not significant to William's authority as King.

Firstly, ~~from~~ from 1066<sup>7</sup>-69 there were numerous threats to William's rule over England. ~~that~~ Firstly, many would argue that the rebellions in the South

of England where incredibly insignificant to William as out of the four rebellions in Kent, Bristol, Exeter and Castle Montacute, William only personally intervened in one. In Exeter in Early ~~late~~ 1068, Exeter rose in rebellion, fuelled by the harsh taxation imposed by the Norman ~~sea~~ rulers and ~~Harold's~~ <sup>the</sup> preference of Harold Godwinson's mother Gytha. We know that William considered this threat to be significant because he crossed the ~~Bay~~ Channel from Normandy with an army to deal with the threat. However after an 18 day siege and the rebels failing to rally support from the surrounding area, they submitted to William, ~~on showing that after~~ <sup>the fact that William</sup> ~~William intervened, the~~ <sup>casualties</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>showed</sup> that this threat was not significant.

Arguably the first significant full scale threat that William received was from the North of England in ~~the~~ 1069. The Yorkshire rebelled once again (having had 2 smaller rebellions

in the years prior) however this rebellion <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ significantly larger than the others. The rebellion was spearheaded by Edgar the Atheling, who had a strong claim to the English throne. Furthermore, it was backed by a Danish fleet of 240 ships, commanded by 2 of King Swens sons - Harold and Knut. Moreover the North was fiercely independent from the rest of England. William reacting to its seriousness reacted with the utmost brutality. He staged a ravaging march from Nottingham to Yorkshire, pillaging the area as they marched. When he reached York the rebellion was crushed and Edgar the Atheling fled to Scotland. In order to secure control in Yorkshire William ordered the 'Harrying of the North' by subdividing his troops to completely devastate the land. Yorkshire was completely destroyed, so much so that in the Domesday Book of 1087, it recorded Yorkshire as 213 wasteland. Here, it's clear that the rebellion in the North was a significant threat, as William reacted in such a

violent way to the uprising, However most importantly, after William intermined the rebellion did not significantly impact William's power and authority, in many ways it aggrandized it, therefore it cannot be regarded as significant.

we can see through the Moreover, ~~another threat that signifies~~ way that William dealt with the ~~threat~~ East Anglian rebellion in 1071, a clear theme of a large threat being <sup>subjugated to</sup> ~~subdued to~~ insignificance after William gets involved. In 1070, the threat started to arise in East Anglia as rebels coallated behind the local English thegn Hereward the Wake. This posed a large threat to William, because of their base in Ely, ~~was~~ seemed to be impenetrable as it was surrounded by marshland and the sea where it had access to potential support from the lands of English exiles and the Danes. Again William ~~soon~~ understood this threat and firstly reacted by getting buying off the Danes, ~~and then~~ knowing that they were the largest contributor to

the threat's significance. & in crushing the rebellion, William lined his troops along the coastline, ~~creating~~<sup>created</sup> a caulkway, so his troops could pass and successfully attacking the Abbey. Again we can see that a threat that posed ~~the~~ a huge threat to William's authority, was not.

Lastly, the failure of the revolt of the Earls in 1075 is the icing on the cake which proves that no rebellion in England was <sup>threat</sup> significant to William. The revolt of the Earls was led by three powerful English earls; Watmeols of Worcester, Ralph de Gael and ~~Robert of Monto~~<sup>Rodger de Brethil</sup>. They planned to launch a full scale attack on England, supported again by a Danish fleet and to conquer England and split it between them. However Watmeols of Worcester confessed the plans to Archbishop Lafranc who had been tasked to deal with the revolt, with the plans for the revolt being jeopardised the two other earls still went on. The revolt was unmistakably a failure when the Danish fleet never came and re

Rebels were cut to shreds by the large Norman army that Lanfranc had raised. Arguably, this rebellion could have posed a significant threat as William didn't get involved personally, but it ~~was~~<sup>still</sup> had the potential for strong leadership. However after its failure, again we can see the recurring theme of a threat with huge potential to affect William's control of England, ending in a defeat, so not being significant at all.

Overall in conclusion it is incredibly clear that the rebellions of 1067-795 were NOT a significant threat to William. Firstly, the rebellions in the north and south were easily crushed by William and aggravated his control over the region, especially in the north. Secondly, here was the wake and the east Anglian rebellion again posed a significant threat to his authority as king but failed. Lastly, the rebellion of the eves was also a huge failure. ~~overall,~~  
~~throughout his time with~~



This is a secure level 5 response. It explores a good range of rebellions and considers the extent to which they were a significant threat to William. The argument is sustained throughout the answer.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

## **Question 4**

This question drew a number of responses and many were rewarded within level 4. However, proportionately, fewer responses achieve level 5 because many candidates had a limited understanding of the term kingship and regarded the question as an opportunity to write a comparison of the features of Anglo-Saxon and Norman England without a focus on the nature of kingship.

The most effective answers compared the personal nature of kingship in both periods, the role of the king in the legal system, the relationship between the king and his earls and barons and the role of the king in maintaining the currency. Some candidates were able to carry out a relevant comparison of the role of the king in the economy in controlling trade and benefitting from customs and tolls, but many lapsed into general discussions of changes in the economy, legal system and the church and lost focus on both the nature of kingship and also the second order concept of similarity and difference.

Overall, the changes to ~~kingship~~ kingship were not as great as other changes to society, with the ~~power~~ authority of the King over the Church, ~~as role as chief~~ as ~~and~~ chief arbiter of justice ~~and~~ ~~of~~ staying largely the same. However there was significant increase in the power of the King from Anglo Saxon to Norman England, ~~as well as~~ especially due to the the new Norman form of ~~of~~ feudalism which gave the King much more authority ~~of~~ over ~~his~~ these nobles. Therefore it is quite inaccurate to say there was very little difference in the nature of ~~of~~ kingship because the changes that did occur had significant effects on kingship and on society.

~~The power of the King~~ ~~the~~ The overall nature of the kingship ~~stayed~~ ~~was~~ was similar ~~of~~ for Anglo-Saxons and the Normans with the centralisation of power in the King remaining the same however ~~it~~ realistically the changes made to the ~~system~~ ~~of~~ ~~king~~ ~~to~~ system of hierarchy significantly increased the Kings power and authority. The change from a system of patronage, where nobles' loyalty was bought with the granting of land and titles

meant that there was a possibility for overmighty nobles holding more power than the king, as seen in Edward the Confessor's reign when in which the power of the Godwin family superseded ~~his own~~ <sup>his own</sup> ~~power~~. By 1066 the Godwins had an estate value of £7000 compared with King Edward's £5,000. This allowed Harold Godwinson to build up ~~a large~~ networks of supporters ~~that~~ <sup>by</sup> through patronage ~~by~~ ~~as~~ which gave him more ~~power~~ support than the king, as seen in the 1065, Northumbrian Uprising where Harold overruled Edward's wish to reinstate Tostig as earl and instead asked him for comparisons, the Norman system, by which the king owned all the land in England ~~and~~ which was held in a 'demesne' by his tenants-in-chief (leading & nobles), meant that ~~the~~ King William's ~~power~~ authority ~~was~~ could not be superseded as the system did not allow nobles to ~~own more~~ land become more wealthy than the king. ~~The power of the Anglo-Norman king~~ <sup>This</sup> is evidenced by William I's ability and authority to ~~also~~ arrest the second richest noble in England ~~the~~ Odo of Bayeux. ~~The Anglo-Saxon~~ One similarity however, was that both ~~the~~ Anglo-Saxon ~~system~~ and Norman kingship ~~was~~ required some form of personality in order to keep ~~the~~ nobles in check as seen by Harold Godwinson's position as "subregulus" or 'eub-king'. Overall, however, ~~the~~ ~~king's~~ power of the ~~king~~ was greatly increased from the Anglo-Saxon to Norman rule which created significant changes in

the political landscape of the kingdom and to the nature of kingship, most importantly due to the Norman changes to land tenure.

The nature of kingship also saw change in the king's authority over military. In Anglo-Saxon England the king was the only person permitted to raise an army which would have consisted of the fyrd (made up of peasants) and the elite housecarls ~~which belonged to the thegnly class~~ <sup>and they were the</sup> ~~the~~ thegnly class. Although there is similarity between the thegnly class of Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman knightly class, their loyalties were different. ~~Anglo-Saxon~~ Knights were loyal to ~~the king~~ a nobleman ~~who~~ ~~was~~ ~~their~~ ~~lord~~ and ~~could~~ ~~be~~ ~~part~~ ~~of~~ a ~~usually~~ ~~followed~~ ~~the~~ ~~king~~ ~~to~~ a noble household thus their loyalty to the king was through a noble and less direct than that of the thegns. ~~It~~ ~~was~~ ~~therefore~~ However, the ~~Norman~~ fact that William ~~was~~ had <sup>Anglo-Saxon</sup> ~~Anglo-Saxon~~ conscripts fighting for him in 1066 ~~was~~ against ~~the~~ Anglo-Saxon rebellions ~~which~~ ~~was~~ ~~compared~~ to Edward's inability to raise an army due to lack of support from nobles in 1052 to fight the Godwins suggests that the military power of ~~Norman~~ kingship had greatly increased or even an outsider could summon an army.



This is a secure level 4 response. There is a judgement given in the introduction with valid criteria which are developed in the answer. It considers three features of kingship; centralisation of power, force of personality and authority over the military. The supporting knowledge is good. The absence of a final judgment prevents this from entering level 5.



In similarity and difference questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept.

## **Question 5**

This was the most popular essay question in 2A.2 and prompted a good number of well-focused and very well informed answers.

Most candidates drew on a wide range of changes to the system of justice under Henry II including the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, the development of the standardised writ for settling property disputes and the use of ordeal for testing guilt or innocence. Many candidates looked at the extension of royal authority into local areas with the additional powers given to sheriffs by the king. Many candidates contrasted these changes with Henry's attempt and failure to extend royal control to church courts. The best responses had an explicit focus on the word 'considerable' and were able to frame their analysis around this term to establish the criteria needed to reach a sound judgement. A common error was to focus on royal authority rather than royal justice and examine the system of finance or control of the barons without reference to justice.

Henry II made various legal reforms effecting in his reign, which had a number of effects on the way royal justice was perceived and carried out across the realm. One may argue that the reforms to development of a system of itinerant justices and their use of writs, along with the role of the King's Bench and development of the law by key officials did have considerable impacts on royal justice. However one may argue that the application of royal justice had always been itinerant in nature, that ties from the law to the Church still remained and that Henry merely made existing aspects of royal justice, such as the *curia regis*, more effective.

One of the key changes to royal justice in the reign of Henry II was the role of itinerant justices. These justices were personally appointed by the king and therefore centralized the law to his intention. They were experts in their practice and travelled the realm to dispense justice through regular eyres. Between 1169 and 1176 there were eight regular eyres, where the itinerant justices, such as Richard de Lucy, would travel the counties and deal with legal disputes and backlogs of cases. This was transformative mainly through it bringing the law further into the localities, and thus bringing the reach of the king further throughout the land. This had the effect of diminishing the authority of baronial courts and barons in the legal system, as not

only was royal justice becoming more potent and recognisable for all, but the increased standardisation and use of writs meant royal justice was available to all free men from 1168.

Another way in which the system of royal justice changed in Henry II's reign was the way in which the law developed. The growing importance of the king's Bench was crucial in this, as it was ruled over permanently by five members of the curia Regis and was the physical embodiment in Westminster of the king's intentions for the law and justice. Here the law developed as the senior judges used their expertise to form the law, which would then be distributed through common practice by one-travelling judges. Moreover, the new systems of royal justice also involved intentional reforms to the law. An example of this was Ranulf de Glanville's treatise on the laws and customs of the English Kingdom, published towards the end of Henry's reign in the around the 1180s, by which time the law had developed substantially. This treatise demonstrated a large step towards a fully-fledged common law system through its codification of legal practices and its development of the 'language of the court'. Not only did this document demonstrate the characteristic shift of royal justice towards the crown, but it also shows Henry II's policy of appointing officials of government, as Ranulf de Glanville was chosen for his extensive knowledge of the law as he had learned it in court, rather than through formal instruction. This was another change to royal justice shown in the appointments of other legal officials such as the sheriffs and itinerant justices.

On the other hand, there is an argument to say that the changes to royal justice under Henry II were not as considerable as they may appear. ~~The~~ It could be pointed out that royal justice had always been itinerant in nature, with the king himself often being expected to travel the land and dispense justice in medieval society. This did not fundamentally change under Henry, he simply imposed upon and expanded these pillars of royal justice. One example of this is the *curia regis*; the king's court was a key facet of any king's government at this time, and although Henry made it more integral to his system of justice and placed more of his close associates into it, does not mean that it was necessarily altered in its use. It may be an unrealistic however to expect all areas of royal justice to be completely overhauled, as although they had often been overlooked by kings to their detriment, such as Henry's predecessor, Stephen, they were still essential pillars structures in the legal system.

Alternatively, one could argue that despite the changes made in Henry's reign, many aspects of royal justice remained unchanged. One example of this is the role of the church in the legal system. Trial by water was still the primary method of determining guilt in criminal cases, and this was standardized in the 1166 Assize of Clarendon. As well as this, the 'benefit of the clergy', which exempted clerks from secular justice remained in Henry's reign, despite his best efforts to change this in his feud with Thomas Becket. As well as this, the barons still played numerous roles in the legal system. Although their courts were often overlooked in favour of royal justice, they were still responsible for the dispensing of justice on their vassals, as they were not free men and therefore could not access royal courts. They also still had a significant

influence in land dispute cases, as the principle landowners, and were often used in times of presentment because of this. Therefore it can be seen that Henry II's changes to royal justice did not reach every corner of the existing system.

In conclusion, one could argue that there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice under Henry II. Not only were the functions of royal justice expanded to meet all of the king's rights, but its administration and development was also adapted to meet this through judicial precedent and legislation/treatise. Although this was often achieved by expanding or reforming existing aspects of royal justice, this does not diminish the material impact these changes had on the systems of law. Certain features were retained, with the church and barons still playing a major role, however these were key components of administration and Henry's reforms ensured that their power was kept in check and the law was ultimately centralised with him and his court. Therefore, one could argue that ~~the statement that~~ ~~there~~ it is accurate to say that there were considerable changes to the system of royal justice during the reign of Henry II.



This is a level 5 response. It has a good range, considering the development of the role of itinerant justices, the establishment of the King' Bench, and provides an effective counter case with a consideration of improvement rather than change and the failure to bring about the desired changes in church courts. It has excellent support. The argument is explicit and sustained throughout the answer. The candidate debates the view 'considerable change' throughout.



This is a change question. The most effective answers consider both changes and continuities in order to reach a reasoned judgement.

## **Question 6**

This question prompted a number of effective answers. Some candidates took a broad approach and surveyed the reasons for determining Philip's culpability while others went into very impressive detail on each occurrence of hostility with Philip, Henry the Younger, Richard, Geoffrey and John. A very popular counter argument was that Henry caused his own downfall by his refusal to name Richard as his heir and properly authorise control of his territories to his sons. A common error was to regard this as a causation question rather than a significance question and to focus analysis on the most important reason rather than evaluate the relative significance of those playing a role in the collapse of power in the Angevin Empire.

Philip II of France played a significant role in the collapse of Henry II's empire. This was through his ~~&~~ encouragement of anger in <sup>family</sup> divisions and also his military action in 1188-89. However, it can be argued that ~~the~~ without the divisions between Henry II and his sons, Philip would not have had the opportunity to exploit and ~~therefore~~ contribute to the collapse of Henry II's power. ~~therefore~~ Therefore, the role of Henry II and his sons was more significant.

~~the~~ Philip II significantly contributed to the collapse of Henry II's power by encouraging Henry's sons to resent him. For example, in 1186, he encouraged Geoffrey to support him by making him Seneschal of France and granting him a position at the French court. This gave Geoffrey a taste of power that his father had failed to grant him and saw his allegiances

shift towards ~~the~~ Philip. ~~the~~ Although this is undermined by the fact Philip was unable to capitalise on this due to Geoffrey's death in 1186, Philip also encouraged Richard to resent Henry II. In 1188, ~~Richard~~ ~~Rich~~ ~~Philip~~ ~~made~~ ~~an~~ ~~error~~ Philip ~~error~~ was able to exploit Richard's frustrations towards his father by forming an alliance with him. Therefore, Philip contributed to Henry's decline of power by ~~the~~ deepening Angevin family divisions. It is notable however, that Philip did not attempt to ally with the young king during his second rebellion in 1182.

Another way in which Philip contributed to Henry's collapse was through his military action. In 1188, Philip proved to be a capable military commander when he successfully secured control of Berry in France. This was followed by his success in Le Mans and eventually Tours. As Philip fought alongside Richard and captured more land, they were able to command more resources and troops. This resulted in Henry's

power in France declining until he was forced to come to terms with Philip and Richard in 1189. Philip was successful in forcing Henry to ~~be~~ comply with his rule in France. However, ~~it~~ ~~is~~ Philip's military success was greatly aided by Henry's son, Richard, who played a significant role in contributing to his father's defeat. ~~and~~ Henry's power was subordinated.)

It can be argued that it was Henry's own sons that played the most significant role in the collapse of ~~Henry's~~ the English monarch's power. In 1182, it was young Henry's insatiable appetite for power in Normandy that resulted in him joining rebellious barons in Aquitaine. He was joined by Geoffrey who was self-interested and rebelled against his father in an attempt to gain power for himself. In 1188, it was Richard's desire for power in Aquitaine that caused him to rebel. ~~Henry~~ Although Henry's sons were evidently keen to gain more power ~~in~~ in the years 1180-89, it is significant to note that Henry himself ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> <sup>greatly</sup> responsible for this.

Henry II arguably caused his own downfall through his failure to reconcile with his sons. At 16, Henry II had been Duke of Normandy in his own right and at 19, King of England. This was a power which he failed to delegate to his sons. ~~At 16~~ By denying young Henry control of Normandy once again in 1182, he further antagonised his son. ~~At 19~~ After the death of young Henry, the king antagonised Richard by failing to recognise him as his principle heir. He also gave John permission to invade Aquitaine in 1185 despite knowing how protective Richard was of the region. These actions alienated Richard and drove him into the camp of Philip II. ~~Therefore~~ consequently, Henry ~~was~~ ~~the~~ played a highly significant role in contributing to his own collapse by alienating all of his sons and selfishly refusing to grant them sufficient revenue and power. This resulted in them rebelling against him, eventually culminating with Richard's success over his father in 1189.

In conclusion, Philip Augustus played a

significant role in bringing about the collapse of Henry II's power in the Angevin empire. This was through his ~~excess~~ exploitation of family divisions and military action in the late 1180's. However, without the divisions in the Angevin family, Philip would have been unable to defeat Henry II alone due to the size of the vast Angevin Empire. Therefore, it is coherent that Henry II played the ~~top~~ most significant role and ~~was~~ arguably orchestrated his own downfall. Although his sons were power-hungry, the king failed to reconcile with them or reach a compromise by granting them any control. ~~the~~ this resulted in the alienation of his sons and their rebellion against him.



This is a level 5 response. It has a secure range and sufficient knowledge to support the argument. The conclusion is based on valid criteria. There are some weaknesses in the discussion of significance which prevents this from reaching the top of level 5.



Significance questions do differ from causation questions. Make sure you develop criteria to explain the significance of a factor and don't focus on explaining causes of an event.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

For section A candidates

- should ensure that they deal with both enquiries;
- should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension of the sources;
- should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Comments about this should be specific to the provided sources rather than generic comments that might apply to any source;
- use contextual knowledge to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry.

For sections B and C candidates

- should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach;
- should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach as this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels;
- must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision;
- should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology. This entails not just the bookend dates but some range across the whole chronology within the parameters of the specification.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



