

# History

Answers and commentaries

A-level (7042)

## **2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154 — 1216**

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

# Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

<a href="#">Question 1</a>	3
<a href="#">Question 4</a>	10

## Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

### Question 1

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Henry II's relationship with King Louis VII of France.

**[30 marks]**

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**

## A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2A ANGEVIN KINGS – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

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

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

Arguably, Source A is mostly valuable to a historian studying Henry II and Louis VII's relationship largely due to provenance, as it displays the perspective of those external to the conflict in the early days of their conflict; a chronicler, who would've likely heard about the account of these events from the rumours, etc that had spread throughout the country. Notably, this is reflected in the condemning tone used throughout the source in reference to the 'foolishness committed' by Louis VII and Henry; which demonstrated clearly that the poor relationship was not due any logical reason but rather pettiness and 'arrogance', i.e Louis grievance at the fact that not only did Eleanor marry Henry but a few months later, but had gone on to provide with an heir by 1155; something he never achieved during his marriage to her. Furthermore, the Source's value is further enhanced by its reference to one of the biggest strains on the relationship between Louis VII and Henry: the 'vexin'. Crucially, this was key to defence of Normandy and issue dating back to the time of Anjou. Simply, this marriage was key to Normandy and Henry would do anything to secure it, even as the source criticises 'prematurely' forcing through the marriage of children.

However, the source is too limited by its provenance, written by a monastic chronicler in the North of England who would've thus likely relied on the recounts of travellers and so forth. Furthermore, clergymen at the time were not particularly inclined to supporting Henry at the time, as he sought to increase his authority of the church and tackle the reform movement, which may explain the bias against Henry. Furthermore, the tone remains fiercely critical of both monarchs and ignores perhaps the more clever strategy at play, the very fact that were never at 'peace' with each is that they were constantly looking to expand their influence and power of their nation, which is why Henry was desperate to secure the marriage of 'Margaret' and 'Young Henry'.

To conclude, this source is mostly valuable as its critical emphasises how both king's played a part in creating tension and problems within their relationship; there was indeed constant 'treachery' and 'affair' from Henry's use of papal dispensation to secure the marriage behind Louis VII's back to Louis VII's refusal to compromise, jealous of Henry's powers and fruitful relationship with Eleanor.

It could also be argued that Source B is mostly valuable largely due to provenance. A personal letter written by Henry II himself to Louis VII, invaluable provided insight into the relationship beyond the grand schemes and was often presented. Crucially within this letter, Henry II utilises a respectful tone and term of address when referencing Louis as 'his Lord and friend', indicative of Henry's respect of the feudal position with Louis as his overlord; something he respected throughout for the most part throughout his reign. Additionally, the source also provides valuable insight into how their relationship had transitioned from the 1150s until now, as typically Henry II is presented, being the wealthier and more warrior like king. In contrast, the source's pleading tone conveyed through the repetition of 'please you' demonstrates a point in time where Louis had the dominant position within the relationship; post Thomas Becket exile. At this time, Henry had received minimal support from the pope who refused to condemn or confirm the constitutions of Clarendon, yet Louis VII still remained

## A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2A ANGEVIN KINGS – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

a potential ally one he clearly felt he couldn't lose. This pleading tone and framing of himself as victim only progresses throughout source in reference to Thomas Becket as a 'Great enemy if mine'; clearly Henry was not always the dominant contender within the relationship.

However, the source is value too remains largely limited by the content itself, yes whilst Henry himself was indeed in a weaker position, with the exile of Thomas Becket, the source remains unrepresentative of the true nature of the relationship between Louis VII and Henry II for the majority of his reign. Whilst Henry takes on a pleading tone throughout the source, just a few years prior in 1158, his sending of Thomas Becket to French court in an ostentatious manner was a clear smight by Henry II to show the true power of the 'king of the English'. Additionally, the source neglects to allude just how shortlived this peace within their friendship is with Louis VII, later utilised Becket's death to gain 'vengeance' in the Great Rebellion.

To conclude, this source is mostly valuable as it evidences for the relationship with Henry II and Louis VII largely fluctuated throughout their respective reigns. Potentially alluding to an alternate perspective on what is often considered to be a vindictive relationship, with Louis even later going on to organise peace talks over 10 times between Becket and Henry to repair their relationship.

Arguably source C is mostly valuable due to its provenance; as source written by Roger of Howden someone who was close to Henry, working as a royal clerk and diplomat within Henry's court; he is likely to have a clear insight and would've potentially witnessed first hand the fallouts of Louis VII and Henry II. Notably, the source takes a critical tone when presenting Louis' actions throughout the latter part of their relationship, with Louis actively looking to instigate issues for Henry; who he'd always 'held hatred' for. Valuably, this source demonstrates how Louis himself actively caused conflict between himself and Henry throughout their respective reigns. Simply, it was Louis who had 'counselled' and 'advised' young Henry to conspire against his father. Indeed, this adds value for historians studying the relationship as it also demonstrates how Louis' very nature contributed to their strained relationship; he was manipulative, and an experienced one who simply sought to manipulate young Henry against his father. Notably, Louis VII did indeed play an instrumental role in the Great Rebellion and did take the opportunity to cause issue for Henry not only via 'suggestion' but also via 'a great council in Paris'. Crucially, this contained several key rebel leaders of the Great Rebellion including Ralph de Fougères, Hugh Bigod, etc, without which young Henry may never have been in the position to fully challenge his father for 'territory'. Again invaluable demonstrating Louis VII's list of ten unprovoked and petty grievances against Henry soured the relationship.

However the source is value too remains largely limited by provenance; as a source written by a member of Henry's court a royal clerk nonetheless, it clearly remains biased towards presenting Henry as a victim, with a clear contrast in the tone when describing the manipulative Louis and Henry II, a victim of 'deceit' and 'Hatred' consequently, the source neglects to allude to the role Henry played within their relationship at the time too, ultimately whilst Louis did often seek to provoke Henry II, this wasn't unfounded; Henry had constantly been looking to extend his influence in France in Gascony, Brittany, Aquitaine, etc; rivalling what was meant to be an era of dominance for the Capetian dynasty. In addition, the source uses

an exaggerative tone in regards to the extent of Louis manipulation of 'young Henry'; much of that dispute was by Henry II's unwillingness to cede control of said territories.

To conclude, this source is mostly valuable, as whilst the source is clearly biased towards Henry II, it provides an the perspective of those on Henry II's side at the time of the conflict and their view of the relationship between them; one in which they clearly believed Henry to be the victim.

**This is a Level 4 response**

The candidate has made a balanced assessment of each source, considering provenance, content, value and limitations across each. Source B is especially good as this shows provenance, tone and content being considered holistically, rather than as entirely separate. Comments on source A, in particular, are sometimes more speculative or lacking in development, which makes the judgement offered less convincing. The answer demonstrates a good understanding of context and focus is clearly maintained upon the issue given in the question.

### Response B

Source A is of value presenting Henry II's and Louis VII's relationship in that it highlights the insecurities Louis VII felt in regards to Henry's power. It is extremely valuable in portraying the importance of the Vexin in Princess Margaret's dowry to Henry the young king – the Vexin was of extreme territorial importance to both Normans and Capetians in that it provided defence and communication to either territories.

The tone of this source is matter of fact in that it evidences names and dates that are accurate, this is unsurprising as William of Newborough was a reputable Monk within a Yorkshire monastery and is known for giving accurate accounts and fair outlooks – however here, it could be seen as less valuable as he initially focuses on 'the diplomacy of Thomas' in which belies his religious affiliations.

The source is also valuable as 'the arranged matters with the king' could allude to Henry's homage of fealty performed to Louis VII in both 1156 and 1158 for his French territories – somewhat suggesting there was as small amicable relationship between the two. It is also valuable in highlighting Henry's 'impatience' in wanting the Vexin territory – this isn't surprising as the 1160 marriage took place between the two children from Henry's doing – promising to support Alexander III in the papal dispute of 1159 in order to gain permission for the marriage – conveying Henry's self interest in dealing with the king of France.

Ultimately, source A is a somewhat valuable source for interpreting the early relationship of the English and French king and Louis VII's humiliation in losing the Norman Vexin to Henry through his 'duplicity'.

Source B is somewhat valuable in studying Henry II's and Louis VII's relationship but is ultimately made less valuable through it being by King Henry II himself. This presents a self-righteous outlook on the Becket dispute and is not surprising as Henry would've believed that his Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164 were the correct view.

The source is valuable, however, in seeing Henry's personal aims in 1164 – the tone of the source is incredibly humble, presenting Louis VII as 'his Lord and friend' completely discards the hostility between the two in recent past – Henry is ultimately looking for support of his past enemy- blinded by his new foe Thomas Beckett.

The source is not valuable as Henry talks of 'not giving any such help to your enemies', However it is known that in the Toulouse campaign of 1159 Henry was aided by the counts of Barcelona to attack Louis' vassal (and brother in law) Raymond V of Toulouse.

This source is lacking in value as there are many contradictions given by Henry for his own personal gain.

Source C is valuable in portraying the relationship of Louis VII and Henry II as incredibly spiteful on Louis's part in 'whispering into the young king's ear' (Phillips).



## A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2A ANGEVIN KINGS – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

The source is valuable as it elevates Louis' hatred of Henry – this is unsurprising as Henry's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1152 (the previous wife of Louis VII) undoubtedly sparked animosity in their having 5 sons together. Ellen admits that 'Louis loved Eleanor with a child-like devotion' and so it is clear that Louis was jealous of Henry's own success.

The source is however, made less valuable through Roger of Howden's scrutiny of Louis VII – this is not surprising as Howden was held in high esteem of Henry II's court (being a royal clerk and diplomat) as well as his appointment of justice of the Forest. It is less valuable as it somewhat negates Henry's actions in the isolation of his sons- the Matrimonial Settlement of 1169 highlights Henry's inability to share power with his sons. The young kings deprivation of the important castles of Chinon, Loudon and Mirebeau to his youngest brother John, evidences Henry's isolating actions towards the young king.

Yet there is value in the source when assessing Louis's compliancy in the origins of the Great Rebellion 1173-74. 'A request that he had made at the suggestion of the king of France' implies Louis motives to meddle in Angevin affairs – Jones notes that 'it was Louis' upmost priority to not allow young Henry to inherit the Angevin lands intact'. Louis inspired Henry the young King's jealousy of Phillip and resentment of his father, by presenting a magnanimous seal in Phillip's name, Henry the young king's own seal was devoid or 'DEI' (by the grace of God) confronting Hil's arbitrary nature.

Overall, this source is very convincing in understanding Louis VII's compliancy with the Great Rebellion in 1173-74 and his personal hatred against Henry II coming to fruition.

### **This is a Level 3 response**

This answer varies in quality with the evaluation of Source C being stronger than that of A or B, thus creating an imbalance. Provenance is tackled, but very superficially, especially in regards to Source B. There is clear awareness of the historical context throughout, though the own knowledge which is deployed is not always of direct relevance for the issue in the question. The use of quotations from historians does not add to the quality of the answer as they are often used in lieu of factual support.

## Question 4

'King John's financial policies were the main cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215/16.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

It cannot be denied that the relationship between King John and the Barons was incredibly strained, eventually culminating in the baronial rebellion of 1215 to 1216, for a number of reasons. Some may argue that this was largely due to his financial policies, particularly with a specific clause connecting to scutage within the Magna Carta itself. However, there are other factors which must also be considered when examining these causes of the baronial rebellion of 1215/16 including the principles of government per consilium alongside John's treatment of prominent figures such as William de Braose.

Arguably King John's financial policies were the main cause of the baronial rebellion, particularly with John's obsession at keeping barons and nobles in debt to him. In fact, it may be argued that John took every opportunity to extract money from the barons, this included upon the inheritance of their land, which John de Lacy paid 7000 marks upon his ascendancy to Pontefract in 1213, all the way to the marked increase that had occurred in regards to Baronial widows and Wardships reaching 314 marks under his reign. Although some of this can be accredited the rising levels of inflation during this time period with magnate indebtedness increasing by 380% from 1199 to 1208, clearly baronial relationship would've been strained by these financial policies with many once written barons now facing crippling debt.

In addition, King John's policies when it comes to scutage must also be considered to have contributed to the baronial rebellion of 1215/16; particularly as it scutage was explicitly mentioned within the rebellion's resulting document establishing a council of barons, bishops, etc who would have to approve any revisions of scutage. Moreover, it is made clear when comparing Henry II's own use of scutage of how extreme in nature John's usage of it was, with him raising it 11 times in 16 years in comparison to Henry II's 7 in 35 years. Evidently, this continual demand for scutage inspired the rebellion of 1215 and 1216, and can be seen to do even more so when noting how John utilised it as a form of punishments on his return from Normandy in 1214 at 3 marks a knight. Simply, the barons were tired of the constant strain of paying scutage, particularly when most of it had been invested in John's failed campaigns to secure Normandy; it was a waste.

However it cannot be denied that other factors such as John's favouritism towards foreign officials also contributed significantly, also mentioned within the Magna Carta is the instruction for the expulsion of foreign officials such as Peter des Roches and Engelhard de Cogne. Notably, both of these figures held great sways of power in John's court with Peter des Roches from Touraine as chief justiciar since 1214 and Engelhard de Cogne Sheriff of Herefordshire and Gloucester. Simply, the barons wanted a return of government per consilium, something they argued had dated back to the time of William the Conqueror. In contrast, they had been excluded from government and replaced by a small circle of John's favourite who appeared to only be enriching themselves. Therefore, it cannot be denied that John's preference of foreign favourites contributed to the 1215/16 rebellion, when considering the barons desire to reinstall good government and according to Magna Carta a committee of 25 barons to scrutinise the king.

Furthermore, incidents such as the treatment of William de Braose must also be considered as contributory factors, particularly when noting how this increased the anxiety of Barons regarding John's impulsiveness. William de Braose, once one of John's favourites and someone he had supported in Wales from 1208 was now facing John's wrath. Not only was William and his family drove out of the country in 1210, John went on to pursue them; an action the barons thought to be too far. This anxiety felt by the barons over John's temper would only go on to be exacerbated when discovering the treatment of William's wife Matilda and his eldest son, who upon John's capture of them from Ireland were confined to a prison where suffered from starvation before eventually dying from the barons perspective; they were tied at being at the mercy of a whim, as well as also fearing what could happen to their own families if they offended the king in any manner, especially when considering how quickly William de Braose's fall from grace occurred.

To conclude, whilst other factors should also be considered when examining the cause of the 1215/16 rebellion, it is undeniable that John's financial policies were the key contributor. As while, incidents such as William de Braose and John's favouritism of foreign officials was frustrating and confusing for barons; ultimately it was the year of crushing financial strain that tipped the barons towards rebellion on 1215/16 – the scutage charge of 3 marks upon John's return from Normandy. Not only this, but the barons had too endured fierce taxation under John's predecessor, this was something that rather than remedy, John heavily contributed and utilised to find his own royal objectives at the expense of the barons. Once again, this is reinforced by the multiple clauses pertaining to scutage including the committee of barons and bishops overseeing any revisions to the scutage imposed, within Magna Carta contain clear criticisms of John's financial policies.

### **This is a Level 5 response**

This is a well-organised and convincingly argued essay. The style is analytical throughout, with wide-ranging and precise evidence to support the points being made. There is good understanding of key issues and the way that the candidate has directly linked John's actions to the specific details within Magna Carta is especially effective. There is detailed analysis of the key factor from the question, and this has been balanced by consideration of other important factors. The conclusion reached is highly convincing and sustained throughout the essay.

## Response B

King John was widely unpopular amongst the barons for numerous reasons including his financial policies. The statement is valid as John's attempt to regain Normandy required a huge tax levied that many barons refused to pay, already being against his decision to fight for it. In addition to this, John raised taxes even lighter in reaction to this – which only enraged the barons further. This was what the barons felt was angevin despotism, and John's greed which had been succeeded from his father and brother.

However, his financial policies, although the main cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215, John's personality also proved a problem for the barons. Taxes that had been levied during Richard's reign had been much higher than John's at the time when raising for his capture, and the resentment towards his financial policies may have stemmed from hatred of his personality, in addition to his loss of Normandy in 1209. John was not like his brother Richard – a strong military leader nicknamed 'lionheart'. He was quiet and his talents did not lie in conquest, so the threats posed by French Kings invading Angevin lands could not be so easily defeated as they were in times of Henry or Richard's reigns. There were also rumours of John's mistreatment of barons wives, which led to barons harbouring great hatred towards him. John had also been shown to amass great cruelty upon one of his barons, when he starved all or his family and left them to die in an act of vengeance further driving their resentment which led to baronial rebellion.

Another major reason in support of the argument was the raising of scutage, which alongside tax that they already had to pay was bankrupting many barons, who had to find other ways of paying it. This made the attempt regain Normandy very unpopular, as well as tarnishing the barons favour of John. His loss of Normandy was a far greater cause of the baronial rebellion of 1215 as it led to the financial policies needed to fund it.

### **This is a Level 3 response**

This essay has relevant paragraphs on finances and John's personality, but the argument would have been more persuasive if the line of argument had been less jumbled and had a more coherent structure. The historical detail provided to support points is valid, but lacks precision, tending to be generalist and speculative. There is little effective link made between John's actions and the actions of the rebel barons in 1215/16, as most of the evidence provided links more to John's earlier reign. This makes the conclusion reached less convincing.

# Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7042](https://aqa.org.uk/7042)

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

