

Anglo-Saxon England the Norman Conquest 1066–88: answers

1 Anglo-Saxon society in c1060

- 1 Describe **two** features of Anglo-Saxon society. (4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

Anglo-Saxon society was hierarchical (1), which means it was ranked in order of status. Everyone knew their status and what was expected, from the enslaved people at the bottom to the king at the top (1).

Anglo-Saxon society was mainly rural (1). Most of England was covered in forest, but there were small villages and towns where the forests had been cleared and land was farmed, and most people were employed in farm-related work (1).

- 2 Explain why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- earldoms
- local government

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England.
2	4–6	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reason why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England.
3	7–9	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reason why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England.
4	10–12	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reason why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon earls were important in Anglo-Saxon England.

An example of a Level 1 answer

Earls were powerful people. They were below the king. The king was helped and advised by these earls. Earls controlled a large area of land (called an earldom). Earls helped the king control England. There were several large earldoms. They helped with local government.

An example of a Level 2 answer

Earls were part of the feudal hierarchy and were powerful people. They were below the king. The king was helped and advised by these earls, who were men of great power and influence. For example, Harold Godwinson, Earl of Wessex. Earls were also important because they controlled a large area of land (called an earldom). Earls helped the king control England, which was a large country. There were several large earldoms, for example Wessex and Northumbria. The earls made sure the king's laws were enforced in the earldoms and local government was controlled. The earls had strong military powers and helped the king get an army.

An example of a Level 3 answer

Earls were important because they were a vital part of the feudal hierarchy and were a key ally of the king. Immediately below the king in this hierarchy were the earls, who were the next most important people in helping the king rule. The king was helped and advised by these earls, who were men of great power and influence. For example, Harold Godwinson, Earl of Wessex, was an important earl who helped the king.

Earls were also important because they controlled a large area of land (called an earldom). England was a large country, which made it difficult for one man to control on his own. By the 1060s, there were four major earldoms: Wessex, Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia. The earls made sure the king's laws were enforced in the earldoms. The earls were also a vital part of the king's military power. The earls had strong military powers. They were the king's military leaders, leading others below them in the feudal system against the king's enemies.

The earls were also responsible for the local government systems within their earldoms. Earldoms were divided into shires and hundreds. Each shire appointed a shire reeve (sheriff) who was responsible for collecting taxes and fines. This meant that the king was provided the wealth he needed. The shire reeve was also responsible for carrying out justice in shire courts for major crimes such as murder and serious theft.

An example of a Level 4 answer

Earls were important because they were a vital part of the feudal hierarchy and were a key ally of the king. The feudal hierarchy meant that the king was in complete control and everybody else was subordinate to him. Immediately below the king in this hierarchy were the earls, who were the next most important people in helping the king rule. The king was helped and advised by these earls, who were men of great power and influence. For example, Harold Godwinson, Earl of Wessex, was so important that King Edward the Confessor sent him to Normandy in France on an official visit in the early 1060s.

Earls were also important because they controlled a large area of land (called an earldom). England was a large country, which made it difficult for one man to control on his own, so the king needed trusted allies to help rule such a geographically large area of land – these were known as 'earldoms'. By the 1060s, there were four major earldoms: Wessex, Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia. The earls made sure the king's laws were enforced in the earldoms. Without people to enforce laws all over the country, the king would lack control and the king would lack order. The earls were also a vital part of the king's military power. The earls had strong military powers. They were the king's military leaders, leading others below them in the feudal system against the king's enemies.

The earls were also responsible for the local government systems within their earldoms. Earldoms were divided into shires and hundreds – there were around 40 shires in total. Each shire appointed a shire reeve (sheriff), who was responsible for collecting taxes and fines. This meant that the king was provided with the wealth he needed to show his status, govern the country, and pay for an army when required. The shire reeve was also responsible for carrying out justice in shire courts for major crimes such as murder and serious theft. This was important because one of the king's roles was to ensure the country was ordered and organised.

3 'Control of land was the main reason why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power.'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- earls
- law-making

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.
4	13–16	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.

An example of a Level 1 answer

Anglo-Saxon monarchs used earls to help them control the country. An earl was a landowner. Earls were rich. Earls were powerful. They helped the king. Law-making was important, too. Laws had to be followed and punishments were strict if laws were not followed. Punishments tended to be brutal, with execution and mutilation common. People followed laws because they feared the strict punishments.

An example of a Level 2 answer

Anglo-Saxon monarchs used the land to reward people in return for loyalty and military service. For example, earls were given a large area of land to control on behalf of the king. By the 1060s, there were several major areas controlled by earls, for example, Wessex and Northumbria. If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of them, his land would be taken away. This made the earls worried about disobeying the king. Another reason why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power was through their control of law and order. The king's laws were used in the country, and it was important they were obeyed so he had control.

An example of a Level 3 answer

Anglo-Saxon monarchs used the land to reward followers in return for loyalty and military service. For example, earls, who were just below the king in the feudal hierarchy, were given a large area of land (called an earldom) to control on behalf of the king. England was a large country, which made it difficult for one man to control on his own, so the king needed trusted allies to help him rule. By the 1060s, there were four major earldoms: Wessex, Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia. If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of them, his land would be taken away. For example, when Earl Godwin had a dispute with Edward the Confessor, Godwin was exiled from England and his land was confiscated.

Links to other noble families through marriage and diplomacy were also important. By marrying into wealthy families, Anglo-Saxon monarchs could reinforce their power and gain wealth. For example, King Edward the Confessor married the daughter of an important earl. Links to leaders abroad could make Anglo-Saxon monarchs powerful. For example, Edward the Confessor was linked to Normandy through his mother and upbringing. Monarchs could also extend their influence through trade. For example, England had strong trade links with France and Scandinavia.

Another reason why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power was through their control of law and order. By using the earls, the king's laws were enforced in the earldoms. If a king wanted to be in control, it was important that he had an effective system of law and order. Without people to enforce laws all over the country, the king would lack control and peace could break down.

In summary, control of land was just one of several reasons why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. However, other factors such as marriage and lawmaking also played an important role.

An example of a Level 4 answer

Although control of the land was a vital factor in ensuring that Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power, there were other reasons such as marriages, lawmaking, and a strong economy.

Anglo-Saxon monarchs used the land to reward followers in return for loyalty and military service. For example, earls, who were just below the king in the feudal hierarchy, were given a large area of land (called an earldom) to govern on behalf of the king. England was a large country, which made it difficult for one man to control on his own, so the king needed trusted allies to help rule such a geographically large area of land. By the 1060s, there were four major earldoms: Wessex, Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia. If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of them, his land would be taken away. This was an effective way of controlling landowners. For example, when Earl Godwin had a major dispute with Edward the Confessor in 1052, he was exiled from England and his land was confiscated. It was only later, when Godwin apologised, that the king reinstated the earl, his lands, and his power. Therefore, through the distribution and control of land, a monarch was very powerful.

However, control of land was not the only reason why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. Links to other noble families through marriage and diplomacy were also an important factor. By marrying into powerful and wealthy families, Anglo-Saxon monarchs could reinforce their status and extend their reach into influential, regional rulers. For example, King Edward the Confessor's power was enhanced through his marriage to Edith, the daughter of Earl Godwin, a rich and powerful earl. Links to leaders abroad could make Anglo-Saxon monarchs powerful. For example, Edward the Confessor had grown up in Normandy and was a distant cousin of William of Normandy, through Edward's mother, Emma of Normandy. This meant that Edward had a powerful ally. Monarchs could also extend their influence through strong trade links. For example, England had strong trade links with France and Scandinavia. England had an advanced economic system, with its own minting system for making coins and a treasury that coordinated taxation and spending by the government.

Another reason why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power was through their control of law and order. Via the earls, who were directly appointed by the king, the king's laws were enforced in the earldoms. Without people to enforce laws all over the country, the king would lack control and the realm would lack order. Earldoms were divided into shires and hundreds; there were around 40 shires in total. Each shire appointed a shire reeve (sheriff), who was responsible for collecting taxes and fines. This meant that the king was provided with the wealth he needed to show his status, govern the country, and pay for an army if required. The shire reeve was also responsible for carrying out justice in shire courts for major crimes such as murder and serious theft. This was important, because one of the king's roles was to ensure the country was ordered and organised.

In summary, control of land was just one of several reasons why Anglo-Saxon monarchs had so much power. If land was not under complete control, then it would be a threat to the king's status and power. However, other factors such as marriage and lawmaking played an important role. Indeed, Anglo-Saxon monarchs made new laws, which people had to obey; this made them powerful. Edward the Confessor, for example, was a respected lawmaker, and there was a refined system of law and order, making the country stable.

2 Edward the Confessor and the succession crisis

1 Describe **two** features of the power of the Godwin family.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

The power of the Godwins had been built up over several years by Earl Godwin, who had died in 1053 (1). By 1060, his sons (or their relatives) were earls throughout most of the country (1).

The Godwins were related to England's king (1). Godwin's daughter, Edith, was married to Edward the Confessor, so Godwin was the king's father-in-law (1).

2 Explain why Harold Godwinson's position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066.

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Battle of Stamford Bridge
- threat from William of Normandy

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	<p>The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised.</p> <p>The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066.</p>
2	4–6	<p>The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066.</p>
3	7–9	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066.</p>
4	10–12	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why Harold Godwinson’s position as King of England was threatened by the events of September 1066.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

- Harold’s position as King of England was threatened, despite his victory at Stamford Bridge. Harold’s victory was a great one, but the Anglo-Saxon army was now bloody, battered, and tired. Just three days later, word reached Harold that William’s fleet had finally landed in the south. Harold now had to return south and take on another great army.
- William was a threat because of a strong claim to the throne. He was a distant cousin of Edward the Confessor, and he claimed that Edward had promised him the throne when William had visited England. William also said that Harold Godwinson had sworn to support William’s claim to the throne in 1064. William claimed the oath had been made over a holy relic and was therefore binding in the eyes of God.

- Harold’s position was also threatened by the Battle of Gate Fulford because it weakened the Anglo-Saxon army: the army was scattered, and the earls were forced to flee. Thousands of English soldiers were killed or wounded, so fewer were available to fight against an invasion by William.

3 ‘The main reason why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066 was because Edward the Confessor did not have a son.’

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- embassy to Normandy (1064/1065)
- Harald Hardrada

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.
4	13–16	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066. There is a clear line of reasoning

		<p>throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why there was rivalry over the throne in 1066.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>
--	--	--

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- Edward’s lack of an heir led to the crisis. It had been increasingly clear in the 1060s that there would be a succession crisis, as Edward was not going to produce an heir. However, none of the claimants had an overwhelmingly strong case: Edgar was young and lacked military experience; Harold was only connected to the throne by marriage; William and Harald were both foreigners. This situation was further complicated because there were no official rules of succession in Anglo-Saxon England. A claim to the throne could be made in several ways – the monarch’s son had the strongest claim (but Edward had no son); another male relative, for example, the monarch’s brother, might have a reasonable claim (but Edward had no brother). The lack of clear rules led to a succession crisis.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- The embassy to Normandy was used by William of Normandy to support his claim. In 1064 (or possibly 1065), Edward the Confessor sent Harold Godwinson, Earl of Wessex, to Normandy in France on an official visit (called an ‘embassy’). Historians are not entirely sure what the visit was for, or what exactly happened during Harold’s time there, but William said that Harold had sworn to support William’s claim to the throne in 1064. William claimed the oath had been made over a holy relic and was therefore binding in the eyes of God. The embassy brought a strong contender into the group of claimants, William of Normandy. This increased the crisis, as it was already clear that there would be great rivalry for the throne.
- Hardrada’s claim to the throne contributed to the rivalry of 1066. He was related to King Cnut, who had ruled England from 1016–35. He claimed his father, Magnus, had been promised the throne by Cnut’s son Harthacnut. When Harthacnut died in 1042, Edward took the throne. Magnus had since died, but his son was determined to claim what he thought was rightfully his.

3 The Norman invasion

- 1 Describe **two** features of the Anglo-Saxon army at the Battle of Hastings. (4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

The Anglo-Saxon army was made up of around 7000 foot soldiers (1). Most of the soldiers were known as the fyrd, with some thegns and elite housecarls. The fyrd were not well trained (1).

The Anglo-Saxon army was positioned behind a shield wall (1). This was a long row of interlocking shields. Traditionally, a shield wall was hard to break and was a very effective defence (1).

- 2 Explain why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Edward dies without an obvious successor
- embassy to Normandy (1064/1065)

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	<p>The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised.</p> <p>The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died.</p>
2	4–6	<p>The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died.</p>
3	7–9	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died.</p>
4	10–12	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why there was a succession crisis when Edward the Confessor died.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

- Edward had appeared to promise more than one person the throne on his death, including William of Normandy and Harold Godwinson. As there were rival claimants to the throne when Edward died, it was likely that there would be violent disputes.
- By the time of Edward's death, the power of the Godwinsons (for example, due to Edward's marriage to Edith) meant that they felt confident that they could challenge for the throne. However, William was bound to dispute this. In 1064 (or possibly 1065), Edward the Confessor sent Harold Godwinson, Earl of Wessex, to Normandy in France on an official visit (called an 'embassy'). However, historians are not entirely sure what the visit was for, or what exactly happened during Harold's time there, but William said that Harold had sworn to support William's claim to the throne in 1064. William claimed the oath had been made over a holy relic and was therefore binding in the eyes of God.

- There were several rival claimants whose claim to the throne all had elements of legitimacy: Edgar was Edward’s nearest relative; Hardrada believed his father had been promised the throne; William of Normandy had a blood connection. It had been increasingly clear in the 1060s that there would be a succession crisis, as Edward was not going to produce an heir. However, none of the claimants had an overwhelmingly strong case: Edgar was young and lacked military experience; Harold was only connected to the throne by marriage; William and Harald were both foreigners.

3 ‘The main reason for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings was superior Norman tactics.’

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- feigned retreats
- fyrd army

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and

		<p>understanding of the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.</p>
4	13–16	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon defeat at the Battle of Hastings and the relation to superior Norman tactics. An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- The Normans were well organised with clear communication around the battlefield. William could be seen by his men because he fought on horseback. The army was organised into divisions and a flag system was used for communication to allow tactics to be changed during battle. This meant that William's tactics, such as the use of the feigned retreat, was carried out successfully and weakened the shield wall.
- William had chosen the battle site and could place his archers and cavalry (which Harold did not have) where he liked. This gave William additional weaponry, and greater flexibility and manoeuvrability.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- Norman victory was helped by Harold's position in the country when William invaded. Harold had to march straight to battle against William, with an inexperienced fyrd army, after fighting at Stamford Bridge and without resting his men or gathering more troops.

4 Establishing control

1 Describe **two** features of motte and bailey castles.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

Motte and bailey castles were built very quickly soon after the Normans arrived in England (1), using earth and wood (1).

The bailey was an enclosed area (1), it provided a space for houses and stables (1).

2 Explain why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- the Marcher earldoms
- Anglo-Saxon rebellion

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066.
2	4–6	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066.
3	7–9	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066.
4	10–12	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why motte and bailey castles were built throughout England after 1066.

Relevant points that could be included

- The borderlands with Wales (the Marches) had been unstable pre-1066 and continued to be so after the Battle of Hastings – and William needed stability to rule effectively. By creating new earldoms (Marcher earldoms) and appointing loyal Normans as the new earls, this gave William security in the Marches. The new earls had great power and total control over the court system, taxes, and building. They built many motte and bailey castles to dominate their earldom.
- Motte and bailey castles were built at key strategic places, for example at river crossings or in (or near) larger towns. This made it easier to keep an eye on the local Anglo-Saxon population in case of rebellion.
- Motte and bailey castles not only provided a centre of administration for an area but were also used as a base for attacks should the local Anglo-Saxon population rebel. They protected Norman settlers, particularly the new lords, and they were a display of power, which served to intimidate the local population. Building castles involved moving large amounts of earth and stone and clearing forests, which demonstrated the strength and power of the Norman invaders.

3 ‘The main reason William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings was his superior leadership skill.’

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Norman tactics
- Battle of Stamford Bridge

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings.

		An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.</p>
4	13–16	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William of Normandy won the Battle of Hastings.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- William was a highly skilled general. He had conquered areas around Normandy and as far away as Sicily. At Hastings, William used his experience when he chose the battle site himself, giving him time to organise his troops properly and prepare.
- William's tactical use of feigned retreat by the Normans tricked the Anglo-Saxons into chasing them, which broke the shield-wall.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- Norman victory was helped by Harold's position in the country when William invaded. Harold had to march straight to battle against William after fighting at Stamford Bridge, without resting his men or gathering more troops.

5 Anglo-Saxon resistance

- 1 Describe **two** features of William of Normandy's claim to the English throne. (4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

William claimed that Harold Godwinson supported his claim (1). He said Godwinson had sworn an oath over a holy relic in 1064, which was therefore binding in the eyes of God (1).

Edward the Confessor had grown up in Normandy (1) and the way he ruled was clearly influenced by this, leading some historians to argue that Edward wanted a Norman to succeed him (1).

- 2 Explain why William faced threats to his throne after 1066? (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Edgar Aethling
- Hereward the Wake

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why William faced threats to his throne after 1066.
2	4–6	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why William faced threats to his throne after 1066. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why William faced threats to his throne after 1066.
3	7–9	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why William faced threats to his throne after 1066. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why William faced threats to his throne after 1066.
4	10–12	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why William faced threats to his throne after 1066. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why William faced threats to his throne after 1066.

Relevant points that could be included

- William angered prominent Anglo-Saxons, such as earls Edwin and Morcar and Edgar Aethling. William had not kept a promise he had made to Edwin that he could marry one of his daughters, and Edwin's earldom had been made smaller. Morcar's land had also been reduced in size because Normans such as Odo of Bayeux and William FitzOsbern were seizing land. The revolt of earls Edwin and Morcar and Edgar Aethling took place as a result, in 1068.
- William faced further threat from Edgar Aethling and northern rebellions in 1069. The north of England was the most rebellious area, as it saw itself as semi-independent from the rest of the country. Also, many people in the north continued to have some loyalty to the Vikings. After fleeing the rebellions of 1068, Edgar Aethling escaped to Scotland and formed a powerful alliance with King Malcolm III. Edgar made a claim on William's throne and even gained support from Danish Vikings (led by King Swegn of Denmark and Morcar), who joined up with an Anglo-Saxon army led by Edgar and other Anglo-Saxon earls. The joint army defeated the Norman forces outside the castle in York and captured the castle itself. However, William raced north and offered to pay the Vikings to leave (which they accepted), and the Anglo-Saxon army scattered. William then began a campaign to destroy vast areas of land around Yorkshire, known as the Harrying of the North.

- William faced threats from Anglo-Saxons such as Hereward the Wake in the early 1070s. Hereward's father was believed to be Leofric, Earl of Mercia. Hereward was angry that William and the Normans had confiscated land from his father and killed his brother. Hereward's best-known attack was the looting and burning of Peterborough Abbey in 1070. William eventually defeated Hereward's forces, which were supported by King Swegn of Denmark and Morcar.

3 'The main reason William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75 was because of the harsh punishments given to rebels.'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- changes in land ownership
- motte and bailey castles

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reason William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75 in relation to the harsh punishments given to rebels. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully

		explained.
4	13–16	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of England in the years 1066–75.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- After rebellions in the north in 1069, William was determined to teach the people of the north a lesson. He began a campaign to destroy vast areas of land around Yorkshire, burning and salting the fields, and killing people and livestock (the Harrying of the North).
- An estimated 100 000 people died, and 80 per cent of land in Yorkshire was left uncultivated and unpopulated. There were no further major Anglo-Saxon rebellions in the north.
- After the revolt of the earls in 1075, Roger de Breteuil was imprisoned and Waltheof was beheaded. Waltheof's execution suggests that William was still prepared to come down hard on Anglo-Saxon rebellion.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- William used land ownership as a key method of keeping control. William confiscated land and titles from Anglo-Saxons to reward his followers. He could remove land if he felt someone was disloyal. By 1076, only two earldoms were still held by Anglo-Saxons. Many of William's followers, his tenants-in-chief, built castles throughout England in towns, on borders, near key rivers, and in trouble spots (such as the Welsh Marches). Castles acted as a centre of administration for an area, protected Norman settlers (particularly the new lords), and were a display of power that intimidated the local population.

6 The feudal system and the Church

1 Describe **two** features of feudalism.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

OXFORD REVISE © Oxford University Press 2023. ISBN 9781382043007

go.oup.com/OR/GCSE/Ed/Hist/AngloSax

An example of a 4-mark answer

Feudalism is a system of give and take, based on control of the land (1). Land could be exchanged for military service, and tenancy could be exchanged for labour, for example (1).

Land could be taken away (1). If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of them, his land would be taken from him, a punishment known as forfeiture. Forfeiture was a powerful way of controlling landowners (1).

2 Explain why William the Conqueror's methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- rewarding followers
- Harrying of the North

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	<p>The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised.</p> <p>The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England.</p>
2	4–6	<p>The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England.</p>
3	7–9	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England.</p>
4	10–12	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why William the Conqueror’s methods of maintaining power helped him secure his position as King of England.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

- All Anglo-Saxons who had fought at Hastings lost their land; it was given to William’s loyal Norman supporters. For example, William’s long-term friend William FitzOsbern was given most of King Harold’s earldom. William sent rich gifts to the Pope, and to others who had fought alongside him at Hastings. William’s system of rewarding loyal following was a key element of the feudal system, and a tactic that helped him maintain power. William gave land and titles to supporters in return for loyalty and military service. If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of him, his land would be taken from him. This was a powerful way of controlling landowners.
- William used terror tactics to maintain power. When there was rebellion in the north in the late 1060s, William wanted to teach the people of the north a lesson and destroy the motivation and

spirit of the people there. So, William began a campaign to destroy vast areas of land around Yorkshire, burning and salting the fields, and killing people and livestock. The event became known as the Harrying of the North.

- William maintained a large army and built hundreds of castles throughout England in towns, on borders, near key rivers and in trouble spots (such as the Welsh Marches). He also controlled who was appointed to the senior positions in the Church. This meant that the monarch could control some of the messages given out in churches.

3 'The main consequence of the Norman invasion of England was the Normanisation of the Church.'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Archbishop Lanfranc
- the feudal system

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church.

		An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.
4	13–16	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the Norman invasion of England in relation to the Normanisation of the Church. An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- The Church was central to everyday life and had a huge influence on society. Any changes to the Church would be far-reaching. The placing of the Church within the system of feudalism benefited William’s political control over England, as bishops became part of the feudal military structure, adding to his security and control.
- By replacing Englishmen with Norman bishops, William strengthened his control over the Church – and all Anglo-Saxon worshippers. The appointment of Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury showed that William was keen to determine his right to appoint senior positions in the Church; Lanfranc proved a willing supporter of William, especially by excommunicating rebels.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- There were many other far-reaching consequences in addition to the Normanisation of the Church. For example, a Norman landowning and governing class was established by William, by giving land to key supporters. Gradually, Anglo-Saxon landownership was eradicated. Norman landowners collected taxes for William and provided him with soldiers, so securing William’s grip on England.

Chapter 7 Norman government

1 Describe **two** features of the Domesday Book.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

Feudalism is a system of give and take, based on control of the land (1). Land could be exchanged for military service, and tenancy could be exchanged for labour, for example (1).

Land could be taken away (1). If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of them, his land would be taken from him, a punishment known as forfeiture. Forfeiture was a powerful way of controlling landowners (1).

2 Explain why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I 's control less likely. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- tenants-in-chief
- centralised power

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	<p>The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised.</p> <p>The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely.</p>
2	4–6	<p>The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely.</p>
3	7–9	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely.</p>
4	10–12	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why changes in land ownership made resistance to William I's control less likely.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

- William used the feudal system, based on land ownership, to make resistance less likely. The king gave land and titles (known as a fief) to his barons and bishops (tenants-in-chief), and in return they gave him their loyalty and military service. If any land-user did not provide the service or duty required of him, his land would be taken from him. This was a powerful way of controlling landowners.
- William made sure he was at the centre of all decision-making and government. This is often called a system of 'centralised power'. William was at the top of the feudal hierarchy, and all landowners swore an oath of loyalty to him. William kept vast areas of land for himself and held the right to take any land away from his supporters. The land held by his barons was not as large as those that had been held by Anglo-Saxon earls, so no single person had the power to seriously challenge William's rule.

- William’s appointment of loyal followers, who built castles, also made resistance less likely. Castles were built at key strategic places; this made it easier to keep an eye on the local Anglo-Saxon population in case of rebellion. Castles not only acted as a centre of administration for an area but were used as a base for attacks if the local Anglo-Saxon population rebelled.

3 ‘It was changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England.’

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- tenants-in-chief
- motte and bailey castles

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.
4	13–16	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England.

		<p>There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the changes in land ownership that did the most to secure Norman control of England.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>
--	--	---

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- William himself owned all the land in England. The king gave land and titles (known as a fief) to his barons and bishops (tenants-in-chief) and in return they gave him their loyalty and military service. This ensured that William had troops without having to pay for them himself. William directly ruled twice as much land as everyone else put together – and he held the right to take control of any land, too. He used land as a reward for loyal followers, but the areas of land (fiefs) held by his barons were not as large as those that had previously been held by Anglo-Saxon earls, so no single person had the power to seriously challenge William’s rule. This was a powerful way of controlling landowners.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- The Normanisation of the Church secured Norman control. By replacing Englishmen with Norman bishops, William strengthened his control over England. Normanisation was not confined to the Church. The Normanisation of Anglo-Saxon society helped secure control by introducing aspects of Norman law and the Norman legal system.
- The building of motte and bailey castles helped secure control. They acted as a centre of administration, protected Norman settlers, and provided a display of power that intimidated the local population. Castles were therefore a clear way of demonstrating the social structure of Norman England.

8 The Norman aristocracy

1 Describe **two** features of the culture of Norman aristocracy.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

The Norman aristocracy liked to show off their wealth and status (1). They wore expensive fabrics and furs (1).

Building large castles, cathedrals, and abbeys was another way to show off wealth and status, and devotion to God (1). Many Anglo-Saxon churches were knocked down and Norman ones built in their place in the Romanesque style (with clean lines, rounded arches, and vaulted ceilings) (1).

2 Explain why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88. (12)

You **may** use the following in your answer. (12)

- Battle of Hastings
- regent

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88.
2	4–6	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88.
3	7–9	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88.
4	10–12	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why Odo was important in Norman England in the years 1066–88.

Relevant points that could be included

- Around 1049, William of Normandy appointed Odo as Bishop of Bayeux. This was an important job because Bayeux was a key town in Normandy. It showed that William trusted Odo and wanted a reliable family member in an influential position. Odo helped organise the invasion of England and contributed 100 ships to the invasion fleet. He also fought at the Battle of Hastings and was rewarded with lots of land (only William I had more land in England than Odo). As a result, Odo became one of the most powerful landowners in England; however, he was resented by the people whose land he took.
- Also in 1067, Odo and William FitzOsbern were left as regents when William returned to Normandy. This shows how much William trusted Odo. However, Odo was brutal with the Anglo-Saxons – acting with cruelty and illegally seizing land – and they hated him. This was a disaster for relations between the Anglo-Saxons and William I, who did not want to provoke Anglo-Saxon rebellions.

- In 1075, Odo led an army against the Earl of Norfolk and ended the Revolt of the Earls. However, in 1076 he was put on trial following a dispute with Archbishop Lanfranc and accused of seizing land and property. The trial revealed the decline in importance of Odo, and the power and influence of Lanfranc. It also showed that there were limits to what was tolerated of the Normans: William respected the law above a family member.

3 'The main reason William I was able to keep control of the people of England was his use of regents.'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- regents
- sheriffs

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.

3	9–12	<p>The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.</p>
4	13–16	<p>The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised.</p> <p>Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the reasons why William I was able to keep control of the people of England and his use of regents.</p> <p>An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- From 1072 until his death in 1087, William spent around three-quarters of his time back in Normandy. His solution was to put trusted men in charge to act for him as regents. While the king was away, the regents had the same power as the king did.
- During his reign, William used his half-brother (Odo of Bayeux), his long-time friend (William FitzOsbern), and the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lanfranc) as regents. The use of these regents was a way of ensuring the continuity of the king's wishes while he was abroad.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- The regents didn't always help William maintain control: Odo of Bayeux and William FitzOsbern did a poor job as the first regents in 1067, undoing lots of William's diplomatic work with the Anglo-Saxon nobility and provoking Anglo-Saxon resistance. In addition to regents, there were other positions that helped William maintain control. For example, Norman sheriffs had lots of power and answered only to the king. They were viewed by the English as a symbol of Norman power and control.

9 William I and his sons

1 Describe **two** features of the career of Bishop Odo.

(4)

Mark scheme

You can award four marks for this question, two for each feature. Award one mark for a valid feature, and one mark for accurate supporting information.

An example of a 4-mark answer

Around 1049, William of Normandy appointed Odo as Bishop of Bayeux (1). This was a significant job because Bayeux was one of the most important towns in Normandy, and it showed that William trusted Odo (1).

When William was in Normandy in the late 1060s, Odo and William FitzOsbern were left as regents (1). Odo was brutal as regent, acting cruelly and illegally, and the Anglo-Saxons hated him (1).

2 Explain why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80.

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Robert's brothers
- William I

You **must** also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–3	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80.
2	4–6	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the reasons why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80. It contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80.
3	7–9	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the reasons why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80.
4	10–12	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the reasons why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80. There is a clear line of reasoning throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of why Robert of Normandy rebelled against his father in 1077–80.

Relevant points that could be included

- Robert brawled with his two younger brothers when a prank involving urine went wrong. Robert resented his father's apparent favouritism towards his brothers and felt his brothers weren't punished enough. His attempt to take control of Rouen Castle in Normandy failed, but he had the support of William's enemy, the King of France, who gave Robert a castle at Gerberoy as a base from which to launch attacks against Normandy.
- Robert had a poor relationship with both his father (William I) and his younger brother, William Rufus. Robert was bullied by his father. He was given the mocking nickname Robert Curthose ('short stockings' / 'dumpy legs'). William felt that Robert was lazy and spoiled. When William was in England, he trusted his wife Matilda to rule Normandy rather than Robert. Robert resented this.
- William did not think Robert was ready to take control of Normandy and Robert resented his father spending most of his time in Normandy rather than in England.

3 'The main consequence of William I's decisions about the succession was that William Rufus inherited the English crown.'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

(16)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Robert of Normandy
- Bishop Odo

You must also use information of your own.

Mark scheme

Level	Marks	Explanation
1	1–4	The answer is simple or generalised. It is not developed, and it is poorly organised. The answer contains limited knowledge and understanding of the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. An overall judgement is missing or is given but is not justified.
2	5–8	The answer contains an explanation, but it is limited and does not link to the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. The answer contains some development and organisation of material, but a clear line of reasoning throughout is missing. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. An overall judgement is given, and it is justified, but the justification is not explained at all or is poorly explained.
3	9–12	The answer contains an explanation, which shows some analysis and is mainly linked to the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. There is generally a clear line of reasoning throughout, but some passages are not as coherent and organised as they could be. Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. An overall judgement is given and it is justified, but the justification is not fully explained.
4	13–16	The answer contains an analytical explanation, which is linked to the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. There is a clear line of reasoning

		<p>throughout, and the answer is coherent and well organised. Accurate and relevant information has been chosen to address the question directly, showing a wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the consequences of William I's decisions about the succession and its relation to William Rufus inheriting the English crown. An overall judgement is given and the justification for the judgement is fully explained.</p>
--	--	--

Relevant points that could be included

Relevant points that support the statement may include:

- William I's decision about the succession directly led to the crowning of William Rufus as King of England. In the hope of avoiding conflict after his death, and because he did not believe Robert had the ability to govern the whole country, William I declared that the inheritance would be split: Robert would have Normandy, William Rufus would rule England, and Henry would receive the substantial sum of £5000. William sent William Rufus to England with a letter for Lanfranc instructing the archbishop to arrange for William Rufus to be crowned King of England. Lanfranc, who was clearly trusted by William I, crowned William Rufus as King William II in September 1087.

Relevant points that counter the statement may include:

- William I's decision about the succession led to rebellion. Bishop Odo, released from prison, said that landowners should choose between Robert of Normandy and William II as their united leader. Odo wanted Robert as the united leader because he felt he would be easier to control than Rufus (who was more like his father). In 1088, Odo led a rebellion against William II, in support of Robert. Robert of Normandy was unhappy with William I's decision about the succession. He believed that as the eldest son he should rule both Normandy and England.
- There were some outbreaks of rebellion in England in support of Odo and Robert, causing a serious threat to William II. However, Odo did not get the support from other Norman aristocrats, the English bishops, or the general population. Odo (and his brother, Robert of Mortain) took refuge in Pevensey Castle (near Hastings). They held out for several weeks but were eventually defeated. Odo managed to escape to Rochester Castle in Kent and awaited the help of Robert. Robert never came to help Odo, the rebellions faded away, and Odo was exiled.