

Anglo-Saxon and Norman England c1060-c1085 (Model Answers)

Option B1: Anglo-Saxon and Norman England, c1060-88 - Question 4a

Describe **two** features of Anglo-Saxon society (four marks)

One key feature of Anglo-Saxon society was its hierarchical structure. This meant that society was arranged in a clear order of rank and everyone knew their status and what was expected of them, from the king at the top to slaves at the bottom.

Anglo-Saxon society was mainly rural. Ninety percent of the two million people lived in villages making a living from farming or farm-related work.

Second key
feature
identified.

Option B1: Anglo-Saxon and Norman England, c1060-88 - Question 4b

Explain why William won the Battle of Hastings. You may use the following in your answer:

Knights

Tactics

You must also use information of your own. (12 marks)

Both William and Harold Godwinson were experienced military leaders. The role of knights, William's tactics and importantly the fatigue of Harold's troops are reasons why William won the battle.

Harold and his Anglo-Saxon troops used the defensive shield wall at the top of Senlac Hill. The Norman knights could move quickly across the battlefield. At the start of the battle, the hill up to the shield wall and its stubbornness to hold firm slowed down the cavalry charge. But, later on as the shield wall weakened, as sections of Harold's troops left the wall, the knights were able to cut through and run down fleeing enemies including killing Harold.

The key to William's victory was his ability to be flexible and try out new tactics. William was able to use his foot soldiers, archers and cavalry in different ways to attack the Saxons. For example, when the foot soldiers and cavalry failed to dent the shield wall, William used the tactic of feigned retreat to weaken the wall. Harold's army included many fyrd who were inexperienced. When they ran after the 'fleeing' Normans, the Normans turned back on them, and cut them to pieces at the bottom of the hill. The loss of troops severely weakened the shield wall.

An important factor to William's victory was the tiredness and lack of experience of Harold's troops. Harold and his men had previously fought at the Battle of Stamford Bridge in the north of the country, which they won. However, this was at a cost because Harold lost many men at the battle and they had to march to fight Hardrada which was roughly a 400 mile round trip. Harold did levy men in London, however, they lacked experience and discipline which played a part in the loss.

The role of the knights, William's tactics and Harold's tired men played parts in William's victory. But the fatigue and lack of discipline caused by the Battle of Stamford Bridge was the most important reason why William won.

Option B1: Anglo-Saxon and Norman England, c1060-88 - Question 4c (i) or 4c (ii)

The main consequence of the appointment of Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1070 was an increase in Norman control of England.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

You may use the following in your answer:

- Archbishop Stigand
- monasteries

You must also use information of your own. (16 marks, 4 SPaG)

A main consequence of the appointment of Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury did see an increase in Norman control. However, other important consequences of Lanfranc's appointment were the attacks on corruption in the Anglo-Saxon Church; and the development of monasticism in England.

It abundantly clear that Lanfranc helped to increase Norman control of England. Archbishop Stigand was removed as the most senior cleric in England. He was the last link to Harold Godwinson and had been at his coronation. So Stigand's removal meant that the Church could not question William's claim which helped to secure his control. Lanfranc's appointments to high positions in Church were almost always of Norman heritage, thus William's desire to control the Church was fulfilled. Hence, increased Norman control of England was major consequence of Lanfranc being Archbishop of Canterbury.

Another consequence of Lanfranc's appointment were his reforms, in particular stamping out corruption among bishops and priests. He and his bishops worked hard in dealing with problems. Lanfranc took a very dim view of married priests as he believed they should be celibate. In 1075, Lanfranc ordered that no new priest could be married. Village priests could keep their wives but priests in cathedrals, which were viewed as more important, had to make a choice, give up their post in the Church or give up their wives and become celibate. Therefore, Lanfranc helped to 'clean' up the Church in England.

Another impact of Lanfranc's appointment was the development of monasticism in England. Lanfranc himself had been a monk and abbot for 30 years. So he increased the number of monasteries in England and the number of monks within them. Lanfranc believed that it was important for monks to be well educated so they in turn could educate and influence those who were not churchmen. Monks had to follow strict rules established in the monasteries. Monasteries in England existed in England until the 1530s.

In conclusion, the biggest and most important consequence of Lanfranc's appointment was the strengthening of Norman control in England because without this factor, he would not have been able to reform the Church as effectively as he did. Also, the development of monasticism would have been slow.

Q4a - Describe two features of the Domesday Book. (4 marks)

One feature of the Domesday Book was that it showed who owned land in England. It recorded landholdings during the reign of Edward the Confessor and afterwards.

Another feature of the Book was that it covered most of England. However, London and the extreme North were not covered.

Explain why William I established the Marcher earldoms.

You may use the following in your answer:

- William's supporters.
- Borderlands

You **must** use information of your own. (12 marks)

William established the Marcher earldoms to protect the border with Wales, to reward his most loyal supporters and to protect his position as king.

Firstly, William established the Marcher earldoms to reward his most loyal supporters such as William FitzOsbern, Hugh D'Avranches and Roger de Montgomery. These men had provided support and gathered knights for William during his invasion of England and helped him to defeat Harold Godwinson at Hastings. In fact, William FitzOsbern had been at William's side from an early age and had been extremely loyal. There were three Marcher earldoms, and land equalled power and wealth. The Marcher earls were exempt from the geld tax which allowed them to become even wealthier. This was the reward for their unwavering support.

Secondly, William needed to strengthen the security on the borderlands with Wales. Hence, the creation of the Marcher earldoms. Wales was particularly tricky for William and had been for Edward the Confessor. There is a strong chance William I would have been aware of this. King Llywelyn had been a threat for Edward the Confessor. In fact, Harold and Tostig Godwinson had helped to deal with Llywelyn. One of the privileges of the Marcher earldoms was the right to build castles without William's permission. This allowed castles to be built within the heart of enemy territory and to deal with any potential attack or rebellion. The Marcher earldoms helped to control the border.

The creation of the Marcher earldoms allowed William to strengthen his position as king, especially financially. The Marcher earls would have not been exempt from providing a certain number of knights for William's army as set out in the feudal system. As the Marcher Earls did not have to pay tax they were encouraged to spend on defences.

Crucially, the building of the castles would have come out of the purses of the Marcher earls. But these earldoms were quite small which meant that the earls could not threaten William's power. Hence, contributing to William increasing his control and wealth.

Explain why William won the Battle of Hastings.

You may use the following in your answer:

- Both William and Harold Godwinson were experienced military leaders. The role of knights, William's tactics and Harold bad luck are all reasons why William won the battle.
- The key to William's victory was his ability to be flexible and try out new tactics. William was able to use his foot soldiers, archers and cavalry in different ways to attack the Saxons. For example, when the foot soldiers and cavalry failed to dent the shield wall, William used the tactic of feigned retreat to weaken the wall. Harold's army included many fyrd who were inexperienced. When they ran after the 'fleeing' Normans, the Normans turned back on them, and cut them to pieces at the bottom of the hill. The loss of troops severely weakened the shield wall. This meant that the Norman troops could cut down the Saxon foot soldiers and finally kill Harold, leading to Williams victory.
- An important factor to William's victory was the tiredness and lack of experience of Harold's troops. Harold and his men had previously fought at the Battle of Stamford Bridge in the north of the country, which they won. However, this was at a cost because Harold lost many men at the battle and they had to march to fight Hardrada which was roughly a 400 mile round trip. Harold did levy men in London, however, they lacked experience and discipline which played a part in the loss.
- Harold's bad luck also helped William win. Harold was fighting Hardrada in the north of England when William invaded in the south. Harold had guarded the south coast all summer, waiting for William. It was bad luck that he had to go and fight Hardrada just when the wind changed at just the right moment, William and his men had time to rest and get organised. This bad luck was the main reason Harold's army was so tired and injured and no match for William's.

Explain why William I established the Marcher earldoms.

You may use the following in your answer:

- William's supporters.
- Borderlands

You **must** use information of your own. (12 marks)

William established the Marcher earldoms to protect the border with Wales, to reward his most loyal supporters and to protect his position as king.

Firstly, William established the Marcher earldoms to reward his most loyal supporters such as William FitzOsbern, Hugh D'Avranches and Roger de Montgomery. These men had provided support and gathered knights for William during his invasion of England and helped him to defeat Harold Godwinson at Hastings. In fact, William FitzOsbern had been at William's side from an early age and had been extremely loyal. There were three Marcher earldoms, and land equalled power and wealth. The Marcher earls were exempt from the geld tax which allowed them to become even wealthier. This was the reward for their unwavering support.

Secondly, William needed to strengthen the security on the borderlands with Wales. Hence, the creation of the Marcher earldoms. Wales was particularly tricky for William and had been for Edward the Confessor. There is a strong chance William I would have been aware of this. King Llywelyn had been a threat for Edward the Confessor. In fact, Harold and Tostig Godwinson had helped to deal with Llywelyn. One of the privileges of the Marcher earldoms was the right to build castles without William's permission. This allowed castles to be built within the heart of enemy territory and to deal with any potential attack or rebellion. The Marcher earldoms helped to control the border.

The creation of the Marcher earldoms allowed William to strengthen his position as king, especially financially. The Marcher earls would have not been exempt from providing a certain number of knights for William's army as set out in the feudal system. Crucially, the building of the castles would have come out of the purses of the Marcher earls. William did not have the financial clout to control the Marcher lands. However, the Marcher earls did due to their greater level of autonomy and privileges. But these earldoms were quite small which meant that the earls could not threaten William's power. Hence, contributing to William increasing his control and wealth.

Question 4 c (i)

'The main consequence of William I's policy of Normanisation was increased control of the Church in England.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

You may use the following in your answer:

- Bishops
- Landholding

You **must** use information of your own. (16 marks + 4 SPaG)

A huge consequence of the Normanisation was the change and control in land during William's reign. The control of the Church and the establishment of Norman culture were significant consequences of Normanisation. However, these were not as important as controlling land as this was at the heart of power and wealth.

The most significant consequence of William's policy of Normanisation was the shift in land control, in terms of shifting land holding from the Anglo-Saxons to key Norman supporters. Under the feudal system, William gifted land to tenants-in-chiefs, who over time were Normans rather than Anglo-Saxons who could be trusted more, especially with the rebellions which Williams had to deal with 1068-71. Many of the earldoms were allocated to Normans in key geographical areas such as the Marcher lands. Under the feudal system, tenants-in-chief had to provide knights for William's arm in return for the land. In essence, a Norman governing class was created by William which effectively eliminated the Anglo-Saxons from any powerful roles. The thegns were wiped out as class and replaced by the knights. So William was the sole land owner of England which made him wealthy and powerful. This was the most significant consequence of Normanisation.

The control of the Church in England cannot be ruled out as significant consequence. William appointed Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury who replaced Stigand. The Anglo-Saxon bishops were replaced by Normans with the exception of Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester, who showed his loyalty in the Earls' Revolt 1075. Bishops were part of the feudal system, so they had to provide knights. Importantly, Lanfranc, loyal to William, destroyed Anglo-Saxon churches, and replaced them with bigger, more elaborate Norman cathedrals. This was significant because William controlled spiritual side of England and in some ways added to his legitimacy in being king of England, as the Church would emphasise this through the bishops.

A third consequence of Normanisation was the emergence and development of the Norman culture. Norman wealth was not displayed by rich clothes but by jaw-dropping buildings such as churches and castles. The language of the elite was Norman not English which was spoken by common people. This demonstrated that the Normans were the victors and superseded the Anglo-Saxons as the Norman culture was another physical reminder of their dominance and superiority.

In conclusion, the shift in landholding was the main consequence of Normanisation because of its impact in terms ensuring that the wealth was in William's hands and no other person, including a Norman, could challenge him. The control of the Church fell into this aspect with its link into the feudal system.

4c (ii) 'William used the same methods to deal with the rebellions in the North (1069) and the rebellion of Hereward the Wake (1070-71).'

How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

You may use the following in your answer:

- Leadership
- Punishment

You **must** also use information of your own. (16 marks + 4 SPaG)

There are some stark differences in the methods used to deal with the rebellions in the North and in Ely. This is exemplified by the Harrying of the North and castle building. However, William did use money to buy off people in both rebellions.

A different method which distinguished the rebellion in the North to the Fens was the brutal Harrying of the North which was a punishment. After the conclusion of the rebellions in 1069, William ordered the destruction of villages, crops and livestock which led to approximately 100,000 deaths. Many of the dead were innocent as well as participants. This action was carried out to act as a punishment and as a deterrent, especially with the death of Robert Cumin and 3,000 Normans. William did not repeat this action in the Ely area after Hereward disappeared. Maybe William acted more harshly in the North as he perceived the area steeped in Danelaw as more of a threat and danger with its links to the Vikings. Perhaps, William realised he went too far in the North and did not lay waste to the Ely area.

The building of castles had always played a prominent part in William invading and conquering England. William used castles in the North. On the way North, William built castles and he had one built in York with William FitzOsbern as its castellan. He did this in order to emphasise Norman power as the motte and bailey castle was a Norman building. Castles were not built in the Ely area. This was a difference because castles were symbols of Norman power and this- needed to be shown in the North as Edwin and Morcar has stirred up a revolt in 1068. And William had to deal with serious rebellions in 1069. The Ely area was different. Perhaps the marshland aspect of the area was not conducive to castle construction.

William's decision making played a part in the resolution of both rebellions. He needed to deal with rebellions rapidly and with serious intent. But he was not foolhardy in terms of sending in troops and risking their lives and serious defeat. William realised that the serious element of threat lay with the Danes especially in the North with a fleet of over 200 ships. William used his leadership and experience by paying off the Danes. Anglo-Saxons kings had done this in the past. William's actions simply divided the forces. In Ely, local church officials were bribed to reveal a passage through the Fens. This leadership allowed William to deal with the rebellions efficiently and to take out the Anglo-Saxons who were at the heart of the rebellious actions, as in the case of the North, William isolated them from the Danes. Efficient leadership allowed William to deal with both rebellions with decisive action.

In conclusion, William used starkly different methods in the North and Ely as they were had different characteristics. The rebellion in the North was more of a threat, especially with so many killed. Hence, it require a brutal punishment with the Harrying of the North. By 1070, William had acquired more experience in dealing with rebellions and realised other methods were needed such as bribery.

Explain why William I built motte and bailey castles

Castles were crucial in establishing Norman control over England because they were strong defensive fortifications, acted as a base for the local lord, and were powerful symbols of Norman power.

The Normans needed strong defences to fight against the more numerous Saxons. Motte and bailey castles were well-fortified, with earthworks, ditches and palisade walls giving lots of protection. They were built at strategic locations, such as along the Welsh border, to shelter Norman troops, and could be erected within a few months. This meant that the outnumbered Normans had protection from potential Saxon unrest.

Secondly, castles were used as a base by the local lord to dominate the surrounding area. Marcher earls used their castles as bases to raid into Wales, and the lords of castles in Warwick and York (among other places) used them to control the local town. The bailey contained stables and barracks and storehouses for the lord's troops, and served as a refuge from which they could attack.

Lastly, the castles were intimidating symbols of the power of the invaders. The keeps of motte and bailey castles could be seen from miles around, and local people were often used to build them, sometimes after demolishing Saxon buildings. This all served as a reminder that the Normans were now in charge, so the castles served both practical and symbolic functions.

Explain why the earls revolted in 1068

The English earls Edwin and Morcar fled from William's court and rebelled in 1068 because of personal resentments, Norman government, and, above all, loss of lands.

The Mercian and Northumbrian earls had reason to be angry at William because William had gone back on his promise to marry his daughter to Edwin. Other rebel leader Edgar the Aetheling still harboured hopes of being king. This made them eager to rebel, especially with William dividing his time between England and Normandy.

A second reason was Norman government. The Anglo-Saxons resented the heavy geld tax they had to pay to the conqueror, and the castles that were swiftly built across the country. There were also reports of Saxons having their land taken unlawfully and attacked, with the perpetrators going unpunished. Thus the Saxons rebelled in part out of a desire to change the Norman government. But the most important reason for the 1068 revolt was land reorganisation. After the Battle of Hastings, William had granted land to his followers, and both Edwin and Morcar had some of their land taken away and given to Norman supporters. The Normans also seized every opportunity to expand their own land at the expense of others, including through illegal 'land grabs'. As a result, the earls were less powerful and wealthy, and the Normans were more so. This was an unacceptable loss of power, so the earls revolted against William to try and regain what was theirs.

Explain why there were rebellions against William in 1068-71 / threats to his throne after 1066

In the years after William's coronation, there were several Anglo-Saxon rebellions (with Danish help) because of personal grievances against William, resentment at Norman government, and opportunism.

Several rebel leaders had reason to oppose the king. In 1068, for example, Earls Edwin and Morcar rebelled. William had gone back on his promise to marry Edwin to his daughter, and, crucially, had reduced the lands of both earls, and, in turn, their power and wealth. Edgar the Aetheling, the principal leader of the northern revolts from 1069, claimed the throne through his royal blood, whereas William was a foreign outsider. Thus personal relationships is one reason for the rebellions in this period.

A further reason for rebellion was Norman government. The Anglo-Saxons highly resented the heavy geld tax, and, most of all, the transfer of land from them to the Normans (which made Hereward the Wake revolt in 1070), who were always seeking to grab even more. This anger at losing land was compounded by harsh government, for instance with Robert Cumin, the new earl of Northumbria, being slaughtered by band of rebels at Durham after he had attacked local towns and villages on his way north to take the role. For the Anglo-Saxons, the only way to change their situation was to remove the Normans completely.

Lastly, opportunism also partially fuelled the rebellions. Edgar the Atheling was aided by King Malcolm of Scotland, and, most significantly, by King Sweyn of Denmark. They perhaps would benefit from having their own candidate on the throne of England. The Danes, moreover, gained financially by plundering Norman lands and forcing William to pay them off, as well as from the attack on Peterborough Abbey with Hereward. This opportunistic aspect to the rebellions is also clear in later ones against William, although resentment at the Normans, especially over land, remained the primary cause.

Explain why the English rebellions failed.

The English rebellions of 1068-71 posed a serious threat to William's power, and were only defeated by William's military skill, his choice of tactics, and the weaknesses of the rebels.

William's military skill was shown throughout this period of revolt. His castle-building in Mercia quickly ended the revolt of Edwin and Morcar in 1068, and during the Anglo-Danish attacks, William routed the rebels every time they met in open battle, for instance at York in 1069 and defeating Morcar and Hereward the Wake at Ely in 1071. The rebels were ultimately only defeated by William's military strength.

But the king's tactics were also important in destroying the rebellion. The intervention of King Sweyn of Denmark in 1069 posed a serious threat, but William was able to neutralise him through paying him a large sum of money. Having bought breathing space, he then followed this up by the 'Harrying of the North', a campaign of total destruction which left no crops or livestock alive. This meant that there would be nothing in the region that could be used to support potential rebels. As a result, William's tactics ensured the English rebellions would fail.

Lastly, the rebels did not put up the most effective resistance. In rebellion of 1068, Edwin and Morcar quickly surrendered to William after their defeat. The Anglo-Danish army split up after their victory at York in 1069 rather than pressing home their advantage. The rebellion at Ely lost allies when the rebels raided Peterborough Abbey, and their final defeat may have been down to local monks who showed the Normans a safe route through the fens. Thus the English rebels and the Danes were often not co-ordinated enough to resist William's clever and brutal campaigns to keep control of England.

Explain why William carried out the Harrying of the North, 1069-70

William laid waste to the North of England during the Harrying of the North because he had sworn to avenge the death of his Earl Robert Cumin in 1069, to put an end to the frequent rebellions and most importantly to end the Danish threat posed by the North's close relationship with the Danes.

William carried out the Harrying of the North to avenge the death of his Earl Robert Cumin and his men who had been slaughtered in 1069. Cumin had taken a large force North, in January 1069 which were slaughtered by a large band of Northumbrians in the streets of Durham and then later killed Cumin. As Cumin was one of William's newly appointed Earl's he had sworn to seek revenge for his death. This revenge was carried out during the Harrying of the North.

A further reason William laid waste to the North was the frequency of the rebellions in England. William had to face three rebellions in 1069 alone. Often William would march his army to deal with one threat and the Anglo-Saxons rebels would flee and then launch attacks on his men when he went to deal with attacks elsewhere. William solved this issue in the North by laying waste to the land making it impossible for anyone, rebels included to be able to stay in the area to launch attacks.

The most important factor which led to the Harrying of the North was the Norths' connection to the Danes. Due to its large Danish population and allegiance to the Danelaw the North made England vulnerable to a Danish invasion. This problem was exacerbated in 1069 when Edgar Aethling joined forces with the Danes in a rebellion against William. This was the most significant threat to Williams power that any rebellion had previously posed as it combined the military might of the Danes and their Northumbrian support with a legitimate claimant for the English throne that the Saxons could rally around. Though William was able to put down this rebellion, the North's connection to the Danes became too much of a threat. Consequently, William embarked on a campaign of total destruction in the North to ensure that this threat was obliterated.

The main reason for the Harrying of the North was to prevent another Danish invasion. How far do you agree.

**Robert Cumin/
Danelaw**

I agree with the statement as many historians would argue that the Danish posed a consistent threat to the north. However, there were other reasons that contributed to William's Harrying of the North such as Williams need to take avenge the frequent rebellions one of which led to the murder of his Earl Robert Cumin.

William laid waste to the North of England during the Harrying of the North because he had sworn to avenge the death of his Earl Robert Cumin in 1069, to put an end to the frequent rebellions and most importantly to end the Danish threat posed by the North's close relationship with the Danish.

The most important factor which led to the Harrying of the North was the Norths' connection to the Danish. Due to its large Danish population and allegiance to the Danelaw the North made England vulnerable to a Danish invasion. This problem was exacerbated in 1069 when Edgar Aethling joined forces with the Danes in a rebellion against William. This was the most significant threat to Williams power that any rebellion had previously posed as it combined the military might of the Danes and their Northumbrian support with a legitimate claimant for the English throne that the Saxons could rally around. Though William was able to put down this rebellion, the North's connection to the Danes became too much of a threat. Consequently, William embarked on a campaign of total destruction in the North to ensure that this threat was obliterated.

Additionally, William recognized that though the Normans had the military advantage on the land and had routed the English and Danish threat several times by the end of 1069. It was clear that the Danes had a military advantage when on the sea. In September of 1069 the Danes sailed across the Humber to the coast of Lincolnshire, difficult to access by land because of swamps. William realized that he could not attack the Danes by land and attacking them by sea would have been foolish since the Normans had no fleet and were far less experienced sailors than the Danes. It became clear to William that the Danes were biding their time until the Norman army was depleted so that they could attack. This would have made it starkly clear to William that his power was vulnerable and that the Danes posed a significant threat to his sovereignty. He decided to Harry the North to prevent a Danish invasion which would have been both welcomed and facilitated by the Northumbrians.

Though the Danish invasion was the main reason that William Harryed the North he also William carried out the Harrying of the North to avenge the death of his Earl Robert Cumin and his men who had been slaughtered in 1069. Cumin had taken a large force North, in January 1069 Which were slaughtered by a large band of Northumbrians in the streets of Durham and then later killed Cumin. As Cumin was one of William's newly appointed Earl's he had sworn to seek revenge for his death. This revenge was carried out during the Harrying of the North. However, the Harrying of the North was an extreme reaction which cost William economically as the North became waste land. Consequently, it seems that he would have only taken such measures to keep control of his crown which was threatened by the Danish.

A further reason William laid waste to the North was the frequency of the rebellions in England. William had to face three rebellions in 1069 alone. Often William would march his army to deal with one threat and the Anglo-Saxons rebels would flee and then launch attacks on his men when he went to deal with attacks elsewhere. Though William was growing tired of the guerrilla tactics adopted by the rebels he had demonstrated several times that he could obliterate the English in open combat. Therefore, these rebellions were not as significant of a threat as the Danish.

Overall, it is clear that William wanted a final solution for the Danish threat and therefore carried out the Harrying of the North. Though his need for revenge and irritation at the guerrilla tactics adopted by the rebels also contributed to his total destruction of the north. It is clear that the Danish threat posed the only genuine threat to his reign as king and therefore William considered the Harrying of the North to be the only viable option.

Explain why the Revolt of the Earls in 1075 failed.

Key words:

forfeited=land taken away

Regent= a person appointed by the king to rule in his absence

Pillage= stealing from a place as an act of war

The most important reason why the Revolt of the Earls failed is because Waltheof reported the plot to Archbishop Lanfranc. Waltheof one of the plotters betrayed the plot to Lanfranc and told him all he knew. It is unclear why Waltheof did this. He may never have been a serious rebel, and immediately regretted talking to Ralph and Roger. It is possible they had forced him to take part in discussions, and he informed Lanfranc as soon as he had the chance, either way, Lanfranc was forewarned which gave him sufficient time to plan a strategy to end the rebellion.

Another reason why the plot was a failure is due to Lanfranc and Odo's quick and effective reaction to stop the armies of the two earls combining. One of the reasons the earls chose that moment to lead a rebellion was because William was in Normandy. However, William had left England in the care of a capable regent Lanfranc. Lanfranc also had the support of William's half-brother Odo of Bayeux. As Lanfranc was forewarned of the rebellion, he was able to act quickly by sending two royal armies north to prevent the armies of Roger and Ralph joining forces. The Royal army captured many of Ralph's men and he was forced to flee to Brittany. Roger was captured, imprisoned and his land was forfeited. Therefore, it is evident that the revolt failed due to Lanfranc's effective decision making.

A second reason that the revolt was a failure was because the Danes did not arrive in time to support the rebellion. The hoped-for Danish support did arrive with a huge fleet of 200 ships, but long after the rebels had fled and been captured. The Danish fleet could have stretched Norman defences beyond their limit. However, rather than battle William himself (who had since returned) they pillaged York again and then sailed home. Had the Danes arrived in good time they may have been able to support Roger and Ralph's armies in defeating the royal army. Their lateness sealed the fate of the rebellion and thus led to its failure.

Explain why there were changes to Anglo-Saxon society, economy and law after 1066?

There were changes in Anglo-Saxon society as William introduced the feudal system. It was a simple, but effective system, where all land was owned by the king. This system marked a change, as under the feudal system the king owned all of the land and leased it out to his tenants in chief whereas under the Anglo-Saxon system the earls owned vast areas of land. One quarter of the land was kept by the king as his personal property. He leased land to his most important supporters the tenants-in-chief. In return for the land the tenants-in-chief agreed to bring men to fight for the king. The tenants-in-chief gave land to their knights. And in return the knights agreed to do military service for their lord, the tenant-in-chief. Therefore, they made up the quota of knights the tenant-in-chief provided for the king. The knights gave their land to the villeins, they also kept some land for themselves. The villeins worked the knights land two or three days a week in return for their own land. This work was known as labour service. This marked a change as many Saxon landowners now found that they were having to work for Norman lords, They had lost status under the feudal system some even became villeins, unfree workers tied to their lord's land.

There were changes to the economy after 1066. For example towns were growing up around new castles such as Newcastle in the north-east. The castle garrisons bought food, clothing and other goods from local people. Another change was that trade had turned west to France, before 1066 there had been more trade with Scandinavia (Danish land) from east-coast ports and towns such as York. England now had less contact with Scandinavia so there was less trade and this made those towns less wealthy. After 1066 ports on the south-coast were doing more trade with France because of the new links with Normandy and parts of France. More goods such as tin and especially wool were being sold in France so English merchants made more profit. Another change was in the law, William increased the power of the king in 1066 and passed various laws. William increased his power by creating a centralised government, by owning all of the land William was able to reduce the power of the earls significantly. Additionally, William was at the centre of all decision making- government did not take place if the king was not present, except when the king appointed a regent. William passed various laws such as the Forest Laws which meant that trees could no longer be cut down for fuel and those caught hunting deer were punished by having their first two fingers chopped off.

Explain why Lanfranc changed the Church

One reason why Lanfranc changed the Church was to end corruption.

William won the support of the Pope for his invasion of England, by saying that when he was king he would reform the Anglo-Saxon Church to end its corruption. Lanfranc began this work by ending corrupt practices such as simony (the selling of Church posts by bishops and archbishops instead of giving the post to the most religious and best qualified person), nepotism (giving Church posts to friends and family) and Pluralism (holding more than one Church post). Lanfranc put an end to these practices, as well as ordering that no priests could be married. These reforms ended some Church corruption and brought the English Church more in line with the Norman Church.

Lanfranc also increased his own control of the Church. Before 1066 the Archbishop of Canterbury and York had been equal. Lanfranc insisted that he, as Archbishop of Canterbury, was superior and controlled the Church throughout England. Additionally, Lanfranc held regular councils of bishops. Councils had been rare before 1066 but Lanfranc held ten Councils to discuss and impose Church reforms. These changes allowed Lanfranc to centralise his power within the Church which meant that he could push through reforms effectively in order to carry out the Normanisation of the Church.

Lanfranc also increased his control within the bishoprics. Every bishop now had deputies called archdeacons who 'policed' parts of the bishopric, making sure that priests were carrying out church services and other responsibilities in the right ways. There had been archdeacons before 1066, but they had little power to deal with problems. Though many of the bishops were Norman most of the priests were Anglo-Saxons. Through increasing the power of the archdeacons Lanfranc could ensure that priests came under stricter Church control and were made to follow Norman Church procedures and customs.

Explain why the earls revolted in 1075.

The revolt of the Anglo-Norman earls Roger de Breteuil, Ralph de Gael, and Waltheof in 1075 was down to the loss of land, resentment against William, and opportunism.

William had reduced the lands of de Breteuil and de Gael. Roger's father, William FitzOsbern, had been a powerful Marcher earl with land in Normandy as well, but Roger only inherited his land in England, which was also smaller than his father's earldom. Ralph had also lost land. While it was sensible of William to try and reduce the earls' land and power, this loss of land also incited them to revolt.

The earls also had other reasons to be angry at William personally. For example, William had introduced his own officials (sheriffs) into the Marcher earldoms, whereas the earls had previously controlled everything themselves. Roger, in particular, was upset by this loss of power. Moreover, William had refused permission for a marriage between the families of the two leading earls. These personal grievances further added fuel to the rebellion.

Finally, the earls were motivated by opportunism. The three ringleaders planned to split the country into three between them, and they seemed to have a good chance of succeeding. Between them, they controlled a large amount of England, and they had the support of a powerful Danish fleet.

Furthermore, William himself – the greatest obstacle to the revolt succeeding – was absent in Normandy. Thus 1075 seemed the right time to rebel.

Explain why there was a succession dispute in 1088

In 1088 William had been mortally wounded and lay dying in Rouen, France. Two of his sons were at his death-bed William Rufus and Henry. As he lay dying William faced a decision over the succession of the throne of England and the duchy of Normandy. There were disputes over this succession because William had a strained relationship with eldest son and presumed heir, Robert Curthose, William favoured his second son Rufus and because William did not name a successor officially before dying.

The most significant reason why there was a succession dispute in 1088 is due to the strained relationship between Robert and William. As per the Norman custom, the eldest son would have usually been named successor to all of his father's lands and titles. However, William and Robert had a strained relationship due to the Robert's 1088 revolt. Robert was not present at William's death bed because he was again in exile.

It seems likely that William did not want to leave Normandy or England to Robert, his eldest son, because he was still angry at his revolt. However, William's nobles were able to convince William to leave Normandy to Robert, which fitted in with Norman custom. Though this solved the issue around the inheritance of the Duchy of Normandy it did not solve the English succession.

A second reason why there was a succession dispute in 1088 is because William favoured his second son Rufus. William wanted his second son Rufus to inherit the English crown even if this meant splitting England and Normandy. One of William's nobles had previously left his land in Normandy to his eldest son and his English land to his second son. Therefore, William bequeathed Normandy to Robert and supported Rufus' claim to the English throne. To enable Rufus' claim William wrote a letter to Archbishop Lanfranc instructing the archbishop to make arrangements for Rufus' coronation.

The final reason why there was a succession dispute in 1088 was due to the uncertainty around William's final wishes. It is most likely that William did not leave England directly to Rufus. Instead, William said he would leave it to God to decide who would be King because that was how William himself had become King, when God had granted him victory at the Battle of Hastings. This left the succession open to question, which later caused disagreements amongst the nobles.