

- 2 Interpretations B and C both attempt to explain Harold's defeat in 1066.  
How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?

[12]

(\*) Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology

[5]

### Interpretation B

An extract from 'The Chronicle of the Kings of England' by William of Malmesbury published in 1125. The author was the son of a Norman noble. He grew up in the care of the monks of Malmesbury Abbey, in Wiltshire, and became a monk there.

On hearing of the invasion in the North by Hardrada, Harold headed there with all his forces. The English gained the advantage, and made the Norwegians flee. Despite what the Saxon songs say, it was an easy victory which cost Harold little, and had only a tiny effect on the events which would follow.

↳ war at Stamford bridge had little impact to troops

The greater cause of defeat was Harold himself. After his victory at Stamford Bridge, Harold refused to give any rewards of battle to his followers, and many men deserted as they marched to Hastings. And so he was defeated at Hastings and his army scattered. They say the victory was brought about by a strategy of William's. But the truth is it was brought about by the Lord God. Harold and his men paid the price for betraying his promise to King William.

Harold broke his promise.

Harold's fault

- no rewards

- men deserted due to God

### Interpretation C

An extract from an article by the historian Teresa Cole in 'BBC History Magazine', published in 2016.

Harold had won a great victory at Stamford Bridge but he suffered heavy losses, particularly among his best troops. Less than a week later he learned that William had landed at Pevensey. Once again the army was summoned to duty. Once again the weary soldiers marched south with the king. Through the long day at Hastings they stood firm against the best that William could throw at them. Only at the very end was their cause lost. In the final analysis it was surely the losses in the north that tipped the balance, shortening their battle line, and thinning their best forces. It was definitely Hardrada and his Viking invaders that in the end cost Harold his crown and his life.

How differ.

Why differ.

- Both mention the impact of Stamford Bridge:

+ B - losses minimal, had little impact

+ C - losses significant - lost him Hastings.

B claims Harold's treatment of others was the cause

↳ his men were not rewarded & deserted

↳ broken promise to William meant God defeated him.

William of Malmesbury is the son of a Norman and would therefore be more sympathetic to the Norman perspective rather than A-S.

Additionally his religious training as a monk would mean he was likely to believe in providence (God's will) and therefore emphasise his displeasure in this analysis.

Turn over

C claims A-S fought to end but were defeated by S Bridge lost his battle.