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In 1066, William the Conqueror successfully invaded England. He established himself as king and began to implement his policies for complete control over the subjugated territory. The Norman invasion did not involve a large influx of people: but, rather a conquest by a man who acquired the country for himself and distributed the land to his followers. The old English aristocracy, mainly composed of the king's thegns, virtually disappeared with the conquest and was replaced by a new aristocracy.

The near disappearance of the English aristocrats and their replacement by Normans holding land in return for military service was an immediate result of the conquest. William needed aid in controlling the whole country and, therefore, replaced the great men of King Edward's reign with new tenants holding former Anglo-Saxon estates.

The class of English aristocrats began to disappear after the Battle of Hastings and the process continued after uprisings against William followed his invasion. Many of the thegn class left England for Scotland and Scandinavia; others joined the Varangian Guard at Constantinople. Those who continued to live in England survived in poverty and reduced circumstances and in an uncertain position, depending on the terms they were able to negotiate with their new
lords. The old English aristocrats were relegated to a "kind of appendix."\(^2\) They took a place with the Norman servants of the king, or "among people of depressed condition."\(^3\)

The demise of the English aristocrat was almost complete at the end of William's reign. In the *Domesday Book* records of landowners in 1086, it is rare to find an English name.

By death, by exile, by misfortune, the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy was so suppressed as a result of the Norman Conquest as to cease after 1070 to be an integral part of English society. By 1086, only about eight percent of the land of England remained in the possession of surviving members of this class.\(^4\)
There are many descriptions of the deaths that resulted from the Battle of Hastings. It is clear from the accounts in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and from reports from historians who wrote after the conquest that the destruction of the English, especially of the aristocrats, began with this conflict. From the Bayeux Tapestry one perceives a visual account of the battle. It shows that the English fought on foot with battle axes and darts. King Harold rode to battle, but dismounted to fight. The tapestry illustrates the defeat of the English by the Normans. William of Jumieges, in his description of the invasion of England by William the Conqueror from the seventh book of the Gesta Normannorum Ducum, written in 1070, reported that "they say that in this battle many thousands of the English perished." According to William of Poitiers in The Deeds of William, duke of the Normans and king of the English", written in 1071, "The blood-stained battle ground was covered with the flower of the youth and nobility of England."...

...they began to fly as swiftly as they could, some on horseback, some on foot, some along the roads, but most over the trackless country. Many lay on the ground bathed in blood, others who struggled to their feet found themselves too weak to escape, while a few although disabled were given strength to move by fear. Many left their corpses in the depths of the forests, and others were found by their pursuers lying by the roadside.

In the Domesday Book there is mention of Aluric of Yelling who was killed in the Battle of Hastings. He held small fees in Huntingdonshire, in Yelling and in Hemingford, and is one of the few specific men mentioned by the Chroniclers as dying in this battle.
After the Battle of Hastings, William reinforced his claim to England by demanding oaths of allegiance from his English subjects.

From the "Laws of William the Conqueror" came the decree that:

...Every freeman shall affirm by oath and compact that he will be loyal to King William both within and without England, that he will preserve with him his lands and honour with all fidelity and defend him against all his enemies.¹⁰

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reported that:

...he came to Berkhamstead. There he was met by Bishop Baldred, prince Edgar, earl Edwin, earl Morcar, and all the best men from London, who submitted from force of circumstances, but only when the deprivation was complete...They gave him hostages and swore oaths of fealty, and he promised to be a gracious lord to them.¹¹

According to William of Jumieges, William was chosen king by both Norman and English aristocrats.¹² William of Poitiers stated that:

This land he has gained as the legal heir with the confirmation of the oaths of the English. He took possession of his inheritance by battle, and he was crowned at least with the consent of the English, or at least the desire of their magnates.¹³

On the day appointed for the coronation the Archbishop of York...demanded of the English...whether it was their will that William should be crowned as their lord. All without the least hesitation shouted their joyous assent, as if heaven had given them one will and one voice.¹⁴

While these accounts appear to demonstrate that the invasion and the coronation of William had the full approval of the English, it must be remembered that these historians were writing after the new regime was firmly established and from a Norman point of view. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, it is simply noted that William came to England and conquered the land. As if to further explain the misfortune of this, the account continued that, "in this year Christ
Church (Canterbury) was burned, and a comet appeared on 18 April."\textsuperscript{15} This "long-haired star" shone every night for a week.\textsuperscript{16}

In spite of the oaths sworn to William at this coronation, the English did not readily accept defeat. Because of subsequent rebellions that were suppressed by William, it became impossible to establish a policy of peaceful existence between the Normans and the English.

The first major rebellion was in 1067 in Exeter. Here William defeated Harold's three sons, Eadmund, Magnus, and Godwine. They withdrew to Ireland and raided south-western England in following summers. These raids managed only to increase the support for the new ruler. The last leaders of the Godwine house never became more than leaders of family factions.\textsuperscript{17}

In the district of the Fens, English rebels, led by earl Hereward, settled in the lands around Ely and Peterborough. Hereward was to be joined by Edwin and Morcar. Edwin was killed on the journey. In the ensuing revolt that William quelled, Morcar was slain and Hereward escaped. The rebellions in this area ended.

Hereward escaped with part of his army. "With his flight across the marshes of Ely he vanishes into the night which has engulfed the entire class to which he belonged, the smaller native land-owners of King Edward's day."\textsuperscript{18} Hereward, according to Gaimar
in his *L'Estoire des Engles*, eventually accepted William as the king of England, married a noble Englishwoman, and submitted himself to the Normans who occupied his country.  

Edric of Laxfield, one of the greatest men in the eastern county of Hereford during the reign of Edward the Confessor, was outlawed and exiled. He allied himself to the Welsh princes and lived the rest of his life in the Marches of Wales. 

Many nobles went into exile in Scotland. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle recorded that in 1067, Edgar AEtheling, appointed successor to Harold at the latter's death, went to Scotland with his mother, Agatha, and his two sisters, Margaret and Christina. They were received by Malcolm Canmore, the king of Scotland, who supported the Anglo-Saxon dynasty. In 1069 Edgar AEtheling returned to England and led a revolt in Northumbria. William had given Robert de Comines the earldom of Northumbria. The inhabitants led by Edgar opposed Robert and killed him. William marched from the south and put down this rebellion also. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle stated that "King Malcolm came and made his peace with King William, gave hostages and became his vassal," in 1072. 

Edgar returned to Scotland and later travelled to Jerusalem with Robert, son of Godwine, at the time of the Turkish siege of King Baldwin at Lama. Eventually Edgar returned to England and lived the rest of his life quietly.
Other Englishmen fled to Flanders and Constantinople. The men who joined the Varangian guard in Constantinople were eventually able to fight the Normans in Southern Italy, aiding the Greek Empire. In the last part of the eleventh century, Europe was full of English exiles. By 1071 William did have control over England. The major Anglo-Saxon landowners had either been killed, or had submitted to him. There was no one to lead a revolt.

In 1085, an invasion of England was planned by King Canute of Denmark and Count Robert of Flanders, an avowed enemy of William. Canute had married Robert's daughter. The two countries had the strongest naval forces in the North and felt the situation in England was conducive to an invasion. However, before the plan was accomplished, Canute was murdered in a church at Odensee, Denmark. This invasion was planned by two neighboring countries, and apparently the Anglo-Saxon nobles were not involved in it.

In 1109, AElnoth, a priest at St. Alban's church in Odensee, recorded that the English nobles had asked for help from King Canute, but that there was internal discontent among Canute's troops and the plans were abandoned. This information was not recorded anywhere else. Perhaps AElnoth was suppressing the true facts of the alliance between Canute and Count Robert by suggesting that the English desired the invasion.

After the failure of the Danish and Flemish plan to invade England, William decided to have his subjects re-affirm their
loyalty to him with the Oath of Salisbury. In 1085, the _Anglo-Saxon Chronicle_ recorded that William went to Salisbury where he was met by his council and all the principal landholders and their vassals. All there promised to be faithful and swore an oath of allegiance. 27

In spite of the oath of allegiance, some Normans remained sceptical of the Anglo-Saxons' fidelity to William. William of Malmesbury reported that the severe actions of William against the English during his reign could be excused because, "...he scarcely found any one of them faithful." 28

At the end of William's reign, he recorded by Ordericus Vitalis to have relented toward some of the surviving English rebels:

...I threw into prison Roger of Bretland who opposed me with bitter animosity, and stirred up against me his brother-in-law, Ralph 'de Gauder', and many others, and I swore that he should not be set free as long as I lived. In like manner I imprisoned many persons to punish them for their causing rebellions...I am now, however, at the point of death, and as I hope to be saved, and by God's mercy, absolved from my sins, I order that the prison doors shall be forthwith thrown open, and all the prisoners...be released...They are however, to be liberated only on condition that they first take an oath to my ministers, that for the security of the realm they will use every means to preserve the peace both in Normandy and in England, and will steadfastly resist the enemies of tranquillity to the utmost of their power. 29

William probably meant to rule generously, but constant rebellions brought out his harshness. 30
III

In 1086, William began the Domesday Survey to catalogue the holdings of his tenants in England. There were seven teams of commissioners in each survey recording who held each manor from Edward the Confessor, carefully omitting Harold's name. They recorded who held the land in 1086, and the changes in size and value of each manor since 1066. The Survey enumerated how many freemen, villeins and cotters lived on the manor. The commissioners also noted how many plow teams were used, the amount of land plowed, and the number of mills and fisheries each land holder owned.

The commissioners used informal inquiries to extract the information. Open court proceedings were used to confirm the details. During the court proceedings, the holder's name and the value of his estate were written down. The reports were compiled in Winchester. The Domesday Book inquests began with Kent, Sussex, and Surrey. They then proceeded to Yorkshire and Lincolnshire.

Information in the Domesday Book was arranged according to the list of landowners, with William's holding listed first. The list of spiritual and temporal lords followed, and the compilation ended with lesser men holding a few acres of land. The Domesday Book was used in the twelfth century to confirm titles to land, to claim privileges and tax exemptions.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in 1085, noted the instigation of the Domesday Survey:
After this the king had important deliberations and exhaustive discussions with his council about this land, how it was peopled, and with what sort of men. Then, he sent his men all over England into every shire to ascertain how many hundreds of 'hides' of land there were in every shire, and how much land and livestock the king himself owned in the country, and what annual dues were lawfully his from each shire. He also had it recorded how much land his archbishops had, and his diocesan bishops, his abbots and his earls, and—though I may be going into too much detail—and what or how much money it was worth. So very thoroughly did he have the inquiry carried out that there was not a single 'hide' not one virgate of land, not even—it is shameful to record it, but it did not seem shameful to him to do—not even one ox, nor one cow, nor one pig which escaped notice in his survey. And all the surveys were brought to him.30

William found this survey necessary in 1086 because he wanted to ascertain the financial potential of the land of England redistributed to his loyal Norman followers from the displaced Anglo-Saxon aristocrats. Norman lords usually received the estates that had belonged to one or more pre-conquest lords. The Norman aristocrats were probably more powerful than the Anglo-Saxon aristocrats. The estates were so consolidated after the conquest that one hundred-eighty Normans replaced four to five thousand thegns.32

The lands of the English who had died at Hastings were confiscated first. In a writ from William, the abbot of Bury St. Edmunds was ordered to give up the holdings of those under his jurisdiction "who stood against me in battle and were slain there."33 There is recorded in the Domesday Book, an example of this confiscation:

They bear witness that Aluric's land of Yelling and Hemingsford belonged to St. Benedict and that it was granted to Aluric for the term of his life on the condition
that after his death it ought to return to the church, and 'Bocestede' with it. But this same Aluric was killed in the Battle of Hastings, and the abbot took back his lands and held them until Aubrey 'de Vere' deprived him of possession.34

In 1077, William issued a writ to the abbey of St. Augustine at Canterbury:

William (by the grace of God), king of the English to Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury, and Geoffrey bishop of Coutances, and Robert, count of Eric, and Hugh of Montfort-sur-Risle, and to his other magnates of England, greeting. I command and order you that you cause St. Augustine and Abbot Scotland to be repossessed of the borough of Fordwich, which Haimo the sheriff now holds, and also of all the other lands which AEthelsige, whom I sent into exile, either by carelessness or fear or greed gave away or allowed to be alienated. And if anyone has taken away anything of them by violence, you are to compel him willy-nilly to restore it. Farewell.35

By 1086, nearly half of England had been given to Norman aristocrats. One-fourth of that total was held by eleven men.36 One-fifth of the land was held by William and one-fourth was held by the church.37

The Domesday Surveys of each county recorded the instances of land bestowed on loyal Norman aristocrats. From the Toseland hundred in Huntingdonshire it was recoreded that:

In Gransden Earl Alfgar had eight hides of land assessed to the geld. There is land for fifteen ploughs. There are seven ploughs now on the demesne; and twenty-four villeins and eight bordars have eight ploughs. There is a priest and a church; fifty acres of meadow; twelve acres of underwood. From the pasture come five shillings and four pence. T.R.E. it was worth forty pounds; now thirty pounds. Rannulf keeps it.38
From the Lancaster Survey, it was recorded that by 1086, William controlled all the manors except five between Cockersham and Lancaster. Amounderness, located north of the Ribble within the ancient kingdom of Northumbria, was held by Tostig, earl of Northumbria and brother of Harold, at the end of Edward the Confessor's reign. By 1086, the land was in poor condition following the outlawry of the gemot at York against Tostig in 1085, and the ravages by William. 39

Ughtred was an important thegn of Roby, Knowsley, Kirkby, Little Crosby, Magula, and Achetun. In 1066, Ughtred was probably the predecessor of Dunning. Ughtred had more liberties than his neighbors concerning his lands. He was free from all forfeitures except breach of peace, house breaking, failure to pay a debt, and disregarding a summons from a reeve to wait on him on a certain day. It was recorded, though, that in 1086, Warin, a Norman, held Ughtred's land. 40

In the county of Cambridge, William held seven manors: Soham, Fordham, Isleham, Chevely, Wilbraham, Haslingfield, and Chesterton. The manor of Exhling had belonged to Edith the Fair, the widow of Harold. Her estates passed to Count Alan. 41

The Norman abbey of St. Wandrille held Dullingham. This had belonged to Earl Algar and was a gift to Earl Roger in 1086. Several of Earl Roger's estates had been held by Goda under Earl Algar, including the lands in Meredith and Melborne. Earl Algar
also held the manor of Eltisley. The Canons of Bayeu were entered as lay tenants.42

William the Conqueror's half brother, Count Robert of Mortain, held Sawston Manor and three other estates in Barton, Grantchester, and Girton. These estates had been held by Judichil the Hunter.43

In Huntingdonshire, Kimbolton belonged to Earl Harold in 1066, and to William de Warenne in 1086. Remigius of London succeeded Wulfwig, the English predecessor, to four manors in the Toseland hundred.44

William Fitz Osbern distributed the Hereford lands among the invaders. Ralf de Mortimer was lord of the land in North Herefordshire and South Shropshire. One of his predecessors was Queen Edith. Ralf crushed a revolt led by Edric the Wild soon after the Conquest. Ralf was also given one of Edward's manors at Leintwardine.45

Hugh "the ass" inherited the lands of Leflet, an Englishwoman. Nigel the Physician also inherited some of her lands.46

King Edward held little land in York. This land was controlled mainly by the Earl of Northumbria, of the House of Godwine. After the conquest, Ulf, son of Thorald, gave part of his estate in North and East Riding to Archbishop Eldred. The estate of Uctred, son of Thorkil of Cleveland, was given to Whitby by the Conqueror after 1086.47
Count Alan of Brittany was given Earl Edwin's manors of Gilling, Catterick, and Askham Bryan in 1071. Alan received the manors of Earl Ralph the Staller in the counties of Lincoln, Norfolk, and Suffolk in 1075.48

In Gillingshire, the largest landowner, Tor, had his lands given to Enisant Musard. In the West Riding Wapentake of Barkston, the lands of Gamil, son of Osmond, Torchil, Chetel, Archil, and William Malet were bestowed upon Ilbert de Lacy and William de Percy.49

The Complete Peerage recorded the establishment of noble families in England. Instances of the establishment of Norman aristocratic families illustrated the suppression of Anglo-Saxon aristocrats after the conquest.

Adelaide (Adeliz) of the Aumale family, a sister of William the Conqueror, and the illegitimate daughter of Robert, Duke of the Normans, held manors in Essex and Suffolk.50

Under the Oxford family it was recorded that Aubrey de Verre, born before 1040, was granted by William the estates of the English thegn, Wulfwine, in Essex, Sulfold, and Cambridge. It is assumed that Aubrey received his lands in return for services in the Conquest.51
Under the Pinkeny family, it was recorded that Ghilo, the brother of Ansculf, and a tenant-in-chief in 1086, held eleven manors in Northantsshire, four in Berkshire, three in Buckshire, Oxfordshire, and one in Oxonshire. 52

In the Richmond family, Brien, son of Eudon, Count of Brittany, had a grant of Cornwall from William in 1069. Alan I the Red (Rufus), son of Eudon, Count of Brittany, was at the Battle of Hastings, formed a part of the court of the Conqueror, and witnessed several royal charters. He held grants of forfeited lands of Earl Edwin in Yorkshire. 53

Under the Earldom of Arundel it was noted that Roger de Montgomery, Lord of Alençon and regent in Normandy during the conquest, came to England in 1067 and received large grants of land from William. He was given one-third of Sussex, including the city of Chichester and the castle of Arundel. In 1070, he was given Shropshire and the Lordship of the West Marches. 54

From these examples it can be seen that the lands of the Anglo-Saxon aristocrats were given to Norman nobles as payment for their loyalty to William and in return for future services. These gifts were recorded precisely in the Domesday Surveys and are occasionally found in the Complete Peerage.

Many estates were transferred to Anglo-Saxon women who married Norman protectors. According to William of Malmesbury,
Normans, "consider strangers to merit the courtesy they extend to each other;...and they intermarry with their subjects." 55

After the conquest, the Anglo-Saxons were removed from control of government affairs and from most of their major land holdings. By 1086, with the compilation of the Domesday Book, only two of the king's main tenants were of English descent. They were Coleswain of Lincoln and Thorkill of Arden.

Coleswain of Lincoln gained his wealth from skillful business schemes in London. He had not had any of this wealth in 1066. 56 Thorkill of Arden held a huge fief in Warwickshire in 1086, including some lands of other dispossessed Englishmen. Thorkill had survived because of his services as sheriff. 57

Another successful landowner was Waltheof, son of Siward of Northumbria. Waltheof had voluntarily surrendered to William and became a personal friend of the Conqueror. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle stated that "Earl Waltheof made peace with the king." 58 He married Judith, the king's niece. In 1066, Walthöf had holdings in the Midlands, in Huntingshire, in Cambridge, Bedford and Northampton. Waltheof was given Earl Tosti's lands also. He did not remain faithful to William and was beheaded in 1076. 59 His wife, Judith, continued to hold forty hides in Cambridgeshire from her husband and from Harold and his brother Gurth. 60
In 1086, Oswold was the only thegn holding twenty-one and a half hides in Surrey. These examples of major English landowners are exceptional. These men favored the conquest and worked well with William. By 1087, there were few Englishmen in the upper ranks of Norman Society.

Most of the remaining Anglo-Saxon aristocrats became tenants of Norman lords, often on land they had previously controlled themselves:

On most large estates there remained a number of Englishmen in the class between the newcomers and the farmers—"squires" with modest estates. These were to be the intermediaries, bi-lingual, but with English as the cradel tongue, and often aspiring to marry into the middle or lower strata of Norman society.

The Domesday Survey recorded the instances of Anglo-Saxon tenants serving Norman lords. The son of Godrich Wisce was the actual occupant of Badlesmere. The manor had been given to Bishop Odo who put a mesne tenant, Anfrid, in charge of the Anglo-Saxon tenant. The Anglo-Saxon actually farmed the land.

In Herefordshire, Aelfwine, son of Edwin, was allowed to keep two of his manors as Walter de Lacy's tenant. Aelfwine's father had controlled seven manors before the conquest. In Surrey, small sub-tenancies were held by Englishmen at Cuddington, Weybridge, and Kingston Hundred. The Isle of Wight was an isolated area of England at this time. In 1086, of one hundred-twenty holdings, twenty-four were still held by thegns.
In Lancaster, Dot, a thegn, held a hide of land in Huyton and Tarboce. He was exempt from all services and forfeitures except theft, assault, breach of peace and neglecting the reeves summons. His area was unfertile, cold, and hilly. Thorfin held the Yorkshire manor of Austwick, and was also probably the thegn who held the manor of Winterburn in Craven under Roger of Poitou. 

Edith the Fair's estates extended into Norfolk, Suffolk, and Hertfordshire. In 1086, her tenant, Colsuan, still held his estates in Wadden, Mildreth, Melbourne, and Lincolnshire.

Ordmaer lost four hides in Swaffham, but retained three and a half hides in Badlingham. Two unnamed men in Boxworth and five in Drayton were undisturbed. In 1086, Adestan at Soham held what Alsi had held in 1066. These two men were related, because the survey showed that the land was passed by descent.

In Huntingdonshire, the division of Washington into two portions, held in 1086 by Eustace the Sheriff and Chetelbert the king's thegn, was continued in the Hundred Rolls of the reign of Edward I.

In York, at Ryther, Chetel and his brothers were tenants of Hugh, who held land under Ilbert. At William de Percy's manor of Cocksford, Chetel was a tenant under Malger. Haregrim, the king's thegn, retained the land on the town of Undolvestadale, Painsthorpe, Huntingdon, and York. Alwin of Kuk Ella, and his son, Uctred,
retained part of the lands in East Riding and probably in West Riding too. Swain, the son of Alric, was a landowner under Ilbert de Lacy.\textsuperscript{71}

In Hampshire and Wiltshire, locations of the King's Forests, were found references to native foresters and huntsmen who had been allowed to keep small estates because these men were familiar with the district in which they lived. These districts provided meat, hides, timber, and hunting for Norman aristocrats. The Norman barons enjoyed the hunt and, therefore, retained the Anglo-Saxons that were familiar with the areas. It was "essential to maintain skilled men who had long known the ways of the hunting grounds."\textsuperscript{72} Ketel and Wulfwig were two huntsmen who were not displaced, because their experience was valuable to the newcomers.\textsuperscript{73}

Many of the barons' fighting men were given small estates. These milites were not all Norman. Some were Englishmen with peasants working for them on the small estates.\textsuperscript{74}

While most Englishmen were removed from their offices with Norman Conquest, William did retain a few in their positions, especially from the years 1067-1069. Important Anglo-Saxon leaders, Edwin, Morcar, and Waltheof, were associated with the council that included the Norman leaders, Odo of Bayeux, Geoffrey of Coutances, Earl William Fitz Osbern and Count Robert of Mortain.\textsuperscript{75} Until 1069, most of the sheriffdoms remained in English control. Edward
the Confessor's sheriffs in Wiltshire, Somerset, and Warwickshire were kept in office by William. In one of William's early writes, AEthelwig and a local sheriff were appointed joint guardians of an estate in Staffordshire belonging to Westminster Abbey. A few years later, William had AEthelwig organize an assembly of feudal lords of this province. This Anglo-Saxon was given great authority from William. Two of the Confessor's officers, "Stalbes" Bundi and Eadnoth, witnessed William's early charters. Eadnoth was one of the few Englishmen granted a military command by William. He was killed in 1068 while leading a Somerset militia against King Harold's sons.

From this information it does not appear that the Normans were unduly harsh to the Anglo-Saxon aristocrats. As has been seen, many English aristocrats were tenants under Normans and did have some sort of livelihood. A few were major landholders, and some took part in William's government. In spite of this, much was recorded of the harsh treatment of the Normans to their subjects. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* recorded that the Normans were, "oppressing the unhappy people and things went ever bad to worse. When God wills may the end be good." William of Malmesbury wrote that the Normans "plunder their subjects though they protect them from others."

A major complaint of the Anglo-Saxons was the heavy taxation imposed by William after his conquest. Most of the complaints were recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. William swore in 1067, that
"he would govern this nation according to the best practice of his predecessors if they would be loyal to him. Nevertheless he imposed a very heavy tax on the countryside." In 1083, the Chronicle reported that: "In this same year, after Christmas, the king levied a heavy and severe tax upon the whole of England, which amounted to seventy-two pence for every 'hide' of land." In 1085, William "...did as he was wont, he levied very heavy taxes on his subjects, upon any pretext, whether justly or unjustly." In 1086, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reported that:

the king and the leading men were fond, yea too fond, of avarice: they coveted gold and silver, and did not care how sinfully it was obtained, as long as it came to them. The king granted his land on the hardest terms and at the highest possible price. He did not care at all how wrongfully the reeve got possession of it from wretched men...Unjust tolls were levied and many other unlawful acts were committed which are distressing to relate.

Robert Losinga, bishop of Hereford, 1079-1095, wrote that: "...the land was vexed with much violence arising from the collection of the royal taxes." William passed laws concerning the Englishmen; their rights and restrictions. From the "Laws of William the Conqueror" came this proclamation:

It was also decreed there that if a Frenchman shall charge an Englishman with perjury or murder or theft or homicide, or 'ran' as the English call open rapine which cannot be denied, the Englishman may defend himself, as he shall prefer, either by the ordeal of hot iron or by wager of battle. But if the Englishman be infirm, let him find another who will take his place. If one of them shall be vanquished,
he shall pay a fine of forty shillings to the king. If an Englishman shall charge a Frenchman and be unwilling to prove his accusations either by ordeal or by wager of battle, I will nevertheless, that the Frenchman shall acquit himself by a valid oath.  

The English were not ignored by William. They were a part of society and were given certain protections. William desired loyal subjects and, therefore, was not overly harsh to the Anglo-Saxons.
The replacement of Anglo-Saxon aristocrats with French aristocrats, resulted in different social customs in England. There was a language barrier and a difference in social conventions. Basically, however, the cultures were similar. Norman, Bretons, Flemish, and other French barons were similar in education, interests, and outlook to the thegns and earls they replaced.

The Norman conquest ended the use of the vernacular language in England. For more than a century what was written and thought by the English was done so in Latin. The English language was spoken only by inferiors after the conquest. It was a barbarous language to the Normans. English personal names appeared absurd and ridiculous. As a result of this mockery the conquered English began to imitate the new aristocrats.

The French language became the superior language. Becoming like the French was a sign of gentility. "All with social pretensions" tried to speak French. English parents gave their children Norman names. Wealthy English families, especially in London, tried to assimilate themselves into the Norman world by learning the new language and the new conventions of the feudal world.

Eventually, however, the English language, re-inforced with French vocabulary, again became the language of England. The Normans, with English wealth, eventually initiated the English fashions that they had previously laughed at. This was evidence
that while William established a strong monarchy it was based on even stronger foundations.\textsuperscript{89}

Mid-English poetry showed that the memory of King Alfred as 'the wisest man that was in England' remained after the conquest.\textsuperscript{90} William did not drastically change English local government, but further developed the local institutions. He utilized existing organs of government and respected local customs. The continued respect for Anglo-Saxon law was illustrated by bishop AEthelric of Stæsey who was brought to a plea held on Pinnendon Heath in 1075 or 1076. He was needed to answer questions concerning Anglo-Saxon law.\textsuperscript{91}

With out much power of invention, they, [the Normans] were both prepared to leave well alone and also quick to grasp the ideas of others and use them to their own advantage. It is these qualities which make it so difficult to analyse with assurance the exact effects of the Norman Conquest. The Normans neither destroyed all things English nor sank entirely into their background.\textsuperscript{92}

Although the Norman Invasion was extremely important in lives of the conquered English, to the Normans England was only a minor part of the Norman kingdom. English interests fell below those of Normandy.\textsuperscript{93}

One reason for the success of the Norman Invasion of England was the inter-related families. Kinship ties kept the Normans together and made them co-operative. Because of these ties, the
Normans were able to settle as a "small, constructive minority" in an alien land.⁹⁴

It was William's triumph and perhaps the condition of the survival of his dynasty in England, that not only did he firmly establish his followers as a new aristocracy on English soil, but he made their endowment subserve the military needs of his new realm.⁹⁵

Through the common acceptance of feudalism by both the king and his vassals, England became a well governed and strong kingdom in Western Europe. Thomas Carlyle wrote in the 19th century that:

England itself, in foolish quarters of England, still howls and execrates lamentably over its William the Conqueror, and the rigorous line of Normans and Plantagenets; but without them, if you will consider well, what had it ever been?⁹⁶

It is generally futile to argue whether the Norman Invasion was beneficial or detrimental to England. Certainly to the personal lives of the Anglo-Saxon aristocrats, it was detrimental. The Anglo-Saxon lords had controlled most of England before the conquest. After the invasion they were no longer superior, having either been killed in battle or relegated to a lower position in society. To the Anglo-Saxon aristocrat the invasion was a change --- a horrible, drastic change. War is a "catalyst of change."⁹⁷ Their fate was to be expected after a successful invasion. Indeed, perhaps they were not treated as harshly as other conquerors have treated their vanquished following invasions. The replacement of the established aristocrats in England by a new aristocracy was the most drastic change in the country following the conquest.
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