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Before entering upon a discussion of the effects of
the Norman conquest upon England, it is necessary to consider the
early history of these Norman victors whose conquest of England
during the latter part of the eleventh century, has wrought so
many and such marvelous changes in the island realm and has influ-
enced so largely the political, social and religious life not only
of England but of all English-speaking peoples.

As early as the beginning of the ninth century, the
Northmen were a piratical and seafaring people maintaining their
existence from the waters swarming with fish which surrounded their
island homes on the Orkneys and Western Islands and the warm water
of the Gulf stream which flows so near the southern coast of Nor-
way. Upon the sterile lands of the Scandinavian peninsular and
the rocky and mountainous areas of the islands of the northern
seas, there grew up a robust and hearty race of beings. Powerful
in physique and with bold stern faces, rough in manner but tender
hearted, admirers of the beautiful and noble in character, appre-
ciative of the value of higher civilisation and the conveniences
to be gained therefrom, yet they were unwilling to avail themselves
of them by their own industry, but rather by prowess of arms. The
short, rainy summers, dark and misty, permitted of only the most
meager cultivation of the soil; hay being the principal crop.
Food consisted of the game and fish which the rocky fastnesses
sheltered from all but the bold Norwegian huntsman. Their houses
were long, often reaching a length of two hundred feet; within
which burned the flaring fire in the center and around the walls
on three sides were built the beds. In front of the beds were
benches where each man had his seat and footstool.
Amid these primitive surroundings lived the Norweigan
beaten by the stern winter blasts which swept down the mountain
passes, tending his little flock amid the more sheltered valleys
and telling tales and recounting sagas and old Norse legends around
the crackling fire in the smoky 'long houses' during the long win-
ter nights. Not only nights but days were passed thus for the
winters of that region were often one long night of fog and rainy
weather. But we cannot say the Northman's life was mainly spent
within this narrow field of labor. The forests furnished him
timber, the straight Norway pine made the best of masts and the
minerals of the soil were converted by his art into warlike weapons.
With these, they repelled invaders and after the crops had been
planted in the spring, a piratical host, they would sweep down
upon the 'rich seaports and trading towns, the strongly fortified
Roman cities, the venerated abbeys and cathedrals with their store
of wealth and provisions which lay along the valleys of the Elbe
and the Rhine, of the Seine and the Loire.' Desolation and waste
followed their 'dragon ships' and when late in autumn, they re-
turned to their northern homes, they brought with them the brightly
colored cloths, red wine and yellow wheat. With their small boats
they would push up the wide mouthed streams of the Loire and Seine
even reaching as far as Paris in 845 A. D. No part of the coun-
try was safe from their plundering raids. Kings saw their approach
and trembled, and it is said that Charlemagne in the ninth century,
saw some pirate ships cruising in the Mediterranean, along the
shores of which they had at last found their way, and covering his
face burst into tears. In vain they were driven from one position
only to reappear in another; their departure was purchased from
one territory and immediately their position was filled by other
bands. The whole last half of the ninth century was taken up
with invasions of this nature. In 840, they burned Rouen; in
848, they pillaged Nantes, Saintes and Bordeaux and then rounding
Spain, whose coasts they ravaged and whose rivers they ascended,
yet advanced to attack Italy and to pillage Luna which they mis-
took for Rome. These devastations continued until 851 in the
reign of Charles the Simple. Gradually the Northmen going often
to these sunny southlands grew to love them and remained longer
away from the long homes of their fathers; they grew to learn of
how much more profit it would be to preserve these captured places
and to cultivate the rich fields than to return each winter to
the bleak and cheerless regions of the north. Soon they brought
with them their wives and children, and then commenced in earnest
a systematic conquest of the Baltic shores and the coast lands
of Gaul. They grew tired of the life of pillage, having destroyed
so much there was nothing left for them to destroy, and settled
down in the places which had become familiar to them in their
raids. Finally their presence became so annoying to Charles the
Simple, that acting upon the advice of his nobles, he gave them
a part of his territory. The agreement was made with Rolf, or
Rollo, French Rou, one of the most terrible of their chiefs. The
land lay between the Andelle and the ocean and as an extra induc-
ment, Rolf was offered the hand of the king's daughter in marriage.
In consideration of all of this, Rollo was to establish himself
there with the title of duke, render homage to Charles and embrace
Christianity. Neustria became the new home of the Norsemen, the
land of the Northmen, who from now on called their new country,
Normandy, and themselves, Normans.
It is now necessary to consider the conditions, principally economic existing in France when the Norseman took up their permanent abode there. The great dominion of the Franks under Charles the Great, was now broken up into four kingdoms. That of the West Franks, Karolingia, took in the greater part of Gaul. The crown was disputed between the kings of the house of Charles the Great who reigned at Laon and the Dukes of the French whose capital was Paris, and who held the greater part of France, north of the Loire. When Charles the Simple gave Normandy to Rollon, he virtually cut himself off from the sea and in this lay the beginning of the strife between Normandy and France and later, when the same king ruled England and Normandy was the source of the long wars between France and England. When France had been ruled by Charlemagne, those whom he put in command of this province were all dictated to by him. Under Charles the Fat, the territory of Charlemagne was divided, forming the three important kingdoms of France, Italy and Germany. During this time however, the power of the nobles had been increasing, they had made their office hereditary, and established for themselves certain rights and privileges. Here was the foundation of the feudal system, that system of rights and privileges which played such an important part in Medieval times until the starting of the crusades.

The feudal regime had a fuller development in Gaul than in Italy or Germany. At the beginning of the barbarian invasions, the Celts who occupied Gaul, were thoroughly Romanized and in many cases, had forgotten their language and spoke Latin. Cities after the model of Roman cities, had sprung up with temples, baths and theatres. The agricultural system was distinctively
Roman. The barbarian hordes did not know how to adapt themselves to the agrarian methods which they found in operation when they descended upon Roman territories and so to a certain extent, broke up the existing state of affairs.

The Roman estate consisted of a villa or fundus, upon which was built the lord's homestead surrounded by two cohortes or courts. At the entrance of the outer court was the abode of the villicus, a manorial officer generally a slave chosen for his commanding qualities. In addition was the common kitchen or 'ergastulum.' The Roman villa, 'scabolim,' if not at first a complete manor, was already the estate of a lord (dominus) worked by slaves under a villicus. Management of slaves required organization and the customary method of managing slaves on a villa was to form them into groups of ten called a decuriae under a decurio or overseer. The villicus or general steward of the manor was sometimes a freedman, but could again be degraded into slavery if he showed ingratitude to his patron. If betrayal of trust took place, the freedman was deprived of his decuriae of slaves and debased, they having been given to him together with a portion of land and no doubt, oxen to work it. Thus as several writers affirm: 'We find that the lord of a villa might in addition to his home farm worked by his own slaves, have portions of the land of his estate let out as it were to farm to freedmen, each with his decuriae of slaves and paying rent in produce. Thus by a joint interest with the lord and a share in the produce, better work was done. Tacitus says that the typical colonus had his own homestead and land allotted to his use and paid tribute to his lord in corn or cattle or other produce. The Justinian code
prohibited an arbitrary increase of these tributes. The villa soon became the prevalent type of estate through the extension of the Roman provinces beyond the Rhine and along the Danube. During the later empire, direct encouragement was given to land owners to introduce barbarians taken from recently conquered districts and to settle them on their estates as coloni and not as slaves.

One can see that in Gaul the later manor is a direct outgrowth of the Roman villa and that the Roman system of management of the imperial provincial domains during the later empire is continuous with the Frankish system of manorial management of the terra regis or villa funscales after the Frankish conquest. 'When the Alamani,' says Seebom, 'were conquered by the Franks who had become Christian, their laws were codified. (A.D. 623.) Permission was then given to the freedman to surrender his property and himself to the Church; if he surrendered his land, he could receive it back again in usufruct during his life as a benefice charged with certain tributes or dues. The burden of the slaves was gradually becoming lessened until only three days' week - work was required. Those who had made themselves subject to the Church were to pay services in like manner as coloni or terra reges did to the king. Sometimes whole villas or manors surrendered themselves to the Church as free coloni. After becoming free coloni of the Church, they could if desired, become servi of Church as they could on the royal manor. Thus the Church estates as on the royal demesnes, two classes of tenants were growing up; i.e. the coloni or accoli set to gafol and the servi set to gafol and week - work. The sinking of the Roman
Colonial thus down into a condition up to which slaves have risen.
in becoming serfs and the medieval manorial estate are rational
results of the Frankish conquest. Christianity did much in al-
leviating the hardships of the slaves and in dignifying labor.
One day out of seven was set apart for rest and three days in the
week wherein the labor of the slave was free to him and on which
he might attend to the cultivation of his own plot of land or serve
for pay. The burdens of the slaves soon came to be looked upon
by the heavily burdened free laborer on their own land as so light
in comparison with their own that they went to the Church and took
upon themselves willingly the yoke of servitude, 'that they might
find rest under her temporal as well as spiritual protection.'

The manorial estates of the monasteries at the time
of Charlemagne had come to hold a large proportion of land in these
once Roman provinces. During the period between the beginning
of the barbaric invasions and the coming of the Northmen to Gaul,
three great economic changes had been taking place. Seebohm
summarizes them as follows:

1 - The villa had become more and more manorial;
i.e., an estate of a lord with a village community upon it.

2 - All lands were falling under some manorial lord-
ship or other, whether royal, ecclesiastical, monastic or private,
and thus were becoming parts of manorial estates.

3 - Originally distinct classes of 'free coloni' on
on the one hand and slaves or servi on the other were becoming
merged into one common class of medieval serfs.

The ranks of the serfs had been recruited both
from above and below. Freemen for protection would willingly
place themselves in serfdom to some strong lord and slaves were raised to a state of serfdom on account of more efficient services received from them when acting with less restraint.

This was the economic situation which received the followers of Rollo in their Norman home. The manorial system had been the outgrowth of the old Roman villa or slave-worked estate having for its working basis the three field system, which implies rotation of crops and which came with Roman rule. It implied fixed settlements and was found first in the old Suevic and Roman districts south of Lippe and the Teutoberger Wald. Whenever tribes settled as the Gaulii, Germans, &c., they founded manors. The conquered districts became in general lands of the king and by generous grants of the royal power, lands were given over to the churches, monasteries, and favorites of the king, thus sprinkling with private manors the royal demesne. The masses of the feudal period took an important step upward towards amelioration of their burdens, with the exception of the freemen, in the higher economic conditions of medieval serfdom. It is generally believed that the manorial system is the joint product of Barbarian and Roman institutions. A few urge, however, that the invaders either brought serfs with them or adopted natives as serfs.

Into this complicated arrangement, the Normans seemed to fit with a remarkable nicety. They treated the conquered with much kindness, the restrictions upon the serfs were gradually removed and the life of the agriculturist was no longer one of drudgery, and the feudal system became highly organized. Throughout our discussion of the Normans, we shall find that they wrought at no time any great change of an economic nature in the existing
condition of affairs either here during their brief stay in Gaul or later, when the descendants of Rolf were crowned kings of England. We shall see however, how easily they adjusted themselves to their surroundings and even in the midst of a conquered but not extirpated people maintained their language, laws and individuality, while assuming with few alterations the industrial life of the conquered people. But while we may not be able to ascribe to them any far reaching reforms yet we can liken them to the 'yeast which leavened the whole lump.' They put into the dying power of feudalism the strength and vigor of their warrior constitutions, the freedom and broadness of their sea-wide lives and caused it to flourish on old England's fields long after it had disappeared from continental lands.

The same spirit of unrest and conquest which called the wary Northmen from the sea-girt islands could not be readily restrained although flourishing farms and thriving industry soon grew up in his French possessions. He soon even lost his native tongue and spoke French, he became sensible to all the refining influences of French life and dress, he became accustomed to the noblest thoughts and impulses, the highest knightly traits, but yet the restless spirit called him forth to still further conquests and exploitations.

We must refer to a few political factors which brought about the invasion of England by the Normans in 1066. In 1009, Aethelred, King of England, married Emma, the daughter of Duke Richard of Normandy, and this marriage marks one of the main stages in the events which led to the Norman conquest, for by reason of this marriage, Normans and other French-speaking people began to
settle in England and hold English offices. A lucrative trade sprang up between the seacoast towns of France and the southeastern districts of England. In 1066, Edward the Confessor, who had been king of England since 1042 died leaving no heir. Previous to his death, William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy, and a direct descendant of Duke Rolf, had visited England and had received from Edward, his cousin, through Emma, the promise of the crown. The people however, chose Harold. Many tales are told of the various promises made by Harold to William concerning his succession to the throne, when once he was cast upon the Norman coast by storm. But all are of doubtful authenticity. Upon William learning that Harold had ascended the throne of England, he called upon him to keep his oath, called upon the Pope for support and prepared for an invasion of England. On the evening of Wednesday, Sept. 27th., 1066, wafted by a south wind, the fleet crossed the channel led by the duke's own ship, the Mora, with a huge lantern at its masthead. While their prows are cutting the blue starlit waters, bearing the future English rulers to their long coveted land, with their precious cargoes of medieval ideas and practices which they had gained during their brief stay in Normandy, let us consider the nature of the country they are about to conquer, its political and economic condition.

As has been mentioned, the ruler of England at this time was Harold who had succeeded to the throne upon the death of Edward the Confessor. The country had suffered greatly during the early part of the century by the invasions of the Danes who coming first as mere piratical bands came later in more organized form and settlements were made during the latter part of the ninth century. Many times they were bought off by Alfred and later
English kings, many battles were fought, they were given all the eastern part of England lying north of the Thames and eventually fused with the English until at last in Kanut, they were represented on the throne of England. The country had been greatly ravaged by their depredations and the political life of the nation had deteriorated under the rule of the Confessor who succeeded Kanut. Having spent much of his time in Normandy, he had become fully imbued with Norman principles, and upon his return, placed Normans in all high positions, both secular and ecclesiastical. Thus politically, we find the English people somewhat prepared for the reception of their Norman invaders.

Gibbons summarizes the trade and industry of the Saxon period as follows: “Crafts and manufactures were few and simple, being limited as far as possible to separate and isolated communities. The fine arts, and works in metal and embroideries were confined to the monasteries, which also imported them. The immense mineral wealth of the island in iron and coal was practically untouched. Trade, both internal and foreign, was small though it developed as the country became more peaceful and united.”

Let us now consider the manorial system of land farming and see how well it fitted in with the system which had been in vogue in France for so many years and with which the Normans were thoroughly familiar. According to investigations made by Seebahn, the open field or manorial system which had been in use in France can be traced on English soil as far back as the laws of King Ine can hold which laws we find republished by King Alfred as the 'Dooms of Ine who came to the throne in A. D. 688.' They represent what was a settled and customary law in Wessex during
the last half of the seventh century during the earliest period of Saxon rule. The land was divided into large estates controlled by the lord of the manor. His house and the land immediately surrounding was known as the lord's demesne, villa or inland, and usually contained about one-third of the estate. The remainder of the land of the estate which was suitable for cultivation was known as open or common land. This land was divided into strips or balks, each strip being a furrow long. This land was held of the lord in villanage by tenants, each tenant holding on the average thirty acres, known as a virgate or yardland, and in the north of England as husbandland. The virgate was the ploughing of a team of oxen for one day. The land of each tenant or villanus, as he was called from the state of villanage in which he lived, his virgate or thirty acres, was not in one place but scattered throughout the entire open field in the strips mentioned above, sometimes one of his strips being separated from another by a space of six or seven other strips belonging to other tenants of his lord. "Each virgate was the holding of a messuage in the village, and between thirty and forty modern acres of land, not contiguous, but scattered in half acre pieces all over the common fields." This peculiar arrangement and distribution of land had come about through the custom of allotting strips anew each year according to a certain order of rotation. This was known as co-rotation. Ploughing was done with a team of eight oxen, in some cases, several villians uniting their oxen for ploughing. The first acre ploughed went to the ploughman, the second to the plough irons, the third to the outside sod ox, the fourth to the swad ox, the fifth to the driver, the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth,
and eleventh to the six oxen in order of worth, and the twelfth for the maintenance of the woodwork of the plough. This explains the order of the rotation of strips. When, later, co-operative ploughing ceased, the villeins occupied permanently their scattered strips, the smallness of the strips in the open field system owing to a day's ploughing ending at noon and the acre being measured by a day's ploughing. It is believed that the Saxon system of hides and yard lands sprung naturally out of British and Roman arrangements which existed before it and that it was not a Saxon importation.

As a result of this method also, the Church received its tithes. King Ethelwulf gave one tenth of the land of England to the Church at one stroke. If the land had been in regularly divided blocks, this could have been easily accomplished. As it was every tenth strip ploughed or every tenth virgate or hide went to the Church. 

A.D. 735 ordained that, "to every Church shall be allotted one complete holding and that this shall be free from all but ecclesiastical services." From the laws of King Ethelred (A.D. 978 - 1016): "And be it known to every Christian man that he pay to his lord his tithe rightly always as the plough traverses the tenth acre, on peril of God's mercy." A Latin law of King Ethelred reads: "And we command that every man give his Church shot and just tithe...i.e. as the plough traverses the tenth acre." This applied to land in villenage as well as to land in demesne. From King Edgar's laws (A.D. 955 - 975): "Every tithe be rendered to the old minster to which the district belongs and that it be then so paid both from a thane's in-land and from geneat.
land, so as the plough traverses it."

Below the virgarii according to Ashley, were the bordars or the cotters, individuals possessing a cottage and two acres of land and who held no oxen or plough. As we see the term bordars often applied to this class which term was perhaps a Nor-

man importation. The bordars or cotters were an intermediate class of holders of half virgates or yard lands.

The lowest class of all was the slave class who were permanent laborers upon the lord's demesne. The duties of the serf may be classed under three general heads:-

1 - Manual labor for two or three days a week --
known as week work or daily work.

2 - A few days' extra work at spring or autumn plough-
ing and at harvest time -- called precaria or precationes ( at the request of the lord, ad precem. ) Their services were no less servile than those of the villanii, but were more trivial. They were above the slaves and could most easily slip into the class of modern laborers.

3 - Small quarterly payments. During boon days, the lord fed his laborers. The cotters having no plough or ox, took no part in the common ploughing.

One peculiar service, the hunting services of the Vil-
lani, is thus described in an Aucklandshire record:- "A corion from each bovate, and to make the bishop's hall sella in the forest, sixty feet long and sixteen feet wide between the posts with a buttery, a steward's room, a chamber and privat." "Also to make a chapel, forty feet long and fifteen wide receiving two shillings charity. On the departure of the bishop, they have a full ton
of beer, or half a ton if he should stay on. They also keep the
eyes of the hawks and put up eighteen booths at the fairs of
St. Cuthbert." There is a passage in the letter of Pope Gregory,
the Great, at the Abbott Mellitus in 610 in which he represents
the Bishop Augustine to be told that after due consideration of
the habits of the English nation, he (the Pope), determines that
because they have been used to slaughter many oxen in the sacri-
lices to devils, some solemnity must be exchanged for them on this
account, as that on the day of dedication, or the nativities of
the holy martyrs, whose relics are there deposited. They may build
themselves huts of the boughs of trees about those Churches which
have been turned to that use from temples, and celebrate the solemn-
ity with religious feasting, it being impossible to efface every-
thing, at once from their obdurate minds. Let them no more offer
beasts to the devil but kill cattle to the praise of God in their
eating. He who rises to the highest places, rises by degrees
or steps and not by leaps.' Five hundred years later we find the
villeins yearly putting up the booths for the fairs held in honor
of their patron saint.

The manor was managed by three officers; a steward,
bailiff and reeve. The steward was however, not strictly a manori-
al officer but was the lord's representative over a number of
manors, — what we would term to-day a general overseer. The
bailiff was the resident representative of the lord in the manor
and had especial charge of the cultivation of the demesne. The
reeve was the representative of the people chosen as their best
man, skilled in agriculture as foreman of the villagers. He was
presented to the lord or his steward for acceptance, receiving as
a reward for his services certain exemptions from duties. But
from the fourteenth century on, we find these three officers re-
duced to one, a reeve or bailiff, superintending the cultivation
of all the manor. "Concerning the labor of tenants upon their
own virgates, we have no direct knowledge," says Ashley, "as Flo-
ta's account of cultivation was only written to meet the needs of
lords of manors and stewards."

Having thus obtained an outline of the manorial sys-
tem as it existed in England previous to the conquest, we find
what a similarity exists between it and that of the continent, es-
specially that of Gaul and Normandy. The principal difference is
found only in the terms used to describe the various classes and
conditions of service, and even when expressed in Latin, we find
a difference between the Latin of Norman and that of Anglo - Saxon.
Let us account if possible, for this similarity of economic life
as we find it existing in Normandy and England. It is said that
a lecturer ten years ago, would have affirmed that the greater
part of England's population was at first grouped together in
free self governing village communities and that the power of the
lord was of slow growth, the dependent community being hastened
by the Norman conquest and by the Roman lawyers who with their
rigid terminology of villanus and bordarius, gave a seeming uni-
formity to a condition of things in which there was a very consid-
erable difference of status. This theory is advanced by M. Fustel
de Coulanges. Seeborn says that the mass of people in what is
now England were from the first in a servile condition, and their
history up to the Roman conquest and beyond, has been of progressive
amélioration. On any other grounds, a uniform agricultural system
with joint compulsory labor is difficult to explain. The dis-
tricts from which the Angles, Saxons and Jutes came are districts
in which is now found neither the three-field system as was most
usual in England nor the two-field system which also frequently
occurs, but a one-field system. It is supposed therefore, that
the English invaders found the three field system already in Brit-
ain when they came. Seebohm further believes that the mass of
Provincials or Romanized Celts, was spared by the conquerors; that
the greater men among the invaders became lords of manors and that
the rank and file received free allotments or were settled in
free village communities. Absolute slavery disappeared in less
than a century after the conquest and servi became customary
holders of small plots, like cotters only on more onerous condi-
tions.

Upon the Danish invasions of England in the tenth cen-
tury, chiefs of Danish bands seized manor homes and put their
followers in place of Saxon villeins, but they soon found that
their Danish subjects would not submit to labor as those whose
places they took. The Danish soamen covered two widely differing
classes, - men holding very considerable portions of land with
villeins dependent upon them and men holding only virgates or por-
tions of virgates and forming a part of the laboring village com-

munity. However, the Danish soeman was like the villanus with
these two exceptions that he was not bound to week - work or mili-
tary service. It has been found by various writers that it is
necessary to restrict our views to evidence furnished by customals
and rentals and to pay no regard to definitions of lawyers "who
throw a fallacious veil of uniformity over widely differing cir-
cumstances and see everything through the spectacles of Roman law."
The Saxons seem either to have introduced the manorial system into England themselves forming bans and tuns of the manorial type or to have found them already existing upon their arrival in Britain. There seems no room for the theory that the Saxons introduced everywhere free village communities on the system of the German mark, which afterwards sank into serfdom under manorial lords. The question presents itself whether the manorial system as introduced by the Saxons was the outgrowth of their old tribal system on the continent or did they adopt it in toto from the Romans. This last hypothesis seems highly probable since during the empire, a large portion of Germany was included within the lines of the Roman provinces.

Thus far we have considered only the manorial system as it existed previous to 1086, without taking into account the civil regime which directed and carried out the system we have discussed. The unit of government was the township, the villata or vicus, at the head of which was the tun - gerefa usually nominated by the lord. The villata seems to bear a relation to the mark organization of Germany although few traces are to be found of the mark system in England. In its earliest stages however, it may have been a community of free laborers as was the mark with its developed form of local jurisdiction. The historical township is the body of alloidal owners who have advanced beyond the stages of a land community. In ecclesiastical terminology, the township was Roman, the Parish in which all business not manorial was transacted in vestry meetings. The township also closely resembled the manor, the lord of the manor exercising similar authority as the lord of the demesne. We find on the manor and in
the township, and in fact all the different divisions of political life, the people maintaining their right to assemble themselves in meeting and exercising some sort of jurisdiction. Their assemblies were known as genots in which the people made their own by-laws, elected officers, etc.

The hundreds were usually a larger division of territory and more completely organized than a township and on account of their size and strength entitled many of them to the name as well as the constitution of the hundred. They were well defended by ditches and mounds from the surrounding country. A number of townships bound together for purposes of defense, judicial administration, etc., was known as a hundred or wapentake, which is undoubtedly a Danish term since hundreds were more numerous in southern England, where Danish influence was less felt. The hundred has had many causes set forth as to origin. Some that it consisted of a hundred hides of land; others as the district furnishing a hundred warriors and possessing irregularly defined boundaries. The principal officer of the hundreds was the hundred-scyldor corresponding to the centurio of the Franks; that of the wapentake, the gerefa, an elected officer, and the one who presided over the court when held. "The court of the hundred was known as the hundred moot, was held monthly and was attended by the land-owners within the hundred or their representatives, the stewards, and by the parish priest, the reeve and the four best men of the township. " The judges of the court were at first the whole body of suitors; later, twelve representative men composed a judicial committee of the court. We find the hundred modifying largely the judicial and Church life of the fourteenth and fifteenth
centuries. Besides its important function as the basis for a judicial body, the hundred served as an area of rating for taxation. The Saxon Chronicle (1008) states that Ethelred ordered that a ship should be furnished by every hundred hides; every ten hides was accountable for a boat and every eight for a helm and breastplate. Certain exceptions were made relieving certain districts from hundred duties. These exemptions were granted by the king and the particular rights granted were the rights and privileges formerly due the king besides release from toll and team. These exemptions were termed sac and soc. Occasionally two, three or more hundreds for purposes of witness would unite. (Ethelred 1:1, Par. 3.)

The division immediately above the township is the shire. The scir - man is spoken of as president of a court by Ini, Par. 3 and the ealdorman may forfeit his scir (Par. 30), thus showing that a shire system had been at work in Wessex as early as the reign of Ini. Each shire was composed of an indefinite number of hundreds and its system of organization was of much the same character as the hundred and was ruled by an ealdorman as well as by a gerefa. The court of the shire was the shire-moot. Legislative authority was vested in the shire-moot to a limited extent, and like the hundred, the shire was a unit for purposes of rating. Each shire furnished its quota for military purposes and later, the ecclesiastical system when it divided the territory for the archdeacons followed closely the boundaries corresponding with the county. As a later step in the development of the political system, we find several shires combining under a single ealdorman. The ealdorman was nominated by the
king and witan, the office being hereditary. Owing to a later subdivision of shires, ealdorman came to rule over more than one shire. The sheriff was the king's representative of the shire, his field being confined strictly to one shire. He was chosen occasionally by the folk - moot or general meeting of the people, but generally appointed by the king and witan. Thus we have the shire governed by a double set of officers; those appointed by the king and those elected by the people, each holding their separate courts at stated periods of the year; the sheriff the shire - moot twice a year; the ealdorman the folk-moot. The sheriff acted as moderator or chairman rather than in the capacity of judge which was reserved for the suitors.

Another feature of the civilization of the eleventh century needs to be mentioned briefly before entering upon the scene our Norman visitors. The country had attained to a comparatively high degree of literary activity. Alfred had written his Chronicle and placed within the reach of the people the treasures of Roman writers. "The chroniclers and sermon writers were now putting forth their strength, but most of the literary life centered about the Church. Schools were founded and foreign ecclesiastics introduced into English bishoprics. The close unity which existed between the Church and state is also a noticeable fact. An analysis of the Church life of the time would be but to retrace the ground already gone over, so closely was the life of the Church bound up with that of the state. The Church maintained the pattern after which the government of the state was largely moulded, and even though at times shires and hundreds and kingdoms divided England into numerous sections often overlapping and obscure, though the earl of one hundred was engaged
in hostilities with the neighboring earldom, yet above all and
over all, loomed the strong central power of the Church in which
all were brothers. "It was the strong ecclesiastical and nation-
al spirit thus growing into one another which supplied something
at least of that strong passive power which the Norman despotism
was unable to break. The Churches were schools and nurseries
of patriots; depositories of old traditional glories. The Eng-
lish clergy supplied the basis of the strength of Anselm when
the Norman bishop sided with the king."

We have given the political causes which led up to
the conquest. On September 26th., 1066, the Duke of the Normans
and his host of followers landed under the walls of the Roman city
of Anderida and on the next day, marched to Hastings where on
October 4th. was fought and won the battle which made all England
fear William and which led eventually, to his crowning as King of
England. Soon after the battle of Hastings, he sought national
recognition. He was crowned by the Archbishop of York and stand-
ing before the altar at Westminster, took his coronation oath.

We now find our Norman invaders confronted by a subdued people,
people speaking an unknown tongue and with customs and habits
in many respects different from their own, with whom they are to
live and mingle; for it was not a war of extermination which the
conqueror waged but simply a war of conquest for the possession
of the crown of England which William claimed as the chosen heir
of Edward the Confessor.

The Normans brought life to the whole English system.
They found the country divided into petty states acknowledging
simply in name their king. This William remedied by making all
the various departments of government dependent upon himself. He took the best from the government which he found upon his accession, combined with it the highest principles which he had learned in his Norman home and allowed the two, the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman, to operate side by side, the stronger points of the one strengthening the weaker points of the other until at last, the two became blended into one as we find them in the great English people of to-day. "But the fusion of the two races was slow and not until the Norman exiled from Normandy began to consider England as his home did the union progress."

The conquest brought the English more in touch with the continent commercially and intellectually, and this continental influence was greatly strengthened by the broadening tendency of the crusades. The Normans added their roving, adventurous spirit to the sluggish and dormant life of the English, while the stern, steady Englishman toned and curbed the energies of the Norman. Again the Normans, like the Romans of old in their relation to Greece, furnished the machinery and administrative genius for the great and mighty powers of the English people when once they had roused them to activity. Taking as we have in the early part of this discussion the agricultural system as the basis for development, let us see how far the manorial system as we found it under Anglo-Saxon rule was altered by the presence of the Normans in England.

King William took possession of all England in his own name and later those who were willing to acknowledge him as king among the followers of Harold, were allowed to redeem their lands, either paying money or giving hostages, and as one section
of the country fell into the conqueror's hands after another, it was given in tenure to new subjects under the uniform and simple feudal principles which he brought from France. The fifteen hundred tenants in chief of Domesday take the place of countless landowners of King Edward's time and the complicated and unintelligible irregularities of the Anglo-Saxon period. Order was brought out of disorder and with apparently little friction, as many of the smaller land holders remained in a mediatised position upon their estates. In order to secure accurate information concerning the state of his kingdom, William had taken in 1085 a great census of the people and their lands, the results of which were incorporated into the Domesday Book. This served also as a basis for further taxation. The survey took in all England south of Tynes and east of the Severn. It was found that there were 1,488 manors in ancient demesne of crown in 1086, and most of them were crown manors in the time of Edward the Confessor. Monasteries held manors and were permitted to retain them after the conquest. As the earls and powerful thanes at the time of Edward the Confessor had held manors, so did their Norman successors at the Domesday Survey. Each manor had its lord, resident or represented by a steward or reeve (villicus), some of the manors were divided and let out to sublords, this process being known as subinfeudation. So thoroughly was the survey made, that it is stated that, "Not a single hill or yard land was omitted." The basis of taxation and assessment was the number of plough teams at time of its taking. No mention is made of free tenants except in the Danish sections. Each census taker was to propound the following questions: "Quot villani;" "quot cottarii;"
"quot servi;" "quot liberi homines;" "quot sochemannii;" the last two being distinctively Danish importations. The demesne lands were not let out until a later period to permanent free holding tenants. The classes of tenants in villanage was found to correspond to those previous to Norman rule, thus showing how little was the general system and conditions of rural life altered by the conquest. The classes of tenants have the same names at the time of the Survey as before the presumption being that they held similar holdings. Allowing thirty acres to each villani, 3,250,000 acres were contained in villein holdings; plus the land held by bordarii and cotter tenants, sochemannii, and liberi homines makes 6,000,000 acres under the plough at the Domesday Survey. There was comparative simplicity in the Domesday Book where villeins, coters or borders and slaves make up the whole population, com pared with the complexity of the later part of the thirteenth century. From 1086 forward, there exists a constant attempt to offset the feudal dues and labor requirements by money rents. This largely led to a condition of diversity of customs. "This condition was also aided by the growth of a large class of free tenants," says Ashley, "the commutation of week - work for money or corn payment; of boon days and other special services, and the appearance of a class of men dependent wholly or in part, upon wages received as agricultural laborers. This process of commuta tion was hastened by the Norman conquest, although there were some cases where men were unjustly degraded by new lords from free tenants to villani. Money was very often more useful to the lord than work itself and as the Norman rule brought a greater popula tion, less insecurity and cheaper labor, it brought increasing
frequency of commutation. During the reign of Henry the First, all the manors of the Abbot of Burton were divided between demesne land at work and land at rent. (ad opus ad malem.) There was also a marked increase during the century after the conquest in the number of holders of half virgates owing to more land being put under the plough or the division of virgates between two persons. in such cases the yardlings or possessors of virgates were often able to commute their services and become free tenants; half yardlings remained long bound to week-work. As personal freedom increased, greater economic inequalities resulted. Portions of the demesne lands were now being let for money rents and since the whole organization of the manor was directed towards providing labor for cultivation of part which the lord kept in his own hands, it mattered little to him whether his land was worked by serfs in pursuance of the servile duties or whether he secured money payments in exchange for this service, with which he secured more efficient paid laborers and men who would not have to be watched so closely. From the thirteenth century onward, commutation of all services except carting, existed and thus a gradual freeing of the servile peasantry and the creation of free tenants had been brought about in three different ways.

1. By the elevation of villeins in commutation of their services for money payments.

2. Enclosure and letting out of portions of the waste land.

3. Letting out of portions of the lord's demesne.

One striking characteristic presents itself to the student of the manorial system of the post Norman period and
that is its self-sufficiency and social independence. Religious-
ly, politically, commercially, each manor was self-sustaining.
The Court Baron was held at the Manor House, and when the lord
had a grant of criminal jurisdiction, the Court Leet which had
to deal with punishment of graver crimes. The village on the de-
mesne had its Church where the congregation changed but little
from year to year; its men who carried on occupations and crafts
necessary for every day life, but the village general shop we do
not find until the present century. The dealings with the out-
side world were few. Spain furnished salt and iron; Norway, tar
to cure the scab among the sheep; Paris, millstones. These
millstones were transported by ship to the coast towns of England
and then the duty of conveying them to the inland estates weighed
alike on tenants of manors — free or villein alike.

When at length the towns appeared, it implied that
purely agricultural districts produced more than was required for
their own consumption. In some instances, we find whole manors
let out for fourteen to twenty — one or thirty — five years for
rent. ( ferm ) In 1189, a whole body of villeins would take
the management of manors into their own hands promising a fixed
annual rent. Some had risen to the position of free tenants but
the great majority continued to hold by servile tenure as villeins
or customary tenants, even after having commuted all or most of
all the customary duties and greatly gained in comfort and gener-
al well — being. Ashley states that the characteristic of the
great majority was permanence. They were bound to the soil
( adscriptitii termo ) and heavy fines were imposed for disposing
of property and for deserting to other manors or cities.
The villein however, had security of tenure and generally were allowed to transfer their holdings to other persons upon payment of fine to their lord. The legal doctrine up to the reign of Edward the Fourth, was as follows:— "The villein could have absolutely no property and the king's court could not protect the villein against any arbitrary injustice of his lord." "This legal doctrine," says Ashley, "was due to the Roman law and was never in harmony with English sentiment and custom." In comparing the village community then with the village and rural life of the present, we find no great social separation between the various classes of actual cultivators of the soil as there is to-day. Aside from the lord and his immediate following, there was no special distinction among the serfs: All lived together on the common street of the village, pursuing their agricultural pursuits in common and no man lived better than his neighbor. "There was however no individual liberty and therefore no complete competition! As gradually payment in money superseded payment in kind, a transition common to all nations, a greater spirit of competition was possible. This change to payment by money took place on the Royal Demesne in the twelfth century. In towns where agriculture was not practiced, payment in money was taken for the pay of soldiers. In other cases, food for a hundred men or the provender for twenty horses was required. In all these cases, currency was served as a measure of value payments of value payments given, thus illustrating that true statement that,— "currency can be used as a common measure of value long before it is actually employed in every day transactions as a medium of exchange." As illustrative of the stages through which this payment of money passed,
we have it termed under King Ethelred as Danegeld; under Canute, as heriot which was a gift of horses and armor; under Henry the Second, as scutage, and in the reign of Edward the First, "money payments by merchants took the place of gifts or seizure of wares." From a study of these conditions, it is evident that there had at last grown up a system of currency and numerous markets.

Let us consider for a time the economical relations of England at this period and something of her mercantile and industrial life. From the time of the Norman conquest, we find the Merchant Guild playing an important part. Around it centers the general activity of the city and village life, and a study of its growth and development is co-extensive with the study of English manufactures and trade for a number of centuries after the conquest.

At the time of the Norman conquest there were eighty towns in England, towns which we should now consider only large villages. Earthen walls surrounded them and earthen mounds kept watch over them. London, Winchester, Bristol, Norwich, York and Lincoln were far in advance of the rest, having from seven to eight thousand inhabitants. The cistercian monks "who lived to set purpose," in the wilderness, introduced life and industry about their lonely estates and "made the wilderness to blossom as the rose." From their industrious habits resulted at length the growth of markets and towns. The towns are only an outgrowth of fairs or markets where the products of the surrounding districts were brought for sale or exchange. If these fairs were located at a strategic point, i.e. where roads crossed, or at a convenient ford of the river, oftentimes a steady trade would develop and
a thriving town grow up. But as yet there was no foreign trade, except in luxuries for the nobility, the exchange consisting simply of home products as a result of one district producing more than it could consume of a certain product, or from having limited itself to the production of one certain article to which it was especially suited and depending upon other districts for other things.

In the troubled times following the Norman conquest, the more important English towns suffered greatly as a result of William's policy of castle building and the chances of war. One third to one half of the towns were destroyed. In 1086, the towns in Scotland had begun to profit by closer connection with the opposite shore and Norman rule when firmly established, secured for the country an internal peace and order such as it had never before enjoyed; the temporary retrogression was made up for and in town after town arose the merchant guild. The merchant guild was an organization of merchants for protection in trade against inferior products and of robbery or theft in the transportation of goods. Regular meetings were held in the guild hall of the town where fraternal and social spirit was bred. These guilds gradually came to play an important part in the municipal life of the cities and their members the ruling class or merchant aristocracy, were known as burgesses or citizens par excellence. Before the Norman conquest, religious guilds and frith guilds were found but it was not till 1088, that we find the first definite mention of the merchant guild. In the charters of Henry the First and Second establishing Bristol, Southampton, Durham, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford and Salisbury, the recognition of the merchant
guild occupies a prominent place. Seventy-two out of one hundred and sixty towns had guilds. Members of guilds worked their way to all important offices of the town, usually having one or two aldermen, two or four wardens, twelve or twenty-four members of council. The membership of the guilds was made up of merchants, craftsmen, merchants from foreign towns and neighboring monasteries and lords of manors. By the end of the twelfth century, merchant guilds had arisen in all considerable English towns, and we find also a new guild beginning to develop about a century later, the craft guild. The craft guild was not an outgrowth of the Roman artisan corporations. They were isolated; society previous to this time having not reached a profitably safe stage to confine itself to any occupation except agriculture. They were companies of men engaged in the same line of industry who bound themselves together for purposes of mutual aid and development of skill in their especial lines of work and crafts; for protection against foreign competitors and unjust demands of employers. "The ideas which governed the craft guilds were not peculiar to themselves but common to the whole society of the time. We find the weavers and fullers of woolen cloth and the bakers among the first to form craft guilds. From the Pipe Roll of 1130, we find mention of guilds of weavers in London. Guilds not authorized by the king were known as adulterine." In 1180, the goldsmiths, butchers, pepperers, and cloth finishers were opening guild halls and by 1350, the guild system had reached the highest point of its efficiency; for two centuries afterward, continuing to be adopted by one industry after another, as it rose in each town. The intercommunal or intermunicipal commerce of England down to the
middle of the thirteenth century together with the export of English commodities, — wool, woofells, leather, tin and lead was almost entirely in the hands of foreign merchants. "The royal power had established one central point where wool and other staple products were to be brought that trade might be more easily regulated and supervised and that custom duties might be more easily levied."

In London and other large cities, the Guild organization had extended to every branch of trade and industry by the end of the fourteenth century. The parliament of 1363 decreed in regard to the supervision of wares and skill:— "Two of every craft shall be chosen to survey that none use other craft than the same which he has chosen. " As regards the mystery which is but another term for guild, we find in a royal order for the concluding years of Edward the Third's reign, the statement concerning the close watch against imposters and adulterations. Doubtless the morality of the times led to the drawing up of those systems of supervision, since there was a greater tendency to deceit and scamped work then than now. The motive for the formation and maintenance of guilds was far from that of a system of survey of wares or on account of royal municipal ordinances. They corresponded to the social tender of the time. "There was a disposition to seek for local or class franchises rather than general liberties; a love of pageantry and public display; a desire to insure the soul's future by means of alms and masses. For all of these, the guild was admirably adapted." They helped to keep out foreign labor; admission to membership in the guild being dependent upon being a freeman of the city. As a result,
competition from new comers was greatly limited.

Long before the Reformation, the guild had come to be associated with religious fraternities. It was finally superseded by the domestic system. "During the reign of Elizabeth, the government felt the need of bringing the guilds more closely under public control, and as a result, we have the statute of apprentices whereby jurisdiction over guilds was given to justices of the peace. Seven years of apprenticeship were requisite for every industry, and it assured to the working man a tolerable certainty of employment." It was well adapted to the times and although as a system of control, it must have hindered to a certain extent, freedom of enterprise and independence of individual initiative. The elementary conceptions of good and honest work had to be driven in by minute rules vigorously enforced. Discipline rather than spontaneity was required. The guild was also of especial benefit since there was no strong national government. The artisans needed the protection of an organized body. The guilds led finally to the growth of that strong middle class of Englishmen who have been the peculiar representatives and introducers of modern ideas. They reconciled for a time the interests of consumer and producer. In short, given the small industrial undertakings, current political, ethical and religious ideas of the years immediately following the beginning of the rule of the Norman in England, the guild system was inevitable."

To Norman influence is also largely attributable the woolen industry of England and especially as regards the finer and more delicate weaves introduced by Flemish artisans. The first product which a nation undertakes to produce after having
provided for its food supply is that of cloth. This is usually of a higher and more intricate nature and generally carried to greater perfection, because of its easy transportation to different regions and exchange value for varieties differing in weave and variety. At the end of the seventeenth century, woolen goods were fully two-thirds of England's exports.

The axiom that the division of labor is limited by the extent of the market applied well to the English woolen manufacturer, and the artisan of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who as the commercial activity was aroused through contact with continental Europe by means of Normandy, and the Far East through the Crusades, laid the foundations in England of the diversified and highly developed manufactories of the present day. "The woolen manufacture was the first to take the form of a guild and the first to break through its limits. It became the most widely spread of 'domestic industries,' " and therefore that in which the factory system gained its most hardly won and signal victory. We find the weavers enjoying large powers at the beginning of the fourteenth century, a certain monopolizing tendency.

The growth of the woolen industry in England may be divided into three main divisions according to Ashley.

1 - First great immigration of foreign artisans in the reign of Edward the Fourth: with the consequent expansion of English manufactories and the beginning of manufacture for export.

2 - Transition in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries from guild system proper to what became known later as the 'domestic system' of industry.
3 - Second great immigration of foreign craftsmen
under Elizabeth and the establishment of the new draperies; i. e.
the manufacture of the finer qualities of goods.

Several schemes were tried by the English government to favor the development of woolen manufacture in England. The tendency was to export the wool to Flanders where it was woven and then brought back to England and sold at an enormous profit. What little woolen cloth was manufactured by the English was of the roughest kind, they being dependent upon Flemish industry and ingenuity for the finer qualities of cloths. It was thought by the higher authorities that manufacture could be encouraged by placing an export duty upon wool. This however, failed as the people were not as yet sufficiently skilled to manufacture properly. To serve as a stimulus to them and at the same time to teach them the art, Flemish artisans were introduced, glad to find refuge from the oppressions they suffered in their own country. They were not allowed at first by the London guilds to enter with them in the guild organization, whereupon they formed guilds of their own. One grievance to the London guild was that at the beginning, the Flemish weavers were exempted from the ferm. Henry the Second had conferred on the poor weavers of London a new monopoly of their craft, - for a consideration of twenty marks yearly. By a proclamation of 1337, foreigners had privileges and yet did not have to contribute to the ferm and as I mentioned this was one of the chief irritating causes of ill feeling, - the exemption of the foreigner from taxes. In 1354, Edward the Fourth compelled the foreigners to contribute to the ferm. At the above date, there were 30,000 sacks of wool exported per year.
The importation of foreign weavers under Edward the Fourth in the fourteenth century led to an extensive manufacture of English cloth for home markets and exportation. The fine fabricical productions were introduced by Elizabeth which enabled English producers to rival foreigners in every branch of woolen industry. The first Flemmings taught the English the unfinished and undyed state. King James advocated projects for dressing and dying cloth within the kingdom. In 1568, there were 3,000 manufacturers in Norwich alone. After a few Flemmings had settled in England, others were induced to come by the glowing accounts sent home to relatives and friends concerning the freedom and liberty of English manufacturing life.

New names of offices and officers take the place of the old Anglo-Saxon terms but the functions they fulfilled were virtually the same. We see how the Anglo-Saxon institutions were fast approaching the feudal model; various systems of relief and military tenure were gradually introduced and the presence of knights upon some of the estates testifies to the growth of the feudal idea. Many have thought that the general oath of allegiance taken by William's subjects at Salesbury was a feudal oath. It showed simply according to Stubbs; 'that the feudal system was already established and that the king wished only to provide a direct tie between the sovereign and all freeholders which no inferior relation between them and mesne lords would justify him in breaking. The Conqueror's policy was to defeat the disruptive tendency of feudal institutions. No great changes were wrought by William in the governmental machinery of the kingdom. His laws were but a reissue of earlier codes and whenever possible, old
English institutions worked side by side with Norman laws; whatever was best of each was kept and grafted into the new government. William was opposed to breaking up the unity of the kingdom by the granting of hereditary territorial jurisdictions and was very sparing in the bestowal of earldoms. He took great care also that no two earldoms should be adjoining as he did not wish to concentrate baronial powers in a few counties.

In the department of law, the changes wrought by the Normans were not so numerous and the basis for much of the law was laid in England in the time of Good King Alfred. Among these, might be noticed the Domesday Survey, Frankpledge, and trial by battle, only the last of which can claim Norman origin. During the reign of William, the bishops were removed from the secular courts and formed into a judicial tribunal of their own, known as ecclesiastical courts. In his dealings with the Pope, the Conqueror was very guarded. Anything like a direct claim on the part of the part of the papacy, William would not abide by. "The Norman period closes with the reign of Henry the Second, a period marked by strife between barons and kings, in which oaths were made and immediately broken; schemes of reform were arranged and carried out; the feudal system tried and proven a failure; the supremacy of the king against the Pope of Rome maintained."

A study of the administrative system during this period requires that we commence with the person, household, court and council of the king and descend gradually to the powers of the common subjects. This is necessary because of the close union which bound each department and office to the next higher, and the dependence of the whole upon the king at the head.
The great court or council, the ancient Witenagemot of the kingdom, is found in Norman England. This assembly was little changed under the Conqueror; the bishops and abbots were still members owing to their great wisdom in official matters, also, the chief officers of state and the principal Norman barons. It partook however, more of the nature of a court than any organized council. We find few earls during the Norman period and most of these were holders of old English earldoms. In some few cases, the earldoman was held by a bishop.

The baronage was a distinct creation of the conquest, the word, homo, from which baron is derived meaning under the feudal institutions, a vassal. As a lord of his manors, he held his own court and often had a body of personal counsellors. Among the minor members of the council, we find the knight who is the eleventh century representative of the Anglo-Saxon thegn but with the addition of the tenure of chivalry, having undergone 'an honorable initiation in the use of arms, which distinctly marked him from his predecessor, the unwarlike tenant in socage.

The assemblies were regarded as having the full powers of the old Witenagemot but their actions were largely directed by the will of the king and their field of action considerably limited. Below the count's court presided over by persons "bound by oath to speak the truth and to the fulfillment of their duties," we find the hundred - most patterned after the court of King Edward's days and at which non - attendance is punishable by fine.

After the conquest, the growth of towns was rapid in England. Originally in large townships, their constitution differed from that of villages but on account of their size, had
developed rights and privileges resembling those of the hundred. At the time of the conquest, they had special governing bodies of their own, and usually a separate judicial tribunal. Charters were granted them by the king, conferring upon them certain exemptions and privileges in return for money grants or military aid in time of war. The towns soon grew to be independent governmental bodies scattered throughout the realm and possessing a general system of fines and revenues. "The Norman conquest produced no change in the towns save this, that the tenure became a more important feature of dependence than the jurisdiction."

There were towns in demesne which held charters direct from the king, and those which held their charters from lords. The towns, originally chartered for purposes of defense and protection of industries gradually grew to monopolize rights and usurp the functions of government. "The chartered towns during the Norman period however, are not numerous, the chief point to be noticed being the great advance made in those already chartered in privileges and systems of local administration, aided continually by the rising influence of the guilds with which we have dealt before. There were also towns which had received no charters, either because too poor to purchase royal charters or whose meane lords had not the power of granting immunities. "They were under the old manorial system, the only distinguishing feature between them and the rural communities being the privilege of holding market."

Lastly, we must consider the Norman military system as the protective feature of all this complicated system of government and the means of defense from foreign powers. The basis of the system was the knight's fee which was a knight's service;
i. e. — to furnish a fully armed horseman to serve at his own ex-
 pense for forty days of the year. This was due from every cer-
tain number of hides. This number varied greatly so that we
 possess no accurate statistics as to the military force which the
country was able to command. Fifty — two thousand knight's fees
are reckoned for the thirteenth century. The service was not
limited to a defense of the county in which the estate lay, but
the king could use the knight in foreign lands or wherever he might
need his services. The baron led his own knights, the hoste be-
ing arranged by the constable or marshal under the supreme command
of the king.

We have now reviewed the administrative and political
life of the Norman period together with a more detailed economic
study of the period, from which we are able to draw the following
conclusions.

1 — The Normans did not undertake to overthrow Anglo-
Saxon conditions and institutions, but used them as a basis upon
which to introduce their more completely developed administrative
ideas. Says Stubbs, — "We have considered the leading principle
of the system of the Conquest to be the combination of the strongest
part of the Norman system with the strongest part of the early
English system; the maintenance of the local and provincial ma-
chinery of the latter with the central and sovereign authority
characteristic of the former."

2 — Under the conditions which presented themselves
to the Conqueror, — two distinct nationalities to be welded to
gether in purpose and aim, — the only resource which commended
itself was the gradual absorption of that which was most enduring
within the two races into a new system which should be typical of all. "In taxation, the Danegeld is distinctly English, the Feudal aid is as distinctly Norman. William maintained both. In legal procedure, the hundred - moot and the shire - moot are English, the custom of trial by battle is Norman; in each case, the Conqueror introduced the one without abolishing the other."

3 - The French substitutes for English terms, although somewhat modifying the character of some offices, only serve to lead to confusion. The charge that the Conqueror forbade the use of the English tongue in court is undoubtedly untrue, as says Stubbe "we have proof that the popular courts transacted their business in English and that the kings issued their charters in English as well as Latin.

4 - The entire Norman period was one of transition, of growth and extension, of experiment and trial, from out of which issued, the strict rule and supervision ended, the England of Elizabeth taking its rank among the nations of the earth in its completely developed and administrative system of government: its men of letters; its wealth and the glory of its men on land and sea. This period of training and discipline was necessary to the fuller development and outburst of the sixteenth century.

5 - After all we cannot measure the Norman influence by these external attributes. It was the sturdy, vigorous life which the Normans infused into the sluggish veins of the Anglo-Saxon life of the tenth century which is the principal thing after all. As Jewett so well expresses the idea:- "The mingling of their brighter, fiercer, more enthusiastic, and visionary nature with the stolid, dogged, prudent and resolute Anglo - Saxons,
belongs to the history of England. It is the Norman graft upon the sturdy old Saxon tree that has borne best fruit among the nations — that has made the England of history, the England of great scholars and soldiers and sailors, the England of great men and women, of books and ships and gardens and pictures and songs.

There is many a gray old English house standing among its trees and fields, that has sheltered and nurtured many a generation of loyal and tender and brave and gentle souls. We shall find there men and women who, in their cleverness and courtliness, their grace and true pride and beauty, make us understand the old Norman beauty and grace, and seem to make the days of chivalry alive again.

But we may go back further still, and discover in the lonely mountain valleys and fiord — sides of Norway even a simpler, courtlier, and nobler dignity. In the country of the sagamen, and the rough sea kings, beside the steep — shored harbors of the viking dragon — ships linger the constantly repeated types of an earlier ancestry, and the flower of the sagas blooms as fair as ever. Among the red roofs and gray walls of the Norman towns, or the faint colors, brightly tinged of its country landscapes, among the green hedgerows and golden wheat — fields of England, the same flower grows in more luxurious fashion, but old Norway and Denmark sent out the seed that has flourished in richer soil. To — day the Northman, the Norman, and the Englishman are all kindred possessing a rich inheritance.
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