Power and Statebuilding in the Anglo-Norman World: An Overview

Le pouvoir et la construction de l'État dans le monde anglo-normand : une vue d'ensemble

Il potere e la costruzione di stato nel mondo anglo-normanno: una panoramica

Judith Ann Green

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/4247>

DOI: 10.4000/tabularia.4247

ISSN: 1630-7364

Publisher:

CRAHAM - Centre Michel de Boüard, Presses universitaires de Caen

Electronic reference

Judith Ann Green, « Power and Statebuilding in the Anglo-Norman World: An Overview », *Tabularia* [Online], Living on both sides of the Channel (10th-13th centuries), Online since 16 April 2020, connection on 18 April 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/4247> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/tabularia.4247>

Power and Statebuilding in the Anglo-Norman World: An Overview

*Le pouvoir et la construction de l'État dans le monde
anglo-normand: une vue d'ensemble*

*Il potere e la costruzione di stato nel mondo
anglo-normanno: una panoramica*

Judith Ann GREEN

University of Edinburgh

Abstract:

This paper explores, in the context of the Anglo-Norman world, some of the characteristics implicit in ideas of the state: relatively fixed frontiers, a sovereign authority with the power to maintain justice, raise taxes and deploy armies, and to command the allegiance of its inhabitants. Normandy and England are considered both separately and together as an "empire". New research areas and themes relating to power and statebuilding are considered: the role of the ruler's wife, ritual and display, the architectural context of power, and of the importance of cities, especially London. The need for a wider approach to the history of power away from the history of kings, including lords and ecclesiastics, is stressed, and developments within a British context, in Wales and Scotland, are briefly considered. The paper concludes by emphasizing the fragility of developments: statebuilding was not consistent or inevitable. Twelfth-century Normandy itself illustrates some of the ambiguities of defining states and statebuilding in this era.

Keywords: States, frontiers, sovereignty, justice, taxation, army, allegiance, empire, Normandy, England, Wales, Scotland, queen, ritual, feasting, gifts, clothing, hunting, castles, palaces, cities, London, Rouen, Caen

Résumé:

Cet article examine, dans le contexte du monde anglo-normand, certaines des caractéristiques implicites du concept d'État: des frontières relativement fixes, une autorité souveraine ayant le pouvoir de maintenir la justice, de percevoir des impôts, de lever des armées, et d'obtenir l'allégeance des habitants. La Normandie et l'Angleterre sont considérées séparément et ensemble comme un « empire ». De nouveaux domaines et thèmes de recherche concernant le pouvoir et la construction de l'État sont abordés: le rôle de l'épouse du souverain, le rituel et l'ostentation, l'architecture au service du pouvoir et l'importance des villes, Londres en particulier. On souligne la nécessité d'une approche plus large de l'histoire du pouvoir, non limitée à l'histoire des rois, mais comprenant les seigneurs et les ecclésiastiques, et on examine brièvement les développements qui s'opèrent dans le contexte de la Grande-Bretagne, dans le Pays de Galles et en Écosse. L'article conclut en soulignant la fragilité des développements: la construction des États n'était ni constante ni inéluctable. La Normandie du XII^e siècle illustre elle-même certaines des ambiguïtés de la définition des États et de leur construction à cette époque.

Tabularia « Études », « Vivre des deux côtés de la Manche », 2020, p. 1-19, 16 avril 2020

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/4247> | DOI: 10.4000/tabularia.4247

Mots-clés: États, frontières, souveraineté, justice, impôts, armée, allégeance, empire, Normandie, Angleterre, Pays de Galles, Écosse, reine, rituel, festins, dons, habillements, chasse, châteaux, palais, villes, Londres, Rouen, Caen

Riassunto:

Questo articolo esamina, nel contesto del mondo anglo-normanno, alcune delle caratteristiche implicite del concetto di stato: frontiere relativamente fisse, un'autorità sovrana che ha il potere di mantenere la giustizia, riscuotere le tasse, convocare eserciti e ordinare la fedeltà degli abitanti. La Normandia e l'Inghilterra sono considerate separatamente e insieme come un "impero". Vengono affrontate nuove aree di ricerca e temi riguardanti il potere e la costruzione dello stato: il ruolo della moglie del sovrano, il rituale e la dimostrazione del potere, il contesto architettonico del potere e l'importanza delle città, Londra in particolare. Viene sottolineata la necessità di un approccio più ampio alla storia del potere, non limitato alla storia dei re, ma comprendente signori ed ecclesiastici, e vengono brevemente considerati gli sviluppi, nel contesto brittanico, in Galles e Scozia. L'articolo si conclude sottolineando la fragilità degli sviluppi: la costruzione dello stato non era né costante né inevitabile. La stessa Normandia del XII secolo illustra alcune delle ambiguità nella definizione degli stati e nella loro costruzione a quel tempo.

Parole chiave: Stati, frontiere, sovranità, giustizia, tasse, esercito, fedeltà, impero, Normandia, Inghilterra, Galles, Scozia, regina, rituale, banchetti, regali, vestiti, caccia, castelli, palazzi, città, Londra, Rouen, Caen

Terminology

This paper was originally delivered at the *table ronde* “Bâtir un État ‘normand’ aux XI^e-XII^e s.” in March 2019. Prompted by the very title of the *table ronde* with its implicit assumption that there were indeed states in the worlds inhabited by the Normans, the paper begins by addressing the fundamental questions of terms and definitions. Not all historians would agree that the term “state” is appropriate for the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Furthermore, even if the term is deemed to be appropriate, the next question is how their essential characteristics are to be defined¹? The kind of features we might expect to see include relatively settled boundaries, and the existence of an independent authority capable of maintaining order, raising resources, and securing the allegiance of its inhabitants over and above family loyalties.

1. This is obviously to enter contested ground both about the chronology and the driving force in the emergence of states. Jean-Philippe Genêt offers an illuminating overview in “La Genèse de l’État moderne: Les enjeux d’un programme de recherche”, GENÊT, 1997; GENÊT, 2014; TILLY, 1992 and, more recently, TILLY, 2011. Another useful overview is that by REUTER, 2006.

Were there states in the eleventh century?

The term “statebuilding” has connotations of construction, of positive movement, perhaps towards modernity, as it was for J. R. Strayer². It could be regarded as a problematic term to use in the context of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. T. N. Bisson’s book, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century* explicitly challenged the idea that there were European “states” or “government” before the late twelfth century, focussing instead on lordship, which might be associated with rulership, as in Normandy and England³. Lordship was violent and self-interested, he argued, and it was only when forced by changing economic circumstances to take account of the ruled that there was movement towards a more associative form of government, and thus the origins of the modern state. His thesis developed out of his earlier views that Carolingian agencies collapsed around the year one thousand, to be replaced by lords and castles⁴. It is a debate which has now been exhausted and, one might argue, did not really fit the development of ducal Normandy, and certainly did not match eleventh-century England.

Was eleventh-century Normandy a state?

A first answer to this question is negative: Normandy surely was a province of the kingdom of France. Yet Normandy in the mid-eleventh century or even earlier seems to fit the definition of a state, with relatively settled boundaries, a powerful duke, and a strong sense of regional identity. Crucial to the question of sovereignty or independence was the relationship between the dukes and the kings of West Francia and then the Capetians. Those who wrote of Norman history from Dudo onwards were sensitive to the nuances of that relationship. If the dukes made acts of submission – and it is by no means certain that they did – what did these signify⁵? In 1120 the son and heir of Henry I did perform homage, but this act, as John Gillingham has pointed out, was in order that Louis VI would accept William as heir to Normandy, rather than his cousin⁶. Later it was said that homage had been performed to the son of Louis VI not to the king himself⁷. By this time the significance of such acts of homage was changing. For Jean-François Lemarignier it was a shift from *hommage en marche* to *hommage réel*⁸. The next

2. STRAYER, 1970.

3. BISSON, 2009.

4. BISSON, 1997.

5. See most recently, HAGGER, 2017, p. 254-265.

6. GILLINGHAM, 2007, p. 68; WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, R. A. B. Mynors (ed. and trans.), vol. 1, p. 734; SYMEON OF DURHAM, *Historia Regum, Opera Omnia*, T. Arnold (ed.), vol. 2, p. 258.

7. *The Warenne (Hyde) Chronicle*, E. M. C. Van Houts and Rosalind C. Love (ed. and trans.), p. 82. Eustace, son of King Stephen, is said to have performed homage in 1140 by GERVASE OF CANTERBURY, *Historical Works*, W. Stubbs (ed.), vol. 1, p. 112.

8. LEMARIGNIER, 1945, p. 92.

clear case of homage occurred in 1151⁹. Henry FitzEmpress as duke submitted to Louis VII¹⁰. John Gillingham has looked closely at the meetings between kings of France and dukes of Normandy and, arguing for a distinction between acts of homage, meetings, and visits, thinks that Henry II's homage in 1183 marked a turning point¹¹. I shall return to this point later.

Was there an Anglo-Saxon "State"?

The Anglo-Saxon kingdom was defined as a state by, amongst others, the late James Campbell in his 1991 Raleigh lecture¹². Whilst some have wondered about the usefulness of the term "state" in this context, there is a general acceptance that the kingdom was relatively closely governed¹³. Subsequent debate has continued to centre on the question of continuity and change after 1066. Did William and his Normans take over a well-developed apparatus of governance and make it work effectively as Haskins – and many other historians – thought¹⁴? Or, did the newcomers simply use native English officials and exploit English resources for what they could get out of them until governance began to break down in the early twelfth century and then collapsed more generally under Stephen, to be revived and reordered under Henry II¹⁵?

Was there an Anglo-Norman Empire?

Historians have grappled with different ways of describing the link between Normandy and England after 1066¹⁶. In their different ways the late Warren Hollister and John Le Patourel argued for a single political entity, rather than two. For Hollister this was a *regnum* and for Le Patourel it was an empire¹⁷. Recently the idea of empire has been explored by David Bates and Fanny Madeline¹⁸. David described William the Conqueror in his Ford Lectures as "the maker of empire"¹⁹. Of course, England was only one political entity in the British Isles. Although England and Normandy are the focus here, the Scottish and Welsh kingdoms bordered and interacted with England and Normandy.

9. The "*Brevis Relatio de Guillelmo Nobilissimo Comite Normannorum*" written by a monk of Battle Abbey, E. M. C. Van Houts (ed.), p. 44-45; *Roman de Rou de Wace*, A. J. Holden (ed.), vol. 1, lines 43-69.

10. KUHL, 2014.

11. GILLINGHAM, 2011.

12. CAMPBELL, 1995; DAVIES, 2003; REYNOLDS, 2003; FOOT, 2005; GREEN, 2017, p. 248–251.

13. MOLYNEAUX, 2015, p. 232-233.

14. See for example, GOLDING, 1994, p. 118.

15. CAMPBELL, 1975; WARREN, 1984.

16. I myself when I should have known better gave a paper titled "Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State": GREEN, 1989.

17. HOLLISTER, 1976; LE PATOUREL, 1976.

18. BATES, 2013; MADELINE, 2017.

19. BATES, 2013, chapter 3.

Governmental developments

Turning to the main themes of recent research into statebuilding in the Anglo-Norman world, there is, first of all, the governance of England and Normandy. What arrangements were made for deputies? As we know, in 1066 the Conqueror left his wife and loyal magnates in charge in Normandy²⁰. The absences from England both of the Conqueror and William Rufus were managed in different ways at different times²¹. In 1104 Henry I used his wife as regent, and after her death relied on Bishop Roger of Salisbury. Roger presided over the exchequer, and in 1123 was appointed viceroy during the king's absence in Normandy²². It used to be thought that in Normandy Bishop John of Lisieux had a comparable role, but this view has been challenged by Mark Hagger, who has argued that the king remained the sole source of authority²³.

How far were the people involved in governance confined to one side of the Channel or the other? How often was revenue moved? What about parallel developments to deal with practical problems? One was the increasing use of local justices or justiciars on both sides of the Channel²⁴; another was the farming out of revenues and the introduction of courts of audit, the exchequers²⁵. As well as parallel development was the introduction of practices developed in Normandy into England and vice versa. One example was the introduction into England of trial by battle which so far as is known, had not been used in Anglo-Saxon England²⁶. Another was the introduction into Normandy of writs, though these did not supersede the types of document more usually used in Normandy²⁷.

There is also the way military obligation developed in England and in Normandy after 1066, too often discussed in isolation from each other. It seems (though evidence is sketchy) that many Normans in 1066 accepted that they owed the duke service for at least some of their lands²⁸. In England, too, military obligation was owed on land²⁹. On both sides of the Channel, the great men were bound by oaths of loyalty and they and their retinues formed the core of

20. WILLIAM OF POITIERS, *The Gesta Guillelmi of William of Poitiers*, R. H. C. Davis and M. Chibnall (eds.), p. 178; ORDERIC VITALIS, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, M. Chibnall (ed.), vol. 2, p. 220.

21. WEST, 1966, p. 2-13; BATES, 1982.

22. GREEN, 2006, p. 79, 136, 182.

23. HAGGER, 2017, p. 350-357.

24. For justiciars in Normandy see now HAGGER, 2017, p. 351-352; for England see GREEN, 1986, p. 107-110; KARN, 2009.

25. HAGGER, 2017, p. 578-611 analyses Norman revenues and the evidence for a Norman exchequer, comparing them with the English evidence. The striking difference was the lack of direct taxation in Normandy, though Hagger (p. 587) takes at face value a solitary reference in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1117 to the taxes taken there, as well as in England, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition Volume 7 MS E: a semi-diplomatic edition with Introduction and Indices*, Susan Irvine (ed.), Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 2004, p. 119.

26. HUDSON, 2012, p. 731-732, 739-740.

27. HAGGER, 2009; BATES, 1985.

28. See most recently HAGGER, 2017, p. 664.

29. BROOKS, 2012.

the rulers' armies. In England after 1066 the distribution of land to the incomers was on the basis of a contract whereby the lord provided service for his land, and by the twelfth century that service was quantified. A similar trend is perceptible in Normandy, whereby the duke's tenants-in-chief were assessed for service in respect of their land³⁰. It is hard to see these as separate developments, not least because in many cases lords held land on both sides of the Channel. Understanding the range of possibilities of transfer, imitation, or parallel developments has enriched our understanding of governance.

New biographies

There have been several biographical studies of the Conqueror and his sons which have tackled the question of their involvement in governance. This might seem old-style "great man" history, but these biographies are very different from their predecessors. Studies of the Conqueror and William Rufus, necessarily forefront their role in war, or "hard power" to pick up Bates's use of the term³¹. A major theme of Bates's biography is violence and the extent to which the Conqueror conformed to contemporary norms of acceptable violence³². His regime brought peace, but peace involved holding down the native population through economic warfare in the north, the building of castles, and harsh justice³³. In the case of William Rufus war had to be financed, and the devices used by his chief agent, Ranulf Flambard, brought criticism from the chroniclers but, as his most recent biographer has pointed out, Rufus was also celebrated as a warrior and generous lord³⁴. As far as Robert Curthose was concerned, his reputation as a fine warrior established on the first crusade was acknowledged, but he was excoriated for his uselessness as duke by critics who were writing after his defeat and imprisonment³⁵. That his rule suffered from the destabilizing efforts of William Rufus and then of Henry I is clear. Richard Allen has recently reminded us of the duke's inability to exercise the same degree of influence over ecclesiastical appointments as his father³⁶.

Henry I's contribution has enjoyed a much better reputation. Those who wrote in the twelfth century after his death and in the context of the disorder that broke out on both sides of the Channel praised the peace he had brought to England and Normandy. In the twentieth century there were sharply different assessments of the fear he undoubtedly inspired, and of his personal contribution to administrative developments³⁷. By extending and consolidating his rule in

30. HAGGER, 2017, p. 667-674.

31. BATES, 2013, p. 4.

32. BATES, 2016. Cf. HAGGER, 2012.

33. LAMBERT, 2017, p. 349-361.

34. Discussed most recently by GILLINGHAM, 2015.

35. GARNETT, 2013; GREEN, 2000; AIRD, 2008.

36. ALLEN, 2010.

37. POOLE, 1955, p. 155; cf. HOLLISTER, 2001; GREEN, 2006.

northern England Henry achieved what none of his predecessors had done, a more complete integration of the north³⁸. Hagger has emphasized the parallel developments in finance and justice, the establishment of farms and exchequers, the rising use of justices and the way Henry sought to maintain law and order³⁹. There is certainly a case for saying that of the Norman rulers Henry achieved most by way of statebuilding. However, Bisson did not agree, commenting that this was not “governance” but an exercise of personal power⁴⁰. Nor was Henry’s rule an unqualified success, if we include, as we must, the years after 1120. By this time problems with the coinage were becoming acute⁴¹. His decision to have oaths sworn to his widowed daughter as his successor before her second marriage, caused problems⁴². The sheer range of his territories has been seen as imposing a degree of strain⁴³.

New themes and topics

In recent years there has been a focus on different aspects of rulership. The role of the two queens Matilda in deputizing for their husbands and complementing their rule is better understood⁴⁴. Ideas about good governance as reflected in narrative texts composed on both sides of the Channel have been studied, and were arguably more influential in restraining rulers’ behaviour than Bisson, for instance, allowed. Rituals such as crownwearings, feasting, gift-giving, and dress have been studied⁴⁵. The royal hunt was at once an opportunity for companionship and display albeit underpinned by arbitrary and punitive forest laws⁴⁶. The physical context of rulership has been studied, though much remains to be done. The grandeur of the White Tower, and the scale of western fortification in London, the castle and palace at Winchester, William Rufus’s great halls at Westminster and Caen, and the development of York as a northern capital all displayed wealth and power⁴⁷. The Norman frontier came to be ringed by stone castles built under Henry I⁴⁸.

38. GREEN, 2007.

39. HAGGER, 2017, chapters 8, 10.

40. BISSON, 2009, p. 180.

41. BLACKBURN, 1990.

42. GREEN, 2008.

43. STRINGER, 1993, p. 8-13.

44. For Matilda I see BATES, 2016, p. 169-170, 220-221, 291-294, 307-308, 433-435; for Matilda II, HUNEYCUTT, 2003.

45. For ritual and feasting see HAGGER, 2012, p. 57-84; GREEN, 2006, p. 289-295; for Anglo-Saxon England see GAUTIER, 2012; GAUTIER, 2006.

46. William’s love of hawking was attested by WILLIAM OF POITIERS, *Gesta Guillelmi*, p. 24, 148; for hunting see the famous obituary in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS E*, p. 97.

47. For Winchester see *Survey of Medieval Winchester*, 1985, 1990, vol. 2, p. 573-575; for Westminster see GEFREI GAIMAR, *Estoire des Engleis: History of the English*, I. Short (ed. and trans.), lines 5978-6110; for York see REES JONES, 2013, p. 91-93.

48. ROBERT OF TORIGNY, *Chronique*, L. Delisle (ed.), vol. 1, p. 164-165.

I have myself argued for a wider definition of power in the transition from war to peace. The lay lords provided the tools of conquest, and they played a key role in the Anglo-Norman state⁴⁹. They were literally in unknown territory. Bargains had to be negotiated about their obligations to the king and their rights over their newly-acquired lands⁵⁰. From the king's point of view it was crucial that the new lords accepted their obligations to provide military service and financial contributions (geld) towards ships, tribute, and payment of professional soldiers. In the past argument centred round the question of how precisely Norman ideas of lordship differed from those of their English predecessors, until the debate really ran out of steam. However, it has recently been argued that the great lords, or tenants-in-chief were granted exemption from geld on their demesne land, for which they would provide personal service, and their tenanted land would be liable for geld⁵¹. Liability to geld proved tricky: William Rufus promised to alleviate it in 1088 in a bid for support, as did Henry I in 1100⁵².

There is a long tradition of studying Norman lordships in England, but our knowledge of political geography in the duchy is still patchy. We also need a comparative survey of the powers of lords over their peasants⁵³. There has been a revolution in castle studies with important repercussions for how they are seen as symbols of power, on both sides of the Channel⁵⁴. First, English castles are seen as developing from earlier fortified residences⁵⁵. Secondly, their siting in the landscape, together with deer parks, ponds etc., has been emphasized⁵⁶. Thirdly, the form of hall-chamber towers may have been exported from England to Normandy rather than the other way round⁵⁷.

Bishops played a crucial role in the transition from war to peace in Norman England⁵⁸. The succession of newcomers, mainly Normans of whom the king approved, was crucially important in shaping the regime. Through a series of councils Archbishop Lanfranc was able to push ahead both with reforming Christian society and reorganizing the English church⁵⁹. Individual bishops, with great landed wealth at their disposal, competed with each other in the construction of vast new cathedrals⁶⁰. They established territorial archdeacons who began to hold church courts separate from shire courts⁶¹. Bishops had an essential role

49. GREEN, 2017, p. 100-124.

50. For discussion of grants of sake and soke see LAMBERT, 2017, p. 323-332; HUDSON, 2012, vol. 2, p. 289-129; GREEN, 2013.

51. PRATT, 2013.

52. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*..., p. 119; *Select Charters*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 119.

53. ARNOUX and MANEUVRIER (eds.), 2003; BLAIR, 2018, p. 408-415; FAITH, 1997.

54. COULSON, 2003; CREIGHTON, 2005.

55. BLAIR, 2018, p. 387-402.

56. LIDDIARD, 2005.

57. IMPEY, 1997, vol. 1, p. 219-241.

58. For the role of bishops as powerful figures, see GREEN, 2017, p. 125-146.

59. COWDREY, 2003, p. 120-172; *Autour de Lanfranc. Réforme et réformateurs dans l'Europe du Nord-Ouest (XI^e-XII^e siècles)*, 2015.

60. FERNIE, 2018.

61. COWDREY, 2003, p. 134-136.

in transmitting knowledge of English law and custom, which William pledged himself to uphold in 1066⁶². In England, as in Normandy, William kept close control over ecclesiastical appointments. So far as Normandy is concerned, the project to publish the *acta* of bishops will allow much closer comparison of the churches of Normandy and England, and their relations with Rome⁶³.

Benedictine abbeys, full of English monks, began to have Norman heads drawn from the great ducal houses, especially Jumièges, Fécamp, and Bec⁶⁴. It was in monastic communities that the great old English saints were particularly venerated, and the construction of new shrines brought natives and newcomers together in new solidarities. Benedictine communities, as Alain Boureau has argued, helped to shape ideas about how kings ought to behave, a point recently re-emphasized by Emily Winkler⁶⁵. Thanks to Véronique Gazeau we have a much clearer idea of the role of abbots in Norman society, and she has suggested that it was basically individuals, like Lanfranc at Caen, or Boso at Le Bec, who played a prominent role⁶⁶.

Greater consideration has been given to the location and type of frontiers, and to the nature of frontier society. Settled frontiers were, and are, after all, integral to states. The old view about the construction of Normandy was of a three-stage process, essentially complete by the mid-tenth century⁶⁷. Now, thanks to the work of Pierre Bauduin and other scholars, we are aware of a much more protracted process by which Normandy reached its historic limits⁶⁸. Mark Hagger, for instance, argued that only with the capture of Verneuil-sur-Avre in about 1120 did the duchy reach that point⁶⁹.

In the case of England, there were open frontiers to the north and west. In the north the fate of the southern portions of the pre-Viking kingdoms of Northumbria and Strathclyde had yet to be permanently decided. In both cases it was the Normans who established bridgeheads, through the building of a castle at Carlisle in the north-west, and in the north-east through the establishment of Norman lords, some as under-tenants of the bishop of Durham⁷⁰. In the north William Rufus and Henry I were able to use the claims to hereditary succession by the sons of Malcolm III to assert their own superior over- or high kingship, but they did not attempt to conquer land north of the Solway and Tweed⁷¹.

62. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, vol. 2, R. R. DARLINGTON and P. MCGURK (eds. and trans.), p. 606. For Bishop Ernulf of Rochester and law, both canon and secular, see CRAMER, 1989.

63. The *English Episcopal Acta* series is being paralleled by a project to publish the acts of Norman bishops. See ALLEN, 2015.

64. BARLOW, 1979, p. 186; for the effects on Bec, see GAZEAU, 1994, p. 132-134.

65. BOUREAU, 2001; WINKLER, 2017.

66. GAZEAU, 2007, vol. 1, p. 343-346.

67. See for example map 2 in BATES, 1982, p. 265.

68. BAUDUIN, 2004; HAGGER, 2017, p. 45-105; ID., 2012; ID., 2013; POWER, 2004; LOUISE, 1992-1993, vol. 1, p. 137-161; HICKS, 2013.

69. HAGGER, 2017, p. 184; for Henry I and Verneuil see LEMOINE-DESCOURTIEUX, 2011.

70. GREEN, 2007.

71. For the idea of over- or high- kingship see DAVIES, 2000, p. 4-30; BATES, 2013, p. 93-94.

In the west the situation was different. Here there were several local rulers who fought each other as well as the English. The frontier between England and Wales was shifting and the new Norman lords, like their English predecessors, soon made inroads into Welsh territory. King William saw himself as having inherited a superior or high kingship over Welsh rulers, and in 1081 he himself went into Wales as far as Cardiff⁷². In the late eleventh century, especially in the north, where the Welsh king Gruffydd ap Cynan allied with Magnus Barelegs, the Welsh made a comeback. Henry I's policy was different from his father's: he made two expeditions into Wales. He sought not to conquer but to overawe. He accepted submissions from Welsh princes and rewarded those prepared to stay loyal with subsidies. Those Normans who held territory in Wales were able to establish relatively autonomous lordships, and these, like the large lordships in the north-west, acted in effect to protect the more intensively settled midlands and south.

The differences between the Scottish and Welsh experiences are significant. The Scots rulers were styled as kings in charters and king lists and, although they were not anointed and crowned, their royal status was acknowledged by their southern neighbours⁷³. The Welsh rulers claimed royal status and, as in Scotland, genealogies provided a history of such claims but, it has been argued, their authority was not such as to form the basis of states, however small⁷⁴. Charter diplomatic provides an insight into changing political culture. It has been noted how variable royal styles were, with a shift in the later twelfth century to three houses only claiming authority over a wide region, Gwynedd, Deheubarth, and Powys⁷⁵. Thus the story of kings or princes in Britain is more complex than is usually suggested. Royal inauguration rites formed part of the story, as did the possession of an archbishopric. The kings of Scots were working to this end from at least the time of Alexander I and were ultimately successful, whereas the efforts of the Welsh were ultimately to fail. So changing political culture has to take account of the way Welsh and Scottish rulers saw themselves, and the way they were regarded by the more powerful English kings. Moreover, the significance of their acts of submission, too, changed over time. Though not all historians would

72. *Brut y Tywysogion or the Chronicle of the Princes. Peniarth MS 20 Version*, Thomas Jones (trans.), p. 17; *Brut y Tywysogion or the Chronicle of the Princes. Red Book of Hergest Version*, Thomas Jones (ed.), p. 31.

73. For the late appearance of a Scottish regnal narrative see BROWN, 2007, p. 48-61. The Norman kings did not challenge the Scots kings' claims to kingship but accepted their submissions as lesser to high kings. The authenticity of a key charter issued by King Edgar to Durham of 1095, in which he refers to himself as holding "the land (*terram*) of Lothian and kingdom of the Scots by the gift of my lord king William and by paternal inheritance" has been disputed. *Early Scottish Charters*, A. Campbell Lawrie (ed.), no. xv, p. 12-13; DUNCAN, 1958 thought the charter was genuine; DONNELLY, 1989 disputed this; DUNCAN, 1999 reasserted his original view. It may be argued that the terms "gift" and "inheritance" applied to both Lothian and Scotland, rather than "gift" to Lothian and "inheritance" to Scotland, and in any case reflect a Durham perspective. For the medieval Scottish state see now TAYLOR, 2016, p. 1-12.

74. MOORE, 1996, p. 50-51.

75. INSLEY, 2008; PRYCE, 2007, p. 49.

agree, the terms of the Treaty of Falaise in 1174 arguably marked a step-change in the relationship between the kings of Scots and England, by asserting English dominion over the Scottish kingdom⁷⁶.

Coined money and thus towns and cities were crucial to statebuilding. The importance of cities and towns such as Caen and Rouen is being recognized, though there are still gaps in our knowledge about other Norman towns⁷⁷. The role of London was particularly significant in the making of the English state, particularly from the reigns of Æthelred and then the Danish kings⁷⁸. Its importance was political, fiscal, and economic, as a centre for trade. The London mint played a major role in producing coined money for eleventh-century kings⁷⁹. The quality of English coinage, and the royal monopoly of coinage, were jewels in his crown⁸⁰. The Conqueror appreciated the city's importance. He chose to land on the south coast of England. He only approached London after his victory at Hastings, and he was quick to have castles built to dominate the city⁸¹. He and his successors could draw on wealthy merchants including a new Jewish community who were able to advance funds⁸². However, the diminishing supply of silver was causing severe difficulties by the early twelfth century, and came to a head in 1124 when Henry I ordered the mutilation of the English moneyers for adulterating the quality of coins⁸³. For the king a reliable supply of coin and access to those with wealth underpinned the transition from war to peace.

Conclusion

This paper began with the issue of terminology, and whether we can appropriately use the word "state" in connection, either with England, or Normandy, or with a single Anglo-Norman polity. There is no doubt that the governance of England was shaped by the Norman Conquest in terms of royal wealth and further integration of the realm. King William was vastly richer than his predecessor had been. He had reconfigured the political elite to suit his ends, and his influence over ecclesiastical preferment in England, as it had been in Normandy, was pervasive. His power was thus more immediate, even tyrannous, a point made by the chronicler Aelnoth of Canterbury when safely out of the country⁸⁴. The maintenance of the courts of shire and hundred helped to prevent too much privatization of justice in lords' courts, thus ensuring the development of royal

76. For the text see *English Historical Documents* II 1042–1189, D. C. Douglas and G. W. Greenaway (eds.), no. 26, p. 446–449.

77. JEAN-MARIE, 2000; *Society and Culture in Medieval Rouen, 911–1300*, 2013; HAGGER, 2017, p. 381–394, 506–520.

78. GREEN, 2017, p. 198–220.

79. NAISMITH, 2013.

80. ALLEN, 2012, p. 1–40.

81. GREEN, 2017, p. 201–205; IMPEY, 2018; ID., 2018.

82. GREEN, 1992; BROOKE, 1975, p. 222–233; ABULAFIA, 2011, p. 256–257.

83. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*..., p. 126.

84. VAN HOUTS, 1995, p. 837.

justice and the common law⁸⁵. Though regional differences remained important, the north was integrated into the realm more fully than before. The king still depended on the support of the great men, and the elite continued to participate in councils. These evolved seamlessly from the old English witan into parliament and eventually into the parliamentary democracy of modern times⁸⁶.

However, we must not get carried away by these signs of strength and centralized royal power. Much still depended on the personal presence of the ruler. For all the increasing numbers of officials and documents, when the ruler was absent it was still remarkably easy to defy his wishes. Secondly, much also depended on a smooth transition of power. The contested successions of 1087 and 1100 provoked insecurity and rebellion. Indeed George Garnett would go further and argue that these were technically *interregna*⁸⁷. The declining quality of English coinage, as noted above, caused problems for Henry I. And, if some Englishmen were able to transition to the new elite and thrive, bitterness remained, articulated by churchmen who saw their fellow countrymen passed over⁸⁸.

And what of Normandy? I suggested above that Normandy in 1066 arguably fulfilled basic criteria for a state: an effectively independent ruler, relatively stable boundaries, and a strong sense of identity. In the medium term William Rufus and Henry I had the resources to defend the duchy against the kings of France. Yet the desire to secure the duchy's future for his own heirs meant that Henry was prepared to acknowledge an obligation to provide military service⁸⁹. This, as well as his son's homage to the son of Louis VI, were straws in the wind. The frequent meetings of Henry II with Louis VII and then Philip Augustus, can only have increased tensions, especially in 1183 when Henry did homage to Philip Augustus. There was continuing sensitivity towards the suzerainty of the Capetians shown in the writings of Stephen of Rouen and Wace⁹⁰. Normandy was to lose its independence formally in 1204, but perhaps this should be seen as the end of a process with several key turning points, rather than a single event.

Finally, the problem remains of finding the most accurate term for the dominions ruled together for protracted periods after 1066. The descriptions "Norman Empire" or "Anglo-Norman state" are a convenient shorthand but hardly do justice to the complexities of relationships, both within the British Isles and between the kingdom and the duchy. This paper has focussed on research

85. GREEN, 1990; LAMBERT, 2017, p. 349-363.

86. MADDICOTT, 2010, p. 57-97.

87. GARNETT, 2007, p. 136-331.

88. Articulated especially by Eadmer and William of Malmesbury. For the former see EADMER, *Historia Novorum*, M. Rule (ed.), p. 224 and for William see most recently WINTERBOTTOM, 2010.

89. For Henry's acknowledgement of military obligation see SUGER, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, H. Waquet (ed.), p. 236. The inquisition into the fees of the bishop of Bayeux also recognized an obligation to the king of France, *Red Book of the Exchequer*, H. Hall (ed.), vol. 2, p. 646-647; NAVEI, 1935, p. 114; HAGGER, 2017, p. 669-670.

90. STEPHEN OF ROUEN, *Draco Normannicus, Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 2, R. Howlett (ed.), p. 707, 720, 760-761; WACE, *Roman de Rou*, i, part I, lines 5-6, 43-69; KUHLE, 2014, p. 427-428, 433-434.

trends devoted to agents and agencies of governance, and for reasons of space has said relatively little about contemporary perceptions as recorded in narrative sources. Yet chronicles make clear that both the kingdom and the duchy retained their own traditions and identities within a wider context, and so the discussion of terms will undoubtedly continue.

Bibliography

Sources

- The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, Volume 7 MS E: a semi-diplomatic edition with Introduction and Indices*, Susan Irvine (ed.), Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 2004.
- The “Brevis Relatio de Guillelmo nobilissimo comite Normannorum” written by a monk of Battle Abbey*, Elisabeth M. C. Van Houts (ed.), Camden Society, 5th Series, 10, 1997, p. 1-48.
- Brut y Tywysogion or the Chronicle of the Princes*. Peniarth MS 20 Version, Thomas Jones (trans.), Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1952.
- Brut y Tywysogion or the Chronicle of the Princes*. Red Book of Hergest Version, Thomas Jones (ed.), Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1955.
- The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, vol. 2, Reginald R. Darlington and Patrick McGurk (eds. and trans.), Oxford (Oxford Medieval Texts), 1998.
- EADMER, *Historia Novorum*, Martin Rule (ed.), London, Longman & Co (Rolls Series), 1884.
- Early Scottish Charters*, Archibald Campbell Lawrie (ed.), Glasgow, James MacLehose and sons, 1905.
- English Historical Documents II 1042-1189*, David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway (eds.), 2nd ed., London, Eyre Methuen, 1981.
- GEFFREI GAIMAR, *Estoire des Engleis: History of the English*, Ian Short (ed. and trans.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- GERVASE OF CANTERBURY, *Historical Works*, William Stubbs (ed.), London, Longman (Rolls Series), 1879-1880, 2 vols.
- ORDERIC VITALIS, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, Marjorie Chibnall (ed.), Oxford, Clarendon Press (Oxford Medieval Texts), 1969-1980, 6 vols.
- Red Book of the Exchequer*, Hubert Hall (ed.), London, printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office by Eyre and Spottiswoode (Rolls Series), 1896, 3 vols.
- ROBERT OF TORIGNY, *Chronique*, Léopold Delisle (ed.), Rouen, Société de l'histoire de Normandie, 1872-1873, 2 vol.
- Select Charters*, William Stubbs (ed.), 9th ed., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913.
- STEPHEN OF ROUEN, *Draco Normannicus, Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vol. 2, Richard Howlett (ed.), London, Longman, Rolls Series, 1885, p. 589-762.
- SUGER, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, Henri Waquet (ed.), Paris, Les Belles Lettres (Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Âge), 1929.

- SYMEON OF DURHAM, *Historia Regum, Opera Omnia*, Thomas Arnold (ed.), London, Longman and Co (Rolls Series), 1882-1885, vol. 2.
- WACE, *Roman de Rou de Wace*, A. J. Holden (ed.), Société des Anciens Textes Français, Paris, Picard, 1970-1973, 3 vol.
- The Warenne (Hyde) Chronicle*, Elisabeth M. C. Van Houts and Rosalind C. Love (ed. and trans.), Oxford, Clarendon Press (Oxford Medieval Texts), 2013.
- WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Roger A. B. Mynors (ed. and trans.), Rodney M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom (completed by), Oxford, Clarendon Press (Oxford Medieval Texts), 1998, 2 vols.
- WILLIAM OF POITIERS, *The Gesta Guillelmi of William of Poitiers*, Ralph H. C. Davis and Marjorie Chibnall (eds.), Oxford, Clarendon Press (Oxford Medieval Texts), 1998.

Studies

- ABULAFIA, Anna Sapir, "The Jews", in *A Social History of England 900-1200*, Julia C. CRICK and Elisabeth VAN HOUTS (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 256-264.
- AIRD, William M., *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy c. 1050-1134*, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2008.
- ALLEN, Richard, "Robert Curthose and the Norman Episcopate", *Haskins Society Journal*, 21, 2010, p. 87-112.
- ALLEN, Martin, *Mints and Money in Medieval England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- ALLEN, Richard, "Episcopal *acta* in Normandy. 911-1204: The Charters of the Bishops of Avranches, Coutances and Sées", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 37, 2015, p. 25-51.
- Autour de Lanfranc (1010-2010). Réforme et réformateurs dans l'Europe du Nord-Ouest (XI^e-XII^e siècles)*, Julia BARROW, Fabrice DELIVRÉ, Véronique GAZEAU (dir.), Caen, Presses universitaires de Caen, 2015.
- ARNOUX, Mathieu and MANEUVRIER, Christophe, "Le pays normand. Paysages et peuplement (IX^e-XIII^e siècles)", *Tabularia*, Guillaume de Volpiano: Fécamp et l'histoire normande, 2003. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/1835>.
- BARLOW, Frank, *The English Church 1066-1154: A history of the Anglo-Norman Church*, London, Longman, 1979.
- BATES, David, "The Origins of the Justiciarship", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 4, 1982, p. 1-12.
- BATES, David, *Normandy before 1066*, London, Longman, 1982.
- BATES, David, "The Earliest Norman Writs", *English Historical Review*, 100, 1985, p. 266-284.
- BATES, David, *The Normans and Empire. The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford during Hilary Term 2010*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- BATES, David, *William the Conqueror*, New Haven CT and London, Yale University Press, 2016.
- BAUDUIN, Pierre, *La Première Normandie (X^e-XI^e siècles). Sur les frontières de la haute Normandie. Identité et construction d'une principauté*, Caen, Presses universitaires de Caen, 2004.

- BISSON, Thomas N., "The 'Feudal Revolution'", *Past and Present. A Journal of Historical Studies*, 142, 1994, p. 6-42; 155, 1997, p. 208-225.
- BISSON, Thomas N., *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century. Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009.
- BLACKBURN, Mark, "Coinage and Currency under Henry I: a Review", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 13, 1990, p. 49-81.
- BLAIR, John, *Building Anglo-Saxon England*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2018.
- BOUREAU, Alain, *La Loi du Royaume. Les moines, le droit et la construction de la nation anglaise (XI^e-XIII^e siècles)*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2001.
- BROOKE, Christopher N. L. and KEIR, Gillian, *London 800-1216: The Shaping of a City*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1975.
- BROOKS, Nicholas, "The Archbishopric of Canterbury and the so-called Introduction of Knight-Service into England", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 34, 2012, p. 41-62.
- BROUN, Dauvit, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain: From the Picts to Alexander III*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- CAMPBELL, James, "Observations on English Government from the Tenth to the Twelfth Centuries", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 25, 1975, p. 39-54.
- CAMPBELL, James, "The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximum View", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 87, 1995, p. 39-65.
- COULSON, Charles, *Castles in Medieval Society. Fortresses in England, France and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- COWDREY, Herbert E. J., *Lanfranc, Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- CRAMER, Peter, "Ernulf of Rochester and early Anglo-Norman Canon Law", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 40, 1989, p. 483-510.
- CREIGHTON, Oliver H., *Castles and Landscapes: Power, Community and Fortification in Medieval England*, reprinted 2002 edition, London, Equinox, 2005.
- DAVIES, Robert Rees, *The First English Empire. Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093-1343*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- DAVIES, Robert Rees, "The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16, 2003, p. 280-300.
- DONNELLY, Joseph, "The Earliest Scottish Charters?", *Scottish Historical Review*, 68, 1989, p. 1-22.
- DUNCAN, Archibald Alexander McBeth, "The Earliest Scottish Charters", *Scottish Historical Review*, 37, 1958, p. 103-155.
- DUNCAN, Archibald Alexander McBeth, "Yes, the Earliest Scottish Charters", *Scottish Historical Review*, 78, 1999, p. 1-38.
- FAITH, Rosamond, *The English Peasantry and the Growth of Lordship*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1997.
- FERNIE, Eric, "1066 and Ecclesiastical Architecture", in *1066 in Perspective*, David BATES (ed.), Leeds, Royal Armouries, 2018, p. 187-203.

- FOOT, Sarah, "The Historiography of the Anglo-Saxon 'Nation State'" in *Power and the Nation in European History*, Leonard SCALES and Oliver ZIMMER (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 125-142.
- GARNETT, George, *Conquered England. Kingship, Succession, and Tenure 1066-1166*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- GARNETT, George, "Robert Curthose: The Duke who lost his Trousers", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 35, 2013, p. 213-243.
- GAUTIER, Alban, *Le Festin dans l'Angleterre anglo-saxonne (V^e-XI^e siècles)*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2006.
- GAUTIER, Alban, "Cooking and Cuisine in late Anglo-Saxon England", *Anglo-Saxon England*, 41, 2012, p. 373-406.
- GAZEAU, Véronique, "The Effect of the Conquest of 1066 on Monasticism in Normandy: the Abbeys of the Risle Valley", in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, David BATES and Anne CURRY (eds.), London, The Hambledon Press, 1994, p. 131-142.
- GAZEAU, Véronique, *Normannia monastica: princes normands et abbés bénédictins (X^e-XII^e siècle)*, Caen, Publications du Crahm, 2007, 2 vol.
- GENÊT, Jean-Philippe, "La Genèse de l'État moderne: Les enjeux d'un programme de recherche", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 118, 1997, p. 3-18.
- GENÊT, Jean-Philippe, "À propos de Pierre Bourdieu et la genèse de l'État moderne", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 201-202, 2014, p. 98-105.
- GILLINGHAM, John, "Doing Homage to the King of France", in *Henry II: New Interpretations*, Christopher HARPER-BILL and Nicholas VINCENT (eds.), Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2007, p. 63-84.
- GILLINGHAM, John, "The Meetings of the Kings of France and England, 1066-1204", in *Normandy and its Neighbours, 900-1250: Essays for David Bates*, David CROUCH and Kathleen THOMPSON (eds.), Turnhout, Brepols, 2011, p. 17-42.
- GILLINGHAM, John, *William II: The Red King*, London, Allen Lane, 2015.
- GOLDING, Brian, *Conquest and Colonisation: the Normans in Britain*, London, Macmillan Press, 1994.
- GREEN, Judith A., *The Government of England under Henry I*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- GREEN, Judith A., "Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State", *Historical Research*, 62, 1989, p. 115-134.
- GREEN, Judith A., *English Sheriffs to 1154*, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1990.
- GREEN, Judith A., "Financing Stephen's War", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14, 1992, p. 91-114.
- GREEN, Judith A., "Robert Curthose Reassessed", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 22, 2000, p. 95-116.
- GREEN, Judith A., *Henry I king of England and duke of Normandy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- GREEN, Judith A., "King Henry I and Northern England", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 17, 2007, p. 35-55.
- GREEN, Judith A., "Henry I and the Origins of the Civil War", in *King Stephen's Reign 1135-1154*, Graeme J. WHITE and Paul DALTON (eds.), Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2008, p. 11-26.

- GREEN, Judith A., "Forest Laws in England and Normandy in the Twelfth Century", *Historical Research*, 86, 2013, p. 416-431.
- GREEN, Judith A., *Forging the Kingdom: Power in English Society 973-1189*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- HAGGER, Mark, "The Earliest Norman Writs Revisited", *Historical Research*, 82, 2009, p. 181-205.
- HAGGER, Mark, *William, King and Conqueror*, London, I. B. Tauris, 2012.
- HAGGER, Mark, "How the West was won: the Norman Dukes and the Cotentin, c. 987-c. 1087", *Journal of Medieval History*, 38, 2012, p. 20-55.
- HAGGER, Mark, "Confrontation and Unification: Approaches to the Political History of Normandy, 911-1035", *History Compass*, 11/6, 2013, p. 429-442.
- HAGGER, Mark, *Norman Rule in Normandy 911-1144*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2017.
- HICKS, Leonie, "The Concept of the Frontier in Norman Chronicles: A Comparative Approach", in *Norman Expansion: Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, Keith John STRINGER and Andrew JOTISCHKY (eds.), Farnham, Ashgate, 2013, p. 143-164.
- HOLLISTER, C. Warren, "Normandy, France and the Anglo-Norman Regnum", *Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies*, 51, 1976, p. 202-242, reprinted in *Monarchy, Magnates and Institutions in the Anglo-Norman World*, London, Hambledon Press, 1986, p. 17-57.
- HOLLISTER, C. Warren, *Henry I*, New Haven CT and London, Yale University Press, 2001.
- HUDSON, John, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England*. II, 871-1216, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- HUNEYCUTT, Lois L., *Matilda of Scotland. A Study in Medieval Queenship*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2003.
- IMPEY, Edward, "La demeure seigneuriale en Normandie entre 1125 et 1225 et la tradition anglo-normande", in *L'Architecture Normande au Moyen Âge*, Maylis BAYLÉ (ed.), Caen, Presses universitaires de Caen, 1997, 2 vol., vol. 1, p. 219-241.
- IMPEY, Edward, "William the Conqueror and the Capture of London in 1066", in *1066 in Perspective*, David BATES (ed.), Leeds, Royal Armouries, 2018, p. 35-47.
- IMPEY, Edward, "William the Conqueror and London's Early Castles", in *1066 in Perspective*, David BATES (ed.), Leeds, Royal Armouries, 2018, p. 96-108.
- INSLEY, Charles, "Kings, Lords, Charters, and the Political Culture of Twelfth-Century Wales", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 30, 2008, p. 133-153.
- JEAN-MARIE, Laurence, *Caen aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: espace urbain, pouvoirs et société*, Caen, La Mandragore, 2000.
- KARN, Nicholas, "Secular Power and its Rewards in Dorset in the late Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries", *Historical Research*, 82, 2009, p. 2-16.
- KUHL, Elizabeth, "Time and Identity in Stephen of Rouen's *Draco Normannicus*", *Journal of Medieval History*, 40, 2014, p. 421-438.
- LAMBERT, Tom, *Law and Order in Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- LEMARIGNIER, Jean-François, *Recherches sur l'hommage en marche et les frontières féodales*, Lille, Université de Lille, 1945.

- LEMOINE-DESCOURTIEUX, Astrid, *La frontière normande de l'Avre. De la fondation de la Normandie à sa réunion au domaine royal (911-1204). Évolution de la maîtrise militaro-économique d'un territoire frontalier*, Mont-Saint-Aignan, Publications des universités de Rouen et du Havre, 2011.
- LE PATOUREL, John, *The Norman Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1976.
- LIDDIARD, Robert, *Castles in Context: Power, Symbolism and Landscape, 1066-1500*, Macclesfield, London, Windgather Press, 2005.
- LOUISE, Gérard, *La Seigneurie de Bellême (X^e-XII^e siècles). Dévolution des pouvoirs territoriaux et construction d'une seigneurie de frontière aux confins de la Normandie et du Maine à la charnière de l'an Mil*, Flers, Le Pays bas-normand, 1992-1993, 2 vol.
- MADDICOTT, John, *The Origins of the English Parliament 924-1327*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- MADELIN, Fanny, "The Idea of 'Empire' as Hegemonic Power under the Norman and Plantagenet Kings (1066-1204)", *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 40, 2018, p. 179-196.
- MOLYNEAUX, George, *The Formation of the English Kingdom in the Tenth Century*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- MOORE, David, "Gruffudd ap Cynan and the Medieval Welsh Polity", in *Gruffudd ap Cynan. A Collaborative Biography*, Kari L. MAUND (ed.), Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1996, p. 1-59.
- NAISMITH, Rory, "London and Its Mint, c. 880-1066: a preliminary survey", *British Numismatic Journal*, 83, 2013, p. 44-74.
- NAVEL, Henri, "L'enquête de 1133 sur les fiefs de l'évêché de Bayeux", *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, 42, 1935, p. 5-80.
- POOLE, Austin Lane, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2nd edition, 1955.
- POWER, Daniel, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and early Thirteenth Centuries*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- PRATT, David, "Demesne Exemption from Royal Taxation in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England", *English Historical Review*, 128, 2013, p. 1-34.
- PRYCE, Huw, "Welsh Rulers and European Change, c. 1100-1282", in *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of Rees Davies*, Huw PRYCE and John WATTS (eds.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 37-51.
- REES JONES, Sarah, *York: The Making of a City 1068-1350*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- REUTER, Timothy, "All quiet except on the Western Front? The emergence of pre-modern forms of Statehood in the central Middle Ages", in Timothy REUTER, *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, Janet LAUGHLAND NELSON (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 432-458.
- REYNOLDS, Susan, "There were States in Medieval Europe; a Response to Rees Davies", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16, 2003, p. 550-555.
- Society and Culture in Medieval Rouen, 911-1300*, Leonie V. HICKS and Elmer BRENNER (eds.), Turnhout, Brepols, 2013.
- STRAYER, Joseph Reese, *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State*, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press, 1970.

- STRINGER, Keith J., *The Reign of Stephen. Kingship, Warfare and Government in Twelfth-Century England*, London, Routledge, 1993.
- Survey of Medieval Winchester*, Derek KEENE (ed.), 1 vol in 2, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985, 1990.
- TAYLOR, Alice, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland 1124-1290*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- The Oxford Handbook of World History*, Jerry H. BENTLEY (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press. Online, DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199235810.001.0001.
- TILLY, Charles, *Coercion, Capital and European States AD 990-1990*, Cambridge, MA, Blackwell, 1992.
- TILLY, Charles, "States, State Transformation and War", *Oxford Handbook of World History*, Jerry H. BENTLEY (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- VAN HOUTS, Elisabeth, "The Norman Conquest through European Eyes", *English Historical Review*, 110, 1995, p. 832-853.
- WARREN, W. Lewis, "The Myth of Norman Administrative Efficiency", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, 34, 1984, p. 113-132.
- WEST, Francis J., *The Justiciarship in England 1066-1232*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- WINKLER, Emily A., *Royal Responsibility in Anglo-Norman Historical Writing*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- WINTERBOTTOM, Michael, "William of Malmesbury and the Normans", *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 20, 2010, p. 70-77.