

Școala doctorală interdisciplinară:

Facultatea de Teologie „Sfântul Andrei Șaguna”

Domeniul de doctorat: Teologie

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

**Anglo-Saxon Migration in the Byzantine  
Empire in the Eleventh Century; Political  
Implications and Religious Implications  
Rezumat**

doctorand:

**Petruț-Ciprian Terciu**

conducător științific:

**Pr. Prof. Dr. Nicolae Chifăr**

## Table of Contents

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Introduction .....  |  |
| Roman and Celtic Christianity in anglo-saxon world .....  |  |
| Roman Britain.....  |  |
| Anglo-Saxon Britain.....  |  |
| The Relations between anglo-saxons and byzantines until the eleventh century .....              |  |
| Viking Age: Danes and Norsmen .....   |  |
| Viking activity in the Orient .....   |  |
| The Byzantine Empire .....  |  |
| The Relations between the British Isles, Scandinavia, Kievan Rus and the Byzantine Empire ..... |  |
| The Norman conquest of England.....   |  |
| The period before the anglo-norman war .....  |  |
| The norman invasion of Duke William .....   |  |
| Anglo-Saxon resistance .....  |  |
| The norman conquest consequences.....   |  |
| The english migration in the Byzantine Empire.....  |  |
| From Byzantine Italy to Norman Italy .....  |  |
| The Great Schism .....  |  |
| Pope Gregory the VII-th .....   |  |
| The Seljuq Turcks .....   |  |
| The decline of the Byzantine Empire .....   |  |
| The Battle of Manzikert.....  |  |
| The colapse of the empire and the english migration .....                                       |  |
| Alexios I Comnenos .....  |  |
| The First Crusade and the english participation .....   |  |
| The Comnenian Restauration .....  |  |

The decay of the Byzantine Empire and the english crusade .....

The Forth Crusade .....

The exiled empire .....

The Slow death of the empire.....

Conclusions .....

Bibliography.....



Key words: Christianity, Anglo-Saxons, Migration, Colonies, Reconquest

Christianity in Britain has been born in the early centuries, spreading with Romanity, Constantine the Great himself being crowned emperor in this provocation. But after the withdrawal of the Roman troops in 410 by Emperor Honorius, and after the invasion of the Saxons, the English and the Jutes, Christianity almost disappeared, keeping only the British natives who withdrew from the Saxons on the Cornwall Peninsula in Wales and the north coast of Roman Britain.

St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, will enter the scene here. He was descended from a Christian family in the prosperous Roman province of Britain, his father being a deacon, and his grandfather a priest. At the age of 16 he was kidnapped by Irish pirates and taken to Ireland as a slave, where he was tending the sheep. Here he found a completely foreign world to the Roman one with which he was familiar with, the Irish society in the fifth century was still in the Iron Age. Under these conditions, Patrick found his refuge in Christianity, constantly praying, and succeeding in giving meaning to the life-full of difficulties he faces. After six years, he managed to flee from Ireland and return to Britain, but here he was shocked to see how much the world he had known had changed: foreign invaders everywhere, destroyed and depopulated cities, exterminated Christianity and paganism restored. After spending some time in France where he deepened his theological knowledge, he turned to the country that captured him and sent him to slavery. Here in Ireland, he headed directly to the center of the royal power, succeeding in converting the king, and with him the entire nation passed to faith in Christ despite the vehement opposition of the Celtic druids. From now on, Irish Christianity will take a spectacular turn, evolving uniquely and separately from the rest of Europe. With strong monastic influences from Egypt on the old maritime route founded by the Phoenicians, Celtic Christianity will bring a period of glory to the Church in the area bearing the name "The Age of Saints." The number of monasteries has begun to grow spectacularly, multiplying throughout the island, and profoundly changing the society it has brought from the Iron Age to an era of thriving culture and profound theology. Ireland, like Christian Egypt, had become a refuge of the monks eager to meet with God, who retreated to the wild savagery of the island, and later founded new and new monasteries. In Celtic Christianity the Abbots had a much higher authority than that of the bishops, this situation continuing until the control of Rome and the papal seat on the island, which led to an inversion of power poles in the Irish Church.

In this universe of faith and saints, another legend of Celtic Christianity entered: St. Columba. After a bloody conflict he had caused because of a copy of a manuscript, he had to leave Ireland. Together with 12 disciples, he headed for the kingdom of Dalriada, a maritime state comprising the Ulster region of northern Ireland and the south west coast of Scotland, with its capital at the ancient Dunadd Fort. Here St. Columba converted the entire monarchy, obtaining from the king an island on which to establish a monastery. He was awarded Iona Island off the western coast of Scotland, where he founded a magnificent monastery that would become a true focal point of culture and Christianity in the area.

From Iona, Celtic Christianity spread throughout Scotland, converting them, after which passed the Hadrian's wall to Britain, where the Holy Bishop Aidan founded a monastery on the isolated island of Lindisfarne, as important as that on the island Iona. Concurrently with the Irish tradition, the Roman Christianity emerged on the British island in the south of the Kent, brought by Augustin of Canterbury.

The two forms of Christianity coexisted peacefully for a while, but the divisions began to appear in the Northumbrian kingdom during the godly king Oswald. The conflict was not of a doctrinal nature, but of a calendar nature: namely, when the Resurrection is celebrated? The Irish retained an old calculation of the Great Fast and the Resurrection, not being in agreement with the rest of the Church that had adopted the Easter date from the first Ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325. Thus we have two different dates of Easter in the same kingdom. King Oswald was a strong follower of the Ionian tradition, spending himself much of his youth on the island when he was exiled. But the Queen followed the Roman tradition. The legend says that after the Easter celebration, King Oswald wanted to fulfill his marital duties but was disappointed to find out that the queen was fasting according to the Roman tradition. To avoid such moments but also to reach a consensus and unity in the Church, the King convened a council at Whitby in the seventh century, precisely in 664. Following this synod he accepted the Roman tradition, Celtic Christianity gradually declined after this moment. The synods would look to the powerful Rome and not to some monks isolated far away on an island. Disappointed, the Irish left the council and retired to Lindisfarne and Iona. The Roman tradition would gain more and more land in Britain at this time.

In 792, the silence of the Lindisfarne monastery was to be permanently laid. On the horizons of the sea the Viking warriors appeared in their ships,. Without mercy, they killed the monks and destroyed the monastery, carrying precious books, relics and treasures with them in Scandinavia. The same monastery will have the Jonah monastery. Here, all the

monks would be brought together and killed. The place would be called the Gulf of Martyrs. From now on, Celtic Christianity would gradually withdraw from history.

This year was to be a beginning in a new phase of European history, namely the Viking era, which lasted for three centuries until the 1100s and would change the destinies of both the Saxons and the Byzantines.

The Danish attacks on the Lindisfarne and Iona Monasteries are very brutal and it is quite safe to say that they were determined by the expansion of Carol the Great into Saxony and Jutland. Its formidable force challenging the role of the Byzantine Empire as the heir of Rome and leader of the Christian oikumene, threatened the Danish territories through its campaigns directed against Saxony and the North East Slavs. The force with which he has subjected the Saxons and the violence he converted to Christianity has led the neighboring Danes to counterattack, and the beginning of the Scandinavian era is precisely a reaction against the expansionist actions of the Carolingians. Six years after the first attacks on Britain, the Danes devastate the northern coasts of France, which causes Carol the Great to build true fortifications of the coastguard at the mouths of the rivers, which caused the Nordic raids to end for 20 years .

As far as the Vikings' attacks on the British Isles were concerned, they resumed with great intensity in 834 when the Danes and Norwegians attacked the Thames estuary. The political situation of the Anglo-Saxon states during the first Scandinavian invasions was a precarious one, characterized by numerous internal conflicts and the decline of Northumbria as a dominant state and the ascension of Mercia under King Aethelbald (716-757). Although he was a skilful politician, Aethelbald was put in an unfavorable light by his subjects because of his immoral life and conflicts with the Church represented by Archbishop Cuthbert. Mercia's dominant position continued under King Offa (757-796). During his reign, Mercia witnessed the apogee due in particular to the king's expansionist military campaigns directed against the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, but also against the Celts in Wales. In order to set a clear border and to prevent the raids of the Welsh, the King ordered the construction of a wave of land similar to those built by the Romans, from north to south, also called Offa's dyke, separating Wales from Mercia, a border that will become a historic and will ethnically and culturally separate the two peoples. Offa is also responsible for his legislative decrees, which will be called Mercia's law, and will only be fully implemented during the reign of King Alfred the Great, but also for close contacts, not without tense situations, with the empire of Carol the Great. After the death of King Offa, Mercia begins to decay and loses its

privileged position, leaving room for the permanent ascension of the kingdom of Wessex led by King Egbert.

King Egbert was born around 771-775, being the son of King Ealhmund of Kent. His father could not maintain for a long time his independence from the Mercia kingdom led by Offa, and Egbert was forced to flee to Wessex, where he had to flee again because of the intrigue of the kings Beorhtric of Wessex and Offa de Mercia. The Anglo-Saxon chronicle mentions that Egbert spent 13 years in the court of Charles the Great, where he learned the way of the Carolingian government. With the support of Charles the Great, after Beorhtric's death in 802, Egbert occupied the throne of the Wessex. It was an expansive and aggressive reign, attacking the British kingdom of Cornwall several times.

In 825, one of the most significant battles in Anglo-Saxon history at Ellandun took place between Beornwulf, King of Mercia and Egbert of Wessex. Victory belonged to Egbert, and the consequences of this battle were irreversible. Mercia has forever lost its dominant position, allowing the kingdom of Wessex to assume it, in the first phase, by absorbing the kingdom of Essex. Instigated by Egbert's victory against Beornwulf, the East Anglia revolted and declared independence from the Mercian kingdom. Two decisive battles have killed both Beornwulf and his successor Ludeca, which has once again strengthened the independence of East Anglia over Mercia. Moreover, in 829, Egbert subjugated Mercia and exerted its supremacy over Northumbria, but that did not take long, since a year later, Mercia's independence was restored by Wiglaf, but this kingdom could no longer impose its former domination.

The apogee of the kingdom of Wessex and King Egbert began to fall sharply after 829, largely probably due to the lack of help provided by the Carolingians who were busy themselves with domestic problems. Mercia, Kent and East Anglia are under the influence of Wessex. At the same time, the Danes reappeared in the British landscape, defeating Egbert in 836 at Carhampton, but two years later the Vikings and Welsh are defeated in Cornwall.

Egbert dies in 838, leaving behind a much stronger kingdom than when he took over and at the same time a powerful legacy for the outspoken accomplishments of his nephew Alfred the Great.

Initially, the attacks of the Vikings in Western Europe were seasonal, focusing mainly on raid, robbery and human trafficking, but since 840 when the Scandinavians first wintered in a foreign territory, notably in the north France at the mouth of the Loire, the prospect of colonizing new territories becomes for them a favorable matter for returning to the frozen and hostile Scandinavia.

From a social, cultural and technological point of view, the Scandinavians were far behind Europe, still in the Iron Age. Their state organization was almost inexistent, large groups of people gathered around an influential and charismatic leader who could promise them war and wealth. The Nordic society was predominantly agrarian and warrior like, but the Scandinavian peninsula left little room among the vast forests, tall mountains and abundant snow, for practicing agriculture, and providing a decent living for the population in full demographic rising. At the same time, the hereditary system based on the firstborn right left many noble sons without enough inheritance from their forerunners. Driven by the hope of new opportunities for enriching and obtaining eternal fame, thanks to their keen spirit and thanks to their advanced technology in the field of maritime and river navigation, many Danes and Norwegians started off to the coasts of Western Europe.

Attacks on the Lindisfarne, Monkwearmouth-Jarrow Abbey, and Iona Monasteries have sparked off the Nordic, as they have found impressive fortunes left without any minimal defense. It is wrong to consider the decisive factor of these attacks, the anti-Christian religious spirit that the Scandinavians could have practiced at these times. Simply, these important monastic centers on the coast of Britain were too easy prey for the Vikings.

Beyond the rich, unprotected monasteries, the Nordic found state formations in Britain, four in number in the middle of the nineteenth century - Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia and Wessex - more or less prepared to face the Scandinavian attacks. As we have already seen, there were two major attacks on Wessex during King Egbert reign, the first led to the Nordic victory, and the second to the English victory. Having objectively measured the reactionary power of the English States, the Danish leaders closely followed by the Norwegian have decided that it is time to launch a full invasion of Britain.

The Danish Army or the great pagan army, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle calls it, landed in Britain in 865 and for 14 years waged war against the four Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Although it is called the Great Army, its number could not exceed a few thousand Scandinavian warriors, but this number is much higher than the one the British were used to, being up to now the most powerful Scandinavian force invading the British Isles. According to Icelandic chronicles, the Danish-Norwegian army was led by Halfdan Ragnarson, Uba and Imar (Ivar) (the Boneless), all three being sons of the legendary Danish king Ragnar Lodbrok.

The starting point of the invasion was East Anglia, where the king made peace with the Vikings by offering horses and supplies. After spending the winter in this province, the Danes headed for Northumbria. The Anglo-Saxons in the north paid the Scandinavians huge amounts of money and accepted a puppet leader to serve the interests of the Danes.

Immediately after this episode, the Vikings invaded the kingdom of Mercia and captured Nottingham in 867, the most important urban center of the kingdom. The King of Mercia begged the King of Wessex for assistance. The combined army of the two kingdoms could not lift the siege of the city, and the Vikings left it only after they had received colossal sums of money. They returned to Northumbria where they spent the fall of 868 and almost full year 869, then headed back to East Anglia. This time, the east angles led by King Edmund met the Vikings on the battlefield, but they were utterly defeated, and their king was captured and martyred in a tragic and brutal manner by Imar for refusing to give up his Christian faith. The heroism he faced with his violent death made King Edmund the patron saint of England in the Middle Ages, and his cult had an impressive spread and popularity in the early years following his martyrdom.

In 871, another army arrived from Scandinavia under Bagsecg. After the merger of the two armies, they turned against Wessex, but the Vikings were defeated by Alfred, the brother of King Aethelred in the Battle of Ashdown, killing Bagsecg in this confrontation. Three months later, King Aethelred dies and is succeeded by the throne by Alfred, who may become perhaps the most remarkable king on the throne of England, one of the two English monarchs who have received the title of "the Great" along with Cnut, king of England, Denmark and Norway, stating that King Cnut was Scandinavian and not Anglo-Saxon.

The information about Alfred the Great's life is quite rich and comes largely from the work of the learned Welsh Bishop, Asser. Alfred was the youngest son of King Aethelwulf and nephew of King Egbert of Wessex. According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, he traveled to Rome at the age of four, where Pope Leon IV named him consul. It is supposed to have spent a few years in the court of the Emperor of the Franks, Charles the Bold (840-877) who was also his grandfather from his mother side, Judith.

At the death of his father in 858, kingdom of Wessex was divided between his three older brothers: Aethelbald, Aethelberht and Aethelred. The reigns of the first two brothers were irrelevant, but with the reign of his third brother, Aethelred de Wessex, Alfred's remarkable and stunning ascension began, precisely in the turmoil of the Scandinavian invasion.

We find Alfred fighting in the unsuccessful campaign backed by the Wessex kingdom in Mercia when Imar, the Danish leader, occupied Nottingham. During the year 870 there were a series of violent clashes between the Danish and the Anglo-Saxon armies, with victories and defeats on both sides to which Alfred was most active. But the important victory at Ashdown helped Alfred debut as the leader of desperate English resistance. Despite the

recent victory, the Anglo-Saxon army lost the battle of Merton waged a few weeks after Ashdown. Within three months, King Aethelred died, leaving the kingdom in the hands of Alfred. Although Aethelred had two sons of early age who had obvious pre-eminence at the throne, Alfred's ascension was uncontested, both because of the extremely fragile situation of the kingdom and of the desperate war with the Danes. While Alfred was busy with his brother's funeral ceremonies, the Danes won an important victory against the English army, prompting the king to ask for peace and the release of his territories, but the terms of the armistice are not known to us, though most likely, Alfred paid the Vikings, as Mercia and Northumbria did before him. The fact is that for five years, the Vikings have dealt with the rest of Britain, leaving Wessex for further campaigns. The warrior spirit of the Scandinavians was reanimated by a new leader of the Vikings, named Guthrum. In 876 he attacked the kingdom of Wessex where he occupied the city of Wareham. Alfred encircled them, but after the failed negotiations and in the shelter of the night, the Scandinavians managed to flee.

In January 878, the Danes launched a surprise attack on the fortress where Alfred spent Christmas, passing through the sword all the inhabitants except Alfred and his companions who could barely escape with their lives, retreating to the Somerset marshes. This dramatic episode represents the culmination of both Alfred's life and his resilience to the violence and horrors of the Northern invasion. From here, from the marshes of Somerset, Alfred managed to organize an impressive and effective resistance, recruiting all the people capable of carrying weapons from neighboring counties and with this improvised army, the king turned to counter-offensive. Inspired by the beautiful character of the king, his piety and the courage with which he was endowed, the English attacked forcefully and won a decisive victory in the battlefield of Edington. Defeated and frightened, the Scandinavians retreated to Chippenham, but Alfred constantly harassed them, triggering a tight siege. The serious lack of supplies forced the Danes to surrender to the king. The condition imposed by Alfred the Scandinavians was that Guthrum convert to Christianity, which happened three weeks later at the King's court. Baptism was celebrated with great fast and enthusiasm, and Alfred became the spiritual father to Guthrum.

On this occasion, Alfred and Guthrum concluded the famous Wedmore treaty that sets the borders of Wessex with the Danish territories. The Kingdom of Mercia was split between Alfred and Guthrum, London returning to Wessex. Danelaw was the name of the border between the English and the Vikings, as well as the entire territory mastered by the Scandinavians, where the Danish law ruled. This division would have long-term effects, with

many Danes settling in the East and North of England, providing these regions with important elements of Scandinavian culture and civilization. At the same time, York, the old Eboracum, the city that proclaimed St. Constantine the Great as the Roman emperor in 306, was to become the most important Scandinavian center in Britain and the capital, where Ivar would rule his own viking realm of Northumbria, the territories on the coast of Ireland, as well as the Kingdom of Laithlinn in the islands of Hebride, Orkney and on the west coast of Scotland. Guthrum will leave Wessex along with what remains of his army, and will retreat to East Anglia where he will be proclaimed king and will rule it until his death, around 890. The followers of Alfred the Great continued the work of their predecessor and led the war of liberation from Scandinavian domination further. In the year 899, Alfred died and was followed to the throne by his son Edward the Elder. He succeeded in defeating the Vikings repeatedly and conquering the Midlands and East Anglia in 917. A year later, after the death of his sister Aethelflaed, Edward occupied Mercia, which he annexed to his kingdom. Thus, the entire Anglo-Saxon land up to the Humber River was united under the scepter of one king. Only Northumbria occupied by the Vikings was missing from the union of the whole kingdom. This mission will come to Edward's son, Athelstan.

Athelstan is perhaps one of the most prominent Anglo-Saxon kings who occupied the throne of England. Athelstan is the first to be the title of King of the English, this event taking place in 927. Like his grandfather Alfred, perhaps even to a greater extent, Athelstan had strong propensities for culture and faith, being a man of profound spirituality who, unlike his father Edward, has often supported the Church, being the one who encouraged the introduction of Benedictine rules in England. He was a relentless follower of Alfred's administrative reforms, centralizing a lot of power in England. At the same time, Athelstan maintained diplomatic relations with the important courts of Western Europe, creating a Carolingian empire of the Anglo-Saxons. During his time, England became the most important power in the West.

It began in 924 under not very favorable auspices. He was recognized as a king in Mercia, not in Wessex, where his stepbrother was chosen, but he did not survive the election for a long time because of poor health. After the last resistances ceased, Athelstan was recognized as king of the Anglo-Saxons in 925. Two years later, in 927, Athelstan conquered the last remnants of the viking kingdom of York, thus uniting for the first time in history all of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms under one scepter. By renouncing the Anglo-Saxon title, Athelstan was proclaimed for the first time, King of the English.

His ascension did not stop here, but continued with the submission of the Welsh in the first phase. In 934, Athelstan invaded Scotland led by Constantine II with the aim of being recognized as overlord by the Scottish king. His mission has achieved its purpose, not without consequences, though. In 937, a coalition formed by Viking King Olaf Guthfrithson of Dublin and Constantine II of Scotland invaded England, but they were defeated by Athelstan in the bloody massacre of Brunanburh. This victory, though earned with difficulty and blood, is seen by many scholars of Anglo-Saxon history, and rightly as one of the most important battles in England's history. If Athelstan had lost the struggle, then everything that his predecessors had accomplished and everything that materialized during his reign would have broken down, and the English kingdom would have been destroyed.

After the death of King Athelstan, the Vikings will attack England again and capture York, but they will be defeated in 954, and their last king, Erik, will be banished from the British Isles.

In the year 1002, in incomprehensible terms, English King Athelred ordered the massacre of the Danish inhabitants of England, which led to the death of several thousand Scandinavians. This unhealthy act will trigger a new, much more numerous Danish invasion of this time that will threaten the English kingdom.

The massacre ordered by English King Ethelred against the Danish people in Britain in the year 1002 had serious repercussions on England, triggering a full scale invasion of the Danes. First of all, a careful analysis of the political, social and religious situation in Scandinavia is needed.

At that time, the Danish throne was occupied by the king Svein Forkbeard, a tough and severe man who won the throne only after brutally removing his father, Harold Bluetooth, the first Christian king of the Danes. His biography, though often contested by some historians, is found in the famous Icelandic saga *Heimskringla*, written by Snorri Sturlson in the 13th century, as well as in the *Acts of the Bishops of Hamburg*, written by Adam de Bremen, a subjective and doubtful description of his reign.

His ascension to the Danish throne took place in 986. At that time, the Danish kings also occupied the throne of Norway, which Svein inherited from his father, the throne which he lost between 995-1000 in favor of the remarkable Norwegian king, Olaf I Tryggvason.

The first invasion of England took place between 1002 and 1005, but a famine that ravaged the country forced Svein to leave Britain. Other Danish raids took place between 1006-1007 and 1009-1012, but in 1013, Svein himself led a total invasion of England.

According to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, King Svein came with his fleet in Britain where he easily conquered Eanglia, Northumbria and the kingdom of Lindsey. He then descended to Oxford, which he conquered, then Winchester, and then headed for London. In London, English resistance was remarkable, which forced Svein to bypass the royal city for a while, but eventually the Londoners surrendered fearing a possible massacre. King Ethelred sent his two sons, Edward and Alfred, to Normandy, and then went to exile. On Christmas Day of 1013, Svein I of the Danes was crowned King of England, but did not enjoy his victory, dying shortly. His son, Harald II, was crowned King in Denmark, but the Danes in England proclaimed his brother Cnut as king, while the English sent to Ethelred in Normandy to come and reoccupy the English throne.

Returning to England in 1014, Ethelred managed to drive Cnut out of the country, but he would come back a year later. Upon his return to England, Cnut found the kingdom divided because Ethelred's son, Edmund Ironside, rebelled against his father and proclaimed himself king in the Danish part of the kingdom.

The Danish invasion of 1015 was a very intense one, similar to that of 865. Wessex was the first English kingdom to surrender to Cnut's forces, and then much of Mercia changed sides along with Eadric Streona, its leader. The English king's forces could not stop the advance of the Danish army that continued its campaign in the north where Northumbria was occupied.

After much of England fell into Cnut's hands, he headed for London, where Edmund strengthened his power after the death of his father, Ethelred. Prior to the Danish arrival in London, Edmund launched campaigns in Wessex where he met a Danish army in two undecided battles. The siege of London was finally lifted by the Danes because of the ferocity of Edmund's fighting when he arrived from Wessex to save the English capital. Another battle in Essex brought the Danes victory this time because of the many betrayals that came from the English camp. As a result of this battle, Cnut and Edmund met and negotiated peace, which stipulated that all the territories north of Thames would be ruled by the Danish prince, and those in the south and London would remain under Edmund's authority. Cnut would also be named Edmund's successor, which happened when the English King died a few days later in unknown circumstances.

Cnut was crowned King of England and he will rule for 19 years until his death in 1035. Cnut died in the autumn of 1035, but his northern empire did not survive. In Denmark and England he was succeeded to the throne by Harthacnut, also called Cnut III, and in Norway by Magnus I. In England, after Harthacnut's death, the throne returned to Edward, the

son of the English King Ethelred, who returned from Normandy to year 1042, restoring the Wessex dynasty.

The reign of King Edward the Confessor will last until 1066 and will be one of the most stable and prosperous in the history of the English people, exemplary to all the monarchs who have occupied the English throne to this day.

His religious devotion and profound spiritual life made Edward to wish a life like the angels in heaven, unaltered by the bodily passions. Although married, Edward and his wife, Edith, have decided to live in chastity for their entire lives. Although it is admirable from a spiritual point of view, politically it was disastrous that a king should die without heirs. The war was inevitable, but in this case England had to deal with four contenders to the throne.

On January 5, 1066, the old and wise King Edward the Confessor dies, but not before handing Harold Godwinson the protection of his kingdom and his widow, according to *Vita Regis Aedwardi*. The Bayeux Tapestry also depicts the dying king pointing to a mustache character who appears to be Harold. Throughout Anglo-Saxon history, at least in theory, the king was chosen by witan, a general assembly made up of the noblemen.

The cause of minor Edgar Aetheling, the true heir, was overlooked because William, the Duke of Normandy, obviously manifested his intention to become king of England. And in these troubled and tense times that surely foretold total warfare, the witan decided that a mature man is needed to handle such a situation. And Harold Godwinson was the perfect man for the mission. Many times he proved his skills in battle, he came from the most important noble family and was always the most trusted man of Edward the Confessor. If anyone was best placed to maintain and continue Edward's good administration and keep his holy laws, then that man was Harald. What the English nobles did not know was that another invasion of scale similar to that of William was being prepared in Scandinavia.

The day after Edward's death, Harold was crowned king in the newly built cathedral at Westminster. Harold's anointing as king was considered by the papacy to be non-canonical one because it was done by Archbishop Stigand, whose election was made without the approval of the pontifical seat. If the head of the English Church was regarded as schismatic, then the whole people and the king were schismatic and it was imperative that they be brought to obedience. William was the best champion for the cause of Pope Alexander II. The Pope was, in turn, the best sponsor of the cause of William, the Duke of Normandy, to complete this precrusade directed not against Muslims persecuting Christians in Spain or the Middle East, but against Christians in Britain who had given time for centuries

some of the most sublime examples of holiness. Their guilt was but to be in the way of far too ambitious and thirsty men, and all their hope of survival was put in Harold, the war veteran, and his elite fighters, the renowned housecarls.

William was hunting when the news about Harold's coronation crossed the English Channel. The first act of the Duke was to address Pope Alexander, from whom he received blessing, money to hire mercenaries and a papal flag, to serve as evidence of the support he enjoys from Rome.

The Norman nobility was reluctant to face such an invasion. The little duchy of northern France will never be able to conquer on its own a prosperous kingdom like England. But William convinced everyone of the reality of his success, promising them English riches, lands and titles they never dared hope for.

Chroniclers William of Jumieges and William of Poitiers describe the preparations made by the Duke for the entire summer of 1066. William has ordered the complete construction of a new naval fleet that can carry over the Canal both armed men, necessary horses, and indispensable supplies of such an expedition. The number of 3000 ships is clearly an exaggeration from William de Jumieges, but the Normand fleet certainly has a considerable size.

In anticipation of William's invasion, Harold settled his troops on the island of Wight in southern Britain. The strained expectation made the Anglo-Saxon king increasingly confident that the duke would not risk a Channel crossing as the autumn approached and the season of military campaigns ended. But William waited on the other side of the sea and prayed to God to calm the winds. For nearly seven months, Harold waited for the invasion that seemed to be no longer happening. An attempt by Norman lord too cross the Channel would cause him a complete disaster. Impatient, William decided in August to cross the sea despite strong winds. His fleet was almost sinking on the bottom of the sea, but the rage of the winds pushed them eastward, eventually succeeding in landing on the northern shores of France.

Harold disbanded his army on September 8, because the harvest season was in full swing and people needed to be in the field to avoid any hunger. Moreover, as time passed, the possibility of the Norman fleet successfully landing on the British coast was becoming less and less real. Had it been any other leader, Harold might have been right, but here is William, the most devoted man of the time, who preferred to die on the seabed with his whole army rather than give up at the initiative. His long prayers were heard, and the winds stopped,

curling the water. The clouds were scattered and left the sun and the clear sky in a totally unusual way for this time of year.

As soon as Harold ordered the retreat, disaster struck, not from the south where everyone expected, but from the north. Harald Hardrada, along with the traitor Tostig, his entire fleet and army, summing up about 300 ships and 30,000 people, invaded Northumbria near the mouth of the Tyne River.

The Norwegian forces defeated the local army led by the brothers Edwin and Morcar in the Battle of Fulford near York on September 20, 1066. The city of York surrendered shortly after this defeat of the Anglo-Saxon army. Harold turned his army northward into an exhausting march, crossing the road from London to York, about 185 miles in just four days.

Most sources indicate that Harald Hardrada divided his troops into two, a part stood near the ships anchored on the Derwent River, providing their protection, and the rest of the army was preparing to winter in Northumbria, relying on a long campaign of conquest, like the previous Scandinavian invasions.

The surprise appearance of the Anglo-Saxon troops took Norwegians by surprise. Harold passed through York City without resistance, because the Norwegians were stationed across the Stamford Bridge, waiting for a Saxon delegation to negotiate the release of the hostages captured during the Battle of Fulford. During this time, Harold Godwinson appeared with his entire army to the surprise and terror of everyone. Between the two armies located on both sides of the Derwent River was the Stamford Bridge. The Anglo-Saxon army had to cross this bridge to attack the Scandinavian army taken by surprise. To gain precious time, a giant viking warrior protected the bridge and killed any Saxon who dared to cross it. The English tried all the options to knock him down and cross the bridge, but the berserk fighter was unbeaten. Then, a brave English warrior, climbed under the bridge, and through the floor pushed the sharp spear straight between the Scandinavian legs, giving him a terrible death. Harold attacked the enemy army with so much ferocity that many Norwegians died cut, slaughtered and drowned, both the Scandinavians and the Flemish and Normans who were in the service of Hardrada. Traitor Tostig and the Norwegian King fell on the battlefield of Stamford Bridge. The latter died of a wound caused by an arrow that pierced his neck. Harold Godwinson allowed Hardrada's son, Edmund, to leave Britain with his life. From the vast Scandinavian army, at the end of the struggle, the survivors barely filled the 25 ships that had taken the road to Orkney Islands.

With the death of Harold Hardrada on Stamford Bridge, the legendary era of the Vikings, which had begun in 793 on the English soil, ended. Military expeditions and incursions, legendary explorations, and heroic acts cease with the death of one of the most renowned Scandinavian warriors. Hardrada waged war in Kievan Rus and the Byzantine Empire, both in the East, from Anatolia to Jerusalem, and in the West in Italy and Sicily. Harald Hardrada led Norway with an iron fist and wise authority for twenty years and led the country to the heights of prosperity. His desire to enter the legend brought him death in battle, but Harald Hardrada ended his military career the same way he started it. He fought alongside his stepbrother, St. Olaf II, in the Battle of Stiklestad in 1030, whom he lost, and died also defeated in the Battle of Stamford Bridge on September 25, 1066. But between these two decisive battles, Harald enjoyed an intense life of legend, enjoying a stunning warrior, explorer and monarch career. His desire to enter the legend was fulfilled, even if not in the way he would have expected. Harald's character perfectly blends the symbol of the Viking spirit with the model of the Christian fighter, supporter and protector of the faith.

Two days later, on 28 September, William's fleet landed in Pevensey Bay. After landing, the Normandy troops traveled a few miles east to Hastings where they began building a temporary wooden castle, fortifying the place in anticipation of Harold Godwinson. From here, the Norman forces devastated the surroundings with outraged violence to excite the wrath of the Anglo-Saxon king and to attract him to the battlefield chosen by William. The Duke was content to attack the coastal areas without getting too far out of the sea, just to avoid interrupting the communication line with Normandy. So great was William's determination to conquer England, that he ordered the destruction of the ships to prevent his men from fleeing and withdrawing. For him there were no options other than total success or defeat. For Norman soldiers and European mercenaries, William's gesture leaves them no alternative then to fight for victory,

After the defeat of Hardrada and Tostig, Harold left a part of his army north under the command of the Edwin and Morcar, and he headed with the rest of the troops to fight the Normans. He headed south with the same speed as he had traveled when he had defeated Hardrada. He stopped on his way to London, where he stayed for a week to set the final plan. Most nobles, led by his mother, begged him to postpone the expedition and be patient. The winter was getting closer and William could be surrounded and starved. It was proposed to treat the invasion in a similar way in which the Scandinavian attacks of the last century were treated, through patience, smart strategy, tact, and decisive attacks. William had only Hastings while Harold had the whole of England.

Knowing that he was excommunicated and that William benefited from the total support of the papacy, Harold did not want to be delayed, so that the morale of his people would not be affected by any circumstances. He did not even wait for the recruitment of new forces, but he headed straight for William, with people exhausted by forced marches, approaching the same strategy he used against Hardrada.

Although Harold was betting on the opponent's surprise, William found out about it. The duke left the wooden fortifications at Hastings and came to meet the English army. Harold adopted a defensive position at the top of Senlac hill, now Battle, East Sussex, about 10 kilometers from Williams' Castle at Hastings.

William of Normandy has decisively changed the rules of the medieval war by introducing armed knights to the battlefield. For the English, this new elite weapon was an entirely new item. Improving for two centuries in the art of war in the endless battles with the Viking invaders, Anglo-Saxons have mastered their struggle. They used horses in military expeditions, but only for travel. On the battlefield they fought on foot, using the formation of the shield wall, compact and almost impossible to penetrate. The mobility of knights will completely change future strategies. The knights resembled terror in battle, their hooves shook the ground. The Middle Age Knight is the equivalent of the tank in today's war theaters.

Harold's defeat is due to complex circumstances. The main cause was that of the double invasion. Although he successfully managed to destroy the Norwegian forces of Hardrada, Harold exhausted his troops in the process, having to double the length of the country in order to cope with the extremely difficult situation. The refusal to listen to his mother's advice and counselors on the postponement of military intervention and the adoption of a methodical strategy may be considered a reason for defeat, but even on the day of the battle, Harold had real chances of winning. Both armies were balanced and well-prepared. The fateful moment of the withdrawal of Norman knights and the break of the ranks by the English have definitely caused defeat. To this is added the violent death of the king, who left the army without a leader. For all the reasons listed above, the unforgivable tactical error on the battlefield brought Harold to the end and with its end, the end of Saxon England. Normandy England was born.

The Norman invasion was, in fact, the last foreign invasion that England to succeed. That's why 14 October 1066 will become the most famous date in England's history.

Harold was the last Anglo-Saxon king and the last native monarch. From William the Conqueror to Queen Elizabeth II, all English monarchs will come from foreign families.

William's hopes of being recognized king right after the battle were denied by the witan's decision to elect young Edgar Aetheling, great nephew of Edward the Confessor as King. The choice was made with the support of the noble brothers Edwin of Mercia and Morcar of Northumbria, with the support of Ealdred, archbishop of York and the blessing of Stigand, the archbishop of Canterbury, considered to be schismatic by Rome.

After some waiting, the Duke secured Dover, Kent and Canterbury, after which he captured Winchester, the old Wessex capital, and the place where the English treasury was kept. The road to London was opened after William defeated a Saxon army sent against him, but failed to secure his crossing of the Thames on the London Bridge, and was forced to deviate.

In Wallingford, William received Stigand's submission, then defeated London's local forces once more. Edgar Aetheling, along with Edwin and Morcar, also submitted to the conqueror. Although he was elected king, Edgar will never be crowned.

William was crowned King on Christmas Day 1066 in the Westminster Cathedral. In accordance with the Anglo-Saxon tradition, the king was chosen, the function not being hereditary. When the people tried to choose William and began to acclaim him with strong voices, Norman knights, French-speaking, did not understand what was happening inside the cathedral and began to set fire to the surrounding buildings, believing it was an uprising. A thick smoke penetrated the cathedral, and all the participants rushed out, leaving William alone. The crowning ceremony was quickly, suddenly and chaotic, among the flames and smoke from the buildings burning in London.

William the Conqueror has made fundamental changes in British history. The coronation marks the end of the Anglo-Saxon period and the beginning of a new one, full of transformations, often violent, which eventually led to the hegemony of England on the European and world political stage. William imposed a new aristocracy, a new ecclesiastical hierarchy, a new culture, and a new language. England was turned into a true Norman fortress, reformed by William's universal vision.

Immediately after his crowning, William began to distribute the vast English properties to his subjects. England was transformed by the construction of wooden fortresses, raised on portions of elevated earth and fenced with defense ditches. Their construction was carried out by the subjugated Anglo-Saxon population. Subsequently, they were replaced by monumental stone castles built to last forever, true splendid fortifications, military artwork in the true sense of the word. The British never saw such a thing. Anglo-Saxon fortifications were designed to incorporate within them entire communities of people, while Norman castles

were compact fortresses designed to protect new political power and intimidate ordinary people. Castles are a testimony of the new relationship between seniors and subjects, of noblemen and ordinary people, and an eternal remembrance of the fact that the English were a conquered people.

Of all the transformations produced, English culture will suffer the most. The Norman conquest brought to power a male elite of only 10,000 knights, nobles and prelates who replaced the Anglo-Saxon ruling elite. The vast majority of political and ecclesial functions have been transferred to the hands of these newcomers. But a group of French-speaking normans could not really rule over a population of several million whose language they could not even understand. That is why vital cooperation was needed with the conquered population. At his crowning, William promised to keep all the laws of Edward the Confessor, he would be the defender of the good, and he would denounce any bad. In other words, William accepts the limits of his power. The English monarchy has never been and will never be an absolutist one, with well-defined limits, over time, developing in parallel with a political and legislative system over which the king will not be able to pass. With all the changes imposed on society, William promised to continue the measures and wise management of the good king Edward.

Like the Viking ancestors, the Normans were assimilated to the conquered population. For them maintaining the purity of blood was not something to be desired. The Normans came, conquered and gradually quenched by merging with the Anglo-Saxon population. They also did this in Normandy following integration into French culture and population and in southern Italy through integration with the Italians. But the footprint they left behind is fundamental, defining and overwhelming. Marriages with Anglo-Saxon women were as natural as possible, and this interference also occurred among English language and culture. Hundreds of words have entered the English language vocabulary over the course of three centuries, shaping it spectacularly. The first French words in the old Anglo-Saxon language were those relating to power, government, the legislative system and social life. Examples: empire, authority, government, justice, war, peace, justice, etc. A particularly interesting fact for English is to have different words that designate the same subject, precisely by introducing by French normans the French alternatives. Example: royal comes from French, and kingly from old Englis. Also for the words land and country. Although the two languages blended perfectly together, the French remained the language of the ruling elite, while English was spoken by the common people. This difference can be seen in the different names for two of the domestic animals feeding the population. Example: pig is

English and pork, French, sheep, English, mutton, French. The English terms of pig and sheep, refer to live animals that spend their lives in dirt in the cottage, and the same terms derived from French equivalents for the same animals, namely, pork and mutton refer to cooked meat dishes of the two animals served to the Norman noble class. The two examples clearly highlight the social differences between the normand ruling class and the Anglo-Saxon class.

The political and social changes have led to the disappearance of the Anglo-Saxon names. Names such as Aethelbert, Edwin, Edith, Athelstan, Edmund, Oswald, Edgar seem to be so distant and away from English culture. Norman names such as William, Robert, Richard, Henry were adopted by the British, and William was soon the most common name in England. The same changes were made to family names. Example: Fitzgerald - son of Gerald, Fitzsimmonds - son of Simmond, Fitzneil - son of Neil. The fashion of the Norman elite was quickly transmitted to the leading class that adapted to the new imposed requirements. In time, the Norman population will absolutely merge into the the English population that it will be impossible to determine who was among the Normans and who among the Anglo-Saxons. French language has significantly influenced the final stage of English language, but not decisively. Even though for two centuries after the Norman conquest, the English monarchs were French-speaking, by the end of the 1500's, French was regarded as a totally foreign language, belonging to a different people.

Contrary to expectations, the Norman conquest of England did not end with the battle of Hastings or the crowning king of William the Conqueror. The North of England has been influenced for over two centuries by the powerful Danish rule that had its capital in York. The proud inhabitants of Northumbria will ignite the flame of resistance against the usurper and will turn their eyes and hopes to the scandinavian intervention.

The change of the native aristocracy by the conqueror and the unjust treatment of the conquered people lit the torches of resistance in many English provinces in Mercia, East Anglia and Northumbria, to which the Welsh support was added. The Norman Knights were watched by Anglo-Saxon Guerrilla troops and killed in the darkness of the night and in the isolation of marshlands. For their part, the Normans were committing atrocities against the Anglo-Saxons. Neither the English clerics were exempt. At Glastonbury, archers stationed in the abbey tower killed 21 Saxon monks under William's order. The whole community of the monastery was replaced by a new one in France. Ultimately, the flames of resistance will turn into a real fire of rebellion that will encompass the whole north, loyal to its Scandinavian origins.

Several prominent leaders of resistance have emerged in the battles against the Normans. One of these was the legendary Hereward the Wake. His life and activity were heavily romanticised, that it is quite difficult to distinguish the historical reality of fiction. He is mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in Domesday Book and in the Chronicles of Ely (Liber Eliensis). Opera Gesta Herewardi, written in the first half of the 12th century, is entirely devoted to it, but contains many exaggerations, hyperbolizations and mystifications of the hero.

After the Norman conquest in 1066, many Anglo-Saxons preferred to emigrate to Byzantium, where they were pursuing the onset of a new destiny. They preferred the exile rather than the new designation of William the Conqueror. The loss of their country in favor of the Normans, backed by the other Westerners, turned British wanderers into the fiercest fighters against the Franks.

Also, the English enemies, the Normans, have found a welcome place in the Byzantine army. Thus, the two groups will have to live in peace, fight together and die for one another under the same flag.

The English adventure was much more complicated and dramatic. The Norman conquest of William left behind only disaster, famine, and genocide. The English resistance from 1069-1070 was repressed with unprecedented brutality, exaggerated even for William's tastes. The flower of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy that survived the massacre and which was almost totally replaced by power, depressed by the loss of its own country, chose exile in hopes of returning and regaining their homeland. Many Britons and Danes from Britain have chosen to emigrate to Denmark, others have reached the court of the Prince of Kiev. Gytha, the daughter of Hastings' martyr king Harold Godwinson, married the Grand Prince of Kiev, Vladimir II Monomah. The Byzantine name of Monomah, adopted by Vladimir II, comes from his mother, a relative of Byzantine Emperor Constantine the Ninth Monomach. As a token of respect for the Empire of the Romans, Vladimir adopted the name of the imperial dynasty.

Along with the exodus in Denmark and Kievan Rus, the largest emigration took place in the Byzantine Empire. It is not, however, for the first time that groups of English sought glory in the Empire of the Romans. The Russian historian AA Vasiliev, in his 1937 article, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration to the Byzantium in the Eleventh Century", is of the opinion that the English arrived in Byzantium to serve in Varangian Guard long before 1066. He also states that the Anglo-Danish elite of the housecarles entered the Byzantine service immediately after the death of King Cnut the Great.

Although there are historians like Franz Dolger who contests Vasilyev's statements, his assumptions can be as real as possible given the many diplomatic relations between England and the Byzantine Empire during the reigns of Alfred the Great, Athelstan and Edward the Confessor. The relations between the two distant states were either direct or intermediate by the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish Scandinavian kingdoms that exported a significant number of Viking warriors to the imperial elite guard of Constantinople. Even the Viking fighters in Iceland and Greenland sought glory in Byzantium, and in order to halt this widespread phenomenon, the Viking leaders issued an edict by which the one who was left to fight in the country of the Greeks was revoked by any right of inheritance during his stay in Byzantium .

Along with the Scandinavian states, another intermediary between England and the Byzantine Empire was the great prince of Kiev that had close diplomatic, political, economic and military relations with the Mediterranean kingdom.

The Varangian Guard in which the English emigrants were also integrated was formed by Emperor Basil II in 988 when he received the help of 6,000 Scandinavian and Slavic warriors from Prince Vladimir the Great. The Scandinavian and Russian warriors have been active in imperial troops before the reign of Basil II the Macedonian. We find them fighting in the sea in 902 and 949 in Crete. We meet them in Constantin Porphyrogenet's naval campaigns, conducted between 930-950. We see them fighting and landing in Syria in 955. But they were not organized into a separate, elite regiment until the reign of Vasile II.

Even though the flow of English migrants was significant, until the end of the 11th century, the dominant element in the Guard was the Scandinavian. And after the English began to settle in Byzantium and Constantinople, the Scandinavians would engage as mercenaries still in large numbers.

Several intense studies have been made in recent years about the English exodus that took place after 1066. The sources attesting this fact are not enough and are difficult to interpret with precision. Neither Byzantine chronicles are of great use to us, except for *Alexiada*, written by Anna Comnena, *Kekaumenos' Strategic*, and *Acts of John and Manuel Comnenos*, written by John Kinnamos. As far as the western chronicles are concerned, we have the *Ecclesial History of Oderic Vitalis*, *Chronicon universal anonyms Laudunensis*, written by an English anonymous monk from the Laon Monastery in Picardy around 1219 and the *Jarvadar saga*, an Icelandic saga of the century XIV century on the life of King Edward the Confessor (1042-1066). Although the last two chronicles are late in the events, they have a unique aspect in English history.

The two sources were written two centuries after the Norman conquest of England. According to the two writings, after the crushing of the last forms of Anglo-Saxon resistance, a part of the English nobility, led by a neglected part of the English population, took the path of exile and headed for the sea to Constantinople in Byzantium. Their fleet of approximately 350 ships crossed the Mediterranean and reached under the walls of the imperial city at a crucial moment when the city was besieged by a pagan fleet. The English defeated the invaders and were rewarded with great honors by the Emperor. Many of them accepted to enter the Empire's service and remained in Constantinople, but the majority, led by Count Siward, asked for a few cities to govern. The Byzantine emperor led him to a former imperial possession in the northeast of the Black Sea, now lost to the heathen. If they succeed in driving the barbarians out there, the land will be theirs. According to the two chronicles, the English occupied the land, built cities they named after those in their native country, "London", "York" and not only, and the land gave it the name "New England."

Starting from the events outlined here, a series of theories are being attempted to try to harmonize as accurately the content of the two above-mentioned sources as historical reality. The Anglo-Saxon presence along with the Viking in Constantinople can not be questioned in any way, this reality becoming a historical truth. What can easily be questioned is the exact moment of their arrival in Constantinople.

It is difficult to accurately determine the year of this exodus; it is certain that it took place after the Byzantine disaster against the Turks at Manzikert in 1071. The two chronicles mention the name of the Emperor Alexios I Comnenus, but the siege of Constantinople about which these two sources speak spent during this great emperor. Indeed Constantinople was besieged during his reign in 1091 by the Pecenegs, but certainly it is not this attack we are speaking of, because the British were already serving the emperor in the war he wore with the Normans ten years earlier. It could be a siege of Constantinople during the time of Emperor Michael VII Ducas (1071-1078), and the erroneous remembrance of Alexios' name can be excused because at that time he was generally crowned with glory and his fame far exceeded that of the Emperor. It is certain that this migration took place between 1070 and 1085.

Another theory is related to the existence of the English Colony in the Crimea, called in the two sources "New England". However, there is very little evidence to come up with these allegations, which will inevitably lead to the difficulty of demonstrating its existence.

Researching this subject is only at the beginning, and the theme generates a clear interest in academic circles. The problem of the supposed existence of an English settlement in the Northeast of the Black Sea has sparked new debates among scholars who are now divided into two camps: those who support the existence of New England on the Black Sea shores and those who deny its existence. Evidence to assert the existence of this colony is quite few but credible, considering how things took place in the 11th and 12th centuries in the Byzantine Empire. If the existence of this colony proves to be real, then we are witnessing the very first signs of British colonialism, organized long before the official one of the 16th-20th centuries.

We consider that this significant exodus could not have taken place without the elements described above, namely the development of the Celtic Christianity in the Anglo-Saxon world, the crystallization of Northumbrian northern culture through the Celtic, Danish and Norwegian influences that will lead to the emergence of an unshaken sense of independence from southern England, the Anglo-Danish wars, the Viking era in Europe and America, the Anglo-Saxon victory at Stamford Bridge, their defeat to William the Conqueror at Hastings, and the Byzantine disaster in Manzikert. Above all, there is also an exceptional Byzantine diplomacy and an extraordinary power of attraction and influence that mattered. The fascination that Byzantium will exert on the Scandinavians and Normans will also be transposed to the conquered Anglo-Saxons.

Anglo-Saxon migration has had a profound impact on Byzantine society by supplying the empire to elite soldiers. The Byzantine Empire was a state that relied too much on mercenaries, but the Anglo-Saxons were the only ones who had settled permanently in the empire for several generations, bringing with them their families. Due to their respect, newcomers have been granted an entire territory, something that has not yet been established in the Roman-Byzantine society. There is no land of Normans or of Vikings within the Byzantine state. But we find an entire well-established and well-organized English colony that has been able to cope with the devastating invasions of the Mongols.

In the West, the migration event was overlooked because no one was interested in the fate of a conquered people. The Anglo-Saxon clerics and scholars were brutally replaced by the Normans. We could see how a few lines were laid in the French chronicles and the crowd of Englishmen who fled for a foreign emperor. These lines were taken over by Icelandic chronicler-lovers of poetry and adventure who dedicated these exiles to their own saga.

Since Byzantium saw itself as a universal empire, it did not give an overwhelming importance to the event of the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons, being occasionally mentioned in various chronicles. After all, in the Romans' view, the English were just Western barbarians who had to be civilized and illuminated by Constantinople. It is only from the reign of Emperor Manuei I Comnenus (1143-1180) that Byzantium will recognize the high degree of civilization that began to emerge in the West and will cease to refer to the West as a retrograde barbarian society. Only after the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 and the exodus of the Greek scholars in Italy would truly begin the renaissance of the European culture, which became heir to the Byzantine spirituality and civilization. The Byzantine Empire was a state that brought the values of classical civilization from Antiquity to the modern age, giving humanity a huge service that can never be disputed.

As for the English in the Empire, they gradually assimilated and became "Byzantine" themselves, if there could be a term defining the multitude of peoples that constituted the Roman state. The phenomenon of Anglo-Saxon migration in Byzantium can be considered as the first manifestation of British and European colonialism. Most historians regard crusades as the onset of these social movements, but here we are dealing with such actions organized two decades earlier than the Clermont sermon, actions also triggered by a crusade, William's pre-crusade against the people and the Anglo-Saxon Church.

Although the Anglo-Saxon migration wave ended somewhere around the fourth crusade, the English fascination for the Byzantine Empire did not cease. The greatest scholars, archaeologists and historians of the Byzantine Empire of modern and contemporary times are also English. Among them we mention Sir Edward Gibbon, Paul J. Alexander, Michael Angold, Timothy D. Barnes, Charles M. Brand, Anthony Bryer, John Bury, Hugh Chisholm, Anthony Eastmond, George Finlay, Lynda Garland, Christopher Gravett, Timothy E. Gregory, John Haldon, William Miller, Donald M. Nicol, David Nicolle, John Julius Norwich, the late dead bizantinologist, Sir Steven Runciman, Jonathan Shepard, Paul Stephenson, Robert Thomson, Warren Treadgold, Stephen Turnbull, John Wortley and not only.