

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Rolls Series

Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, usually referred to as the 'Rolls Series', was an ambitious project first proposed to the British Treasury in 1857 by Sir John Romilly, the Master of the Rolls, and quickly approved for public funding. Its purpose was to publish historical source material covering the period from the arrival of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII, 'without mutilation or abridgement', starting with the 'most scarce and valuable' texts. A 'correct text' of each work would be established by collating 'the best manuscripts', and information was to be included in every case about the manuscripts used, the life and times of the author, and the work's 'historical credibility', but there would be no additional annotation. The first books were published in 1858, and by the time it was completed in 1896 the series contained 99 titles and 255 volumes. Although many of the works have since been re-edited by modern scholars, the enterprise as a whole stands as a testament to the Victorian revival of interest in the middle ages.

Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I

The third volume of this four-volume set of Latin chronicles, edited by Richard Howlett (1841–1917) and published between 1884 and 1889, contains five separate works.

The *Gesta Stephani regis Anglorum* ('Deeds of King Stephen') is a primary source for Stephen's reign and especially his wars with his cousin Maude. This is supplemented by the shorter *De gestis regis Stephani* by Richard, prior of Hexham, covering the years 1135–9. The treatise *Relatio de standardo* by St Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx, is a partisan account of the Battle of the Standard in 1138. Jordan Fantosme's long poem (in French, with an English translation) describes the rebellion against Henry II of 1173–4. Finally, Richard of Devizes chronicles the deeds of Richard I in *De rebus gestis Ricardi Primi*, which is 'one of the most amusing products of the middle ages' according to Howlett, whose introduction provides historical background and manuscript details. English side-notes to the Latin texts are provided throughout.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library and other partner libraries, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection brings back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I

VOLUME 3

EDITED BY RICHARD HOWLETT



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108052283

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2012

This edition first published 1886
This digitally printed version 2012

ISBN 978-1-108-05228-3 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

RERUM BRITANNICARUM MEDII ÆVI
SCRIPTORES,
OR
CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
DURING
THE MIDDLE AGES.

U 29911.

a

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE CHRONICLES AND MEMORIALS
OF
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY, UNDER
THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

ON the 26th of January 1857, the Master of the Rolls submitted to the Treasury a proposal for the publication of materials for the History of this Country from the Invasion of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII.

The Master of the Rolls suggested that these materials should be selected for publication under competent editors without reference to periodical or chronological arrangement, without mutilation or abridgment, preference being given, in the first instance, to such materials as were most scarce and valuable.

He proposed that each chronicle or historical document to be edited should be treated in the same way as if the editor were engaged on an *Editio Princeps*; and for this purpose the most correct text should be formed from an accurate collation of the best MSS.

To render the work more generally useful, the Master of the Rolls suggested that the editor should give an account of the MSS. employed by him, of their age and their peculiarities; that he should add to the work a brief account of the life and times of the author, and any remarks necessary to explain the chronology; but no other note or comment was to be allowed, except what might be necessary to establish the correctness of the text.

The works to be published in octavo, separately, as they were finished; the whole responsibility of the task resting upon the editors, who were to be chosen by the Master of the Rolls with the sanction of the Treasury.

The Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury, after a careful consideration of the subject, expressed their opinion in a Treasury Minute, dated February 9, 1857, that the plan recommended by the Master of the Rolls "was well calculated for the accomplishment of this important national object, in an effectual and satisfactory manner, within a reasonable time, and provided proper attention be paid to economy, in making the detailed arrangements, without unnecessary expense."

They expressed their approbation of the proposal that each Chronicle and historical document should be edited in such a manner as to represent with all possible correctness the text of each writer, derived from a collation of the best MSS., and that no notes should be added, except such as were illustrative of the various readings. They suggested, however, that the preface to each work should contain, in addition to the particulars proposed by the Master of the Rolls, a biographical account of the author, so far as authentic materials existed for that purpose, and an estimate of his historical credibility and value.

*Rolls House,
December 1857.*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CHRONICLES OF THE REIGNS
OF
STEPHEN, HENRY II., AND RICHARD I.

VOL. III.

- I.—THE “GESTA STEPHANI REGIS ANGLORUM.”
 II.—THE CHRONICLE OF RICHARD, PRIOR OF HEXHAM.
 III.—THE “RELATIO DE STANDARDO” OF ST. AELRED, ABBOT
 OF RIEVAULX.
 IV.—THE METRICAL CHRONICLE OF JORDAN FANTOSME.
 V.—THE CHRONICLE OF RICHARD OF DEVIZES.

EDITED BY

RICHARD HOWLETT,

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF HER MAJESTY'S
 TREASURY, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

LONDON :

LONGMAN & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW ; TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL ;

ALSO BY

PARKER & CO., OXFORD ; AND MACMILLAN & CO., CAMBRIDGE ;

A. & C. BLACK, AND DOUGLAS AND FOULIS, EDINBURGH ;

AND A. THOM & CO., LIMITED, DUBLIN.

1886.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Printed by
EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, Her Majesty's Printers,
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CONTENTS.

PREFACE	-	-	-	-	-	Page vii
CORRECTIONS						lxxv
THE "GESTA STEPHANI REGIS ANGLORUM"						3
THE CHRONICLE OF RICHARD, PRIOR OF HEXHAM, (A.D. 1135 to A.D. 1139)						139
THE "RELATIO DE STANDARDO" OF ST. AELRED, ABBOT OF RIEVAULX						181
THE METRICAL CHRONICLE OF JORDAN FANTOSME						202
THE CHRONICLE OF RICHARD OF DEVIZES, (A.D. 1189 to A.D. 1192)						381
GLOSSARY	-					455
INDEX	-					456

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

P R E F A C E.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

P R E F A C E.



THE somewhat miscellaneous collection of short historical treatises published in the present volume¹ does much towards completing the list of chronicles of the twelfth century already included in the Rolls Series.

Considered by themselves it was obvious that these treatises must either be neglected or issued as a collection, for they are not, so far as is known, continuations of any great chronicles, nor are they, when isolated, of sufficient bulk to form volumes of reasonable size. The idea of printing them, and the *Draco Normannicus*, in company with the chronicle of William of Newburgh therefore commended itself as a middle course; for the latter work is specially fitted to act as a connecting narrative, and as a running commentary on the whole. It moreover bears traces of special relationship to at least one member of the group, the poem of Jordan Fantosme.²

The later years of Henry II. and the reign of Richard I. are well illustrated in our annals; but the same cannot be said for the epoch of Stephen; and prominence will therefore be given in the present preface to affairs connected with the days of that unhappy monarch.

It is proposed to discuss first the probable authorship of the *Gesta Stephani* and their credibility; then to

¹ The *Gesta Stephani Regis*; the Chronicle of Richard of Hexham; the brief treatise by St. Aelred of Rievaulx, entitled *Relatio* | *de Standardo*; the Chronicle of Jordan Fantosme; and the Chronicle of Richard of Devizes.

² See Preface to vol. i., p. xxvi.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

mark their contributions to our knowledge; next to consider the chronological difficulties they present; afterwards to discuss certain aspects of the time of which the author treats; and in the last place to mention such facts as we can ascertain as to the manuscript source of the work.

The remaining disposable space in this preface will be devoted to notes connected with the MSS., authors, and special features of the minor chronicles which fill up the rest of the volume.

Author-
ship of the
Gesta
Stephani.

The author of the *Gesta* is unknown, and many speculations have been offered as to his position and circumstances. He was probably not an Englishman, although his way of writing *Avrentia*,¹ instead of *Abrinca* for Avranches, would seem to mark him as one; but his foreign origin shows itself clearly in several places, as, for instance, in the words "*veniens-que ad viculum, qui lingua Anglorum dicitur Ferenduna.*"²

Would an Englishman or an Anglo-Norman take the trouble to say that an obscure place in England, which had no special Latin or French name, was called *Ferenduna* in the English tongue?

The circumstance already mentioned as to Avranches militates against the idea that he was a Norman. What then more natural than to suppose that he came from a third royal possession, the Boulonnais,³ and was by birth, as well as by inclination, an ally to the brothers Stephen and Henry of Blois? Let us see if the theory of his being a chaplain to the latter could be sustained.

It seems certain that he was an ecclesiastic; but it is improbable that he was in personal attendance on

¹ *Aurentia*, as Duchesne has it.

² p. 115.

³ Like one of Stephen's chaplains, Ricardus de Bolonia (Cott. Galba, E. ii. fo. 31).

Stephen as chaplain, for he fails to record many of the king's greatest deeds, and omits all notice of his illness in 1142. He exhibits, with one exception, no special acquaintance with the northern and eastern counties of England; but on the other hand shows minute knowledge of Oxford, Bristol, Bath, Exeter, and Winchester.

The work considered as a whole contains too great a mass of topographical information to be the product of a monastic pen. A monk who writes largely of general events invariably writes with special distinctness about things happening within a short radius of his fixed dwelling, often betraying it by allusions to trifling events which assume for him an undue importance. Not so the author of the *Gesta*. His description of the Roman structures at Bath,¹ his verbal sketch of the tower of Bampton church,² and similar graphic passages, might mislead us if we did not see that he also knows Exeter, Winchester, and the Isle of Ely.³ We feel that he must have been a dependent of some great personage whose public duty led him to these places. Have we not such a person in the king's brother Henry of Blois, who was at the same time abbot of Glastonbury and bishop of Winchester? We cannot sketch an itinerary for the great prelate; but we know that Exeter, when captured, was left in his military charge, and that he attended his brother Stephen in force on many occasions, notably at Wilton, where he was nearly taken prisoner. We do not positively know that he joined the expedition to Ely, but it is quite possible that he did.

Our author certainly writes like one who stood beside

¹ This should be compared with Mr. Morgan's paper in the Arch. Assoc. Journ., vol. xli., p. 398.

² p. 90.

³ John of Worcester, a well-informed chronicler, has two blundering lines only as to the expedition to the Isle of Ely.

the prelate, explaining on the one hand the story that he persuaded his brother to let the empress reach Bristol, on the other telling us the bishop's stern advice to Stephen, to grant no terms to the Exeter rebels, for their skin was loose and their lips dry, and they must consequently be soon driven by thirst to unconditional surrender.

Our chronicler can tell us, too, with obviously personal knowledge, how the same prelate was flouted by the empress when she was mistress of London, and thought herself queen of England. Then again we have from him an account of the siege of Winchester, which must have been written by an eye-witness; and we know that bishop Henry of Blois was present on that occasion. Finally the prelate's quarrel with William de Pont-de-l'Arche, and his dealings with Robert Fitz-Hildebrand are known to us through no other writer.

Of course we must expect to find a man, who according to our theory is a confidential agent, ignorant of specific matters happening at a distance from the place of his special mission; but when we find him writing nothing about the council held in April 1140, at Winchester, and little as to the one assembled in December of the same year at Westminster, the silence is eminently suspicious. At both of these councils Henry of Winchester presented an exceedingly sorry figure, withstood to the face and openly charged with shameful dealing by an envoy of the queen in the first assembly; in the second, similarly and deservedly insulted by a supporter of the empress. We can well understand that our author, if he were Henry's chaplain, could not venture to write down such excuses and falsehoods as the prelate was driven to employ, and we are conscious that we lose by the suppression of inconvenient facts, not through our chronicler's want of knowledge. It would be troublesome to note every minute point, but, allowing for the deliberate omission of certain matters, we may say that

our knowledge of the character of Henry of Blois depends more on the *Gesta*, than on William of Malmesbury.

It is even a favourable point in the present argument that our truth-loving chronicler indites a few words of censure upon the worldliness of his master. Such happily is the independence of early ecclesiastical writers that a circumstance of this kind has many parallels.¹

If the author of the *Gesta Stephani* were, as we have supposed, a chaplain to the bishop of Winchester his intimate knowledge of events would no longer appear marvellous. Chaplains, then as now, were ecclesiastical aides-de-camp, and, with such warlike masters as Henry of Blois and other mediæval bishops, must often have had military experiences as well as clerical. No messenger in troublous times could be so safe as a churchman; and our author, if in such a position, must no doubt have frequently ridden with despatches from the prelate to his brother the king. He would thus know the military events of his time in a way impossible to a monk,² and he would have precisely such experiences of the rough soldiery of the day as he describes for us on p. 100. Indeed we may suspect that it was the author's own serving men who were beaten before his eyes, when he went on some occasion to complain of an injury to church property.

Perhaps the incident occurred on one of the many journeys he must have taken to Glastonbury, for his supposed master was, as we have said, abbot of that most ancient and most sacred house,—a burden of rule which would necessitate constant ridings to and fro

¹ We may instance the free speech of William of Newburgh as to the conduct of the bishops with regard to criminous clerks; Etienne de Rouen's strictures on Becket; and Jocelin de Brakelond's amusing commentaries on his superiors.

² If our author were chaplain to Henry of Winchester, his name probably is in the long list of the bishop's clerks attesting a charter in Dugdale's *Monasticon* (ed. 1655), i., p. 703.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

of messengers from Winchester. Glastonbury, unapproachably safe in its pre eminent sanctity, seems to have been untouched by war; and its monks, close to the scene of the thickest strife, must have been singularly well able to inform their abbot's chaplain as to all that happened around them.

Finally our theory would offer a probable explanation of the circumstance that the manuscript of the *Gesta Stephani* was found in northern France; and of the further, and perhaps consequent, fact that no later chronicler has borrowed a single word from it.

The explanation may well be derivable from the circumstance that, in 1148,¹ Henry of Winchester found it desirable to proceed to Rome, to answer before the pope the charges made against him by various enemies. It is beyond a doubt that a princely bishop like Henry took some of his chaplains with him on this occasion to act as secretaries and private agents, and, if the author of the *Gesta Stephani* were one of them, his death, or even a mere accidental loss of baggage, may have caused his book to appear as a derelict in France.

This theory would furnish a narrow limit to the loss we have sustained by the mutilation of the MS. Certainly it is supported by the circumstance that there are no allusions which indicate such a knowledge of later years as constantly appears in other chronicles, and indeed in the *Gesta* themselves, when dealing with earlier events.

We may cite, for example, the reference, under the year 1136,² to the ultimate fate of Milo of Gloucester, who did not die until December 1143,—an allusion which

¹ John of Hexham, Rolls ed., p. 322. He may of course, if he lived so long, have gone with the bishop in 1151 or in 1155; but, had he done so in 1155, some hint of the

ultimate solution of the great problem of the day would surely have appeared in the book.

² p. 16.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

PREFACE.

xiii

also tends to show that the work was not undertaken very early in Stephen's reign.

Whoever may have written the treatise, it is obvious that he was as much a partisan of Stephen as Malmesbury was of Maud; but if we compare the writings of these men, who approached events with opposite feelings, we are astonished at the candour and fairness they have obviously manifested. Not less marvellous is their accuracy. They produce on the reader's mind the same sense of certitude as is felt when tallies are compared, or the dispersed fragments of an ancient urn are fitted together.

Reliability of the narrative of the *Gesta*.

Strict agreement between Malmesbury and the *Gesta*.

Just as a mathematician who has found that a similar law governs two series, infers their correspondence in the higher terms, even so may we confide in the parallel records of these two singularly honest men, and when the *series temporum* of the one is broken seemingly by death, we may justly say that, as the survivor has been found to act according to the same law of careful veracity as his compeer, we will trust him to the end with as much confidence as we should have felt if his brother writer had lived to confirm his assertions.

We need not, however, rely on mere theory. We may try the later portions of the *Gesta Stephani* by the test of undesigned coincidences with the private correspondence of Gilbert Foliot, a man of learning and eminence, who did not seek to tell any connected story; but who wrote to bishops, nobles, and popes on matters of urgent business.

Corroborations from Foliot's letters.

These letters can be more confidently classed according to date than many similar series, for the author became a bishop in 1148. Almost all his writings therefore in which he appears as abbot of Gloucester belong to the period of the *Gesta Stephani*.

U 20911.

b

If we read the third letter in Dr. Giles' edition we shall see our abbot appealing to the legate, Henry of Winchester, on behalf of earl Milo, who, having been excommunicated by the bishop of Hereford, had vainly offered satisfaction to the angry prelate. If we now read the account of the affair in the *Gesta*, p. 102, we shall feel absolute confidence in both writers.

Proceeding to a less distinct coincidence, let us take Foliot's letter No. XL., which, being addressed to pope Eugenius, must have been written at some date after February, 1145. In it the writer pleads for the monks of Malmesbury, whose precincts have been occupied by a new fortification, and whose sacred retreat is infested by soldiers.

Taking up the *Gesta* at p. 114 we see that, in 1145, Stephen hastened to Malmesbury, threw a body of men into the castle, and stored it with provisions. The new fortress is not mentioned, but few will doubt that the same transaction is referred to by both writers, when we find William of Malmesbury, at a much earlier date, complaining of a castle having been *begun* by the bishop of Salisbury within the conventual enclosure.

In the last place let us select the account of the acts of John le Marshal, otherwise John FitzGilbert,¹ castellan of Marlborough, as given by Foliot in letter No. XIV., and compare it with a passage on p. 107 of the *Gesta*. In doing so we shall see that the apologist of Stephen is corroborated by Foliot, the partisan of Maud.

These coincidences will also abundantly attest that which, in truth, no one seems ever to have questioned—the genuineness of the work.

Authenticity of the work.

¹ The identity of this noble, the father of the great William Marshal, with the John FitzGilbert of the *Gesta*, is clear from Malmesbury, p. 734, when compared with

the *Gesta*, pp. 66, 67, 80, and 107, and with the *C. Fl. Wigorn.*, pp. 117, 125–127, and 135. See note 3 on p. 67.

PREFACE.

xv

The statement by which Duchesne introduces the treatise,¹ mentioning the library from which the MS. came, and the friend through whom he obtained it, is brief but clear, and his honesty is notorious. Still as the MS. is not now forthcoming, and as C. J. Bertram's forgery of the "*De situ Britannicæ*" is a fact to be remembered, it is necessary to refer formally to the matter.

We will now consider the special contributions of the *Gesta* to our knowledge of English history.

We must remember that up to varying dates, as far as the end of 1142, we have the efficient aid of Ordericus Vitalis, of John of Worcester, the excellent continuator of Florence, and above all of William of Malmesbury.

Portions of Stephen's reign as to which the *Gesta* afford special or exclusive information.

It is not to be expected that such writers would have left any facts of transcendent importance to be stated for the first time by a fourth chronicler; but we may instance as original contributions by our author the interesting account of the days preceding Stephen's coronation, including the debates among the nobles on his election; the prompt dispersion of lawless bands; Stephen's royal progress; facts as to the important quarrel with Robert of Bathampton; interesting details as to the siege of Exeter, including a statement as to its cost in money; and finally, information as to the intervention of the barons on behalf of Baldwin de Redvers. In this last-mentioned matter our author affords a good explanation of an act usually passed over as merely one more manifestation of Stephen's weakness.

After this point—the end of 1142—and as far as the end of 1147, the *Gesta Stephani* constitute the main stem of the history of England. Huntingdon devotes the equivalent of about four octavo pages to this period. Gervase, when he does not copy Huntingdon, gives us few but ecclesiastical events, and those few in

¹ See p. liii.

wrong order. Newburgh and Hoveden copy Huntingdon, and add but few secular facts; the English Chronicle is but a shadow of its former self; and John of Hexham, like the others, is almost exclusively ecclesiastical.

In short, for those six years we must regard the remaining chronicles as the means of adding dates and stray facts to the valuable narrative of the *Gesta*.

We will, however, select a few points on which the *Gesta Stephani* cast an entirely new light. The explanation of Stephen's conduct towards the earl of Chester is clear, satisfactory, and nowhere else to be found. The desertions of Turgis of Avranches from Stephen, and of Philip, son of the earl of Gloucester, from Maud are nowhere else mentioned, though the latter fact reveals serious dissensions in the Angevin party—dissensions with which we may possibly connect Ralph of Chester's change of sides. These differences apparently led to the negotiations for peace conducted by Reginald earl of Cornwall, whose diplomacy brought about a meeting of king and empress in 1146. This conference was unfortunately unavailing, and has perhaps on this account been neglected by all the chroniclers except the careful author of the *Gesta*. Finally, the efforts of Henry, in 1147, to rival the early deeds of his great ancestors are not only unrecorded by any other chronicler,¹ but have hitherto been confused by many English historians with the events of 1149, when he went north to be knighted by David king of Scotland. This matter has been dealt with at some length in a note on p. 130; but

¹ The passage in John of Hexham (Rolls ed., pp. 324, 5), under the year 1150, which seems at first sight possibly to relate to it, will be found on examination and comparison with Gervase, i. 151, 2, to be a mixture of the events of 1146 with those of 1153. There seems

to be no certain explanation of this blundering interpolation; but as the facts do not appear in their proper places, the notes of them would seem to have been carelessly misplaced, and to have been ignorantly miscopied in the Hexham scriptorium.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

PREFACE.

xvii

considerations which lead to a conclusion adverse to historians in general require to be made more clear than would be possible in a foot-note.

Certainly the chronology of this period is very difficult, and we feel on safe ground at but one or two points. Let us, however, first summarise the story as given in the *Gesta*. Chronological difficulties:

The series of events having led up to the earl of Chester's attack on Lincoln in the early days of the year 1147, some minor actions of Stephen's are mentioned, ending with an account of the blockade of Pevensey castle. Then our history states that while those events were in progress, Henry, whom the chronicler boldly terms "*justus regni . . . hæres,*" came across to England "*cum florida militum caterva,*" and wild rumours spread as to the men and money he had brought. (1.) Henry's invasion of England in 1147.

Soon the truth became known, that his following was small, and was paid only in promises. The boy commander was repulsed from Cricklade, and routed from Bourton. Outwitted at all points by Stephen, disappointed of help from the barons, and threatened with desertion by his mercenaries, the lad fell ill, apparently through sheer chagrin. He applied to his mother and to his uncle, earl Robert of Gloucester, for money to pay his men, but not receiving any, he turned in desperation to his chivalrous enemy.

It was thoroughly in keeping with the knightly character of Stephen to send to a beaten opponent, who was at once his cousin and a mere child, the means of getting out of an ugly position. The king's nobles advised a contrary course; but kindness of heart prevailed, and the silence of history shows reasonably well that his noble act wrought him no immediate harm.

We must begin our examination of this story with the evidence of Gervase,¹ who alleges that in 1146 (meaning 1147, as is obvious by the immediate mention of the death of the earl of Gloucester) Geoffrey of Anjou sent to fetch Henry away from England. Certainly Gervase writes as if Henry had already been four years in this country; but he errs sadly at this part of his chronicle.

A further piece of evidence is the charter to Saint Ouen given, apparently in Normandy, by Henry, "*ducis Normannorum . . . filius*,"² at some date between March 5 and April 20, 1147, and finally we are assured by Robert of Torigni³ that Henry returned from England to Normandy and was received at Bec on May 29, 1147.

Now there are certain points in the story itself which tend to fix the date. It is quite certain that Henry's application to earl Robert of Gloucester was made before the 31st of October, 1147, for we have overwhelming testimony that on that day the earl died.⁴

We should thus be able to place the invasion definitely before November 1147, and probably between the beginning of March and the end of May in that year; but there is an apparent difficulty raised by the assertion of Gervase that the empress left England before March 5, 1147. Had she done so Henry could not have consulted her in urgent circumstances, as the *Gesta* tell us he did; but against Gervase, whose dates at this point are by his own admission almost worthless, we must place the fact that the narrative of the *Gesta*, which covers the whole of 1147, contains no

¹ i. 131.

² *Neustria Pia*, p. 15.

³ i., p. 243.

⁴ See n. 134, note 2.

reference to her departure, and indeed, as we have seen, alludes to her presence; and we should especially remark the probability that she quitted England in discouragement after the death of her great champion, rather than that she left him to fight for a cause she had herself deserted. Assuredly she must have left early in 1148, and our first trace of her in Normandy, naturally enough, is in the month of June of that year.¹

These facts would alone suffice to prevent this expedition from being confused with the visit in 1149; but let us examine the details known about the latter. From Gervase, Huntingdon, and John of Hexham we learn that Henry came over in the middle of May 1149, a date which receives at once confirmation and correction from his charter to Salisbury cathedral, given at Devizes on April 13, 1149.² At this time, as Gervase expressly says, Robert of Gloucester was dead, and the empress had quitted England, and Henry, joining himself to Ralph of Chester and Roger of Hereford, marched north towards Scotland. At Carlisle, on May 22, 1149, he was knighted; the date being absolutely fixed by the concurrent testimony of Huntingdon, John of Hexham, and the Chronicle of Melrose.

After this ceremony an invasion of England was planned; but it came to nothing, and there is no trace of any fighting on this occasion. Clearly we have two

¹ The empress was certainly at Falaise in June 1148 (Salisb. charters, Journ. Brit. Arch. Assoc., xl. 145, 146), so we have a fixed limit of error, one which at any rate helps to show that this visit of Henry's is not to be confounded with the one in 1149.

² See charter preserved at Salis-

bury. A translation is printed in the Journal of the Brit. Archæol. Assoc., xl., p. 146. Another of Henry's early charters, given at Devizes to Quarr abbey, and, as the list of witnesses shows, almost certainly at this date, is printed by Dugdale, *Monast.*, i., p. 750 (ed. 1655).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05228-3 - Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I: Volume 3

Edited by Richard Howlett

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xx

PREFACE.

separate visits, one about April 1147—a boy's failure; the other in April 1149—a sober commencement of a definite though abortive scheme of invasion. If we are to say that these two alleged visits are really but one, we must suppose that the author of the *Gesta Stephani* has presented us with two pages of circumstantial fable, and we must also set aside the clear testimony of Robert of Torigni; but mediæval history would simply disappear if the evidence of chroniclers were to be treated in this way.

Our conclusions as to this expedition will be confirmed by an examination of the curious chronological difficulty which arises on the assertion of the *Gesta*¹ that almost at the same time as Henry's invasion,—the one in 1147 of which we have just spoken,—Stephen knighted his son Eustace and made him *consul*. Now both Huntingdon and John of Hexham² say that the rivals, Henry and Eustace, were knighted in the same year, that year being 1149, while on the other hand the writer of the *Gesta* places the knighthood of Eustace just before the death of Robert of Gloucester, that is before October 31, 1147.

Chronological difficulties:

(2.) The date of the knighting of Eustace.

Thus far the matter stands as a dispute between the chroniclers; but there is other testimony which seems decisive against Huntingdon and John of Hexham, though we have to introduce the evidence of the *Gesta Stephani* so far as regards the fact that Eustace was knighted and made *consul* at one time. This however, is but a matter of course, for he could hardly have been made count of Boulogne before knighthood in an age in which even a bishop who became an earl

¹ p. 132.

² It is observable that while the chronicle of Melrose confirms these

writers as to the date (1149) of Henry's knighthood, it says nothing as to Eustace.

was also made a knight, though what Eustace received was evidently a lordship not an earldom.¹

If we now examine the charter of queen Matilda to the Priory of the Holy Trinity, London,² we see that one witness was “*comes Eustachius filius regis*”; another, bishop Hilary of Chichester, who was consecrated in August 1147; a third, Robert bishop of Hereford, who died in September 1148. These limiting dates for the grant of the lordship to Eustace are fixed by the charters giving land for the building of Faversham abbey, in or before 1148, for in these he again appears as *comes*. In earlier charters he is merely “*Eustachius filius meus*.” We are thus sure that he became a *count* before September 1148, and we may confidently add that he also became a knight before the same date—no doubt in 1147, as the *Gesta* tell us.

We must therefore, it would seem, give the case in favour of the author of the *Gesta*, and admit that he once more demonstrates his superiority over his fellow writers.

There is a third, and an exceedingly complex, chronological difficulty respecting the date of the landing of the empress and Robert of Gloucester, for William of Malmesbury³ asserts that they landed at Arundel on Sept. 30,

Chronological difficulties:

(3.) The date of the landing of the em-

¹ Hugh de Puiset, bishop of Durham, became earl of Northumberland in 1189 or 1190, and of him Richard of Devizes (see p. 389) says, “*et solo sibi gladio, quo manu regis in militem fuerat accinctus, vix relicto . . .*” There is probably nothing which can be adduced to show positively that knighthood *must* precede the grant either of the office or of the dignity; but girding with the sword of a county seems to imply a previous or concurrent knighthood

in the case of an earl. The point, is strongly set before us by Gervase, who says that on June 14, 1170, when the younger Henry was to be crowned, his father “*ipsa die Henricum . . . militem fecit, statimque eum . . . in regem ungui præcepit et coronari.*” Haste is implied in this passage; but the ceremony of knighthood was carefully observed before the coronation.

² *Monast.* (ed. 1673), ii., p. 81.

³ p. 724.

press Maud 1139, and the task of impugning the testimony of such
and the a writer is not a little serious.¹ There was a council
earl of held, he says, from August 29 to September 1, and on
Gloucester. September 30 the invasion was effected.

More or less in support of this we have (i.) a vague date, "*in autumno*," from Ordericus Vitalis;² (ii.) another vague date, "*circa mensem Septembrem*," for the council from John of Hexham; and (iii.) a date *in August*, also for the council, from the Waverley Annals.³

Against these we must set the important evidence of John of Worcester, the continuator of Florence; for the true text of his chronicle⁴ informs us, in one place, that the empress and her brother landed at Portsmouth "*mense . . . Julio*," in another, that they came before August 1.

Against both Malmesbury and John of Worcester we must next cite Robert of Torigni,⁵ who at this point has interesting original information. He says that the empress crossed "*mense Augusto*," and, as we shall see, he is very likely right.

Now we should remark *in limine* that the *Gesta*, and all the chronicles which allude to both events, agree to place the landing *after* the council.

Let us then proceed to see what light the series of events will cast on the controversy.

We know from Malmesbury⁶ and John of Worcester that the bishops were seized at Oxford just after June 24. Then the king marched to Devizes and Sherborne, and thence towards Lincolnshire to seize Newark and Sleaford. After all this—" *nec longe post* " Huntingdon says—the council was held.

¹ His testimony, however, as to another pair of dates (see p. 73, note 3) is refuted by the evidence of the charter given by Adam de Domerham, ed. Hearne, p. 329.

² v. 121.

³ p. 227.

⁴ As supplied by Gervase and by Cott. MS. Calig. A. VI.

⁵ i., p. 215.

⁶ p. 107.