

Dutton, Kathryn Ann (2011) *Geoffrey, Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy, 1129-51*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/3052/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

GEOFFREY, COUNT OF ANJOU AND DUKE OF NORMANDY, 1129-51

Kathryn Ann Dutton
MA (Hons.), MA

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of PhD (History)

History (Medieval Area)
School of Humanities
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

August 2011

GEOFFREY, COUNT OF ANJOU AND DUKE OF NORMANDY, 1129-51

KATHRYN DUTTON

APPENDICES

CONTENTS AND NOTE ON TEXT

APPENDIX I	Comital and ducal <i>acta</i> , 1129-51
APPENDIX II	The Bayeux Inquests
APPENDIX III	The conflict with Bishop Ulger of Angers
APPENDIX IV	Post-9 th September 1151 references to lost <i>acta</i>
APPENDIX V	Letters, 1129-51
APPENDIX VI	<i>Acta</i> , 1129-51, petitioned for or witnessed by Geoffrey

NOTE ON TEXT

This calendar of texts is arranged alphabetically, by beneficiary, and details of their geographical and diocesan locations supplied. References to Chartrou's catalogue of *acta* are provided in smaller numbers adjacent to the main number where necessary.

Manuscripts have been lettered and ordered according to their date. 'A' has been used only where the existence of an original manuscript is attested, either by its survival or by reliable references to lost texts.

Details of dating and witnesses have been provided in full, with the exception of the acts catalogued in Appendix IV (later confirmations of lost acts) as all of these texts are printed in full and discussed elsewhere, and the witnesses and dates of issue are all posterior to Geoffrey's reign. The only exception is Appendix IV, no.14, which reproduces the witnesses and sureties to Geoffrey's original charter in favour of the men of Rouen in 1144.

Transcriptions have been provided where possible and where no published edition exists. Abbreviations have been silently expanded; where doubt exists over transcription, triangular brackets have been used. Square brackets denote more precise identification of individuals suggested by the author.

Occupational names and titles have been left in the original Latin, with the exception of common titles such as bishop, abbot, count and duke. Toponymics have, where possible, been translated into their modern French equivalents. Where doubt exists, the original Latin has been included.

Geoffrey's titles (count, duke) have been provided for each text in the order in which they appear.

Every effort has been made to supply complete lists of the manuscripts in which these texts appear, but there are without doubt some omissions and errors which will need to be rectified through future archival work. Where possible these have been noted.

Abstract

Count Geoffrey V of Anjou (1129-51) features in Anglo-French historiography as a peripheral figure in the Anglo-Norman succession crisis which followed the death of his father-in-law, Henry I of England and Normandy (1100-35). The few studies which examine him directly do so primarily in this context, dealing briefly with his conquest and short reign as duke of Normandy (1144-50), with reference to a limited range of evidence, primarily Anglo-Norman chronicles. There has never been a comprehensive analysis of Geoffrey's comital reign, nor a narrative of his entire career, despite an awareness of his importance as a powerful territorial prince and important political player.

This thesis establishes a complete narrative framework for Geoffrey's life and career, and examines the key aspects of his comital and ducal reigns. It compiles and employs a body of 180 *acta* relating to his Angevin and Norman administrations to do so, alongside narrative evidence from Greater Anjou, Normandy, England and elsewhere. It argues that rule of Greater Anjou prior to 1150 had more in common with neighbouring principalities such as Brittany, whose rulers had emerged in the tenth and eleventh centuries as *primus inter pares*, than with Normandy, where ducal powers over the native aristocracy were more wide-ranging, or royal government in England. It explores the count's territories, the personnel of government, the dispensation of justice, revenue collection, the comital army, and Geoffrey's ability to carry out 'traditional' princely duties such as religious patronage in the context of Angevin elite landed society's virtual autonomy and tendency to rebel in the first half of the twelfth century. The character of Geoffrey's power and authority was fundamentally shaped by the region's tenurial and seigneurial history, and could only be conducted within that framework. This study also addresses Geoffrey's activities as first conqueror then ruler of Normandy. The process by which the duchy was conquered is shown to be more intricate than the chroniclers' accounts of Angevin siege warfare suggest, and the ducal reign more complex than merely a regency until Geoffrey's son, the future Henry II (1150-89), came of age.

Through use of a much wider body of evidence than previously considered in connection with Geoffrey's career, and a charter-based methodology, this thesis provides a new and appropriate treatment of an important non-royal ruler. It situates Geoffrey in his proper context and provides an account of not only how he was presented by commentators who were sometimes geographically and temporally remote, but by his own administration and those over whom he ruled. It provides an in-depth analysis of the explicit and implicit characteristics of princely rulership, and how they were won, maintained and exploited in two different contexts.

Contents

Abstract		i
Accompanying material		iv
Acknowledgements		v
Abbreviations		vii
Note on texts, translations and names		x
Introduction	Evidence, traditions and contexts	1
	Historians and historiography	5
	Evidence	9
	From Anjou to Greater Anjou: the rise of the comital dynasty	18
Chapter 1	The narrative of two reigns	27
	1120-29: formative years	27
	1129-35: count of the Angevins	30
	1135: a new challenge	38
	1135-44: the fight for Normandy	40
	1144-50: duke of the Normans	58
	1150-1: cession, conflict and an untimely death	61
Chapter 2	Authority, aristocracy and administration in Greater Anjou	67
	Demesne, baronial estates, fortifications and urban centres	68
	Military prerogatives	78
	Judicial prerogatives and practices	88

Chapter 3	Family, friends and followers in Greater Anjou	96
	Family	98
	Local administration and officials	111
	Familiar men: household and retinue	116
Chapter 4	Geoffrey and the Church in Greater Anjou	137
	The Greater Angevin episcopate	137
	Monastic patronage	156
	Saint-Laud of Angers	168
Chapter 5	The conquest of Normandy	177
	1135-41: defection, unrest and the Angevin foothold	179
	1141-4: consolidation and <i>de facto</i> rule	197
	1144: the fall of Rouen and Geoffrey, duke of the Normans	206
Chapter 6	The ducal reign	211
	Heir to Henry I: confirmations and restitutions	215
	The Bayeux Inquests	220
	Patronage and prerogatives	229
	Cross-Channel activities	233
	Succession and cession	240
Conclusion		245
Bibliography		251
Maps	Greater Anjou	275
	Normandy	276

Accompanying material

The accompanying CD-Rom contains six appendices of calendared *acta*, referred to in the text, as follows:

Appendix I Comital and ducal *acta*, 1129-51

Appendix II The Bayeux Inquests

Appendix III The conflict with Bishop Ulger of Angers

Appendix IV Lost comital and ducal *acta* referred to after 9th September 1151

Appendix V Letters to and from Geoffrey, 1129-51

Appendix VI *Acta* petitioned for or witnessed by Geoffrey, 1129-51

Acknowledgements

I have incurred many debts during the course of writing this thesis, a process which was first suggested by my supervisors, Dr Stephen Marritt and Prof. Matthew Strickland, while I was studying at University College London in 2005 and finally completed while working at the University of Liverpool in 2011. I thank them for their support, advice and insight, as well as their patience and friendship. Generous funding from the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland made my research possible.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my examiners, Prof. Daniel Power and Prof. Dauvit Broun, not only for their insightful comments and criticisms, but also – along with the chair, Dr Andrew Roach – for making the viva such a positive, pleasant and constructive experience. Any errors of style or substance which remain are my own.

This thesis would not have been possible without the assistance of Prof. Nicholas Vincent, whose generosity with archival and unpublished material led in several cases to new discoveries, and who provided clarification on many technical matters. Dr Stuart Airlie, Prof. David Bates, Prof. Dauvit Broun, Dr Elisabeth van Houts, Prof. John Hudson, Dr Graeme Small and Prof. Julia Smith all offered their assistance, advice and access to unpublished material. M. Luc Forlivesi, directeur des Archives départementales d’Indre-et-Loire, and M. Florent Lenègre, directeur adjoint des Archives départementales de la Seine-Maritime, amongst many other archivists, were particularly helpful in providing original documents, which in some cases were undergoing conservation. The generosity of M. Octave Julien made my research trips to France not only possible, but also a pleasure. Maps were drawn up by Mr Mike Shand.

Fellow PhD students have unhesitatingly offered their help, knowledge and friendship, and I owe particular thanks to Dr Richard Allen, Ms Colette Bowie, Dr Laura Crombie, Dr Daniel Gerrard, Mr William Hepburn, Dr Andrew Smith and Ms Vanessa Traill. I am also grateful to my colleagues at the University of Liverpool, who encouraged and patiently waited for me to complete this thesis while also serving in a teaching post. Particular thanks are owed to Dr Jonathan Hogg, who has contributed more than he knows, as well as Dr Christoph Laucht, Dr Stephen Kenny, Prof. Mark Peel and Dr Mark Towsey, and Dr Siobhan Talbott of the University of Manchester, who all made the task a little less daunting and took me out for more well-earned drinks

than I can justify.

My most personal thanks are for Hibah Akram, Paolo Basetti-Sani, Desmond McKenna, Brendan and Marc McKenna-Nicoll, Phoebe Weller, and most particularly Dr Maureen McCue and Maisie Taylor, who were there through all the ups and downs. My final thanks are for my parents, Shirley and Charles, and my sister, Caroline, whose support and love is immeasurable. This thesis is dedicated to them.

Abbreviations

AD	Archives départementales
ADIL	AD d'Indre-et-Loire, Tours
ADML	AD de Maine-et-Loire, Angers
ADSM	AD de la Seine-Maritime, Rouen (formerly AD Seine-Inférieure)
AN	Archives nationales de France, Paris
BL	British Library, London
BM	Bibliothèque municipale
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
TNA	National Archives (formerly Public Record Office), Kew
<i>AHR</i>	<i>American Historical Review</i>
<i>ANS</i>	<i>Anglo-Norman Studies</i>
<i>APC</i>	<i>Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium</i> , ed. G. Busson, A. Lédru and E. Vallée, Archives historiques du Maine II (Le Mans, 1902)
App.	Appendix (I-IV), accompanying CD-Rom
<i>Aquaria</i>	'Chronicon Vindocinense seu de Aquaria', <i>Chroniques des églises d'Anjou</i> , ed. Paul Marchegay and Émile Mabille (Paris, 1869), pp.153-77
<i>BEC</i>	<i>Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes</i>
<i>CartulR</i>	<i>CartulR – Répertoire des cartulaires médiévaux et modernes</i> , ed. Paul Bertrand, <i>Ædilis</i> , Publications scientifiques, 3 (Orléans, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, 2006), http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/index/
<i>Cassini</i>	Carte de France ('Carte de Cassini'), produced for the Observatoire de Paris by Gian Domenico (Jean-Dominique) Cassini (1625-1712); Jacques Cassini (1677-1756); César-François Cassini de Thury (1714-1784) and Jean-Dominique, comte de Cassini (1748-1845), www.cassini.ehess.fr (L'École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris)
<i>CCM</i>	<i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i>
Bienvenu	<i>Grand cartulaire de Fontevraud: pancarta et cartularium abbatissae et ordinis Fontis Ebraudi</i> , ed. Jean-Marc Bienvenu, with Robert Favreau and Georges Pons (2 vols., Archives historiques du Poitou 63 and 64, Poitiers, 2000-5)
Black Book	AD du Calvados, Caen, Bibliothèque du chapitre de Bayeux MS 193
<i>Cart. noir</i>	<i>Le Cartulaire noir de la cathédrale d'Angers</i> , ed. Charles Urseau (Paris and Angers, 1908)
<i>CSA</i>	<i>Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin d'Angers</i> , ed. Bertrand de Broussillon, with tables by Eugène Lelong (3 vols., Angers, 1896-1903)
<i>CSJ</i>	<i>Chartes de Saint-Julien de Tours: 1002-1227</i> , ed. L.-J. Denis (2 vols., Archives historiques du Maine 12, Le Mans, 1912)
<i>CSL</i>	<i>Cartulaire du Chapitre Saint-Laud d'Angers (Actes du XI^e et du XII^e siècle)</i> , ed. Adrien Planchenault (Angers, 1903)
<i>CSPL</i>	<i>Cartulaires des abbayes de Saint-Pierre de la Couture et de Saint-</i>

	<i>Pierre de Solesmes, publié par les Bénédictins de Solesmes</i> (Le Mans, 1881)
CSV	<i>Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans (ordre de Saint Benoît), premier cartulaire: 572-1188</i> , ed. R. Charles and Menjot d'Elbenne (Mamers and Le Mans, 1886-1913)
CTV	<i>Cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme</i> , ed. Charles Métais (5 vols., Paris and Vannes, 1893-1904)
Delisle Intr.	Léopold Delisle, <i>Recueil des actes de Henri II, Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France</i> (Introduction, Paris, 1909)
DB	Léopold Delisle, <i>Recueil des actes de Henri II...</i> , ed. Élie Berger (3 vols., Paris, 1909-47)
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
GCA	'Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum', <i>Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise</i> , ed. Louis Halphen & René Poupardin (Paris, 1913)
GAD	'Gesta Ambaziensum dominorum', <i>Chroniques des comtes</i> , ed. Halphen & Poupardin
GS	<i>Gesta Stephani</i> , ed. and trans. K. R. Potter (rev. ed., Oxford, 1976)
HSJ	<i>Haskins Society Journal</i>
JM	John of Marmoutier, 'Historia Gaufridi ducis Normannorum et comitis Andegavorum', <i>Chroniques des comtes</i> , ed. Halphen & Poupardin
Liber albus	<i>Chartularium insignis ecclesie Cenomanensis quod dicitur Liber albus capituli</i> , ed. R.-J.-F. Lottin (Le Mans, 1869)
Livre noir	<i>Antiquus cartularius ecclesiae Baiocensis (Livre noir)</i> , ed. Valentin Bourrienne (2 vols., Rouen, 1902-3)
Méron	'Chronica vel sermo de rapinis, injusticiis et malis consuetudinibus a Giraudo de Mosteriollo exactis; et de eversione castri ejus a Gaufrido comite', <i>Chroniques des églises</i> , ed. Marchegay and Mabilie, pp.83-90
OV	<i>The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis</i> , ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall (6 vols., Oxford, 1969-80)
Papsturkunden	<i>Papsturkunden in Frankreich: Neue Folge</i> , ed. Johannes Ramackers, Dietrich Lohrmann and Rolf Grosse (9 vols., Göttingen, 1937-99)
p.j.	<i>pièce justificative</i>
Pl. Acta	<i>Acta of the Plantagenets</i> , ed. J. C. Holt, Nicholas Vincent and Judith Everard (Cambridge, forthcoming)
RB	<i>Red Book of the Exchequer</i> , ed. Hubert Hall (3 vols., Rolls Series 99, London, 1896)
RHGF	<i>Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France</i> , et M. Bouquet et al (24 vols., Paris, 1738-1904)
Ronceray	Paul Marchegay, 'Recherches sur les cartulaires d'Anjou (<i>Cartularium monasterii Beatae Mariae Caritatis Andegavensis</i>)', <i>Archives d'Anjou</i> (3 vols., Angers, 1843-54), III
RPR	<i>Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII</i> , ed. Philip Jaffé (2 vols., 2 nd rev. ed., Leipzig, 1885-8, repr. 1956)
Round	<i>Calendar of documents preserved in France, illustrative of the history of Great Britain and Ireland: A.D. 918-1206</i> , ed. John Horace Round

	(London, 1899)
RRAN	<i>Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066-1154</i> , ed. H. W. C. Davis, R. H. C. Davis, H. A. Cronne <i>et al</i> (4 vols., Oxford, 1913-69)
RT	<i>Chronique de Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont Saint Michel</i> , ed. Léopold Delisle (2 vols., Rouen, 1872-3)
Stein	Henri Stein, <i>Bibliographie générale des cartulaires françaises ou relatifs à l'histoire de France</i> (Paris, 1907)
St-Aubin	'Chronicae Sancti Albini Andegavensis in unum congestae', <i>Chroniques des églises</i> , ed. Marchegay and Mabille, pp.17-61
St-Florent	'Breve chronicon Sancti Florentii Salmurensis', <i>Chroniques des églises</i> , ed. Marchegay and Mabille, pp.179-95
St-Pierre	<i>Le chapitre royal de l'église collégiale de Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour, Sainte-Chapelle du Mans</i> , ed. Menjot d'Elbenne and L.-J. Denis, Archives historiques du Maine 10 (Le Mans, 1910)
St-Serge	'Chronicon Sancti Sergii Andegavensis', <i>Chroniques des églises</i> , ed. Marchegay and Mabille, pp.127-52
WM, HN	William of Malmesbury, <i>Historia Novella</i> , ed. Edmund King and trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford, 1998)

Note on translations, editions and names

To avoid confusion, the subject of this biography is referred to as Count Geoffrey V, not Geoffrey IV; this is taken to be his uncle, who co-ruled Anjou 1106-9. Members of the dynasty are referred to by their ordinal numbers rather than cognomina. Regnal dates have been provided where appropriate.

Translations of Latin text excerpts have been provided where necessary, and in these instances the original Latin text has been provided in a footnote. For ease of reading, extended Latin excerpts are in ordinary type, while individual words bracketed in the body of the text are in bold. Where translations exist, the original Latin has not been provided. In some instances, where useful, the Latin text has been provided in a footnote where I have not provided a translation in the body of the text.

For the sake of consistency, personal names have been Anglicised, with the exception of some unusual names which have no obvious Anglicised form. ‘Of’ has been used instead of ‘de’ for toponymics. Many names within this study have been rendered in a variety of ways by historians. Of the most frequently-used, Berlai/Berlay has been regularised as Berlay, though the seat of the lordship, Montreuil-Bellay, retains the Bellay ending. Eudo/Odo had been regularised as Odo. The dedications of religious houses follow the French format and naming-form (Saint-Julien, Sainte-Catherine) in France, the English (St. Paul’s) in England.

In the case of geographical locations, with the exception of capitals or other major urban centres, details of the modern département, arrondissement and canton (except where the location is the chef-lieu du canton) have been provided; details of the commune have also been given for very small or no-longer extant locations. Details of English counties have also been provided where necessary.

Introduction

Evidence, traditions and contexts

He was a man of admirable honesty, distinguished by justice, dedicated to knightly deeds, highly literate and the most eloquent amongst clergy and laymen, circumspect in his decisions, tall and with a handsome face, in general full of all good moral habits, and although constantly subjected to many tribulations by his men, he was loved by all.¹

The Angevins remained in Normandy for thirteen days and made themselves hated for ever by their brutality...As for the count, who had entered Normandy riding on a foaming steed and voicing threats, he was carried home pale and groaning, lying in a litter; but in the course of his retreat he suffered worse harm from his own men than from the enemy...[his] chamberlain was killed and his baggage with his robes of state and precious vessels were stolen.²

I, Geoffrey Martel, count of the Angevins, son of King Fulk of Jerusalem, and husband to Matilda, daughter of the king of the English and former wife of the Roman emperor, Henry...have suffered to hear the complaint of Matthew, abbot of Saint-Florent of Saumur and his monks...³

These twelfth-century assessments of Geoffrey, count of Anjou (1129-51) and duke of Normandy (1144-50) encapsulate two different perspectives which dominate contemporary and modern historiography, and a third which is less familiar. For his medieval biographer, John of Marmoutier (writing c.1170-80), Geoffrey was the princely embodiment of contemporary chivalric ideals, and a just and good ruler. For the Anglo-Norman monk Orderic Vitalis (d.1141), he was the leader of an unruly band of violent and disloyal thugs, a desecrator of the church who had been sent to conquer Normandy on behalf of his wife. Geoffrey's administrative documents, while not giving us direct access to his own voice, present not only a conception of his comital and ducal

¹ Addition by John of Marmoutier to *GCA, Chroniques*, p.170: 'Fuit iste probitate admirabilis, justitia insignis, militie actibus deditus, optime litteratus, inter clericos et laicos facundissimus, in consilio providus, statura procerus, vultu decorus, fere omnibus bonis moribus repletus, et quamvis multas tribulationes a suis sit perpressus, tamen ab omnibus est dilectus.'

² OV VI, pp.469-70, 474-5.

³ App. I, no.89: 'Haec omnia, ego, Goffridus Martellus, Andegavorum comes, Fulconis regis Ierosolimitanorum filius, idemque Mathildis, regis Anglorum filiae, Henrici videlicet Romani imperatoris quondam uxoris, maritus, haec, inquam, supradicta diligenter attendens, querimoniae Mathei abbatis Sancti Florencii Salmurensis monachorumque suorum...cumpassus sum.'

authority as perceived by Geoffrey himself, his followers and administrators, and the recipients of such texts, but also a more dispassionate account of the concerns of his career and the way in which his authority functioned.

This study is the first biography of Geoffrey since 1928, when Josèphe Chartrou's *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151* – which remains the only full-length examination of the careers of both Geoffrey and his father Fulk V (1109-29) – was published.⁴ In the interim, the weaknesses of Chartrou's monograph, including a limited body of evidence and a superficial approach to aspects of that evidence, have been recognised by historians.⁵ This study is therefore important for several reasons. As discussed below, the earlier and later history of Anjou has been researched in depth by historians, yet Geoffrey's career, which laid the foundations for the count's transformation from a territorial prince of the Loire valley to king and duke, ruling lands from Gascony to the Scottish border, remains relatively neglected. The structures which underlay Geoffrey's reign as count of Anjou – his administration, the personnel who operated it, and the constraints upon it – have hitherto not been satisfactorily analysed. Examination of Geoffrey's career allows us to gain a detailed insight into non-royal rulership, and the forces which shaped it: as recently suggested by Thomas Bisson, to study Geoffrey's reign is to consider the nature of non-royal power and authority in the twelfth century, and this is a concern to which the thesis will frequently return.⁶

Modern interpretations of the reign are largely the product of chronicle evidence, mainly from the Anglo-Norman realm; they deal with only certain aspects of Geoffrey's life and career, normally in conjunction with those of his wife and eldest son. In one of these studies it is argued that '[W]e can do no more than review the achievements of Geoffrey as count'.⁷ The present study indicates that not to be the case, primarily through the collation and examination of the *acta* – the charters, letters and other diplomatic materials relating to Geoffrey's Greater Angevin⁸ and Norman

⁴ Josèphe Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jerusalem et Geoffroi Plantagenêt* (Paris, 1928).

⁵ Jacques Boussard, *Le comté d'Anjou sous Henri Plantagenêt et ses fils (1151-1204)* (Paris, 1938), pp.131, n.10 and 132, n.7, criticises Chartrou's approach for not engaging sufficiently with the evidence.

⁶ Thomas N. Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton NJ and Oxford, 2009), esp. pp.128-42.

⁷ Jim Bradbury, 'Geoffrey V of Anjou, count and knight', *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood III: papers from the fourth Strawberry Hill conference, 1988*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, 1990), pp.21-41, at 26. Bradbury does not consider the charter evidence.

⁸ The counties of Anjou and Maine, and the western Touraine, and see below, pp.17-18.

administrations – which provide rich evidence for many neglected and unexplored aspects of Geoffrey's career. 180 documents have been collected, enlarging Geoffrey's corpus of *acta* by almost fifty per cent, from its previous total of 128 texts compiled by Chartrou. This thesis not only utilises this information, but collects it together in the form of a calendar, appended to the main study, which will form the basis of a future full-text edition of Geoffrey's comital and ducal *acta*, which is currently a serious lacuna in Angevin and Anglo-Norman historiography.

Alongside narrative evidence and other *acta* from Anjou, Normandy, England and elsewhere, this material enables a detailed account of the chronology of Geoffrey's comital and ducal reigns to be constructed, and a host of questions to be answered on themes as diverse as the nature of his authority, the mechanisms of his rule, and his priorities and attitudes as count of Anjou and duke of Normandy. These include religious and lay patronage, legal custom and practice, courtly culture, family matters, and ceremony and ritual. Analysis of the *acta* is this study's central methodology: they are examined for both their content, and what it can reveal about the events of the reign, and also their information on the structures and supports of comital rule. Prosopographical analysis of witness-lists permits a detailed picture of Geoffrey's officers and wider entourage to be constructed, which sheds light on not only the individuals who played roles in his administration, but also their backgrounds, inter-connections and the reasons why they played certain roles. This analysis is undertaken in the context of serious aristocratic revolt described by the chroniclers, and seeks to understand how comital authority and administration functioned under these circumstances. In the case of Normandy, the evidence is interrogated first with the aim of establishing how the conquest was achieved – seeking to quantify the value of alliances and territorial gains, and to understand how they were won and maintained – and then to illuminate the priorities of Geoffrey's short ducal reign.

Geoffrey emerges as a dynamic ruler, yet one whose lands had not yet been brought under convincing control, and who faced a potentially disastrous set of circumstances as a result. Although he met the continual challenges posed by the Angevin baronage, whilst managing to conquer the duchy of Normandy, other aspects of his rule appear modest and muted by comparison with his contemporaries. This study thus offers a fresh perspective on the events, concerns and structures of Geoffrey's

career. Instead of the one-dimensional Geoffrey ‘Plantagenet’ of popular culture – a cognomen which is attested to in some contemporary narrative sources, which has been exhaustively debated but which adds little to our understanding of the ruler or his career⁹ – the Geoffrey who emerges from this thesis is the Geoffrey ‘Martel’ (*Martellus*, ‘Hammer’) defined by comital precedent, the records of his own administration and the acts presented for his approval by the recipients of his patronage, as well as by contemporary and near-contemporary commentators.¹⁰ This thesis aims to dig beneath the physical portrait of the lean, red-headed Geoffrey ‘the Handsome’ or ‘Le Bel’ (*formosus*) provided by John of Marmoutier and taken up by Kate Norgate.¹¹

Though we will never know the kinds of details about Geoffrey’s personal life that have survived for rulers like Charlemagne and Henry I,¹² the extant sources do enable us to examine closely how Geoffrey approached and reacted to the circumstances of his times; how he differed in his actions from his father and his contemporaries, both royal and princely; and how he exercised, or attempted to exercise, power over his lands and subjects. Although in some respects a biography, therefore, what follows is emphatically an elucidation of the events and details of a reign which occurred in the context of a very particular period, the second quarter of the twelfth century, primarily in a very particular region, Greater Anjou, in the context of non-royal rulership. This is a study of a reign which was punctuated not only by serious domestic problems, but also by the immense effort to conquer the duchy of Normandy. Though Geoffrey as man, husband, father, brother and son will feature, this is a study of Geoffrey as count, duke, lord and knight.

No detailed chronological framework for the events of Geoffrey’s career has

⁹ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, pp.83-4, details the evidence for the use of the cognomen, including *GCA*, p.170, and its apparent meaning of ‘broom plant’ (*planta genista*). For the debate on and evidence for the name, see Martin Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire, 1154-1224*, trans. David Crouch (Harlow, 2007), pp.6-7.

¹⁰ Geoffrey is named as *Martellus* in nine extant texts, including his obituary at Angers cathedral: App. I, nos. 6, 41, 48, 58, 86, 89, 93, 111; App. IV, no.2. See below, p.13, n.50, for use of the term on his seal. For its use by and for Geoffrey II and Geoffrey IV, see, for example, *CSA* I, nos. 1, 84, 111, 160, 220, 306.

¹¹ JM, p.177; *Chronique de Parcé*, ed. H. de Berranger (Le Mans, 1953), p.10; Kate Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings* (2 vols., London, 1887) I, pp.261-2.

¹² Janet L. Nelson, ‘Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?’, *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: essays in honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), pp.15-28, discusses at 18, for example, how Charlemagne wrote in bed. For Henry’s death, which contemporaries put down to his fondness for lampreys, Judith Green, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.6, 221, citing Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum: the history of the English people*, ed. and trans. D. E. Greenway (Oxford, 1996), p.490.

hitherto been established, and Chapter 1 therefore sets out a narrative for his lifetime. The subsequent chapters address the key themes and issues of his Angevin and Norman reigns. Chapter 2 explores the nature and extent of comital authority and administration in Greater Anjou, and the ways in which this was affected by the structure of local aristocratic society. Chapter 3 turns to the personnel utilised by Geoffrey to administer Greater Anjou, and examines the comital court, paying particular attention to Geoffrey's family and the most frequent witnesses to his *acta*. Chapter 4 deals with the Church in Greater Anjou, detailing Geoffrey's relations with abbeys and bishops. Chapters 5 and 6 turn to Normandy: Chapter 5 examines Geoffrey's conquest of the duchy, exploring how it was achieved, whilst Chapter 6 looks at his ducal reign. Inevitably, the constraints of a thesis mean that certain aspects of interest cannot be addressed in detail. Most prominent amongst these are Geoffrey's military expertise, the technical aspects of which fall beyond the scope of this study, and his role in scholarship, which can only be addressed briefly in relation to the upbringing of his children. His mistresses and illegitimate children are only touched upon in passing. The prosopographical analysis of the personnel of the Angevin administration has not been replicated for Normandy, as the backgrounds of some of these individuals are already treated elsewhere.

Before beginning it is necessary to survey Geoffrey's treatment in modern historiography, the nature and scope of the evidence employed here, and – briefly – the Angevin comital dynasty's history.

Historians and historiography

The Angevin comital dynasty and Anjou have a presence in modern historiography, but the emphasis in recent years has lain with the counts of the tenth and eleventh centuries, particularly in the work of Olivier Guillot and Bernard Bachrach. In his two-volume work, Guillot sought to examine the nature of comital authority from c.975 to 1109, namely between the reigns of Geoffrey II (958-87) and Fulk IV (1067/8-1109).¹³ The second volume of Guillot's work calendared some 472 authentic and spurious comital *acta*, which were used as the basis for his investigation of comital personnel, institutions and patronage. Guillot's work builds upon and supersedes that of

¹³ Olivier Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XI^e siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1972).

Louis Halphen.¹⁴ Much of Bachrach's work focuses on Fulk III (987-1040), and characterises him as a 'neo-Roman consul', a ruler whose power and the attitudes of those who perceived it was shaped by Classical culture and references.¹⁵ This aspect of Bachrach's work has been much debated and holds little sway amongst many, but his research has nonetheless highlighted how the Angevin counts built up and maintained their power through castle-building and local ties of fidelity.¹⁶

The other strong voice in Angevin historiography is that of Jacques Boussard, whose work on institutions, land tenure and administration focuses upon the reign of Geoffrey's son Henry II (1151-89), who also succeeded to the duchy of Normandy in 1150, the duchy of Aquitaine in 1152 and the kingdom of England in 1154.¹⁷ Much of Boussard's work is, like Guillot's, founded in a close reading of the charter evidence, and in fact addresses many aspects of Geoffrey's reign from this perspective in order to establish the context for Henry's activities. Boussard's research has left a significant legacy, and interest in the reign of Henry II is unabated, and has generated modern monographs on the king, as well as a multitude of shorter studies directly connected with both Anjou and his charters.¹⁸ Henry's *acta*, and those of his wife and children, are also the subject of a significant project – the *Acta of the Plantagenets*, begun by Sir James Holt and continued by Nicholas Vincent – shortly to be published by the British Academy. Unlike Guillot's work on the earlier counts, this publication will provide the full texts of the *acta*, which currently number more than 3,000 for Henry alone;¹⁹ this material is already the basis for new interpretations of Henry's reign.²⁰

¹⁴ Louis Halphen, *Le comté d'Anjou au XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1906).

¹⁵ Bernard S. Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra, the Neo-Roman Consul, 987-1040: A Political Biography of the Angevin Count* (Berkeley CA, 1993) and a number of papers, many collected in idem., *State-Building in Medieval France: Studies in Early Angevin History* (Aldershot, 1995).

¹⁶ For criticisms of key aspects of Bachrach's work, see the reviews of Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra* by Geoffrey Koziol in *Speculum* 70 (1995), pp.332-4 and K. S. B. Keats-Rohan in *EHR* 111 (1996), pp.668-9; cf. Thomas F. X. Noble's positive review in *Journal of Military History* 58 (1994), pp.319-20.

¹⁷ Most importantly, Boussard, *Le comté*; idem., *Le gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt* (Paris, 1956); Boussard has also written on general aspects of Angevin history during the period, for example, 'La vie en Anjou aux XI^e et XII^e siècles', *Le Moyen Âge* 4th series, 5 (1950), pp.29-68.

¹⁸ W. L. Warren, *Henry II* (new ed., New Haven CT and London, 2000); Richard Barber, *Henry Plantagenet* (new ed., Woodbridge, 2001); Noël-Yves Tonnerre, 'Henri II et l'Anjou', *Plantagenêts et Capétiens: confrontations et héritages*, ed. Martin Aurell & Noël-Yves Tonnerre (Poitiers, 2006), pp.211-25; *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Nicholas Vincent and Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge, 2007).

¹⁹ Judith Everard, 'Lay Charters and the *Acta* of Henry II', *ANS* 30 (2008), pp.100-116, at 101, provides a total of 3,205 acts collected for Henry by April 2007.

²⁰ For example, Nicholas Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Harper-Bill and Vincent, pp.278-334, and idem., 'Regional variations in the charters of King Henry II (1154-89)',

John Gillingham, Martin Aurell and others have synthesised scholarship and conducted original research on the so-called ‘Angevin Empire’²¹ – that is, the territories stretching from Gascony to England which were united under Henry II – but it is only Kate Norgate’s *England under the Angevin kings* that attempts to trace in detail the dynasty from its tenth-century origins to its thirteenth-century decline.²² Aside from Chartrou’s monograph, this is the most comprehensive account of Geoffrey’s reign, but both rely on a limited body of evidence, largely from the chronicles, and naturally employ methodologies and reflect concerns which were current in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

Of all of these studies, Boussard and Guillot’s work on Anjou points the way for study of Geoffrey’s reign in many respects.²³ Their focus on charter material alongside chronicles, annals and other narrative evidence has allowed them to reconstruct many aspects of Angevin administrative, legal and customary practice, and in doing so to gain an insight into the nature of comital and then royal authority. This approach has also been successfully employed in several studies of Anjou’s ecclesiastical history, especially that of the region’s bishops, and in a recent examination of a local family who rose to prominence in the twelfth century.²⁴ Nevertheless, there has been no attempt to

Charters and Charter Scholarship in Britain and Ireland, ed. Marie-Thérèse Flanagan and Judith Green (Basingstoke, 2005), pp.70-106.

²¹ John Le Patourel, *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet* (London, 1984); John Gillingham, *The Angevin Empire* (2nd ed., London, 2001); Jean Favier, *Les Plantagenêts: origines et destin d’un empire, XI^e-XIV^e siècles* (Paris, 2004); Aurell, *Plantagenet Empire*. Shorter studies include Robert-Henri Bautier, ‘Conclusions. ‘Empire Plantagenêt’ ou ‘espace Plantagenêt’. Y eut-il une civilisation du monde Plantagenêt?’, *CCM* 29 (1986), pp.139-47, and Ralph V. Turner, ‘The problem of survival for the Angevin ‘Empire’: Henry II’s and his sons’ vision versus late twelfth-century realities’, *AHR* 100 (1995), pp.78-96, plus the papers in *La cour Plantagenêt (1154-1204): actes du colloque tenu à Thouars du 30 avril à 2 mai 1999*, ed. Martin Aurell (Poitiers, 2002); *Culture politique des Plantagenêts (1154-1224)* (Poitiers, 2003), ed. Martin Aurell; and *Plantagenêts et Capétiens*, ed. Aurell and Tonnerre.

²² Norgate, *Angevin kings*, I.

²³ Noël-Yves Tonnerre, ‘Henri II et l’Anjou’, *Plantagenêts et Capétiens*, ed. Aurell and Tonnerre, pp.211-25; see also n.17, above.

²⁴ For Angers and Anjou, see Jean-Marc Bienvenu, ‘Renouveau de l’Église Angevine (an mil-1148)’, *Histoire de Diocèse d’Angers*, ed. François Lebrun, *Histoire des diocèses de France* 13 (Paris, 1981), pp.19-42; Joseph Avril, ‘L’Église d’Angers au temps des grands conciles (1148-1317)’, in *ibid*, pp.43-67; Avril, *Le gouvernement des évêques et la vie religieuse dans le diocèse d’Angers (1148-1240)* (2 vol, Paris, 1984). Cf. Jörg Peltzer, *Canon law, careers and conquest: Episcopal elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c.1140-c.1230* (Cambridge, 2008), which makes less use of comital charters. Christian Cussonneau, ‘Une famille de chevalerie saumuroise: les Roinard de Boumois’, *Archives d’Anjou* 7 (2003), pp.5-23. Cf. the older, very patchy studies of Alphonse Angot which deal with some prominent families of Maine, including ‘Baronnie de Château-Gontier’, *Bulletin de la Commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne* 31 (1915), pp.15-46 and ‘Sablé’, *ibid*. 35 (1919), pp.166-204, 266-308, 369-91. Other studies have examined local families as case studies in the debate on the ‘feudal revolution’: J. Peter Burkholder, ‘The “feudal revolution” and the lords of Durtal’, *HSJ* 11 (2003), 85-96.

incorporate this research into accounts of comital rule in the twelfth century. Some shorter studies have explored Geoffrey's presentation in the works of John of Marmoutier, but only ask a limited range of questions connected mainly with chivalry, literacy and military technology.²⁵

The other substantial historiographical strand related to Geoffrey's career deals with his position in the Anglo-Norman world, both as Matilda's husband and with regard to the succession arrangements for Anjou, England and Normandy.²⁶ The Anglo-Norman dimension of Geoffrey's career was first examined in depth by Charles Homer Haskins and Sir Maurice Powicke, whose studies on the ducal period remain seminal.²⁷ More recently, Marjorie Chibnall and David Crouch have provided detailed accounts of the conquest, though almost exclusively from the chronicle evidence.²⁸ This work has been supplemented by a series of smaller studies on Norman law and custom under Geoffrey and by the commentaries in *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum*, in which Geoffrey's Norman *acta* are published.²⁹ In spite of keen interest in Norman history, however, Geoffrey's ducal reign has never been systematically examined. George Garnett's recent monograph briefly addresses Geoffrey's role in the succession crisis, arguing that he only began to exercise real power in Anglo-Norman affairs from 1142

²⁵ Jim Bradbury, 'Greek Fire in the West', *History Today* 29 (1979), pp.326-31; idem., 'Geoffrey V'; Bernard S. Bachrach, 'The practical use of Vegetius' 'De re militari' during the early Middle Ages', *Historian* 47 (1985), pp.239-55; C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness – Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia, 1985), pp.201-10.

²⁶ C. Warren Hollister and Thomas K. Keefe, 'The Making of the Angevin Empire', *Journal of British Studies* 12 (1973), pp.1-25; Thomas K. Keefe, 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession', *Albion* 6 (1974), pp.266-74; John Le Patourel, 'The Plantagenet Dominions', *History* 1 (1965), pp.289-308, repr. idem., *Feudal Empires*, ch. 8; idem., 'Angevin Successions and the Angevin Empire', *Feudal Empires*, ch. 9; Bernard S. Bachrach, 'Henry II and the Angevin Tradition of Family Hostility', *Albion* 16 (1984), pp.111-30; Richard Benjamin, 'The Angevin Empire', *History Today* 36 (1986), pp.17-22; Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda: queen consort, queen mother and lady of the English* (Oxford, 1991).

²⁷ Charles Homer Haskins, 'The Early Norman Jury', *AHR* 8 (1903), pp.613-40; idem., 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', *EHR* 27 (1912), pp.417-44, both reprinted in idem., *Norman Institutions* (Cambridge MA. and London, 1918), pp.123-55, 196-238; F. M. Powicke, 'The Angevin Administration of Normandy' parts 1 and 2, *EHR* 21 (1906), pp.625-49 and 22 (1907), pp.15-42;

²⁸ Marjorie Chibnall, 'Normandy', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Edmund King (Oxford, 1994), pp.93-115; David Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (Harlow, 2000), passim. For the restrictions of the chronicle-based approach to the conquest, especially in Chibnall's account, see David Bates, 'Review: Medieval Historiography: Stenton, Maitland, and Round', *Journal of British Studies* 38 (1999), pp.93-7, at 97.

²⁹ *RRAN* III, pp.xxxii-xxxix and notes at the relevant charters. Studies which deal with select aspects of Geoffrey's ducal reign since Haskins include: Sarell E. Gleason, *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: The Bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204* (Cambridge MA, 1936); Robert Helmerichs, 'Norman Institutions or Norman Legal Practices? Geoffrey le Bel and the Development of the Jury of Recognition', *HSJ* 10 (2003), pp.81-94.

onwards.³⁰

The appetite for the history of northern France and the Anglo-Norman realm has not lessened in recent years, which have witnessed a flurry of biographies and regional studies. Not only have several biographies of key individuals connected with Geoffrey's reign – including his father-in-law, Henry I (1100-35), and his wife and their rival, King Stephen (1135-54) – been published,³¹ a series of studies engages with rulers and aristocracy in regions neighbouring Anjou.³² Particularly prominent amongst these are Judith Everard's volume on the duchy of Brittany under the Angevins, who took the area over in the mid-twelfth century – but which also provides an account of the nature and apparatus of ducal rule under Geoffrey's contemporaries – and several studies on the county of Maine, annexed to Anjou by Fulk V in 1110.³³ Many of these modern studies utilise both charter and narrative evidence to illuminate not only the lives of the men and women who appear in the sources, but also the structures, institutions and dynamics of power.

Evidence

As discussed above, the 180 extant *acta* appended to this study form a substantial part of the evidence for Geoffrey's career, alongside more familiar narrative material. It is necessary to outline this body of evidence and the approaches taken to it.

³⁰ George Garnett, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession, and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford, 2007), pp.222-31.

³¹ Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*; as well as Crouch, *King Stephen*, see also Donald Matthew, *King Stephen* (Hambledon and London, 2002); Edmund King, *King Stephen* (New Haven, CT and London, 2010). See also *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), especially David Crouch, 'King Stephen and Northern France', pp.44-57. Also relevant are C. Warren Hollister, *Henry I*, ed. Amanda Clark Frost (New Haven, CT and London, 2001), and Judith Green, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 2006).

³² André Chedeville and Noël-Yves Tonnerre, *La Bretagne féodale, XI-XIII^e siècles* (Rennes, 1987); G. Louise, *La seigneurie de Bellême, X^e-XII^e siècles* (2 vols., Flers, 1992); Dominique Barthélemy, *La société dans la comté de Vendôme de l'an mil au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1993); Kathleen Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship in Medieval France: The County of the Perche, 1000-1226* (Woodbridge, 2002); Daniel Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, 2004); Theodore Evergates, *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne, 1100-1300* (Philadelphia PA, 2007).

³³ Judith Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins: province and empire, 1158-1203* (Cambridge, 2000). On Maine: André Bouton, *Le Maine: histoire économique et sociale, des origines au XIV^e siècle* (2 vols., Le Mans, 1962); Daniel Pichot, *Le Bas-Maine du X^e au XIII^e siècle: Étude d'une société* (Laval, 1995); Bruno Lemesle, *La société aristocratique dans le Haut-Maine (XI^e-XII^e siècles)* (Rennes, 1999); Richard E. Barton, 'Lordship in Maine: transformation, service and anger', *ANS* 23 (2001), pp.7-38; Barton, *Lordship in the County of Maine, c.890-1160* (Woodbridge, 2004). These studies are all grounded in Robert Latouche, *Histoire du comté du Maine pendant le X^e et le XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1910).

The acta

The *acta* consist of 114 documents issued by Geoffrey and/or recording his direct involvement in the comital or ducal courts (i.e. judgments). A further sixteen comprise the history of inquests in the Norman diocese of Bayeux, and are made up of texts issued by Geoffrey, his officers, and successive popes. Eleven texts pertain to a long-running disagreement between Geoffrey and Ulger, bishop of Angers, with documents drawn up by both parties. Nineteen charters issued by others after Geoffrey's death in 1151, normally but not exclusively by his son Henry II, confirm charters granted or renewed by Geoffrey, the text of which is now lost. This section includes what may best be described as three obituary-charters drawn up by the cathedrals of Greater Anjou, which commemorate Geoffrey's life and record specific grants, as well as a further three charters issued by Henry after his father's death make amends for depredations committed against the abbeys of Fontevraud and Saint-Florent of Saumur; they record actions made by Geoffrey – sometimes recorded in a lost charter – and are therefore included.

In addition to these charters, and also included in the appendices, are eight letters between Geoffrey and his contemporaries, including his son Henry and Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis. The final twelve charters were issued by Geoffrey's contemporaries – including the king of France, local barons and knights, and the heads of religious institutions – and Geoffrey either witnessed them or petitioned for their issue. Geoffrey's *acta*, therefore, are a diverse collection of documents which were not assembled in any one place by contemporaries.³⁴

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Europe's ruling elites were solidifying their possession of the written word: kings and princes employed increasing numbers of their own scribes and learned clerics in their own chanceries, which developed their own clear styles. Michael Clanchy has demonstrated that the output of the chanceries operated by the papacy, the kings of England and the kings of France grew dramatically during the course of the twelfth century, and that these kings largely controlled document production.³⁵ Some important differences exist between the documents calendared here, and those of these royal contemporaries and associates. First,

³⁴ Cf. later aristocratic charter cartularies, e.g. *The Cartulary of Countess Blanche of Champagne*, ed. Theodore Evergates (Toronto, 2009), which contains 443 documents compiled for the countess in 1224.

³⁵ Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p.60, fig.1.

Geoffrey's *acta* are dwarfed by the materials pertaining to both his father-in-law, Henry I, and his son, Henry II – for whom over 3,000 texts have been collected – as well as contemporaries such as Louis VI of France (1108-37).³⁶ Second, document production in Greater Anjou and – though to a markedly lesser extent – Normandy lay primarily with beneficiaries, normally monasteries, and as Louis Halphen's examination of the eleventh-century material has shown, the Angevin counts depended upon beneficiaries to produce charters, and accordingly the *acta* of Geoffrey's predecessors 'conform to no particular diplomatic rule'.³⁷ On one hand, this makes tightly-controlled analysis of the diplomatic features of the *acta* difficult, and indeed somewhat obsolete, as although Geoffrey did occasionally utilise his own scribe,s there was no formal chancery; on the other, the *acta* were produced in a local diplomatic tradition which was narrative and descriptive in style. This fact, more than any other, makes Geoffrey's Angevin *acta* invaluable to the reconstruction of his reign, for they contain many details which would otherwise have been lost.

Although a far smaller collection of documents than those pertaining to the kings of England and France, Geoffrey's *acta* are greater in number than the extant charters attributed to Geoffrey's wife Matilda, and those which have been uncovered for other French territorial princes, with the exception of the dukes of Normandy.³⁸ The corpus also represents a substantial portion of the known charters of the Angevin comital dynasty: Chartrou calendared ninety-seven charters issued by Fulk during his twenty years as count of Anjou, over one quarter of which were issued for Fontevraud.³⁹ For

³⁶ Green, *Henry I*, pp.9-10, n.40, gives some indication of the Henry I *acta* project, which in 2004 numbered 1,630 texts (<http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/sharpe/index.htm#anglonorman> [accessed 01/02/10]). Judith Everard, 'Lay Charters and the *Acta* of Henry II', *ANS* 29 (2007), pp.100-16, at 101, notes that Henry II's known *acta* totalled 3,205 in April 2007. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p.60, fig. 1, calculates Louis VI's average yearly output of extant *acta* to be less than 10, but this needs to be revised to 15.1 in the light of the 439 extant *acta* Louis issued as king which are printed in *Recueil des actes de Louis VI, Roi de France, 1108-1137*, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier and Jean Dufour, Chartes et diplômes relatifs à l'histoire de France 13-16 (4 vols., Paris, 1992-4), discussed in III, p.9.

³⁷ Halphen, *Le comté*, p.237.

³⁸ Marjorie Chibnall, 'The charters of the Empress Matilda', *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp.276-98, at 276, numbers Matilda's 'known and probably authentic' charters at just under 100. These charters were issued during a 45-year career, by contrast with Geoffrey's 22 and a half years as count of Anjou and duke of Normandy. Cf. the 31 authentic acts collected for Geoffrey, duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond (1181-6), which is a rate of just over 5 per year, and the 77 of Constance, duchess of Brittany (1181-1201), a rate of 3.85 per year (although there were periods of inactivity during the reign); see *The Charters of Duchess Constance of Brittany and her Family, 1171-1201*, ed. Judith Everard and Michael Jones (Woodbridge, 1999), pp.1, 38-9.

³⁹ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pp.253-81. She identified twenty five charters issued by Fulk for Fontevraud, and

the period before Fulk's reign and the dynasty's involvement with Fontevraud (975-1109), Olivier Guillot's expansion of Louis Halphen's work identifies 444 authentic comital charters and twenty-eight apparent forgeries.⁴⁰ The charters of Geoffrey's reign benefit from better preservation than those issued by his predecessors: the authentic and forged charters of the period before 1109 survive at the rate of around 3.5 per year; Fulk V's comital charters at around 4.85 per year. The survival rate for Geoffrey's charters, by contrast, is closer to seven per year if Anjou and Normandy are taken together; if all of the *acta* (including later confirmations and letters) are taken together, the rate of issue/survival is a little over eight per year.

Most of these acts were issued for ecclesiastical beneficiaries ranging from small hermitages to ancient monasteries and cathedrals. Charters for lay beneficiaries are extremely rare. Only three grants to individual laymen survive, plus a small number of charters for collectives, such as the men of Angers, Saumur and Rouen.⁴¹ The vast majority of these texts exist in copies. Of the charters issued by Geoffrey, only twelve still survive in the original, and very few are in a good state of preservation. Parts of some are illegible through wear and tear;⁴² one is heavily altered;⁴³ another was cut into strips during the medieval period, presumably for bookbinding or recycling in another form.⁴⁴ Dozens of originals have vanished without trace, while the destruction of others occurred through the demolition or dilapidation of churches,⁴⁵ by the wholesale burning of charters and cartularies during the French Revolution,⁴⁶ and by the intensive bombing of northern France in 1944.⁴⁷ Others still are perhaps victims of theft.⁴⁸

also included in the catalogue a confirmation issued for Fontevraud by Countess Aremburga (cat. no.23), which I have excluded from this total.

⁴⁰ Guillot, *Le comte* II; cf. Halphen, *Le comté*, pp.244-355. Both collections are printed as calendars, though Halphen, like Chartrou, included several charters in full.

⁴¹ Ibid., nos. 51, 52 and 54 are all for individual laymen; nos. 29, 82 and 93 are for collectives. App. IV, nos. 5, 13, 14 and 19 are confirmations by Henry II of grants or confirmations made by Geoffrey to laymen in Normandy.

⁴² E.g. App. I, no.27, an important confirmation issued for Saint-Laud of Angers, is essentially illegible; no.83, a writ instructing the vicomte of Rouen to dispense money to the town's lepers, is damaged but mostly legible.

⁴³ Ibid., no.92 for Saint-Florent of Saumur, the terms of which and the names of its witnesses were erased and reinserted differently.

⁴⁴ Ibid., no.103, for Saint-Julien of Tours.

⁴⁵ E.g. ibid., no.57 for Le Loroux exists only in a copy as most of the church's archive was destroyed during the English occupation of church buildings in the Hundred Years War.

⁴⁶ French historians have gone to great pains to reconstruct cartularies destroyed by the revolutionaries, including the twelfth-century *cartulaire noir* of Angers cathedral; *CN*, pp.v-xi.

⁴⁷ E.g. App. I, no.69, for Lessay.

⁴⁸ Ibid., no.44, a charter for Fécamp which was apparently 'misaid' in the old AD Seine-Inférieure (now

Of the extant originals, only one still has Geoffrey's seal attached.⁴⁹ This sole survival is a decent impression of Geoffrey's double-sided second seal, the matrix for which was struck after the conquest of Normandy had been completed in 1144. Wear and tear has worn away most of the legend, but its images clearly show Geoffrey on horseback, as count of Anjou – with shield and pennant – on one side, and duke of Normandy – with sword and shield – on the other. Fortunately, the French scholar Roger de Gaignières (1642-1715) made several sketches of Geoffrey's single-sided first seal that pertained to Anjou, impressions of which were in the seventeenth century still attached to several charters.⁵⁰ Contrary to what has been argued in the past, the precedent of earlier seals engraved for Geoffrey and his predecessors suggests that Geoffrey never styled himself count or duke 'by the grace of God' (*Dei gratia*) on his seals, even after the acquisition of Normandy.⁵¹ Seals and charters here highlight one of the key issues tackled in this thesis: the nature of Geoffrey's power and authority.

The evidence of the *acta* is particularly valuable given the total absence of comital financial records and contemporary legal compilations or customals. Geoffrey's *acta* yield some details of comital finances, but only a very few, and it simply is not known how they were managed; there is no evidence, for example, of an exchequer system similar to that found in England or Normandy. They are slightly more forthcoming with regard to law and custom, and in Chapter 2 it has been necessary to utilise the evidence of thirteenth-century customals to explore aspects of these matters under Geoffrey. Conclusions here are necessarily tentative, given the potential of Angevin law and custom to be transformed by a century which witnessed the firm rule of Henry II and, ultimately, French royal annexation of the region.

ADSM); perhaps also no.55, a charter for the Hospitallers which went astray from the Calvados archives at Caen sometime after 1918.

⁴⁹ App. I, no.31, issued for the Norman abbey of Bec-Hellouin after the conquest of the duchy.

⁵⁰ Gaignières bequeathed his collection to the French royal library, now the Bibliothèque nationale.

⁵¹ Cf. Georges de Manteyer, 'Le sceau-matrice du comte d'Anjou Foulques le Jeune (1109-1144 [*sic*])', *Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de France* 6th series, 10 (1899), pp.305-38, at 323, which reconstructs the legend on the reverse of the ducal seal as + G[AUFRIDVS DEI GRATIA COMES ANDEGAVOR]VM. The legend on Geoffrey's first seal read + SIGILLVM GOFFRIDI MARTELLI ANDEGAVORUM COMITIS, as shown in the drawings made by Gaignières (App. I, nos. 63 and 48, which is partially destroyed but shows that the legend was probably the same (the letters ...ILLI AND... are visible). Manteyer, 'Le sceau-matrice', p.308 shows that Geoffrey's father Fulk V did not employ the title, while Guillot, *Le comte* II, pl.XX (cat. no. C363) shows that Geoffrey's grandfather Fulk IV likewise did not use the style on his seal.

Chronicles and other narrative sources

A rich body of narrative material exists for this period, primarily from Greater Anjou, Normandy and England. Though the period witnessed a flourishing of chronicle-writing in England and Normandy, there is no easily-defined ‘chronicle’ dealing with events in Anjou during this period. Rather, the major work is that of a monk of the Tourangeau abbey of Marmoutier, John, who was writing between c.1173 and c.1180. His prose history of Geoffrey’s career, the ‘History of Geoffrey duke of the Normans and count of the Angevins’ (*Historia Gaufredi ducis Normannorum et comitis Andegavorum*), enumerates key incidents – both real and apocryphal – in the count’s life, to demonstrate Geoffrey’s probity, fairness and chivalry and thus to produce a study of ideal rulership which, although dedicated to the bishop of Le Mans, carried a clear message for Henry II.⁵² The *Historia* was dedicated to William of Passavant, bishop of Le Mans (1142-86), who had overseen Geoffrey’s burial within the cathedral in Le Mans in 1151.⁵³

John continued a historical tradition which, in the mid-twelfth century, had turned its attention to the Angevin comital dynasty and the barons of the region, particularly the lords of Amboise. As well as authoring the *Historia*, John continued and interpolated a dynastic history, the ‘Deeds of the consuls of the Angevins’ (*Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum*, or *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*).⁵⁴ The *Gesta* were originally written between 1135 and 1151 by Thomas of Loches, a clerk in the employ of Fulk V and Geoffrey; they were revised by a certain Robin, of whom nothing is known, and Brito, apparently a canon of Saint-Florentin of Amboise, a foundation which does not feature in twelfth-century comital patronage.⁵⁵ John’s additions to the *Gesta* were completed before the *Historia*, which incorporated large sections of the former, along with material from the dynastic history of the lords of

⁵² JM, pp.172-231. Sharon Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours* (Ithaca NY, 1991), pp.88-9; Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness*, pp.203-6.

⁵³ JM, p.172, and see Chapter 4.

⁵⁴ GCA, pp.25-73 and additions, *Chroniques*, pp.135-71.

⁵⁵ GCA (additions), p.164; *Chroniques*, pp.xxxvi-xxxviii. This is the dating given by Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness*, p.202; cf. Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, p.87, who dates the first redaction by Thomas to before 1115. This is unlikely for, as Chapter 4 shows, Thomas – who has been claimed by historians to have been Geoffrey’s chancellor, but there is contradictory evidence – was in Geoffrey’s service at the end of the reign, and did not die until c.1168.

Amboise and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*.⁵⁶

Although it appears that John did not know Geoffrey personally, he provides some indication that he relied on oral testimony from those who did as a source for the *Historia*.⁵⁷ Those named as sources are Matthew, dean of Angers cathedral (who died c.1177), and several laymen from both Anjou and Normandy, including Reginald Rufus and Goffereus of Bruyères – both of whom appear in Geoffrey's *acta*⁵⁸ – and Engelger of Bohon, a Norman from the Cotentin who was one of Geoffrey's earliest supporters in the conquest of the duchy.⁵⁹ Information was also provided by another Norman, Jordan Taisson, lord of Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte (Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville), who while not a habitual member of Geoffrey's Norman entourage can be found witnessing one of his charters.⁶⁰ John's final named source is *Obertus de Ocrea*, who was probably Osbert of La Heuze, Henry II's constable for Cherbourg.⁶¹ John's purpose and strategy in writing the *Historia* deserves a study of its own, but it is interesting to note that these Norman informants all had strong Cotentin connections, and this region indeed becomes one of John's focuses.

Other narrative sources from Greater Anjou are not as rich in content or description as the works connected with John of Marmoutier. Annals survive from a variety of religious institutions, most notably Saint-Florent of Saumur, Saint-Serge and Saint-Aubin of Angers, and La Trinité of Vendôme, founded by the counts in the mid-eleventh century but outside Greater Anjou.⁶² The deeds of the bishops of Le Mans, primarily a narrative but also a collection designed to stake a claim to estates, contain

⁵⁶ The history of the lords of Amboise (*GAD*) is also printed in *Chroniques*, pp.74-132. The use of Henry of Huntingdon as the basis of the second, incomplete, book of John's *Historia* is discussed in *ibid.*, p.lxxxv-lxxxvi. Henry's *Historia* was also used heavily by Robert of Torigny for sections of his chronicle: see Patricia Stirnemann, 'Two twelfth-century bibliophiles and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*', *Viator* 24 (1993), pp.121-42.

⁵⁷ JM, p.174.

⁵⁸ Reginald appears in App. I, nos. 13, 21, 27; App. III, no.1; and App. VI, no.11. Goffereus is in App. I, nos. 45, 50, and App. IV, no.5 (a confirmation by Geoffrey's son Henry, 1151×3, of a lost act for Fontevraud and Reginald of Saint-Valéry).

⁵⁹ For Engelger, see Chapter 5.

⁶⁰ App. I, no.40. For Jordan's estates and a history of the Taissons, see *Lands of the Normans*, <http://www.brownonline.ac.uk/normans/casestudies.shtml#taissoon> [accessed 22/08/11].

⁶¹ *Pl. Acta*, nos. 847, 1833, 1835 and 1842 were all addressed to Osbert; see also *RRAN* III, no.168, a writ issued by Empress Matilda 1148×51 instructing Osbert *de Hosa*, constable of Cherbourg, to seize the canons of Sainte-Marie du Voeu, Cherbourg, with land in the Cotentin.

⁶² *Chroniques des églises d'Anjou*, ed. Paul Marchegay and Émile Mabille (Paris, 1869), has been used here in preference to *Recueil d'annales angevines et vendômoises*, ed. Louis Halphen (Paris, 1903).

much useful evidence on the counts of Anjou.⁶³ A thirteenth-century chronicle composed in Tours survives, but is of limited use.⁶⁴ Another chronicle was produced in this period by the Manceau abbey of Parcé, which reflects on Geoffrey's apparent role in the Second Crusade and examines the history of several local baronial families.⁶⁵ Unfortunately, much of its content is simply fabricated; indeed, Geoffrey never went on crusade and the Parcé chronicle must therefore be treated with extreme caution.

The Anglo-Norman chronicles which discuss Geoffrey's reign are well known and can supply some of the details lacking in their Angevin counterparts; indeed, as outlined above, they have been heavily used by historians to reconstruct elements of Geoffrey's career. In Normandy, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigny both treat his marriage to Matilda and the conquest of Normandy at length; Orderic's account was cut short by his death, however, in 1141. Orderic's account in particular requires careful unpicking in order to glean accurate information on Geoffrey: his vehemently anti-Angevin perspective, as demonstrated above, is well-known to historians, and was in part a result of the impact of Geoffrey's conquest of the duchy upon the region surrounding Orderic's abbey of Saint-Évroul.⁶⁶ As demonstrated in Chapter 5, Orderic's outlook is also manifest in much more subtle ways in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, which serve to conceal and skew the nature and scale of Geoffrey's activities in the duchy. In England, the chief sources for Geoffrey's career are the anonymous *Gesta Stephani*, composed in the 1140s and 1150s, and the *Historia Novella*, begun by William of Malmesbury c.1140 but terminated upon his death c.1142. William dedicated the *Historia* to Matilda's half-brother Earl Robert of Gloucester, whereas the *Gesta* was pro-Stephen, at least until 1148.⁶⁷

A notable lacuna in the Norman material is Geoffrey's *gesta*, which Robert of Torigny exhorted Gervase, prior of Saint-Céneri, to add to the other Norman ducal *gestae*, but which never came to fruition.⁶⁸ Though the reasons why the chronicle never

⁶³ *APC*.

⁶⁴ *Recueil de chroniques de Touraine*, ed. André Salmon, Collection de documents sur l'histoire de Touraine I (Tours, 1854), pp.64-161.

⁶⁵ *Chronique de Parcé*, ed. Berranger.

⁶⁶ See Chibnall's introduction to the text, OV VI, p.xxviii; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.48; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.60.

⁶⁷ For the dating and changes of sympathy of the author, perhaps Bishop Robert of Bath, see R. H. C. Davis, 'The authorship of the *Gesta Stephani*', *EHR* 77 (1962), pp.209-32.

⁶⁸ Daniel Power, 'Angevin Normandy', *A Companion to the Anglo-Norman World*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Elisabeth Van Houts (Woodbridge, 2002), pp.63-85, at 63-4. The priory is located at the

appeared are not known, it is noteworthy that Gervase's priory was a daughter-house of Saint-Évroul – home to Geoffrey's harshest critic, Orderic – and situated on the River Sarthe, on the border with Maine and thus in the area which was securely held from the earliest Angevin incursions into Normandy after Henry I's death.⁶⁹ This is not the only lacuna in the primary material, for although Henry II commissioned first Wace then Benoît of Sainte-Maure to rework Dudo of Saint-Quentin's original *gesta*, this redaction did not extend to new material on Geoffrey. The other Norman chronicles that do exist offer up rather smaller pieces of information, such as the details of the siege of Rouen in 1144 supplied by a local anonymous commentator.⁷⁰

The Norman material does not consist solely of chronicles and annals. The chivalric epic, which had legendary figures of both history and romantic myth at its core, was a genre in the ascendant. The earliest and most relevant to Geoffrey's reign is the *Draco Normannicus*, a Latin verse epic composed between 1167 and 1169 by Stephen of Rouen, a monk of Le Pré, alias La Bonne Nouvelle, a dependent priory of Bec Abbey.⁷¹ Although it deals with Geoffrey's exploits, Stephen's use of epic *topoi* means that the poem is of only limited historical use, and this study consciously aims to move away from previously-employed 'chivalric' approaches to the reign.⁷² It is important to note, however, that Stephen's patron was perhaps the Empress Matilda herself, who had strong connections with Le Pré, and that his work certainly had currency in the court of Henry II.⁷³ Stephen also composed a short poem eulogising Geoffrey in much the same way as in the *Draco*.⁷⁴ This evidence is not considered in detail here.

Other English chronicles offer scraps of information on Geoffrey's reign. The most interesting is the collection of narratives produced by Ralph of Diceto, dean of St. Paul's in London: during his long career, Ralph had studied in Paris in the 1140s, and

modern St-Céneri-le-Gérei (Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Alençon-1), and was founded c.1050 by the Giroie family: Pierre Bauduin, 'Une famille châtelaine sur les confins normanno-manceaux: les Géré (X^e-XIII^e siècle)', *Archéologie médiévale* 20 (1992), pp.309-56, at 334.

⁶⁹ Although there is no direct evidence of Geoffrey taking any action at Saint-Céneri, see Chapter 5 for discussion of this area and other Giroie possessions.

⁷⁰ *RHGF* XII, pp.784-6.

⁷¹ *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. Richard Howlett, Rolls Series 82 (4 vols., London, 1885) II, pp.589-781.

⁷² E.g. Bradbury, 'Geoffrey V'.

⁷³ Marjorie Chibnall, 'The Empress Matilda and Bec-Hellouin', *ANS* 10 (1987), pp.35-48, at 46.

⁷⁴ *Chronicles*, ed. Howlett, II, pp.772-4.

had spent time in Angers, of which he writes with affection and knowledge.⁷⁵ Ralph's chronicles are peppered with sections on the history of the counts of Anjou, often drawn from the Angevin chronicles.⁷⁶ Other English chroniclers tended to note Geoffrey's existence in connection with the civil war of the 1130s and 40s, considering him in conjunction with Matilda. Such material can be found in the work of northern historians like Henry of Huntingdon – the source for John of Marmoutier's unfinished second book of the *Historia Gaufredi* – and John of Hexham, the continuator of Symeon of Durham's chronicle for the years 1130-54.⁷⁷ Geoffrey is mentioned in passing by later writers such as Gerald of Wales, who projects his hatred of Henry II – a result of the murder of Thomas Becket – onto Geoffrey, claiming that he had slept with Eleanor of Aquitaine, his son's future wife, and that the Angevins had 'come from the devil'.⁷⁸

From Anjou to Greater Anjou: the rise of the comital dynasty

It is necessary to outline very briefly the contours of Angevin history and geography. The boundaries of the county of Anjou were contiguous with those of the *pagus* of *Andegavia*, and correspond roughly to the modern *département* of Maine-et-Loire and its margins with Mayenne and Sarthe to the north, and Vienne to the south. This compact territory emerged as one of several 'territorial principalities' from the Carolingian kingdom of Neustria, a region which was slowly given over to the progenitors of the Capetian dynasty.⁷⁹ By the time of Geoffrey's death in 1151, comital rule had expanded well beyond these confines. To the north, the larger county of Maine – comprising the northern two-thirds of the *départements* of Mayenne and Sarthe – had

⁷⁵ *Radulphi de Diceto Decani Landoniensis, opera historica: The historical works of Master Ralph of Diceto, Dean of London*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series 68 (2 vols., London, 1876) I, pp.291-2. Ralph's connections with Anjou and Aquitaine are discussed by Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c.500 to c.1307* (London, 1974), p.236.

⁷⁶ Particularly the *Abbreviationes chronicorum*, in *Opera historica*, ed. Stubbs, I; also *ibid.*, II, pp.15-17 (*Ymagines historiarum*) and pp.267-9 (*opuscula*) which relate the Angevin genealogy.

⁷⁷ Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Greenway; *Symeonis monachi opera omnia*, ed. Thomas Arnold (2 vols., London, 1882-5) II.

⁷⁸ Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione*, in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer (8 vols., Rolls Series 21, London, 1861-91), VIII; *idem.*, *De contemptu mundi*, in *ibid.*, chap.27.

⁷⁹ Jean-François Lemarignier, 'Political and Monastic Structures in France at the end of the Tenth and the Beginning of the Eleventh Century', in *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe: Selected Readings* (New York, 1968), ed. Fredric L. Cheyette, pp.100-127, at 100, 105; David Bates, 'West Francia: the Northern Principalities', *New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024*, ed. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge, 1999), pp.398-419. For Brittany: Julia M. H. Smith, *Province and Empire: Carolingian Brittany* (Cambridge, 1992); Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*. For Maine: Barton, *Lordship in the County of Maine*.

been annexed by Geoffrey's father Fulk V in 1110, while to the east, the western Touraine (dép. Indre-et-Loire) up to and including its capital, Tours, had been held since 1044. To the south, crucially important footholds had been established in the marchland with the county of Poitou, though territory to the south of Poitiers had been lost. Anjou, Maine and the eastern Touraine together formed what modern historians have labelled 'Greater Anjou', and although this area was assimilated in a piecemeal fashion by the counts, it had some territorial and organisational unity: all three counties were within the archdiocese of Tours, although the territory's margins were not strictly defined, even where natural boundaries, such as the River Sarthe on the Maine-Normandy frontier, existed.⁸⁰

The comital dynasty emerged around the turn of the tenth century. Between 898 and 929 the future Count Fulk I was vicomte of Angers, apparently following the death of his father, Ingelger, an obscure figure even to his own descendants in the eleventh century. In the extant fragment of a chronicle written c.1096 and attributed to Count Fulk IV, Ingelger was said to hold the vicomté of Angers from the descendants of the Carolingian king Charles the Bald.⁸¹ This Carolingian pedigree, however, has been disproved, and the dynasty's rise was dependent upon the ancestors of Hugh Capet, who invested Fulk as vicomte in 898; despite the fact that 'he should have exercised no power independent of the counts...around 930 Fulk exchanged the title of *vicecomes* for *comes* in his charters, and the county of Anjou ceased to be a Capetian possession'.⁸² The dynasty's successful self-promotion was part of a much wider and deeper current of change in western Europe, which heralded the rise of a whole host of new rulers as well as petty lords, castellans and knights.⁸³

After a period of reasonable growth under Fulk I (929-42), Fulk II (942-58) and

⁸⁰ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.7.

⁸¹ 'Fragmentum historiae Andegavensis', *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, pp.232-7, at 232-3: 'Et ille primus Ingelgarius habuit illum honorem a rege Francie, non a genere impii Philippi sed a prole Caroli Calvi, qui fuit filius Hludovici filii Caroli Magni'.

⁸² Constance B. Bouchard, 'The origins of the French nobility: a reassessment', *AHR* 86 (1981), pp.501-32; pp.514-20.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp.515, 520. The houses of Chalon, Nevers and Mâcon all evolved in this way. See also Bates, 'West Francia', *passim*. The literature on the so-called 'Feudal Revolution' is substantial and will not be cited in full here, but see Thomas N. Bisson, 'The Feudal Revolution', *Past and Present* 142 (Oxford, 1994), pp.6-42; Dominique Barthélemy, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution I', *Past and Present* 152 (1996); Stephen D. White, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution II', *ibid.*, pp.205-23; Timothy Reuter, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution III', *Past and Present* 155 (1997), pp.177-95; Chris Wickham, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution IV', *ibid.*, pp.197-208; Thomas N. Bisson, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution. Reply', *ibid.*, pp.208-34.

Geoffrey I fostered by the implantation of castles, the cultivation of political alliances, and the subordination of local castellans, it was Fulk III who was instrumental in solidifying and extending the gains begun by his predecessors. Fulk's overarching policy until 1005 was the creation of a strong chain of castles within Anjou, extending into the Touraine and towards Blois-Chartres territory, particularly around Amboise and Loches.⁸⁴ Earlier territorial gains to the east were augmented by Fulk's possession through his mother of Loudun and Mirebeau, which brought Angevin authority to within twenty miles of Poitiers.⁸⁵ By 1025 Fulk had pledged homage to the duke of Aquitaine for Loudun, and in return was granted the highly strategic town of Saintes, south-west of Poitiers and deep within Aquitaine.⁸⁶

It was in Fulk III's reign that the Angevins broke with the practice of acknowledging Capetian – now royal – overlordship. In Anjou, as elsewhere in West Francia, the 'veneer of royal authority peeled away'.⁸⁷ Although Fulk's reign did not witness a complete decline in Capetian fortunes in the territorial principalities – it has been noted, for example, that Angevin monasteries continued to seek the input of Henry I (1031-1060) in their confirmation charters, and that the king even acted in union with the count in such affairs – the relationship had been renegotiated.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, the slackening of royal overlordship enabled Fulk to further add to his growing collection of lands. In an effort to strengthen his own precarious succession in 1031, Henry I was keen to secure Fulk's support in 1031, and thus ceded the county of Vendôme (Loir-et-Cher) to Fulk's son Geoffrey Martel.⁸⁹

Geoffrey Martel's relationship with his father established a precedent which was to prove sporadically troublesome for the counts into the twelfth century. He was entrusted with custody of Anjou during Fulk's third pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1035, and when Fulk returned he found that his son had upset the careful balance of power, interfering in matters such as the king's installation of the bishop of Le Mans. A

⁸⁴ Halphen, *Le comté*, pp.153-9; Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, p.151; Bachrach, 'Angevin strategy of castle building', *passim*.

⁸⁵ Sidney Painter, 'Castellans of the Plain of Poitou in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Speculum* 31 (1951), pp.243-57, at 245.

⁸⁶ Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, p.159.

⁸⁷ Bates, 'West Francia', p.410.

⁸⁸ Steven Fanning, 'Acts of Henry I of France Concerning Anjou', *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp.110-14, esp. p.113.

⁸⁹ Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra*, pp.207-9.

pressing concern for the Angevins was the desire to establish influence in Maine, and Geoffrey's assertion of dominance over its new count, Hugh, still a minor, clashed with Henry I's and Fulk's interests, and endangered Fulk's relationship with elite families in both Maine and Normandy.⁹⁰ It is unclear whether a war ensued between father and son, but it is certain that Geoffrey – though associated in his father's government – was deprived access to its administration and revenues.⁹¹

Despite Fulk and Geoffrey's conflict of interests, Geoffrey succeeded to the county – enlarged by the addition of Saintes (Charente-Maritime, arr. Saintes) and the Saintonge – as Geoffrey III (1040-60) and reigned for twenty years. He had custody of his wife Agnes, countess of Poitou's two children by William, count of Poitou and duke of Aquitaine; his step-daughter, Agnes, was married to Emperor Henry III in November 1043;⁹² William, the elder son, was designated duke of Aquitaine in 1044.⁹³ Geoffrey's power was further augmented by possession of a strong network of castles in the south of Maine, held by influential vassals such as Robert the Burgundian and Reginald of Angers.⁹⁴ The most significant gain, however, was to the east and occurred at the expense of the counts of Blois: after a prolonged siege in 1044, the city of Tours was surrendered to Geoffrey by Theobald of Blois.⁹⁵ Though Geoffrey did homage for the western Touraine to Theobald, this was an 'empty ceremony', for he imprisoned Theobald, and held the region and the city directly of the French king, who considered Theobald's claim to Tours entirely forfeit.⁹⁶

But Anjou's ascent came at a price. The alliance Geoffrey had forged with the Holy Roman emperor in 1043 left him diplomatically isolated in the face of a Capetian-Norman alliance until 1048, whereupon hostilities erupted between Anjou and Normandy.⁹⁷ Normandy had also grown in strength, and could command alliances with the Capetians, and Geoffrey's claims to overlordship of Maine were matched by Duke William's efforts to bring the county under Norman suzerainty. Though Geoffrey's

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp.229-32.

⁹¹ Ibid., p.233.

⁹² Guillot, *Le comte I*, p.60.

⁹³ Norgate, *Angevin kings I*, pp.174-6.

⁹⁴ W. Scott Jesse, 'The Angevin Civil War and the Norman Conquest of 1066', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.101-9, at 101.

⁹⁵ Norgate, *Angevin kings I*, pp.178-88.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.63-79.

attitude towards Maine in the 1030s had caused conflict with his father, the death of the young Count Hugh in 1051 enabled him to take control of the county during the minority of Herbert II. Geoffrey was received 'with open arms' in Le Mans and though Herbert, his sister and his mother Bertha, Hugh's widow, fled to Normandy, there is evidence in the mid-1050s of Herbert collaborating with Geoffrey in two acts, and that he probably did not do homage to Duke William II until at least 1056.⁹⁸ However, it is clear that the balance of power was changing in northern France, and soon after his gain in 1051 Geoffrey lost the important Norman frontier castles of Alençon and Domfront (Orne, arr. Alençon) to William. He retained Maine, however, until his death.⁹⁹

Geoffrey II's death after a clash with Duke William in November 1060 posed a challenge for the dynasty. Geoffrey's nearest male heir Fulk the Gosling, son of his half-sister Adela, who had already inherited Vendôme, was passed over. Instead, control of Greater Anjou passed to Geoffrey the Bearded, Geoffrey II's nephew by his sister Ermengarde. Geoffrey the Bearded's younger brother Fulk le Réchin was given overlordship of Saintes, the Saintonge and the castle of Vihiers (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur). Saintes was quickly lost to Duke William VIII of Aquitaine and Maine to William II of Normandy.¹⁰⁰ Geoffrey went on to alienate both Angevin castellans and the Angevin episcopate.¹⁰¹ Fulk launched a full-scale bid for the county from his base at the important Loire town of Saumur, and in 1067 the papal legate recognised him as count of Anjou; this was cemented beyond doubt in 1068, when Geoffrey was imprisoned.¹⁰²

To avoid further conflict it was necessary for Fulk first to satisfy Count Stephen of Blois by doing homage for the Touraine, and second to cede the Gâtinais – the maternal inheritance – to Philip I.¹⁰³ Though Maine continued to plague relations with Normandy, William's death in 1087 meant that the county finally fell into Angevin hands; even though William had agreed that his son Robert Curthose should pay homage to Fulk for the county in 1073, 'William kept [this] a dead letter by steadily

⁹⁸ Halphen, *Le comté*, p.75; Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.86-7; Latouche, *Histoire du comté du Maine*, p.32.

⁹⁹ David Bates, *William the Conqueror* (Stroud, 2001), pp.46-51.

¹⁰⁰ Norgate, *Angevin kings I*, pp.215-6; Jessee, 'The Angevin Civil War', p.102; William M. Aird, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy (c.1050-1134)* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.41-7.

¹⁰¹ Jessee, 'The Angevin Civil War', pp.104-6.

¹⁰² Halphen, *Le comté*, p.144.

¹⁰³ Norgate, *Angevin kings I*, p.221; Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.114-5, where it is also noted that Fulk lost the fortress at Château-Landon in the Île-de-France.

refusing to make over Maine to his son, and holding it as before'.¹⁰⁴

Greater Anjou in the twelfth century

By the time Fulk IV was invested count, Greater Anjou was 'diminished and exhausted' by eight years' civil war; by the turn of the twelfth century, Angevin barons and castellans could claim benefices which had previously been granted by the count as hereditary fiefs.¹⁰⁵ A significant loss of comital authority was a key feature of Fulk's reign, and its importance cannot be understated. The incipient power of the Angevin aristocracy transformed into something far more tangible during this period, and it was only in Henry II's reign that the dynasty could successfully 'ruin the independence of the Angevin lords', primarily through the creation of a stronger, centralised administration.¹⁰⁶

Since Chartrou's monograph it has become increasingly clear that the aristocracy's strength and the count's weakness were critical in shaping Greater Anjou in the twelfth century.¹⁰⁷ In Boussard's view, the first half of the twelfth century was a stage on the route to centralised authority and, although the baronage was unruly, the relative compactness of Anjou meant that they were effectively under comital control.¹⁰⁸ Recent work modifies but does not discard Boussard's conclusions. Judith Everard has stressed that, in common with Brittany and Poitou, the counts' earlier rise as *primus inter pares* meant that in the twelfth century local barons retained an ability to act autonomously.¹⁰⁹ Even after 1158, strong royal authority was restricted to the former Breton ducal demesne, while in large areas of the duchy the king/duke necessarily 'relied upon the personal loyalty of local magnates'.¹¹⁰ In terms of land tenure, French barons – including those of Anjou – tended to command compact, discrete lordships with structural integrity, by contrast with the scattered honours which characterised

¹⁰⁴ Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, p.223.

¹⁰⁵ Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.125, Halphen, *Le comté*, p.151; Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1180* (2nd ed., New York, 2000), p.189.

¹⁰⁶ Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.2-3.

¹⁰⁷ Jacques Boussard, 'Aspects particuliers de la féodalité dans l'Empire Plantagenêt', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de l'Ouest* 4th series, 7 (1963), pp.29-47, at 39; see Gillingham, *Angevin Empire*, p.51, for a neat summary of Boussard's findings. Cf. n.

¹⁰⁸ Boussard, 'Aspects particuliers', p.39.

¹⁰⁹ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, p.17. Cf. Boussard, 'Aspects particuliers', p.39, where a strong distinction is drawn between the count's territorial dominance over Anjou and his Aquitanian ducal counterpart's difficulties in controlling counts with greater lands and resources.

¹¹⁰ Judith Everard, 'The "Justiciarship" in Brittany and Ireland', *ANS* 20 (1998), pp.87-105, at 89.

English landholding.¹¹¹ As a partial consequence of the dependence created by this fragmentation, the higher aristocracy in England were extremely prominent at the royal court and held important posts with defined duties attached to them.¹¹² The tension between comital authority and baronial autonomy was, as this study will show, a defining feature of Angevin society in the twelfth century, and the count's ability to control the aristocracy was on a thinner knife-edge than Boussard allows.

Against this backdrop, Fulk announced in 1103 his decision to bypass his eldest son, Geoffrey Martel, in the succession and instead to invest his second son – his first by his second wife, Bertrada of Montfort – Fulk the younger as heir.¹¹³ Count Fulk's decision led to a brief war with Geoffrey, who allied with Helias of La Flèche, count of Maine (1092-1110), and forced his father into agreeing to associate him in the government of Anjou. For a time, father and son ruled together but in 1106 Geoffrey was killed whilst besieging Candé, on the Anjou-Maine border.¹¹⁴ Geoffrey's death, followed by that of his father in 1109, paved the way for his younger brother's succession. Fulk V's reign has been understood as a turning-point in Angevin history primarily because of the change in the dynasty's relations with its neighbours. In the months before his father's death on 14th April 1109, Fulk married his brother's former fiancée Aremburga, heiress to Helias of La Flèche, count of Maine.¹¹⁵ Upon Helias' death, Maine was definitively annexed to Anjou, triggering a renewal of hostilities with the duke of Normandy and king of England, Henry I. Though long-lasting, these tensions were in time to be smoothed over, ensuring that the future Geoffrey V was to be a key player in Anglo-Norman as well as Angevin and French politics.

The first few years of the 1110s were dominated by Henry I's attempts to pacify Normandy's hostile neighbours, including Anjou, and to gain their support against the

¹¹¹ C. Warren Hollister and John Baldwin, 'The Rise of Administrative Kingship: Henry I and Philip Augustus', *AHR* 83 (1978), pp.867-905, esp. pp.874-6.

¹¹² Ibid.; Aurell, *Plantagenet Empire*, p.50, citing the statistics in Thomas K. Keefe, *Feudal Assessments and the Political Community under Henry II and his sons* (Berkeley CA, 1982), pp.93-6, 110-12, and idem, 'Counting those who count: a computer assisted analysis of charter witness-lists and the itinerant court in the first year of the reign of King Richard I', *HSJ* 1 (1989), pp.135-46.

¹¹³ Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, pp.227-8; cf. Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pp.1-2, who states that Geoffrey took the initiative and allied with Helias in 1103.

¹¹⁴ *GCA*, pp.65-6; *Chronica domni Rainaldi archidiaconi Sancti Mauricii Andegavensis*, in *Chroniques des églises*, ed. Marchegay and Mabille, pp.3-16, at 15-16; *Chronicon Sancti Maxentii Pictavensis*, ibid., pp.351-433, at 423; *St-Aubin*, pp.30-1; *St-Serge*, p.142; *Aquaria*, p.171; *St-Florent*, p.190.

¹¹⁵ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.4, citing BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou III (4), no.963, which indicates that Fulk IV was still living when his son, a knight, was married.

threat posed to the duchy by Robert Curthose and William Clito. When events came to a head with Henry's arrest of Robert of Bellême in 1112, Fulk was approached by the king with the offer of a marriage between Henry's heir, William Adelin, and Fulk's eldest daughter Matilda.¹¹⁶ The betrothal was highly advantageous for the Angevins, and homage for Maine – refused in 1110 – was paid by Fulk to Henry.

Despite these positive developments in the larger struggle for power between the duke of Normandy, the king of France and the counts of the northern French territorial principalities, Fulk continued to pursue a policy of aggrandisement. On the basis of Orderic's account, 'knowing that his aid was sought by Henry I and by Louis VI,' wrote Chartrou, 'he sought to gain the best possible advantage from his position'.¹¹⁷ Fulk and the other territorial princes of northern France found themselves holding levers in the struggle between Henry and Louis over homage and succession in Normandy, and the competing claims of William Adelin and William Clito. Henry crossed the Channel several times, dealing with rebellion and problems in both England and Normandy, and by 1118 the turbulent Norman barons were lent support by the new alliance of Louis and Fulk.¹¹⁸ Tensions peaked in the same year when the inhabitants of Sées, just north of the frontier with Maine, appealed to Fulk for protection against Stephen, count of Mortain, Theobald of Blois' brother and Henry I's nephew. 1118 has been described as 'the most difficult year of [Henry's] rule in Normandy', and it was capped by Fulk's defeat of him in battle at Alençon.¹¹⁹ The following year, Henry sued for peace with Fulk by proposing the marriage of his heir, William, to Fulk's eldest daughter Matilda. This, as discussed in the following chapter, was to set in motion a train of events which would closely bind Geoffrey's future and that of his heir to the Anglo-Norman realm.

Although the historiographical focus of Fulk's reign has been directed towards Normandy, it has also been recognised that he attempted to solve some of the problems which had erupted under his father. Chartrou suggested that Fulk's primary concern was to bring the barons of Anjou and Maine to heel, and to 'do work' on their lordships.¹²⁰ In doing so, he faced many of the problems of order and rebellion which were to recur under his son: magnates in the Touraine proved particularly troublesome,

¹¹⁶ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.6; Green, *Henry I*, pp.125-6.

¹¹⁷ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.7.

¹¹⁸ Green, *Henry I*, pp.138-9, 141-6.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.139.

¹²⁰ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.26; for what follows, see *ibid.*, pp.26-8.

while in 1124, Fulk was also forced to besiege Berlai of Montreuil-Bellay, a move which Geoffrey had to repeat against Berlai's son Gerald at the end of his reign. Chartrou's account is based upon Angevin annals and chronicles, and even then is preoccupied with Fulk's Norman affairs, not least because she found no indication of any Angevin activities after 1124.¹²¹ Further investigation – particularly of the charter material – would without doubt elucidate the details of Fulk's reign, but that task cannot be addressed here. Despite the patchy historiographical coverage of Fulk's reign it is therefore clear that Geoffrey was heir to a volatile inheritance.

*

Geoffrey V's career was in thrall to this political and territorial legacy. Although his predecessors successfully promoted themselves within a culture of power, their own power and authority were never unchallenged and frequently difficult to maintain. The following chapters examine Geoffrey's career in this context, offering a more balanced appraisal of his life than previous studies, which have tended to concentrate on his activities in the Anglo-Norman world, primarily with reference to the chronicle material. Investigation of a wider range of evidence illuminates how Geoffrey's Angevin administration functioned, under whom and in what conditions; it also reflects the events and forces which affected the reign, and how Geoffrey responded to new challenges and fulfilled traditional roles of patron and lord. This evidence provides an opportunity to anatomise secular non-royal rulership, and its manifestations under Geoffrey as both ruler of a heterogeneous collection of inherited lands and conqueror of one of the richest and most dynamic territorial principalities of the period. Although Geoffrey's personality is only rarely, if ever, glimpsed, this biographical study explains the deeds, interests and approaches that made up his ruling persona and were the means by which his subjects and neighbours experienced and recorded his power. The following chapters offer a picture of what kind of ruler Geoffrey was, and why.

¹²¹ Ibid. p.28, and n.1, which details Fulk's expeditions in 1122 and 1126 with Louis VI to the Auvergne.

Chapter 1

The narrative of two reigns

Geoffrey V of Anjou was born on 24th August 1113, the first son of Fulk V and Aremburga, whose first daughter, Matilda, was born several years before; a brother, Helias, soon followed, as did another girl, Sybil.¹²² Geoffrey and his brother were primarily brought up in Fulk's household, along with the sons of local barons, and educated from a young age in leadership, administration, war and letters. Geoffrey accompanied both of his parents in many of their daily duties, witnessing charters alongside them, attending sessions of the comital court and making public appearances. He was in the care of a male nurse and instructor who was one of several men who instructed the dynasty's children in matters of learning, conduct, martial skills and administration.¹²³ He participated in his parents' government from a very early age, as will be shown in Chapter 3.

1120-29: formative years

This upbringing meant that Geoffrey was not sheltered from the events of Fulk's reign. Soon after victory at Alençon in 1118, Fulk made peace with Henry I – sealed by the marriage of Henry's son William Adelin and Fulk's daughter Matilda in June 1119 – and embarked upon a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1120.¹²⁴ Aremburga and her three small children were left behind, and the countess had to rule in her husband's stead.¹²⁵ According to William of Malmesbury, Henry was named as the protector of Fulk's 'county' (*comitatus*), although it is unlikely that this referred to anything more than Maine, for so long a bone of contention between the dynasties.¹²⁶ Geoffrey's protector,

¹²² *St-Aubin*, p.32. For Matilda: OV V, p.229. The dates of birth for both Helias and Sybil are uncertain. Helias was married in 1129 or very soon after, which would suggest that he was not much younger than Geoffrey. See William of Tyre, *Chronique*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (2 vols., Turnhout, 1986) I, pp.632-3; for the dating of the wedding, Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship*, p.77. She notes that his age meant he was unlikely to have married before 1129, and that his father-in-law Count Rotrou of Perche made a visit to Rouen in 1129, possibly on account of the wedding.

¹²³ These practices are discussed further in Chapter 3, and see Kathryn Dutton, 'Ad erudiendum tradidit: the upbringing of Angevin comital children', *ANS* 32 (2010), pp.24-39.

¹²⁴ *St-Aubin*, p.32; *St-Florent*, p.190. The annals also state that Reginald, bishop of Angers, went with Fulk.

¹²⁵ See Chapter 3.

¹²⁶ Norgate, *Angevin kings*, I, p.238, and n.4; Hollister, *Henry I*, p.261, both citing William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (2 vols., Oxford and New York, 1998-2002) II, p.482.

by contrast, was not a king but Julien, patron saint of Le Mans. Fulk's departure coincided with the consecration of the newly built cathedral in Le Mans, and the occasion was the ideal opportunity for a public display of dynastic and symbolic power. Geoffrey, aged just seven, was offered up to Julien's protection.¹²⁷ In one fell swoop, Fulk demonstrated his family's rule of a county acquired only ten years previously, and emphasised the role of his son – as opposed to that of Henry I – in the custody of his lands during his absence. Fulk's attempts to protect his interests, however, could not prevent what was to happen next. Soon after his departure, the young Matilda's husband William, heir to the English throne, drowned along with a group of Anglo-Norman magnates and officials whilst crossing the Channel.¹²⁸

William's death extinguished Henry I's hopes for a male heir and derailed an alliance between the Angevins and the Anglo-Normans which had been designed to combat William Clito's claim to the English throne.¹²⁹ The alliance was revived in spring 1127, however, with the betrothal of Henry's eldest daughter Matilda, former Empress of the Holy Roman Empire, to the young Geoffrey.¹³⁰ Matilda is known to have initially resisted the marriage, but it was key to the security of the Anglo-Norman realm in the face of the alliance formed between William Clito and Louis VI, who had established a base in Flanders.¹³¹

Meanwhile, the death of Aremburga in 1126 had left Fulk a widower and father of two brothers close in age and fast approaching adulthood. Soon after the formalisation of Geoffrey and Matilda's betrothal in May 1127, representatives from the Kingdom of Jerusalem who were seeking a suitable husband for Melisende, the daughter of King Baldwin II, approached the count. Fulk had already spent time in Jerusalem as a pilgrim and, following the representations of the envoys, he assented to their request. In the autumn of 1127, the envoys – led by the Master of the Temple, Hugh of Payens – travelled from Jerusalem to Anjou to begin negotiations with Fulk.

They arrived around early spring 1128, and witnessed charters for Fulk during this period.¹³² On 29th May, Pope Honorius II wrote to King Baldwin, commending Fulk

¹²⁷ *APC* pp.416-7, and see Chapter 4.

¹²⁸ *St-Aubin*, p.32; *St-Florent*, p.190.

¹²⁹ Sandy Burton Hicks, 'The Anglo-Papal Bargain of 1125: The Legatine Mission of John of Crema', *Albion* 8 (1976), pp.301-10.

¹³⁰ A detailed account is given by Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.55-6; for the peace-making value of the marriage, *The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni*, ed. and trans. Elisabeth M. C. van Houts (2 vols., Oxford, 1992-5) II, pp.240-1.

¹³¹ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.54-5; Green, *Henry I*, pp.198-9; *PL* CLXXI, cols. 291-2.

¹³² Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'The Succession to Baldwin II of Jerusalem: English Impact on the East',

to him as a suitable husband for his daughter: he had selflessly ‘set aside his barons and the innumerable people under his rule in order to serve God’.¹³³ On Ascension Day (1st June), Fulk took the cross at a solemn ceremony in Le Mans cathedral, and was committed to leaving Anjou in the near future.¹³⁴

A little over a week later on Pentecost (10th June), and just shy of his fifteenth birthday, Geoffrey was dubbed to knighthood by Henry I in an elaborate ceremony at Rouen.¹³⁵ Another rite of passage soon followed, for John of Marmoutier informs us that ‘for a second time, an envoy was sent by the king to Fulk of Anjou so that the marriage celebrations of his son could take place’.¹³⁶ On 17th June, Geoffrey’s betrothal was realised and he was married to Matilda in Le Mans cathedral, halfway between his patrimonial capital of Angers and Henry I’s duchy of Normandy. Political alliances were being realised, and Geoffrey was being prepared for ‘the exercise of power at a new level’ in the period prior to Fulk’s departure.¹³⁷

The knighting ceremony, the marriage and the joyous reception the couple received in Angers upon their entry to the town as husband and wife all occurred after Fulk’s agreement to leave Anjou.¹³⁸ Although Geoffrey and Matilda were already betrothed before the arrival of the envoys from Jerusalem,¹³⁹ the marriage of the teenage Geoffrey before his fifteenth birthday indicates that the ceremony was quickly performed, probably as a result of Fulk’s publicly announced decision to leave Anjou.

Dumbarton Oaks Papers 39 (1985), pp.139-47, at 146-7. Mayer has established the chronology of the diplomatic mission, although he over-confidently assigns a dating system to the Angevin chancery in which the year began at Easter. In fact, the year was frequently dated by the Incarnation, which could refer to either Christmas Day or, more commonly, 25th March. For the chronology of the arrival of the envoys, this error is of little consequence; Mayer’s dating is only altered by a few weeks (Easter 1128 was 22nd April). The use of 22nd April as a *terminus ante quem* for a charter witnessed by the envoys needs to be altered to 24th March. The negotiations, therefore, began sooner than Mayer allowed.

¹³³ *RPR* I, p.833, no.7314 (5268).

¹³⁴ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.j. no.39; *APC*, pp.430-1.

¹³⁵ *JM*, p.177-80. For the significance of the date and Geoffrey’s age, see D’Arcy J. D. Boulton, ‘Classic Knighthood as Nobiliary Dignity: The Knighting of Counts’ and Kings’ Sons in England, 1066-1272’, *Medieval Knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Strawberry Hill Conference, 1994*, ed. Stephen Church and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, 1995), pp.41-100.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.180; Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, pp.258-60, convincingly establishes this chronology.

¹³⁷ Jean Flori, *L’Essor de la chevalerie XI^e-XII^e siècles* (Geneva, 1986), pp.51-2.

¹³⁸ For the reception in which the couple entered Angers with Fulk, *JM*, p.181, and see below.

¹³⁹ A charter of Bishop John of Sées, dated 1127, and therefore perhaps dateable to the period 25th March 1127 × 24th March 1128, was witnessed by Henry ‘quando dedit filiam suam Gaufredo comiti Andegavensi juniore’: Round, no.1192. It is likely that the betrothal was made soon after 25th March 1127, as earlier in the same month the rebellious William Clito, Henry’s nephew, has been made count of Flanders, threatening the alliance between Anjou and England/Normandy: Hollister and Keefe, ‘The Making of the Angevin Empire’, p.13. Matilda went to Normandy in May 1127, and was joined by Henry in August, making the betrothal dateable to autumn 1127; Henry was in Rouen, the likely location for the betrothal, in the last few months of 1127 (*RRAN* II, nos. 1545, 1547; Hollister and Keefe, ‘The Making of the Angevin Empire’, p.15).

Indeed, Georges Duby asserted that Geoffrey ‘was not yet old enough to have been made a knight, fitting though it was that the young husband should be one...So Henry arranged that he himself should give the accolade to his future son-in-law – a means of getting a further hold over him through that kind of spiritual yet secular paternity accorded to a chivalric patron’.¹⁴⁰

On the other hand, it has been suggested that the marriage was postponed for a year so that arrangements for Geoffrey’s succession to Anjou could be made.¹⁴¹ The two suggestions are not incompatible. The wedding was probably not intended to take place straight after the formal betrothal, as Geoffrey was still relatively young; by autumn 1127 Henry may well have known of the envoys’ imminent entreaties to Fulk. As soon as Fulk declared his intentions, the alliance could be solemnised by the marriage. The taking of arms as a knight would ease Geoffrey into a position of respect, and bestow upon him title and status; it was appropriate for his marriage to the Empress, and a necessary prelude to the ceremony itself.

Geoffrey and Matilda had been accepted by both Henry and Fulk as the heirs apparent to Greater Anjou, and began to prepare themselves for Fulk’s departure. With the marriages of his heir and second son settled, Fulk could embark for Jerusalem.

1129-35: count of the Angevins

The Angevin annals attest to Fulk’s departure in 1129, but do not supply a specific date.¹⁴² The earliest extant charter issued by Geoffrey as count in his own right is dated 29th May 1129.¹⁴³ The evidence from other sources in both Anjou and Jerusalem, however, allows the date of Fulk’s departure to be more precisely fixed to the weeks between the start of February and mid-April.

William of Tyre states that Fulk was married to Melisende immediately upon his arrival in Jerusalem, but before Pentecost (2nd June) 1129.¹⁴⁴ Fulk’s movements prior to his departure are sketchy, but a charter confirming Fontevraud’s privileges indicates that

¹⁴⁰ Georges Duby, *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest: The Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France*, trans. Barbara Bray (London, 1985), p.251.

¹⁴¹ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.56.

¹⁴² *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Serge*, p.144; *St-Florent*, p.191.

¹⁴³ App. I, no.2.

¹⁴⁴ William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis* XIII.14, *Recueil des historiens des croisades (Historiens occidentaux)* (6 vols., Paris, 1844-95) I, p.593; this dating is agreed upon by Mayer, ‘The Succession of Baldwin II’, p.141.

he convened his children at the abbey just prior to his departure.¹⁴⁵ His daughter Matilda had recently taken the veil at the abbey, of which Fulk was a keen patron, making Fontevraud an apt location for what appears to be the final meeting between the four siblings and their father, ‘wishing to take the road to Jerusalem’ (*ire volens Iherusalem*). This meeting can be dated to around the beginning of February by another charter, this time issued by Duke Conan of Brittany. On 2nd February, he issued a charter recording a grant to Fontevraud, the abbey at which his kinswoman, Matilda, had recently become a nun (*meam cognatam Fulconis comitis Andegavensis filiam noviter ibi factam monacham*).¹⁴⁶

Fulk had certainly embarked upon his journey before mid-April.¹⁴⁷ A letter sent to the pope by Archbishop Hildebert of Tours complains of the war being waged upon the count by Guy of Laval.¹⁴⁸ The letter was composed at the time of the association and coronation of Philip, son of Louis VI, which took place on 14th April. It is unlikely that Guy was rebelling against the outgoing count, but seizing upon the potential weakness at the start of the young Geoffrey’s reign. Indeed, both chronicles and charters attest to a wave of rebellions against Geoffrey at the time of Fulk’s departure. The only detailed information is provided by John of Marmoutier, but his account requires careful examination as it does not present a chronologically accurate version of events.

Domestic unrest

The garbled account given in the *Historia* begins with Geoffrey’s role in the capture of William II, count of Nevers at Cosne castle in Burgundy (Nièvre, arr. Cosne-Cours-sur-Loire).¹⁴⁹ These events are immediately followed by the eruption of rebellion in Anjou by the lords of Laval, Montreuil-Bellay, Thouars, Mirebeau, Parthenay, Amboise, Sablé ‘and many others’.¹⁵⁰ That this rebellion occurred at the start of Geoffrey’s reign is corroborated by Archbishop Hildebert’s letter of mid-April and by a charter of protection issued in favour of the college of Saint-Martin in Tours, against the

¹⁴⁵ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, cat. no.90 (*p.j.* no.40), noting its erroneous dating to 1120 in *pancarte* and later copies, in error for 1129.

¹⁴⁶ Bienvenu I, no.99.

¹⁴⁷ If Fulk departed in early February, his journey would have taken five months; cf. the journey of Richard I in 1190-1, in which he took almost a year to reach Tyre, but which took in an extended stay in Messina, the defeat of Isaac Comnenus and a marriage at Cyprus. Five months seems feasible, particularly as Fulk set out at the end of winter, allowing him to arrive before autumn.

¹⁴⁸ Printed *PL* CLXXI, col.181B and *RHGF* XV, pp.327-8; summarised Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, cat. no.112.

¹⁴⁹ JM, pp.200-1.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p.201. And see below for John’s confused chronology of the Angevin rebellions of the 1130s and 1140s.

depredations of the local baron Sulpice of Amboise. The dating and the nature of events in Burgundy, however, is more problematic.

William of Nevers, an adherent of the king of France, had already been imprisoned for over three years by Count Theobald of Blois, who ordered his capture in 1115 by Hugh the Manceau, lord of Cosne.¹⁵¹ Tensions between the same group of magnates erupted again in the late 1120s, when William allied with the king of France, Louis VI, and the bishop of Autun to attack Hugh at Cosne. Hugh sent for aid to Theobald, who subsequently ‘begged most urgently’ for aid from Geoffrey, ‘whose help, above that of all [his men] he most confidently anticipated’.¹⁵² Geoffrey and Theobald hurried to Cosne, and successfully broke the siege by capturing Count William.

In the account of these events, John consistently refers to Geoffrey as count, suggesting a date posterior to Fulk’s departure.¹⁵³ His action in battle itself suggests a date after his knighting by Henry I. No local chronicles, however, attest to Geoffrey’s absence in the period after his investiture; evidence from Burgundy cited by Chartrou that these events occurred in 1129 is in fact nothing of the sort.¹⁵⁴ The paucity of extant charters from the early years of Geoffrey’s reign may suggest his absence from the county but also precludes speculation on the timing of any such venture: only one of the three extant charters issued in 1129 supplies a place-date, and that is Beaufort near Angers.¹⁵⁵

Despite the obscurity of Geoffrey’s movements after Fulk’s departure, it is clear that much time was spent within the confines of Greater Anjou, dealing with the baronial rebellions and opportunistic attempts at aggrandisement which sprang up throughout the region. The rebels named by John of Marmoutier were the more powerful barons of Greater Anjou and the fuzzy border region to the north of Poitou. In 1129, Geoffrey led an army to the castle of Parthenay, east of Poitiers; he made a similar move in 1130, when he besieged nearby Mirebeau.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵¹ OV VI, p.259; Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.30.

¹⁵² JM, pp.200-1: ‘Quos inter et pre cunctis Andegavorum comitem Gaufridum obnixius orat, postulat confidentius, de cuius nimirum auxilio fiducialius presumit’.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p.200, at n.1 Halphen and Poupardin place events at Cosne to 1129, on the strength of John’s account alone, as does Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.30.

¹⁵⁴ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.30, n.2, cites the Vézelay chronicle, *RHGF* XII, p.344, stating that it describes Geoffrey as taking William at Aunay (Nièvre, arr. Château-Chinon, cant. Châtillon-en-Bazois), near Cosne. In fact, the information given in the chronicle refers to the events of 1115 (s.a. 1116) and is silent on the revival of tensions between William and Theobald.

¹⁵⁵ App. I, no.2.

¹⁵⁶ *St-Aubin*, p.33.

Historians have puzzled over the precise causes of the unrest of these early years, and it appears that the overarching motive of the diverse group of lords was the opportunity for enhancement of land, power and influence upon the succession of a young and inexperienced count.¹⁵⁷ The reign, however, was plagued by baronial unrest, and evidence discussed in chapters 2 and 3 shows that the structure of Angevin society and the nature of comital authority almost guaranteed the existence of a strong baronage who could act, in many spheres, in a markedly independent manner.

In 1129, baronial unrest drew Geoffrey first to Amboise and the Touraine, to arrest the chaos caused by Sulpice of Amboise, who had recently succeeded to the lordship of Amboise near Tours.¹⁵⁸ He then turned his attention to southern Maine, besieging Guy of Laval's castle at Meslay-du-Maine (Mayenne, arr. Laval) in response, according to John of Marmoutier, to the rebels' attack on an unspecified location.¹⁵⁹ By contrast with events at Amboise, Geoffrey was successful in immediately bringing Guy to terms. The agreement, however, was short-lived, and hostilities rumbled on into the 1130s. In 1129 and 1130 clashes along the southern Anjou border, at Thouars, Parthenay, Blazon and Mirebeau, are attested to by local annalists and in greater detail by John of Marmoutier. The Saint-Aubin and Saint-Florent annals record sieges or actions by Geoffrey's army at Parthenay (1129) and Mirebeau (1130), but reveal nothing of their causes or outcomes.¹⁶⁰ John's version of events is fuller, and adds a third siege to the chain of events, at Thouars (Deux-Sèvres, arr. Bressuire). After subduing Guy of Laval at Meslay, John tells us that 'urged on by a reason similar in all respects, [Geoffrey] moved his army and besieged Thouars'.¹⁶¹ He was met with strong opposition, but eventually rendered the castle's main tower – to which the viscount of Thouars had retreated – useless; Geoffrey accepted the viscount's homage, before moving on to Parthenay (Deux-Sèvres, arr. Parthenay).¹⁶²

After the attack on its neighbour, the castle fell to Geoffrey without a siege. Its lord, 'hearing of the misfortunes of others, became scared, asked for peace through

¹⁵⁷ Bruno Lemesle, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions (1129-1151)', *La vengeance, 400-1200*, ed. D. Barthélemy, F. Bougard and R. Le Jan (Rome, 2006), pp.199-236, at 208-11, emphasises our reliance upon John's account, which does not talk about the rebels' motives. Further consideration of motives can be found in Chapter 3.

¹⁵⁸ *GAD*, pp.115-20. A papal bull protecting the Saint-Martin of Tours' rights and estates was issued on 19th December 1129: *RPR* I, no.7379 (5298), printed *PL* 166, col.1301.

¹⁵⁹ *JM*, p.202.

¹⁶⁰ *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Florent*, p.191.

¹⁶¹ *JM*, p.202: 'Hac igitur facta compositione, urgente causa consimili, exercitum movens Toarcium obsidet'.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p.203.

intermediaries', which was granted.¹⁶³ Geoffrey immediately moved his army to the seat of Theobald of Blazon, a castle just to the south of Angers in what is now Blaison-Gohier (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Ponts-de-Cé). Theobald was initially not named by John as one of the prime movers of the rebellion, but here John asserts that Geoffrey 'knew him to be party to the conspiracy', and took decisive action by burning his castle and its appurtenances to the ground. Meanwhile, Theobald had fled to Mirebeau (Vienne, arr. Poitiers), on the Poitevin border, 'a safe place' and entreated the count of Poitou for help against Geoffrey.¹⁶⁴ A violent incident followed, in which the besieging Angevins became themselves besieged upon the arrival of the Poitevin knights and infantry.

John describes Geoffrey's tactics in detail: 'in the dead of night, [the Angevins] sweated over digging ditches, which would prevent an attack and protect the count from being overrun'. In the morning, the Poitevins fell into the trap.¹⁶⁵ Geoffrey thus granted Theobald forty days to surrender and blocked the garrison's incoming supplies of food, swiftly bringing Theobald to terms.¹⁶⁶ John states, however, that Geoffrey's men (*barones*) advised him to avenge the injuries committed against him by the Poitevins. But Geoffrey, 'weighing up the difficult conditions and the relentlessness of his war, sought a truce'.¹⁶⁷ The Poitevins were not satisfied by this agreement, offered their defiance (*in verbis diffidentie descendentes*) and proceeded to ravage Geoffrey's own lands. It was only after several days campaigning that Geoffrey was able to bring them under control.¹⁶⁸

The *Historia* gives the impression of a rapid chain of events between Geoffrey's accession and his victory at Mirebeau, but other evidence indicates that the problems that Geoffrey experienced in 1129 dragged on. Local annals indicate that Mirebeau fell

¹⁶³ Ibid.: 'Amoto inde exercitu, Parteniaceum, injurie gratia ulciscende, proficiscitur. Parteniensis vero dominus, auditis aliorum infortuniis, sibi amplius pertimescens, per internuncios rogat que ad pacem sunt; et, facta deditione, a liberalitate principis pacem et gratiam optatam assecutus est'.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p.203: 'Parteniaceensi indulta, ut dictum est, venia, castra movet et in Blazonensem Theobaudum, quem conspiracy reum noverat, ultum ire superbiorum indefessus satagit expugnator. Blazone itaque succenso et ejus pertinentiis in favilla redactis, fugientem ad Mirebellum, tutiora loca, Theobaudum persequitur'. Theobald's wife, Matilda, was the daughter of William, lord of Mirebeau: Alfred Richard, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou, 778-1204* (2 vols., Paris, 1903) II, p.13.

¹⁶⁵ JM, p.204: 'Intempeste igitur noctis silentio, in fossatis faciendis summopere desudant, quorum tuitione protecti cursantis comitis impetum inhibere queant. Illucescente die crastina, more solito in exercitum ruunt; sed aggere inopinato prepediti, discurrendi libertate sublata, nocturni laboris instantiam obstupescunt'.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p.204.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., p.205: 'Comes temporis angustias et guerre sue importunitatem pretendens, inducias querit et eis, soluta obsidione, de omnibus satisfactorum prout ratio dictaverit pollicetur'.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., p.205; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.31.

in 1130, and Archbishop Hildebert's letter to Geoffrey – a contemporary document, probably sent in 1131, by contrast with John's account written over forty years posterior to events – specifically discusses the after-effects of the siege of Thouars.¹⁶⁹ He warns against pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela because of Geoffrey's duties to his land and people, writing that '[I]f you go on pilgrimage, you will have to cross through the duke of Aquitaine's fortifications, the hatred of whom you have already roused by storming the higher [tower] of Thouars'.¹⁷⁰ Hildebert's letter also refers to Henry I's displeasure at Geoffrey's plans, suggesting that the conflict with southern Angevin and northern Poitevin families had repercussions beyond the already serious potential to reverse the prevailing peace between Anjou and Poitou/Aquitaine, and to work to the advantage of other Angevin and Manceaux lords intent upon gaining power at Geoffrey's expense.¹⁷¹

Once more, events to the east commanded Geoffrey's attention. John of Marmoutier writes that, after the victory at Mirebeau, Geoffrey was caught on the back foot and forced to hurry to Île-Bouchard (Indre-et-Loire, arr. Chinon), a stronghold on the Vienne to the east of Chinon, which formed the frontier of Angevin authority.¹⁷² There, men led by the lord of Île-Bouchard, Peloquin, were ravaging the town, and had set fire to one of its bridges. When Geoffrey reached Île-Bouchard, Peloquin's followers retreated to Chinon; but the next day, 'they returned without warning and, in an echo of the fire of the day before, they reduced the borough of La Manse and whatever remained of the bridge over the Vienne to cinders'.¹⁷³

It was during this period that Geoffrey constructed a new fortification, Châteauneuf-sur-Sarthe (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Segré), to keep the threat posed by

¹⁶⁹ As suggested by R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, CT, 1953), p.95; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.58; cf. *PL* 171, cols. 181-3, where it is dated to 1123.

¹⁷⁰ 'Porro praeter solitum mentis tuae oculus caligavit, si non vides plenam periculosis casibus assumptam tibi peregrinationem. Per munitiones ducis Aquitanorum transiturus es, cujus tibi invidiam suscitasti, factus in expugnatione Toarcy superior...Audivimus autem venerabili regi Anglorum, tuoque avunculo, id quod te facturum significas displicere altius, id ferre graviter, id constanter improbare. Sane eorum aspernari consilium, vicina dementiae pertinacia est.'

¹⁷¹ Richard, *Comtes de Poitou* II, p.15. Amongst others, Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.57, has surveyed the evidence for estrangement between Geoffrey and Matilda between 1129 and 1133, which may have contributed to the wording of Hildebert's letter.

¹⁷² JM, p.205; Chantal Senséby, 'Une notice fausse du cartulaire de l'abbaye tourangelle de Noyers?', *BEC* 155 (1997), pp.61-94, discusses the edge of Angevin authority around Vienne, at 61-2.

¹⁷³ JM, p.205: '...Cainonis nocta illa quieverunt. Prenuntia vero diei aurora illucescente, Insulam ex improvviso regressi sunt et, hesterni instar incendii, burgum Esmantie et quidquid pons primus circa Vigennam reliquerat in cineres redigerunt.' *Esmantia* is translated by Halphen and Poupardin as La Manse and refers to an area along the River Manse, a tributary of the Vienne which joined the river on its north bank, just opposite the island of Île-Bouchard.

Manceaux barons to the north – particularly the lord of Sablé (-sur-Sarthe, dép. Sarthe, arr. La Flèche), whose ‘foul swords’ were ‘the kindling of all treason’ – in check.¹⁷⁴ Robert of Sablé had been brought up in the comital household as Geoffrey’s foster-brother (*collactaneus*) succeeded his father Lisiard in 1130, swearing an oath of liege homage to Geoffrey.¹⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the new lord was just as problematic for the count as his father and Manceaux kin had been. The construction of Châteauneuf was necessary to check his aggression, though the new castle appears to have created more problems than it solved, bringing Geoffrey into a bitter and protracted dispute with Bishop Ulger of Angers, discussed in Chapter 4.

Encastellation was also attempted elsewhere in the same period. On 1st July 1133, Geoffrey made an important agreement with the monks of Saint-Florent of Saumur not to refortify the motte at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Cholet), the original site of the monastery to the south-west of Angers on the Loire.¹⁷⁶ The site was strategically placed on the river, and could act as a defence for the western approach to Angers.¹⁷⁷ There was a hefty price for relinquishing a prerogative established and used by his predecessors, but in fact already ceded by them in 1061: in an echo of the exchange with Bishop Ulger in 1131, the monks paid out 10,000s. to Geoffrey.¹⁷⁸ It seems that Geoffrey was attempting to revive the dynasty’s claim to the right to fortify the site and, in the likely event of the claim’s failure, to raise a substantial sum of money which would assist his campaigns in other ways. Other charter and narrative evidence likewise hints at the scope of Geoffrey’s military activities elsewhere during this period, at the castles of Château-Gontier (Mayenne), Montrevault (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Cholet) and Candé (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Segré), all held by lords over whom comital authority was weak.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ *St-Aubin*, p.33; JM, p.208.

¹⁷⁵ JM, p.206: ‘Robertus igitur, Lisiardi filius, terram suam de manu consulis suscepit, hominagio et leigiatione facta, et sacramentis juratis non servaturus accessit.’

¹⁷⁶ App. I, no.89.

¹⁷⁷ Bachrach, ‘Castle Building’, *AHR* 88 (1983), p.548, discusses the early significance of the fortification.

¹⁷⁸ The site was originally fortified by Fulk III in the period after the recognition of his lordship over Saint-Florent. By 1061, an earthwork with a wooden fortification was attested to in a charter in which Count Geoffrey III ceded the right to exact military service from the abbey, retaining only the right to garrison the fortification in times of war (surviving in eleventh-century copy in the *Livre noir* of Saint-Florent, Paris BnF MS N.A. Lat. 1930, ff.57-8; Paul Marchegay, *BEC* 36 (1875), p.396). See also Guillot, *Le comte* I, pp.302-4 and II, p.151, C226; William Ziezulewicz, ‘The Fate of Carolingian Military Exactions in a Monastic Fisc: The Case of Saint-Florent-De-Saumur (ca.950-1118)’, *Military Affairs* 51 (1987), pp.124-7. For Ulger’s payments, see App. III and Chapter 4.

¹⁷⁹ App. III, no.5; *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Serge*, p.145. See Chapter 4 for the bishop of Angers’ relationship with these lords.

The problems experienced in the mid-1130s may even have extended to Le Mans, one of the few Manceau localities under strong comital control, for an act of 1134 in which the alms of one of Geoffrey's followers, Reginald of Saumoussay, were distributed refers not only to Geoffrey pitching camp at Le Mans, but also to Reginald's death at this time.¹⁸⁰ The evidence thus indicates that Geoffrey was constantly engaged in military activity across his territories during the first half of the 1130s.

Whilst Geoffrey criss-crossed Greater Anjou, attempting to dampen the baronage's enthusiasm for aggregation of power at his expense, he had also managed to overcome his marital problems and Matilda gave birth to their first son in Le Mans on 5th March 1133.¹⁸¹ Henry was christened in the presence of Matilda and Henry I, though apparently not Geoffrey, in the cathedral of Saint-Julien on 25th March.¹⁸² Skirmishes during 1133 and 1134 may have influenced Matilda's withdrawal to Rouen, where the couple's second son, Geoffrey, was born on 3rd July 1134.¹⁸³ After suffering complications during the birth Matilda remained in Rouen; Geoffrey's movements, however, are obscure.¹⁸⁴ Though the charters and annals attest to sieges at Candé and elsewhere, it is not known whether Geoffrey joined his wife and father-in-law in Rouen at any point. Matilda certainly remained in Normandy with her father and children.¹⁸⁵

Despite the evidence for the serious unrest of 1133 and 1134, one of the most notorious powers of the region, Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay, had not yet openly broken with the count. In 1133, Geoffrey attended the foundation ceremony of Gerald's new Tironensian priory of Asnières, and assented to the grants that were made by several local men to the monks to support the new community.¹⁸⁶ Gerald also accompanied Geoffrey to Saint-Maur to deal with Reginald of Saumoussay's alms.¹⁸⁷ The presence in the comital entourage of Gerald and his *familiares*, including another notorious troublemaker, his cousin Aimery of Doué, cannot easily be disentangled or explained in terms of periods of loyalty or stability. Loyalties were constantly shifting, and the appearance of a prominent figure such as Gerald as a witness to one of Geoffrey's charters (or vice versa) does not necessarily equate to an alliance or a subjugation.

¹⁸⁰ App. VI, no.10, and also no.4.

¹⁸¹ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.60-1.

¹⁸² *APC*, p.432.

¹⁸³ *RT I*, p.192.

¹⁸⁴ *GND II*, pp.244-7.

¹⁸⁵ *RT I*, p.192, and see Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.61.

¹⁸⁶ App. VI, no.6, and see Chapter 2.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, no.10.

1135: a new challenge

1135 was a pivotal year, which witnessed the death of Henry I and the seizure of the English throne by his nephew and Matilda's cousin Stephen, count of Mortain and Boulogne, younger brother of Count Theobald of Blois. Charter evidence from the spring and summer of 1135 indicates that Geoffrey was in Angers, where he issued charters on 14th April, 30th June and 10th August.¹⁸⁸ By contrast with the previous five years, Anjou appears to have experienced a period of relative peace, with no major sieges or skirmishes reported by the chroniclers and annalists. Matilda continued to spend time in her father's company in Rouen, honing the skills necessary to become his heir.¹⁸⁹ She neither issued a charter alongside her husband nor witnessed any of his extant acts between July 1133 and the period between 1136 and 1138.

Matilda's recovery and the temporary halt in Angevin unrest allowed the couple to take stock and turn their attention to Normandy, engendering by September 1135 a situation in the Maine-Normandy border region which ultimately led to Matilda's estrangement from her father, and to war. The issues were not just personal or familial, but involved questions of power and right, and drew in the claims of important local magnates. The events of this period – like those of the ensuing civil war between Matilda and Stephen – have been closely scrutinised by historians, but it is to this evidence that we must at least briefly turn to consider events in Normandy from an Angevin perspective.¹⁹⁰

Robert of Torigny states that Henry remained in Normandy throughout the year. His joy at the birth of Matilda's second son, however, had soured by September 1135, for Matilda's cunning had 'detained him with various disagreements, from which arose several grounds for argument between the king and the count of Anjou'.¹⁹¹ Robert claimed that 'the king was unwilling to do the fealty required by his daughter and her husband for all castles (*firmitatibus*) in Normandy and in England', and it seems that Matilda left her father's court as a result.¹⁹² Orderic's account is similar: 'Geoffrey of

¹⁸⁸ App. I, nos. 29, 46, 86.

¹⁸⁹ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.62.

¹⁹⁰ The conquest of Normandy is analysed in Chapter 5; a narrative is established here.

¹⁹¹ RT I, pp.194-5: '...detinebat eum filia ejus discordiis variis, quae oriebantur pluribus causis inter regem et consulem Andegavensem, artibus scilicet filiae suae'.

¹⁹² Ibid. p.200. In *GND* II, pp.264-5, Robert wrote that Matilda quarrelled with Henry and 'had left Normandy some time before her father's death, somewhat angry with him because the king refused to be reconciled with William Talvas without punishing him, even though she urgently begged him to do so'. She probably travelled south to meet Geoffrey, perhaps in Le Mans or another northerly stronghold, rather than Angers where Geoffrey appears to have spent the summer.

Anjou aspired to the great riches of his father-in-law and demanded castles in Normandy, asserting that the king had covenanted with him to hand them over when he married his daughter'.¹⁹³ In England, William of Malmesbury took a similar line, stating that on his deathbed Henry 'assigned all his lands on both sides of the sea to his daughter in lawful and lasting succession, being somewhat angry with her husband because he had vexed the king by not a few threats and insults', the nature of which is not expanded upon.¹⁹⁴

Geoffrey and Matilda evidently wished to tap into Matilda's Anglo-Norman inheritance before her father's death, in the same way that Geoffrey's Angevin ancestors had been associated in their parents' rule or sought landed power before their accession as counts. Their most pressing claim was to a line of castles in the Passais and Séois, as well as some Angevin castles over the border in Maine. The strategically-placed Domfront (Orne, arr. Alençon), Argentan and Exmes (both Orne, arr. Argentan) probably formed Matilda's Norman dowry, which Henry had never made over to Geoffrey.¹⁹⁵ Henry was perhaps reluctant to cede territory so close to northern Maine because of his own ambitions for the county. After the death of William Adelin, he refused to return the dowry provided by Fulk for his daughter Matilda, which probably consisted of castles at Ambrières, Gorron and Colmont (all dép. and arr. Mayenne).¹⁹⁶ These three strongholds were situated between Mayenne and Domfront, and Henry had them in hand in 1135. These were castles within the county of Maine, and therefore Geoffrey's by virtue of his title.

The couple's unsuccessful demands were followed by attacks on Henry's partisans on the Manceau side of the Norman border. It is again Orderic who records events. Without explicitly identifying a cause, he wrote that 'the king took it very hard that Geoffrey had besieged his son-in-law, Roscelin, the vicomte of Ste-Suzanne, and burnt Beaumont to the ground, and had not spared Roscelin out of respect for his own royal father-in-law'.¹⁹⁷ Recently, Daniel Power has suggested that Roscelin's wife – Henry's daughter Constance – was during the same year working with her father to increase his influence in northern Maine.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹³ OV VI, pp.444-5.

¹⁹⁴ WM HN, pp.12-13.

¹⁹⁵ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.66.

¹⁹⁶ Hollister, *Henry I*, p.291, citing RT I, pp.197, 199, 335.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁹⁸ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.345 and n.36.

Geoffrey and Matilda's claims dovetailed with those of William Talvas, whose estates and castles around Sées had been seized by Henry I in 1135; the king had also seized William's father's estates in 1113.¹⁹⁹ William himself had invested his son as count of Ponthieu sometime between 1126 and 1129, and all he held in 1135 were lands around Sées, Almenêches and Alençon, all strategically valuable border castles. In 1135, William was one of several Norman lords, presumably those along the border with Maine, who were attracted to 'the Angevins'.²⁰⁰ Disloyalty to Henry was incipient but not open: suspicion fell on some men, including Roger of Tosny and William Talvas. Although Roger's honour of Tosny was located in the south-east of Normandy, he held the key Evrecin stronghold of Conches (Eure, arr. Évreux), and lands in the Cotentin and at Nogent in the Chartrain.²⁰¹

Orderic's account indicates that Henry harried the Saosnois from August onwards and seized Talvas' castles; dispossessed, Talvas openly joined the Angevin camp 'in September, after forfeiting his whole honour'.²⁰² His association with Geoffrey and Matilda stretched back into the summer, however, and he was instrumental in the break between Henry and his daughter and son-in-law.²⁰³ Geoffrey immediately installed William in the neighbouring castles of Peray and Mamers (both Sarthe, arr. Mamers), in the very north of Maine.²⁰⁴ As Chapter 5 shows, the support of barons like William and Roger of Tosny was to prove indispensable after Henry's unexpected death on 1st December. The priority in autumn 1135, however, was to secure Matilda's dowry; possession of the entire duchy only entered the equation after Henry's death.

1135-1144: the fight for Normandy

Henry's death on 1st December prompted a frantic scramble for the English

¹⁹⁹ Robert of Torigny's interpolations in *GND* II, pp.264-7, give a detailed account of William's pedigree. William's career is examined by Kathleen Thompson, 'William Talvas, Count of Ponthieu, and the Politics of the Anglo-Norman Realm', *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Bates and Anne Curry (London, 1994), pp.169-84. For the evidence that William successfully gained possession of his southern Norman estates to the advantage of the Angevin cause in Normandy after 1135, see Chapter 5.

²⁰⁰ OV VI, pp.444-5.

²⁰¹ Green, *Henry I*, p.218; Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.179; Maurice Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy 1189-1204: Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire* (2nd ed., Manchester, 1960), pp.355-6.

²⁰² OV VI, pp.444-7. Orderic wrote that Henry 'prowled around the Sonnois from the beginning of August until the feast of All Saints and took into his hand Alençon and Almenêches and the other castles held by Talvas'.

²⁰³ RT I, p.200, states that Henry exiled William from his Norman possessions, '[A]nd for that reason there was considerable discord between the king, the count and the empress before the king's death, because he was unwilling to return William's fee to him'.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.446-7.

throne and plunged Geoffrey into cross-Channel power politics for the rest of his life. Whilst Stephen made the journey from Boulogne to London, and successfully claimed the English throne,²⁰⁵ Geoffrey and Matilda were handicapped by their position in Greater Anjou, able only to consolidate a presence in the area where they already had some support, the Saosnois and Passais.²⁰⁶

As soon as news of Henry's death reached them, Geoffrey sent Matilda to claim her dowry castles. With the help of a handful of Normans, the couple gained Exmes, Domfront and the recently refortified Argentan, as well as Ambrières, Gorron and Colmont, the dowry given to William Adelin and retained by Henry.²⁰⁷ Matilda installed herself in one of her dowry castles, while the others were placed in the custody of Normans and Juhel of Mayenne, one of Geoffrey's Manceau vassals, who claimed the latter three castles as part of his honour.²⁰⁸

Geoffrey's own precise movements in the weeks after Henry's death can only be roughly reconstructed. After making their way into Normandy from Greater Anjou, Geoffrey and Matilda divided in order to establish more effectively their presence in the border region. While Matilda consolidated her presence to the west, Geoffrey was received by William Talvas at Sées with 'the troops of Angevins and Manceaux'.²⁰⁹ Meanwhile, Stephen's brother Theobald of Blois was in Normandy to negotiate the duchy's rulership with its leading men. Matilda's half-brother, Robert of Gloucester, arrived soon afterwards and was with Theobald when news arrived of the choice of Stephen to be king.²¹⁰

The repercussions of this meeting were complex for both sides. On one hand, Robert immediately attached himself to Stephen's cause and hastened to the castle of

²⁰⁵ Stephen's movements are given in detail by Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.30-39.

²⁰⁶ *GND* II, pp.264-5: Robert of Torigny interpolates the detail that 'when the king died in Normandy his daughter, the Empress Matilda, whom he had long before appointed heir to his realm, was staying in Anjou with her husband Count Geoffrey and her sons. She had left Normandy some time before her father's death...'.
²⁰⁷ *OV* VI, pp.454-5; *RT* I, p.199; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.66 and n.11. Cf. (as noticed by Chibnall) the 1135 entry in *St-Aubin*, p.34, which records that Geoffrey took Domfront and Argentan *in dominium*. *WM*, *HN*, p.27 notes that 'some castles in Normandy, of which Domfront was the chief, sided with the heiress'.

²⁰⁸ *RT* I, pp.199-200. Juhel's marriage, performed before Geoffrey succeeded to his father, is discussed by Power, *The Norman Frontier*, p.225.
²⁰⁹ *OV* VI, pp.454-5.
²¹⁰ *RT* I, p.200; *OV* VI, pp.454-5. Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.33, discusses the discrepancies between these two accounts – Torigny describes two meetings between Theobald and the magnates, at Rouen then Lisieux on the 21st December, whereas Orderic describes only one, at Lisieux. Despite these differences, it is clear that while Geoffrey and Matilda were confined to the south-west of the duchy, Theobald met with magnates much further east, who had less to gain from supporting the Angevins.

Falaise to secure the Norman treasury for the king.²¹¹ Falaise lay just north of Argentan, and was an obvious target for the Angevins. On the other hand, the news of Stephen's impending coronation prompted Theobald – the elder of the two – to 'quit Normandy in disgust'.²¹² Theobald made a truce with Geoffrey soon afterwards, probably at Christmas 1135, which was to last only a few months.²¹³

After Stephen's coronation, the majority of chroniclers concentrate on English events. Orderic, however, details Geoffrey's initial attacks on the Saosnois and subsequent withdrawal from Normandy after his reception at Sées with William Talvas. Geoffrey's army 'dispersed through the province round about [Sées], committed outrages, violated churches and cemeteries, oppressed their peasants, and repaid those who had received them kindly with many injuries and wrongs'.²¹⁴ Meanwhile, a contingent led by Geoffrey's Norman supporters Alexander and Engelger of Bohon targeted Stephen's county of Mortain, which although not subdued until 1142, was a key target from the beginning of the conquest.²¹⁵

Although the initial phase of what proved to be a decade-long conquest had begun boldly, Orderic attributes Geoffrey's withdrawal from Normandy in 1136 to the assured defence of the Normans.²¹⁶ Over the horizon, moreover, was a repeat of the events of 1129, this time catalysed by Norman affairs rather than the Angevin succession:

...he made no further attempt to repeat the experience for the time being. Indeed Robert of Sablé, the son of Lisiard, and other nobles rebelled against Count Geoffrey and, by occupying him with civil wars, prevented him from returning to Normandy.²¹⁷

The charter evidence, though sparse, confirms that Geoffrey returned to Anjou. In charters dated 1136 he confirmed the monks of Saint-Nicolas of Angers in their rights along the Loire and settled two disputes, one between the abbess of Fontevraud and members of the Montreuil-Bellay family, and another between his own forest officers and the monks of Marmoutier, near Tours.²¹⁸

²¹¹ RT I, p.200; OV IV, pp. 448-9, states that Henry bequeathed £60,000 from the Falaise treasury to Robert on his deathbed, discussed in Davis, *King Stephen*, p.16, and Green, *Henry I*, p.220.

²¹² Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.33.

²¹³ OV VI, pp.458-9 (Chibnall's dating).

²¹⁴ Ibid., pp.454-5.

²¹⁵ JM, p.225, and see Chapter 5.

²¹⁶ OV VI, pp.456-7.

²¹⁷ Ibid., pp.456-7.

²¹⁸ App. I, nos. 21, 48, 100.

John of Marmoutier's account of Robert's repeated attempts to gain power at Geoffrey's expense is the only narrative authority for the true extent of the domestic turmoil of the first decade of the reign, but it is garbled, and cannot be disentangled by reference to the annals. With the clarification provided by Orderic, however, it is clear that the *Historia* describes three separate occasions involving Robert: the first, described above, led to the construction of Châteauneuf in 1131; the second is that referred to by Orderic, which delayed Geoffrey's return to Normandy until September 1136; the third and final occasion was his support of Geoffrey's brother Helias' bid for power in 1145. The earliest of these is in fact described last in the *Historia*: in a few lines of his own composition, sandwiched between extracts from the *Gesta Ambaziensum dominorum* and the *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*, John states that Geoffrey built Châteauneuf-sur-Sarthe as a reaction to 'the foul swords of Sablé' which were 'the kindling of all treason'.²¹⁹

The events of 1135-6 were in fact placed first in the narrative sequence, immediately after Lisiard of Sablé's death in 1130. He identifies the year as that in which Robert 'received land from the hand of the consul'.²²⁰ Here, John either conflates the chronology of the 1131 and 1135/6 rebellions, or supplies evidence that Robert's patrimony at La Suse and Briollay was withheld by Geoffrey between Lisiard's death and 1135. Considering Robert's status as Geoffrey's foster-brother (*collectaneus*), and perhaps a minor, this is a possibility.²²¹ Two things make it clear that these events took place in 1135-6: first, Orderic supplies us with a date; and second, this date is confirmed by the *Historia*'s allusion to Hugh of Saint-Calais, bishop of Le Mans, as one of the mediators who brokered peace between Geoffrey and Robert. Hugh was invested as bishop in 1136, sometime after 7th February.²²²

The annalists' silence belies the severity of these events, which ended in February and may well have raged for months prior to the prelates' intervention:

...in that year in which he [Robert] had taken the land from the consul's hand, by the counsel of Hugh of Matheflon and his son Theobald, stirring up war, he plundered everything from Briollay to Angers, from Sablé and La Suze to Le Mans, assailing with sword and fire. But

²¹⁹ JM, p.208.

²²⁰ Ibid., p.206.

²²¹ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.32 posits the same conclusion.

²²² APC, p.442. The editors of the APC also draw attention to Orderic's note that Hugh's predecessor Bishop Guy died in 1136, and that the martyrology of the cathedral in Le Mans, as well as those of the abbeys of Saint-Vincent and Saint-Pierre de la Couture, commemorated his death on 7 ides February, i.e. 7th February.

because the aforementioned Robert was the foster-brother of the count and had lived with him as a familiar, and was fed and nourished with him, he [Geoffrey] was hesitant for a long time, unwilling to fight against his *familiaris*...²²³

Eventually Geoffrey moved against Robert, with the support of his knights and the townsmen of La Suze, which was placed under the custody of Geoffrey's men; Briollay was destroyed. Peace was made between Robert and Geoffrey, but only through the mediation of Bishop Ulger and Bishop Hugh.²²⁴

The regrouping of Angevin forces and fortunes thus came a year after initial incursions into Normandy. On Sunday 21st September – a month after the birth of William – Geoffrey 'crossed the River Sarthe and entered Normandy with a great force of men-at-arms', moving towards Argentan.²²⁵ The Angevin army was augmented by Duke William X of Aquitaine, Count Geoffrey of Vendôme (one of Geoffrey's vassals), William son of the count of Nevers, and William Talvas.

The crossing of the Sarthe heralded a violent and comprehensive thirteen-day campaign to capture strongholds from the Angevin base near Argentan to as far afield as Lisieux.²²⁶ The army headed for Carrouges (Orne, arr. Argentan), and secured it within three days, though its castellan later regained it.²²⁷ They moved on to the nearby castle at Écouché, which the town's inhabitants had pre-emptively burned it to the ground. The garrison at Annebecq,²²⁸ between Carrouges and Alençon, gave way easily to Geoffrey: Orderic notes that Robert of Neubourg, who was to go on to be one of Geoffrey's chief justiciars in Normandy, was the castle's lord and 'had for some time been on terms of close friendship with him' through Amalric of Montfort, Geoffrey's great-uncle. Geoffrey continued with the tactic of radiating his army out from securely-held castles at and around Argentan, including those he gained along the way. Montreuil (now Montreuil-au-Houlme, Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Briouze) put up a stiff resistance, and Geoffrey was forced to withdraw. Further afield, Les Moutiers-Hubert (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Livarot) was the next target. The castle fell, and was used

²²³ JM, p.206. The final phrase is taken from *GAD*, p.109.

²²⁴ JM, p.207.

²²⁵ OV VI, pp.466-7; RT I, p.205, notes that in September Geoffrey 'led a great army into Normandy' (*mense Septembris...adduxit maximum exercitum in Normanniam*). What follows is from Orderic's account, which is far more detailed than Robert's.

²²⁶ OV VI, pp.470-1, notes that the Angevins remained in Normandy for a total of thirteen days, therefore from 21st September to 3rd October; and see below.

²²⁷ But App. I, no.93, shows that by June 1138 Matilda was firmly in possession of Carrouges.

²²⁸ Now Saint-Georges-d'Annebecq (Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Briouze).

as a base from which to attack Lisieux (Calvados) on 29th September, the feast of an important Norman saint, Saint Michael.

Geoffrey's cavalcade had swept through western and central Normandy at an astonishing pace. At least six castles were targeted over the course of just nine days, and most fell through a combination of military might and lords joining the Angevin cause – there was no need for recourse, it seems, to the offer of forty days' respite to come to terms. Contingents of the Angevin army, led by Geoffrey's high-ranking allies, must have struck out in different directions to fight such a rapid and widespread campaign, and Chapter 5 shows that the Angevins appear to have held more castles than those named by the chroniclers. The next target was Lisieux, over 40 kilometres east of Caen. Custody of the town had been entrusted to Alan of Dinan, future earl of Richmond, by Stephen's partisan Waleran of Meulan. Its garrison, however, learned of Geoffrey's approach and pre-emptively burned the town to the ground.²²⁹

Following the failure at Lisieux, both Orderic and Robert write that Geoffrey immediately retreated south and besieged Le Sap (Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Vimoutiers), which lay just to the south of the previously taken Les Moutiers-Hubert (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Livarot).²³⁰ Geoffrey met Walter of Clare's resistance with an impressive body of archers – Orderic gives 3,000 as a number – and siege engines, which 'directed showers of stones against the garrison, so that they crushed them in the violent storm of the assault'.²³¹ On 1st October however, as the siege was taking place, Geoffrey was wounded on his right foot; in Orderic's opinion this, and the dysentery and diarrhoea visited upon the Angevins by God 'as a result of carelessly devouring uncooked food after desecrating consecrated buildings', led to their withdrawal on 2nd October, despite Matilda's arrival the previous evening with 'many thousands of soldiers'.²³²

The same week, Roger of Tosny, lord of Conches, was captured at his castle of Acquigny (Eure, arr. Évreux, cant. Louviers-Sud) by Waleran of Meulan.²³³ Acquigny was already a mere shell, burned by Waleran in May, and another of Roger's castles at Pont-Saint-Pierre (Eure, arr. Les Andelys, cant. Fleury-sur-Andelle) also appears to

²²⁹ OV VI, pp.468-71; RT I, p.205.

²³⁰ OV VI, pp.470-1; RT I, p.205.

²³¹ OV VI, pp.470-1.

²³² Ibid., pp.472-5.

²³³ RT I, p.205.

have been taken.²³⁴ Although the foothold appears not to have been entirely lost, as discussed in Chapter 5, Angevin fortunes in central and eastern Normandy now hung by a fine thread. To compound these losses, Geoffrey seems to have encountered problems during the withdrawal, for near Alençon, his route across the River Don was barred by Engelram of Courtomer and Roger of Médavy, forcing the Angevins to ford the river elsewhere, and many were drowned or captured. Geoffrey's own chamberlain was reputedly killed during the withdrawal.²³⁵

The retreat cannot be traced in any further detail; not a single dated charter issued in 1137 by Geoffrey survives, and those issued in 1136 may date to the period before the second campaign. Likewise, Matilda's movements between the Angevin withdrawal and 1139 are sketchy, and it has been suggested that she spent most of this period at Argentan, possibly making short visits to Anjou.²³⁶ For the Angevin annalists, the year's only noteworthy events were the deaths of dukes and kings elsewhere in France, and a severe drought.²³⁷

Though a period of relative peace in Anjou is perhaps suggested by this silence, events in Normandy were moving along. Stephen made his only crossing of the Channel in 1137, with the express aim of 'assaulting the castles which the count had taken' in 1135 and 1136.²³⁸ Orderic and Robert give contradictory accounts of Stephen's arrival and subsequent movements in the duchy; these accounts have, however, recently been reconciled with the charter evidence to produce an itinerary of Stephen's movements.²³⁹ After his arrival in the Cotentin between the 14th and 20th March, he quickly moved east, pausing at Bayeux before besieging castles held by the Norman baron Rabel of Tancarville in central Normandy, arriving at Évreux before Easter (11th April). He met with, and seems to have bought off, Richer of L'Aigle, Richer's uncle

²³⁴ Ibid.; OV VI, pp.455-8. Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.61 discusses Waleran's campaigns against Roger.

²³⁵ OV VI, pp.474-5, where the location is named as the forest of Maleffre, the precise location of which is unclear. There exists a Maleffre just north of Ballon (Sarthe, arr. Mamers, cant. Marolles-les-Braults, comm. Congé-sur-Orne). It lies on the Orne, just before it meets the Sarthe, and therefore on the Norman side of the Sarthe. Orderic takes the Sarthe as the border and, although extremely close to Le Mans, Maleffre was in Normandy. Cf. Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.390, n.11, who identifies it as Malèfre (Sarthe, arr. Mamers, cant. and comm. Saint-Paterne), further north and closer to Alençon. Power also claims that it was Geoffrey's chancellor who was murdered, but Orderic states that it was his chamberlain. Latouche, *Histoire du comté du Maine*, p.49 and Barton, *Lordship in the County of Maine*, p.124, n.59, show that Ballon had been held by the lords of both Bellême and Montdoubleau.

²³⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.67, and see below for her confirmation of one of Geoffrey's charters at Argentan in 1138.

²³⁷ *St-Aubin*, p.34; *St-Florent*, p.191.

²³⁸ JM, p.225.

²³⁹ Helmerichs, 'Norman Itinerary', passim, from which what follows is taken.

Rotrou of Mortagne, and his own brother Theobald, for 2,000 marks. He then met with King Louis VI, and Stephen's son Eustace gave his homage for the duchy, recognising French royal overlordship.

It is only in June that the Norman sources offer a glimpse of Geoffrey's activities and reaction to Stephen's arrival in Normandy. Orderic and Robert both record Stephen's move to Lisieux in order to launch an attack on the Angevins; but by the time he had reached Livarot (Calvados, arr. Lisieux) his army was in disarray and the expedition was called off, perhaps en route to Angevin-controlled territories just to the south.²⁴⁰ Hearing of Stephen's problems, Geoffrey rushed to the king with a substantial number of armed men.²⁴¹ This meeting may have occurred at Livarot itself, or possibly even at Caen, to which the dismayed king withdrew after disbanding his army.²⁴² Rather than pitched battle or siege warfare, Geoffrey and Stephen agreed to a truce which was to last either two or three years.²⁴³ Stephen was to pay 2,000 silver marks each year to Geoffrey, the first payment of which was made immediately. The truce in fact fell apart after a year, around the time of the feast of Saint John the Baptist (24th June) 1138.²⁴⁴

While it is known that Stephen returned to England during Advent (18th-24th December) 1137, Geoffrey's movements again are unrecorded. John of Marmoutier follows the account of Stephen's retreat to Caen with details of Matilda's crossing to England in 1139, and only resumes his detailing of Geoffrey's Norman campaigns with the siege of Mortain in 1142.²⁴⁵ Orderic attests that 'by God's grace peace was restored to Normandy, and the defenceless people...for a time enjoyed a measure of greater tranquillity after the terrible upheavals of the disorders'.²⁴⁶ The proximity of Orderic's abbey, Saint-Évroul, to Angevin-controlled castles meant that he was well-placed to comment on the after-effects of the truce.²⁴⁷ Nevertheless, as Chapter 5 shows, Geoffrey continued to seek alliances with influential magnates such as Robert of Gloucester,

²⁴⁰ OV VI, pp.483-6; RT I, p.207. JM, p.225, specifically identifies disagreements between Stephen's Flemish commander William of Ypres and the Norman magnate Reginald of Saint-Valéry as the cause of bigger problems within Stephen's army.

²⁴¹ RT I, p.207.

²⁴² JM, p.225: 'Qua seditione confusus rex expeditionem solvit, Codomum regressus'.

²⁴³ OV VI, pp.486-7 says the truce was to last for two years and that Normandy was in peace from July onwards; RT I, p.207, opts for three. See also the discussion in Helmerichs, 'Norman Itinerary', p.95.

²⁴⁴ RT I, p.207.

²⁴⁵ JM, p.226 and n.1; see below for discussion of both these events.

²⁴⁶ OV VI, pp.466-7.

²⁴⁷ A similar point is made by Helmerichs, 'Norman Itinerary', p.92, in his argument that Orderic was less well-placed than Robert of Torigny at Bec to account for Stephen's movements further north and east during 1137.

slowly building up his landed powerbase and resources in the duchy to launch a renewed attack the following year.

The failure of the truce in June 1138 was noted by the Norman chroniclers, and their testimony is fleshed-out by a remarkable three-part charter issued by Geoffrey in favour of the men of Saumur.²⁴⁸ The first part of the text was drawn up at the gates of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour in Le Mans. Three days later the document had made its way with the comital entourage to the Norman stronghold of Carrouges, where Matilda, Henry and William assented to the grant by adding their *signa* to the text. Finally, one of the men of Saumur and a monk of Saint-Florent took the text to Saumur, whereupon Geoffrey's youngest son, aged just two years, added his sign.

The charter can be dated beyond any reasonable doubt to the period just prior to the fourth invasion of Normandy in June 1138. Geoffrey was in his northern capital, Le Mans, in the company of several key Angevin barons; this was clearly en route to Normandy, where he met his wife and children. The act indicates that Matilda's entourage was on a war footing. Not only was she accompanied by the Cotentin lord Alexander of Bohon, unambiguously described as 'the foremost amongst the countess's military retinue' (*cohortis comitis primipilo*), she also retained key Angevins such as Guy of Sablé and Robert of Pocé, the former of whom appears to have been entrusted in 1136 with defending the castle of Gacé (Orne, arr. Argentan).²⁴⁹

Geoffrey and Matilda were undoubtedly encouraged to begin a campaign at this point by the defection of Matilda's half-brother Robert of Gloucester.²⁵⁰ Not only was this an invigorating morale boost for the Angevins, it also eased access across swathes of territory in the Bessin, much of which Robert had seized from the bishops of Bayeux over recent years, and prompted other lords to follow suit, as discussed in Chapter 5. Robert's defection, like that of Waleran of Meulan in 1141, was a turning-point of the conquest, and indeed Orderic attributed Geoffrey's successes in gaining Bayeux, Caen 'and numerous Norman strongholds' to Robert's assistance.²⁵¹ Doubtless Stephen's preoccupation with a spate of rebellions in England and the subsequent Battle of the Standard aided the Angevin successes in Normandy.²⁵²

Falaise – which Robert of Gloucester had previously made over to Stephen,

²⁴⁸ App. I, no.93, with dating notes.

²⁴⁹ For Guy and Gacé, see Chapter 5.

²⁵⁰ OV VI, pp.514-7; *HN*, p.34. For the defection, see Chapter 5.

²⁵¹ OV VI, pp.516-7.

²⁵² *HH*, pp.712-9.

along with Henry I's treasure which was housed there – was the next target. According to Robert of Torigny, Geoffrey and Earl Robert lay siege to it for fifteen days; subsequently, 'in that year the inhabitants of the Hiémois and Bessin were subordinated' to Angevin rule.²⁵³ The siege, though, was difficult and the Angevins had to settle in for a lengthy period to win this strategic site.²⁵⁴ According to Orderic, Geoffrey besieged Falaise from 1st October for eighteen days and, after a 'fruitless struggle', withdrew on the nineteenth after merciless taunting by the castle's keeper, Richard of Lucy, though not before wasting much of the surrounding countryside.²⁵⁵

Geoffrey and the army made a surprise return ten days later, 'scouring the country around Falaise' and elsewhere in Normandy for three weeks, from the end of October to the third week in November.²⁵⁶ Soon after the return to Falaise he went north, to the town of Touques and the nearby castle of Bonneville-sur-Touques (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Pont-l'Évêque), besieging the castle and occupying empty houses in the town. Meanwhile, Geoffrey's supporters 'did much damage to Normandy by slaying and plundering, keeping up his savage deeds relentlessly for three weeks'. Despite the devastation of the Angevin cavalcade on the Norman countryside, however, Geoffrey again met with a troublesome castellan. William Trussebut, who held Bonneville, instructed the people of Touques to set fire to their town; the Angevins were caught off guard, but managed to beat a retreat to Argentan.²⁵⁷

Orderic's account does not indicate that Geoffrey returned immediately to Anjou, but a series of charters in favour of Bishop Ulger and the canons of Angers cathedral suggests that he may have done so.²⁵⁸ Geoffrey had important business with Ulger, who travelled to Rome to petition the papacy on Matilda's behalf at the Second Lateran Council (4th April 1139), and Matilda's attestation of one of these texts suggests that the couple convened at Angers to attend to the legal side of the succession struggle.²⁵⁹ Agreement over tricky Angevin matters was vital if Ulger was to plead the Angevin case before the pope.

²⁵³ RT I, p.213: 'Gaufridus...obsederat Falesiam per xv dies cum magno exercitu, et Robertus comes Gloecestrie cum eo...Hoc etiam anno Oximenses et Baiocenses subditi sunt ei'.

²⁵⁴ The importance and subsequent renown of the siege of Falaise is reflected in its inclusion in Angevin annals, by contrast with most events in Normandy in the 1130s: *St-Aubin*, p.34; *St-Serge*, p.145.

²⁵⁵ OV VI, pp.526-7.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., pp.526-9.

²⁵⁸ App. III, nos. 5, 7, 8, of which the second appears to have been drawn up by the bishop before 21st August 1138; cf. the erroneous conclusion drawn in *RRAN* III, pp.xlv-xlvi and by Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.74.

²⁵⁹ App. III, no.7; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.75-6.

The next time Geoffrey's movements can be precisely fixed is 25th August 1139, when he settled a dispute in favour of Saint-Aubin in a sitting of the court held at the college of Saint-Laud in Angers.²⁶⁰ The chroniclers were less concerned with Geoffrey's movements in 1139 than with Stephen's shocking arrest of the bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury and Ely, and Matilda and Robert of Gloucester's subsequent arrival in England on 30th September.²⁶¹ Only the Saint-Aubin annalist supplies any information at all about events involving the count in 1139; after noting that Matilda crossed to England, the account indicates that Geoffrey took Mirebeau into his possession (*Mirebellum in dominium accepit*).²⁶² Domestic strife continued to plague Anjou: action at this border castle probably, as in 1130, involved Theobald of Blazon.²⁶³

Several charters issued by Geoffrey in 1140 survive and show that he was in Angers on 14th February and in Le Mans on 15th August.²⁶⁴ At some point he returned to central Normandy and besieged the Hiémois castle of Fontenay-le-Marmion (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Bourguébus).²⁶⁵ The castle was the seat of Robert Marmion who, according to the chronicle, provoked the siege by holding Falaise against Geoffrey. The strongly-fortified castle (*castellum...munitissimum et arte et natura*) fell to the Angevins, who proceeded to destroy it. Serious campaigning in Normandy, however, appears to have been put on hold. Chartrou suggested that both sides were worn out and disposed to peace, but the appeal to Rome, and Matilda and Robert's implantation in the southwest of England in 1139, all marked a new phase of the larger campaign rather than a slackening of effort.²⁶⁶ The absence of a lengthy Norman campaign was perhaps a reflection of the disarray of the Norman resistance to the Angevins, as well as the diplomatic efforts of Theobald of Blois and Louis VII.²⁶⁷

It was 1141 which was to prove the real turning point in the Anglo-Norman succession crisis. The capture of Stephen at Lincoln on 2nd February left the English leaderless, and as soon as he was informed of this Geoffrey 'sent out envoys to the magnates [of Normandy] and commanded them as of right to hand over their castles to

²⁶⁰ App. I, no.3.

²⁶¹ OV VI, pp.530-5; RT I, pp.214-6; WM *HN*, p.34; GS, pp.58-60.

²⁶² *St-Aubin*, p.34.

²⁶³ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.35.

²⁶⁴ App. I, nos. 15, 64. *St-Florent*, p.191, states that Geoffrey besieged Champtoceaux on the eastern frontier of Anjou in 1140, but other sources show that this occurred in 1142; see below.

²⁶⁵ RT I, p.219

²⁶⁶ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.58.

²⁶⁷ WM *HN*, p.44. Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.190.

him and keep the peace'.²⁶⁸ During Lent, which began on 12th February, peace was made with Rotrou of Perche;²⁶⁹ a truce was brokered by Robert of Leicester on behalf of his brother Waleran of Meulan, which gave Geoffrey control of the important castle of Montfort-sur-Risle;²⁷⁰ a week after Easter, around 6th April, Bishop John of Lisieux surrendered, bringing his diocesan town with him.²⁷¹

The surrender of key magnates and ecclesiastics ushered in a wave of defections and surrenders to Geoffrey, discussed in Chapter 5, which transformed the dynamics of the conquest, and allowed Geoffrey to begin to build up his Norman court in earnest. Robert of Torigny wrote that 'all the leading men of the county of Lisieux' surrendered, soon to be followed by 'all the men of the Roumois, except the citizens of the town [of Rouen]'.²⁷² Control of the swathe of land between the Risle and the Seine gave Geoffrey his most substantial foothold to date in central and eastern Normandy. In the west, control had finally been gained over the important castle of Falaise, as well as Lisieux,²⁷³ while further east the border castles of Verneuil and Nonancourt (both Eure, arr. Évreux) were also in hand.²⁷⁴ Although the Norman chronicles attest only to campaigning in the spring of 1141, the paucity of charters dated or dateable to 1141, and the concomitant lack of material relating to Geoffrey's activities in the Angevin annals for the same year, suggest that he was occupied with affairs in the duchy for the entire year. It was at this point that Geoffrey could begin to assume a form of ducal authority.

William of Malmesbury picks up the story in 1142. Soon after the beginning of Lent – during a truce which had been agreed with Stephen – Matilda sent men to Geoffrey to ask for his support, 'it being his duty to maintain the inheritance of his wife and children in England'.²⁷⁵ His answer was delivered to Matilda and her supporters by the envoys at Devizes on 14th June: 'the count of Anjou in some respects approved of what the nobles had proposed but knew none of them except the Earl of Gloucester and had long been assured of his prudence and loyalty, high spirit and energy. If the earl would cross the sea and come to him he would meet his wishes as far as he could; if not,

²⁶⁸ OV VI, pp.546-7.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.; RT I, p.225.

²⁷¹ RT I, p.224.

²⁷² RT I, pp.224-5.

²⁷³ OV, pp.550-1; RT I, p.225; *St-Aubin*, p.34; *St-Serge*, p.145.

²⁷⁴ OV, pp.550-1; cf. RT p.229, which indicates that Geoffrey took Verneuil and Vaudreuil in 1143, discussed in Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194. Verneuil is now Verneuil-sur-Avre.

²⁷⁵ WM, *HN*, p.123.

it would merely be a waste of time for anyone else to come and go'.²⁷⁶

Matilda's supporters were in favour of Geoffrey's request, although William of Malmesbury makes it clear that Robert himself had reservations, not least for the safety of his sister during his absence. Nevertheless, the earl took hostages from Matilda's men to act as sureties for the continued support of the Angevin cause, and left Devizes for the port of Wareham, which was held by his son William.²⁷⁷ He set sail soon after 24th June, and arrived in Caen after a stormy crossing, whereupon Geoffrey was summoned to meet him. Geoffrey was occupied in Anjou and made his way to Caen via Le Mans, where he issued a charter on 9th August.²⁷⁸ Upon his arrival in Caen, Robert attempted to convince Geoffrey to provide assistance in England.²⁷⁹ According to Robert of Torigny, Geoffrey refused 'because he feared the rebellion of the Angevins and his other men', and instead handed over his eldest son, Henry.²⁸⁰

Geoffrey's fears stemmed from the action he was forced to take in Anjou before his meeting with Robert. Local annals record Geoffrey's siege and capture of the castle of Champtoceaux in the far west of Anjou (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Cholet).²⁸¹ The castle, which belonged to the Crispins of Neaufles (Eure, arr. Les Andelys, cant. Gisors) – one of the few Norman families with strongly evidenced Angevin connections – was destroyed.²⁸² Both annals state that it was only after events at Champtoceaux that Geoffrey proceeded to Normandy where 'he took several castles' and sent his son Henry to England.²⁸³ Meanwhile, Bishop Ulger had been detained in Rome, effectively suspended from episcopal duties by the pope whilst a settlement over a vicious dispute with Abbess Petronilla of Fontevraud was sought.²⁸⁴ Anjou's fragile stability looked even shakier than before in the absence of both temporal and spiritual authorities.

Though great strides had been made in 1141, much of western Normandy was yet to be subdued. William of Malmesbury writes that the count was eager to meet his

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p.71.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., p.72; King, *King Stephen*, pp.182-3.

²⁷⁸ App. I, no.59. He was also at Château-du-Loir, south of Le Mans, some time in 1142; App. I, no.102.

²⁷⁹ RT I, pp.225-6; WM, *HN*, pp.125-6.

²⁸⁰ RT I, p.226.

²⁸¹ *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Serge*, p.145.

²⁸² *St-Florent*, p.191, records *excidium Castri Celsi* in the year 1140. Several entries in this period of the annals are misdated by two years, and this entry must refer to events in 1142. For the family, see Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.495.

²⁸³ *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Serge*, p.145: 'Qui postea cum exercitu in Normanniam properans castella plurima cepit, Moritonium etiam accipiens; et post hoc Henricum filium suum, per Robertum, comitem Glocestriae, in Angliam ad matrem suam transmisit'.

²⁸⁴ Jean-Marc Bienvenu, 'Le conflit entre Ulger, évêque d'Angers, et Pétronille de Chemillé, abbesse de Fontevraud', *Revue Mabillon* 58 (1972), pp.113-32: 126-8.

brother-in-law, but adamant that 'he was kept from coming to England because a number of castles were in revolt against him in Normandy'.²⁸⁵ Robert was forced to join Geoffrey on a series of campaigns in western Normandy 'to deprive the Angevin of every pretext' for not coming to Matilda's assistance in England.²⁸⁶ Robert's presence was a prime opportunity to secure western Normandy, and as Chapter 5 shows, Geoffrey had the upper hand in the relationship. Robert's son, Bishop Richard of Bayeux, had recently died, and his replacement was a candidate sponsored by Robert's rival Waleran of Meulan, who embarked upon a programme to recover alienated lands, many of which were held by Robert.

According to William, Geoffrey and Robert took ten castles during the course of this campaign, named as Tinchebray,²⁸⁷ St-Hilaire-de-Harcouët,²⁸⁸ Briquessart,²⁸⁹ Aunay-sur-Odon,²⁹⁰ Bassebourg,²⁹¹ Trévières,²⁹² Vire,²⁹³ Plessis,²⁹⁴ Villers,²⁹⁵ and Mortain; Robert of Torigny does not list all of these castles, but adds Cérences²⁹⁶ and Le Teilleul,²⁹⁷ both of which along with Tinchebray were part of the count of Mortain's patrimony.²⁹⁸ These successes, according to Robert, were followed by the surrender of all the men of the Avranchin and Cotentin.²⁹⁹ After describing the difficulty of the siege at St-Hilaire, John of Marmoutier adds a further victory at Pontorson,³⁰⁰ placed before Cérences in the sequence of events, and then describes victories at Avranches, St-Lô, Coutances and Cherbourg.³⁰¹ The latter three were all key castles of the Cotentin, and Cherbourg fell to Geoffrey in 1143, not 1142.³⁰² The Angevin annals indicate that Avranches and Coutances were not taken until 1143, and the place of the capture of St-Lô in the

²⁸⁵ WM, *HN*, pp.125-7.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p.127.

²⁸⁷ Orne, arr. Argentan.

²⁸⁸ Manche, arr. Avranches.

²⁸⁹ Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Caumont l'Éventé.

²⁹⁰ Now Aunay-sur-Odon (Calvados, arr. Vire).

²⁹¹ King gives Bastebourg, as does Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.128. The castle was probably Bassebourg (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Dozulé, comm. Criqueville-en-Auge).

²⁹² Calvados, arr. Bayeux.

²⁹³ Calvados, arr. Vire.

²⁹⁴ Probably Le Plessis-Grimoult (Calvados, arr. Vire, cant. Aunay-sur-Odon) or perhaps a castle of the Plessis honour of the lords of La Haye-du-Puits (Manche, arr. Coutances).

²⁹⁵ Probably Villers-Canivet (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Falaise-Sud) to the west of Falaise, but possibly Villers-Bocage (Calvados, arr. Caen) on the Odon to the south-west of Caen.

²⁹⁶ Manche, arr. Coutances, cant. Bréhal.

²⁹⁷ Manche, arr. Avranches.

²⁹⁸ WM, *HN*, p.72; RT I, p.226.

²⁹⁹ RT I, pp.226-7.

³⁰⁰ Manche, arr. Avranches.

³⁰¹ JM, pp.227-9.

³⁰² RT I, p.229; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194.

sequence of events suggests that it was only targeted in this later campaign.³⁰³

Though the chronicle accounts are contradictory, it is clear that the major campaign begun in 1142 had to be completed in 1143. Recent work suggests that Geoffrey was involved in the election of Richard of Subligny as bishop in 1143.³⁰⁴ He was thus peacefully received at Avranches by the town's citizens and Bishop Richard's predecessor, Richard of Beaufou, all of whom offered their homage. All the castellans of Avranches were then summoned to the count, where they 'joyfully received themselves into his lordship, pledging faith to him and oaths against all enemies'.³⁰⁵ Geoffrey then turned northwards to attack St-Lô, and then on to Coutances.³⁰⁶

By contrast with his Avranchin counterpart, Bishop Algar of Coutances personally led the Cotentin resistance against Geoffrey. The castle of St-Lô belonged to the episcopal demesne, and was manned by almost 200 of the bishop's knights; on the third day of Geoffrey's siege, however, the garrison surrendered and swore fealty and homage to the count.³⁰⁷ At Coutances, the army found no resistance (*nemine resistente*) in Algar's absence and Geoffrey took the opportunity to recuperate and to allow the barons of the region to submit to him.³⁰⁸ All of the barons of the Cotentin (*Constantiane provincie*) pledged their faith to Geoffrey, except for Richard and Ralph of La Haie.³⁰⁹ Ralph attempted to stage a rebellion by fortifying his castles (the number and locations of which are unspecified) against Geoffrey, while Richard took a large cohort of knights to Cherbourg, a strong castle at the tip of the Cotentin peninsula, and awaited the count's arrival.³¹⁰

Geoffrey wasted Ralph's lands, besieged his castles and then captured Ralph

³⁰³ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194 states that Geoffrey 'drew the campaign deliberately to a close' in September 1142, and then Robert and Henry left, but he ignores John of Marmoutier's account. Cf. Norgate, *Angevin Kings I*, p.340, who suggests that 'while Robert and Henry sailed for England together, Geoffrey remained to finish his work in Normandy', first at Avranches, then in the Cotentin, though she does not consider Robert of Torigny's record of the siege of Cherbourg in 1143.

³⁰⁴ David Spear, *The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals during the Ducal Period, 911-1204* (London, 2006), p.4, and see Chapter 5.

³⁰⁵ JM, p.228: 'Nec mora Bricatenses castellanos unumquemque ad se venire mandat, eos duntaxat qui ejus dominium suscipere non recusarent; qui omnes pari concordia advenerunt et eum gaudentes in dominum susceperunt, fidem ei et sacramenta contra omnes adversarios facientes'.

³⁰⁶ Ibid: 'A Bricate movens, comes Sanctum Laudum petiit...Inde Constantiam civitatem venit'.

³⁰⁷ Ibid: 'Milites qui intus erant ferme CC, e contra exeuntes ad prelium, ipso primo impetus refugere ad municipium coguntur. Prima die resistentes et altera, tertia sese dedentes, portas aperiant, pacem petunt, hominum faciunt, fidem et sacramenta comiti contra hostes jurantes'.

³⁰⁸ Ibid, p.229. The comital army lodged in the castle and were fed while Geoffrey received local barons: 'loca milite complet et escis. Constantiane provincie barones evocat, fidem ab eis postulans'.

³⁰⁹ Now La Haye-du-Puits (Manche, arr. Coutances).

³¹⁰ JM, p.229: 'Radulfum et fratrum ejus Richardum de La Haia, quorum prior, castella sua contra comitem muniens, rebellare conatur, alter cum grandi militum copia CC et eo amplius Cesaris Burgum occupat, exinde comiti se posse resistere ratus'.

himself. Richard, however, held out at Cherbourg while Geoffrey anxiously gathered his knights and siege engines together and hastened to the fortress.³¹¹ Richard had ordered his entourage to repel Geoffrey's attacks whilst he himself attempted to cross the Channel to the safety of his immediate overlord, King Stephen, lord of Mortain, perhaps heading for Chichester, near the family priory of Boxgrove.³¹² John reports, however, that pirates had captured Richard; the hopes of his garrison quickly faded once the news reached them and, as hard as they tried, they could not escape the castle. It is claimed that Richard was taken abroad (*in exteras nationes adducitur*) by his captors, but John's choice of words leave another possibility open: the news of Richard's kidnap is described as a 'fatal rumour' (*rumor letalis*), and Richard surfaces soon after the siege as one of Geoffrey's supporters.³¹³

The Cherbourg garrison finally came to terms with Geoffrey after some mediation, and no doubt with an eye to the imminent close of the campaign season at the advance of winter (*hiemi imminenti cedendum arbitratur*).³¹⁴ Cherbourg was the last significant outpost of resistance in western Normandy. The allegiance of Bishop Algar of Coutances had already been sealed by 18th September, when he witnessed a charter of William Talvas for the monks of Vignats, along with Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux and Bishop John of Sées: the charter unambiguously identified Geoffrey as duke of Normandy (*principante in Normannia duce Gaufrido*), though Geoffrey himself did not use the ducal title until the time of his investiture the following year, as shown in Chapter 5.³¹⁵

Robert of Torigny supplies details of victories much further east, at the castles of

³¹¹ Ibid.: 'Hinc ad Cesaris Burgum, bellico apparatu sollicite procurato, militum aciebus dispositis, machinis provide et solleter aptatis, properatur. De cujus castri vocabulo, situ, artificiosa firmitate, multum quod loqueremur erat, sed ad exitum festinamus'.

³¹² Ibid, p.230. Boxgrove Priory, Sussex, was a dependency of Lessay founded by the brothers' father Robert on land granted to him by Henry I: Katharine S. B. Keats-Rohan, *Domesday Descendants: a prosopography of persons occurring in English documents, 1066-1166. II, Pipe Rolls to Cartae Baronum* (Woodbridge, 2002), p.496. For the brothers' connections with Stephen as count of Mortain, see Chapter 5.

³¹³ RT II, p.12, in fact records his death in 1169. Richard was a surety to Geoffrey's agreement of c.23rd April 1144 with the citizens of Rouen (see below) and also witnessed Geoffrey's confirmation of 1144x50 of Henry I's grants to the abbey of Montebourg, near Coutances (App. I, no.73). He also acted on the duke's behalf in the Bayeux inquests. Cf. the charter of Henry II for Saint-Sauveur witnessed by Richard of La Haie and the other barons mentioned by John of Marmoutier as intercessors, printed DB II, no.515, but recently and conclusively deemed spurious and reworked by Vincent et al, *Acta* no.2391 (1812H).

³¹⁴ Ibid, p.230.

³¹⁵ *Recueil des actes des comtes de Pontieu, 1026-1279*, ed. Clovis Brunel (Paris, 1930), no.27; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.65.

Verneuil and Vaudreuil,³¹⁶ as well as the surrender of Walter Giffard and the men of the Pays de Caux.³¹⁷ The defection of Walter and his men had the effect, combined with the earlier surrender of the men of the Roumois, of encircling the town of Rouen. Orderic recorded a victory at Verneuil, on eastern Normandy's southern border, in 1141; whether Robert's testimony is incorrect or indicates that Geoffrey was forced to retake the castle is impossible to verify. A victory at Vaudreuil, by contrast, is entirely consonant with a determined attempt at the next objective, which was the siege of Rouen. The castle was situated on the western bank of the Seine, downriver from the castle of Vernon – which commanded a crossing of the Seine and was already in Geoffrey's hands – and extremely close to the ducal capital.

Angevin supporters were closing in on Rouen. Around this time, Waleran of Meulan brought a large army of mounted knights and soldiers to the town, and burned the suburb of Emendreville and its monastery of Saint-Sever.³¹⁸ Rouen's main bridge was probably also a casualty.³¹⁹ Emendreville and neighbouring Quevilly were together to become important as Matilda's residence after her return to Normandy in 1148, and Henry I's heart and entrails had been buried at Bec's priory of Notre-Dame-du-Pré at Emendreville.³²⁰ Waleran's assault may have been brutal, but for the Angevins it was an important symbolic and strategic victory.³²¹ It appears that the flurry of critical victories in both eastern and western Normandy in 1143 was simultaneous, and it is possible that Geoffrey's brother Helias – who was certainly present at the siege of Rouen – played a part with Waleran in the securing of the Seine valley between Vernon and Rouen.

Geoffrey thus hastened to the Seine, unfortunately leaving no trace of his movements between the fall of Cherbourg and his arrival at the castle of Vernon. Although Stephen still commanded some support in Normandy, the situation was desperate by spring 1144. Geoffrey's military expertise, honed against the overmighty barons of Anjou as well as the magnates and castellans of a vast area of Normandy, proved itself unstoppable and was now matched by the creeping recognition amongst the magnates and bishops of the duchy of his *de facto* possession of the ducal title.

³¹⁶ Respectively situated at Eure, arr. Évreux and Eure, arr. Louviers, cant. Pont-de-l'Arche.

³¹⁷ RT I, p.229.

³¹⁸ RHGF XII, p.785, *sub anno* 1143; the district (now part of Rouen) is noted as *Ermentruville* in Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy*, p.175.

³¹⁹ RT I, p.239, states that Geoffrey rebuilt (*reficit*) the bridge in 1145.

³²⁰ Chibnall, 'Matilda and Bec', pp.36-7.

³²¹ RHGF XII, p.785: 'Gualerannus Comes Mellentis, multis comitatus militibus et peditibus, combussit Ermentruvillam et Monasterium S. Severi, et intus multos utriusque sexus'.

While Matilda remained in England, Geoffrey marched on Rouen and, within a few short weeks, was invested as duke of the Normans.

14th January – 23rd April 1144: triumph

Soon after the feast of Saint Hilary, 14th January 1144, Geoffrey crossed the Seine in the shadow of the castle of Vernon and by 19th January left his camp at La Trinité-du-Mont, on the eastern fringes of Rouen, to approach the gates of the town.³²² The next day, 20th January, he was ‘solemnly received’ by the citizens of Rouen and Archbishop Hugh at the cathedral of Notre-Dame.³²³ The town did not completely submit, however, and Geoffrey was forced to begin a siege on 25th January of the tower ‘in which King Stephen had invested all his hopes’ as a last bastion of defence.³²⁴ One of Stephen’s remaining loyal followers, Earl William of Warenne, was ensconced in the tower with his men, and it took a substantial force led by Geoffrey, Waleran of Meulan and ‘other Norman princes who were now on good terms with the duke’ until 23rd April to subdue William’s garrison.³²⁵

Charter evidence, analysed further in Chapter 5, indicates that Geoffrey did not assume the title before the capture of the tower, and that he did not remain in Rouen or indeed in Normandy during the entirety of the siege. After installing his retinue around the tower with a variety of siege engines – which were repeatedly unsuccessful because of the tower’s strength and location³²⁶ – Geoffrey departed for Angers, and was reunited with his eldest son Henry, who had recently returned from England. Their presence is recorded by a settlement with the priory of Cunault, which must have been reached in February or March.³²⁷ Geoffrey soon departed from Angers, leaving Henry behind in his stead, and returned to Rouen, and appears to have broken his journey at Saint-Évroul. If

³²² RT I, p.233. The abbey on the hill was later renamed Sainte-Catherine-du-Mont, and is now destroyed, but its site is the Côte Sainte-Catherine, just east of the Mont Gargan cemetery in the Bonsecours district of Rouen. Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.195, dates the feast of Saint Hilary to 13th January; cf. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2nd edn., Oxford, 2000), p.267, which notes that the feast fell on the 14th not the 13th prior to 1969.

³²³ RT I, p.233: ‘sequenti die, videlicet in festivitate sanctorum Fabiani et Sebastiani, receptus est a civibus Rothomagi sollenniter’; *RHGF* XII, p.785 *sub anno* 1144: ‘XIV Kal. Februarii...in ipsa die, intempestatis hora, Gaufridus Comes Andegavensis maritus filiae Regis Henrici in Ecclesia S. Mariae Rotomagi susceptus est, jam sibi reddita civitate’.

³²⁴ *RHGF* XII, p.785, dating the beginning of the siege to 8 kalends February.

³²⁵ RT I, p.233; *RHGF* XII, p.785. Although Geoffrey is here called duke, this should not be taken as a sign that he had been invested; see below.

³²⁶ RT I, p.234; *RHGF* XII, p.785.

³²⁷ App. I, no.42; A. L. Poole, ‘Henry Plantagenet’s Early Visits to England’, *EHR* 47 (1932), pp.447-52, at 451.

genuine, a charter issued for the abbey shows that although it had been at the eye of the storm throughout the campaigns of the previous decade – and Geoffrey’s harshest critic Orderic Vitalis, a monk of Saint-Évroul, was only recently dead – the abbot received Normandy’s new *de facto* duke amicably.³²⁸ As Chapters 5 and 6 show, this charter was a taste of things to come: Geoffrey, as the heir to Henry I (*regis Hainrici antecessoris mei*), confirmed the monks in all of their rights and privileges as they stood in his father-in-law’s reign, and situated himself as their protector.

Geoffrey arrived in Rouen before the siege was over. Though his siege engines could not breach the tower’s defences, they encircled and cut the garrison off, and as their supplies slowly dwindled so did their strength. It must have been obvious to the citizens of Rouen, who had already received Geoffrey amicably and who were the beneficiaries of what was probably his first ducal charter, that victory was inevitable.³²⁹ As soon as the earl of Warenne surrendered on 23rd April, Geoffrey was officially invested as duke of the Normans by Archbishop Hugh.³³⁰ The charter for the citizens of Rouen indicates that a host of high-ranking Normans and Angevins, including Archbishop Hugh, Bishop Philip of Bayeux, Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, Waleran of Meulan and Geoffrey’s brother Helias were all present. The charter was also warranted by a large number of Normans, many of whom were connected to Waleran, whilst others held strategically important honours in the Vexin.³³¹ Geoffrey’s support was drawn from almost every corner of the duchy, and as Chapter 5 shows, it was aristocratic defection which proved to be the decisive factor in the conquest’s success.

1144-50: duke of the Normans

Geoffrey’s investiture irrevocably altered the Angevin dynasty’s fortunes and had a marked impact on his own reign. Much time was spent in Normandy, evidenced by the fifty-two charters issued either in the duchy or for Norman beneficiaries.³³² As chapters 5 and 6 show, the newly-invested duke was immediately petitioned by Norman bishops and abbots, as well as the pope, to investigate the extent of the losses of episcopal and abbatial land and privileges made to the profit of local magnates and

³²⁸ App. I, no.85; and see commentary for dating and authenticity.

³²⁹ App. IV, no.14.

³³⁰ *RHGF* XII, p.785. For the process of investiture, see Chapter 5.

³³¹ Judith Green, ‘Lords of the Norman Vexin’, *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. John Gillingham and James C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp.47-61, esp. 53-4.

³³² App. I, nos. 1, 30-3, 36, 40, 43-5, 53-6, 69, 72-4, 78-85, 87-8, 94-7, 113; App. II, nos. 2-4, 7, 8, 11-13, 15-16; App. IV, nos. 3-5, 12-14, 19; App. VI, nos. 1, 5.

institutions during both the struggle with Stephen and the earlier decades of the twelfth century. These inquests were in the pipeline even prior to the official investiture, and did not conclude until at least 1147. Matilda and Henry returned to the duchy in 1148, and efforts were made to integrate Henry into ducal life at Rouen, the acceleration of a process of training and association begun at a young age, as discussed in Chapter 3.

The first tasks, however, were those of completion and confirmation. The latter, discussed in Chapter 6, primarily took the form of a substantial number of charters and writs which confirmed and restored Norman religious houses in their rights and privileges as they stood under Henry I; indeed, Geoffrey was consciously acting as Henry's heir in issuing these confirmations. Few such documents exist for lay beneficiaries, but it is clear that this was a programmatic endeavour which aimed to restore a kind of legitimate stability to the duchy and which must have extended to Norman magnates and their vassals.

The former task was prompted by the existence of a pocket of resistance in the far north-east of the duchy, and necessitated the continuation of military campaigning into 1145. Geoffrey was forced to mount an expedition to Arques, where a certain William the Monk, a Fleming still loyal to Stephen, had been holding out against Geoffrey since the fall of Rouen.³³³ The new duke's adherents had been besieging Arques since 1144, but it was only in the summer of 1145 that it fell, after an arrow killed William. Robert of Torigny's description does not make it clear whether Geoffrey was present; earlier siege practice at Rouen and events in Anjou suggest that he may not have been.³³⁴

Trouble, however, was fermenting elsewhere. All of the Angevin narrative sources indicate that Geoffrey was the victim of another serious rebellion in 1145, and the episode is well known amongst historians.³³⁵ Local annals simply record a 'war of the barons' against Geoffrey (*guerra baronum contra comitem Gaufridum*);³³⁶ John of Marmoutier makes it clear that the barons had a new figurehead in Geoffrey's own brother Helias.³³⁷ The causes of the rebellion, apparently an attempt by Helias to increase his power after Geoffrey's Norman victory, are examined in Chapter 3. These

³³³ RT I, pp.235, 237.

³³⁴ App. I, no.27; cf. Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, p.342: 'the Angevin was obliged to leave a body of troops before the place and go home without waiting to finish the siege in person'.

³³⁵ E.g. Norgate, *Angevin kings* I, p.343; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.66; Lemesle, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions', *passim*.

³³⁶ *St-Aubin*, p.35, from *St-Serge*, p.146.

³³⁷ JM, p.207; *GCA*, p.71.

events drew Geoffrey away from the business of the duchy and back to Anjou, where he can also be found dealing with other local matters and giving thanks to the Angevin church and saints for his Norman success.³³⁸ Despite problems in Anjou, Normandy was now securely under Geoffrey's control; paradoxically, this may have been a crucial weakness for the new duke, who seems to have failed to have offered his Angevin followers any serious rewards for the services they must have provided since 1135. Nevertheless, as discussed in Chapter 3, the rebellion was effectively quelled, and Helias – at least temporarily – imprisoned.

During the third quarter of the 1140s, Geoffrey split his time between Greater Anjou, Normandy and his other possessions, while many of his contemporaries, including his own barons, joined the Second Crusade.³³⁹ He oversaw the reconstruction of Rouen's castle and tower in 1146, after rebuilding the town's bridge the previous year.³⁴⁰ As Chapter 6 shows, the inquests and other measures taken to recover land at Bayeux reached crisis point in 1147, and Geoffrey was compelled by the papacy and Norman episcopate to bring Robert of Gloucester, the most prolific usurper of the bishop's rights and estates, to terms. In the same year, the inquests appear to have fizzled out, perhaps as a result of Robert's death on 31st October, although they were revived under Henry II.

The focus of Geoffrey's activities shifted after the initial years of ducal rule. Henry crossed from England to Normandy and was solemnly received at Bec on Ascension Day, 29th May 1147.³⁴¹ Matilda likewise returned to Normandy, basing herself just outside of Rouen in the priory of Le Pré, and on 11th October 1148 she can be found – alongside her husband and three children – assenting to Geoffrey's confirmation of Mortemer's estates granted since its foundation by Henry I in 1134.³⁴² Henry was not formally invested duke until 1150, but as Chapter 3 shows, he was being prepared for ducal rule throughout the 1140s. At Pentecost 1149, he was knighted by his uncle, King David of Scotland, and Geoffrey's plans for cession of the duchy were

³³⁸ App. I, nos. 27 and 41, the latter being a summary of a charter of 1145, in which Geoffrey thanked Cunault and its saint, the Virgin Mary, for his success.

³³⁹ For evidence that Geoffrey intended but failed to join the crusade, see Chapter 4. In 1146, he was apparently in Curçay-sur-Dive, on Anjou's southern fringes (App. I, no.39, and see dating notes therein), and Le Mans (*ibid*, no.57); he visited Vendôme on 23rd February 1147 (*ibid*, no.112), then Mirebeau and Saumur during the spring and summer (*ibid*, nos. 30, 55), as well as Argentan at some point in the same year (App. II, no.13).

³⁴⁰ RT I, pp.239, 242.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.243.

³⁴² App. I, no.75.

public.³⁴³

1150-1: cession, conflict and an untimely death

Before the end of the decade, Geoffrey had to deal with two challenges which, although at opposite ends of his dominions, placed serious stress on his relationship with the king of France, Louis VII (1138-80) and throw the question of the succession into sharp relief. Robert of Torigny and the Angevin annals both attest, first, to a long-running siege by Geoffrey at the castle of Montreuil-Bellay (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur), on the margins of Anjou and Poitou, and, second, to conflict with Louis which involved intricate military and diplomatic manoeuvring. The discrepancies between the different extant accounts of this period, and the absence of comment on the precise causes of both problems, have resulted in differing modern accounts of events.

Robert of Torigny's account is the fullest, occupying six pages in Delisle's edition of the Chronicle, and forms the basis of the overviews provided by Yves Sassier, David Crouch and Edmund King.³⁴⁴ According to Robert, Geoffrey laid siege to Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay in 1149, and this was in place over the course of the following three years.³⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Geoffrey's son Henry was knighted by his uncle, King David I of Scotland (1124-53), at Carlisle, and returned to Normandy early in 1150.³⁴⁶ Henry's return was the occasion for his investiture as duke, and Robert states that 'his father rendered to him his maternal inheritance, namely the duchy of Normandy'; as a result, 'a disagreement arose between the king and the count' in 1150, prompting Louis to join forces with Stephen's son Eustace, count of Boulogne, who brought an army to Arques in north-eastern Normandy.³⁴⁷ Henry also went north-east with unnamed Norman nobles and Norman, Angevin and Breton troops, but was advised by his followers not to engage Louis and Eustace in combat.³⁴⁸ Meanwhile, Geoffrey had remained in the south, and seized the castle of La Nue (Sarthe, arr. and cant. Mamers, comm. Contilly),

³⁴³ Warren, *Henry II*, p.36; *GS*, p.142.

³⁴⁴ RT I, pp.251-6; Yves Sassier, *Louis VII* (Paris, 1991), pp.200, 217-26; Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.247-50; King, *King Stephen*, pp.265-7.

³⁴⁵ RT I, p.251 (1149): 'Dux Gaufridus castellum Monasteriolum...obsedit...et duravit illa obsidio per tres annos'; *ibid.*, p.253 (1151): 'Everso castro Monasteriolo a duce Gaufrido, obsessio...per tres annos'.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.251-3.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.253-4. Robert's language suggests a causal link here: 'pater suus reddiderat ei hereditatem ex parte matris, scilicet ducatum Normannie. Facta itaque discordia inter regem et comitem...'. As King, *King Stephen*, p.266 notes, this account is given s.a.1151 but refers to the previous year (*jam anno praeterito*).

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.254. Robert states that, prior to riding to Arques Henry had also besieged the castle of Torigni-sur-Vire (Manche, arr. Saint-Lô), though does not say why.

which John Talvas, husband to Geoffrey's niece Beatrix, had lost 'through betrayal' to the king's brother Robert, count of Perche (1144-88) in 1149.³⁴⁹ In retribution, Louis and Robert burned Sées, controlled by Geoffrey's old partisan William Talvas, John's father.

Robert of Torigny then details how Louis amassed a second army, and stationed it in the French Vexin, between Meulan and Mantes (both Yvelines, arr. Mantes-la-Jolie); Geoffrey and Henry did not delay, and assembled their troops on the other side of the Seine.³⁵⁰ Louis himself was not present, and appears to have fallen ill at Paris: peace quickly followed, for a truce was made with Geoffrey and Henry, who gave his homage to the king, who also received the Norman Vexin; Geoffrey, who had destroyed Montreuil-Bellay and captured Gerald, restored him to freedom.³⁵¹ Finally, Geoffrey and Henry joyfully left Paris (*laeti discessissent*), planning to meet Henry's Norman subjects at Lisieux on 14th September.³⁵²

Some historians have interpreted Geoffrey's siege of Gerald as the trigger for the conflict with Louis, for whom Gerald acted as seneschal for Louis' county of Poitou, while others explain events purely with reference to the Norman succession.³⁵³ In an unpublished paper, Robert Helmerichs has drawn attention to the shortcomings of Robert of Torigny's account, which is remote in time and place from events in southern Anjou, and can be shown by comparison with Angevin evidence to be factually incorrect in parts.³⁵⁴ Without exception the Angevin annals indicate that the siege only lasted around a year, concluding in 1151.³⁵⁵ These accounts include a second version of the Saint-Serge annals, composed in 1153, which in its entry for 1151 states that Geoffrey besieged the castle for an entire year, and details the lengths to which he had to go to reduce Gerald's resistance, building six *ad hoc* 'castles' and battering Montreuil with stone-throwers.³⁵⁶ The *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*'s assertion that the siege

³⁴⁹ Ibid.: 'quod anno praeterito per traditionem Johannes filius Willermi Talvas'. Delisle is unsure of La Nue's location; see Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.351 and index.

³⁵⁰ RT I, p.255.

³⁵¹ Ibid.

³⁵² Ibid., pp.255-6.

³⁵³ Sassier, *Louis VII*, p.217; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.248; cf. King, *King Stephen*, pp.262-6. For Gerald as seneschal, see JM, p.215.

³⁵⁴ Robert Helmerichs, 'The Siege of Montreuil Bellay', summarised in *Anglo-Norman Anonymous* 17:1 (1999), at <http://www.haskins.cornell.edu/archive.html> [accessed 17/08/2011], and cited by Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.248, n.49.

³⁵⁵ *St-Aubin*, p.36; *St-Serge*, p.147; *St-Florent*, p.191. This is also pointed out by Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.71, n.1.

³⁵⁶ *St-Serge*, pp.147-8, s.a.1151.

lasted for a year is also copied into the *Historia* by John of Marmoutier.³⁵⁷

All of the Angevin sources attest to a hard-fought year-long siege in which Geoffrey employed some unusual tactics, surrounding the castle with multiple siege engines, apparently employing Greek fire and even filling its ditches with rubble to reduce its defences.³⁵⁸ The relationship between the Angevin accounts requires further work which is not possible here, but it is striking that both John and the so-called ‘Méron Chronicle’ – a dramatic account written by the monks of Saint-Aubin’s priory of Méron, which stood in the shadow of Montreuil – both state that Geoffrey had a vision of Saint Albinus, the priory’s patron. The miraculous nature of these accounts reflects the difficulties Geoffrey faced in gaining the upper hand, and the strength of feeling against Gerald, a ‘tyrant’ who had oppressed Méron and, along with his allies – his relative Andrew of Doué and the minor lords Rogon of Coué, Aimery of Avoir and Pagan *Bafer*³⁵⁹ – had ravaged the countryside of southern Anjou.³⁶⁰

If the Angevin sources’ assertion that the siege lasted a year is correct, it probably began in June 1150, for on 10th June 1151, Geoffrey issued a charter for Saint-Aubin, restoring Méron’s privileges which had been granted by the counts and usurped by Gerald.³⁶¹ Both the narrative sources and the *acta* indicate that this was issued after Geoffrey took not only Gerald and his allies, but also their wives and children, captive, and brought them first to Saumur then to Angers in a symbolic show of victory.³⁶² By June 1150, it is likely that Geoffrey had already recovered La Nue and Louis and Eustace had assembled at Arques; indeed, the need to capture La Nue for the Talvas, who had lost it in 1149, indicates that border hostilities had already broken out.

There is strong evidence, therefore, that the siege commenced around seven months after Louis’ return from crusade in mid-October 1149, and that contrary to Robert of Torigny’s version of events, it was not the trigger for Angevin-French hostilities. Rather, it occurred as part of these hostilities, which followed Henry’s return from England and his installation as duke of Normandy in early 1150. The issues at stake were the Norman succession and the French king’s control over it. A flurry of letters written during this period by Louis’ regent and advisor, Abbot Suger of Saint-

³⁵⁷ *GCA*, p.72; *JM*, p.215.

³⁵⁸ *JM*, pp.215-7; *Méron*, p.87. For Geoffrey’s use of Greek fire, see Jim Bradbury, ‘Greek Fire in the West’, *History Today* 29 (1979), pp.326-31.

³⁵⁹ *JM*, pp.215-6.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p.216; *Méron*, *passim*.

³⁶¹ *App.* I, no.7.

³⁶² *St-Serge*, pp.147-8; *Méron*, p.87; *App.* I, no.19.

Denis, and other prelates, which pressed for a peaceful solution to these problems has been described as a ‘diplomatic ballet’,³⁶³ and although problems with the chronology of events still remain, this evidence gives an impression of their resolution.³⁶⁴

Lindy Grant has shown that Eustace and Stephen had been in contact with Suger, approaching Louis, Eustace’s father-in-law, through him.³⁶⁵ After Louis, Eustace and the king’s brother Robert’s first incursions into Normandy, Suger wrote to Geoffrey, appealing for peace, and in the background collaborated with Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, the chief advocate of Henry’s succession, to intercede with Geoffrey and Louis for peace.³⁶⁶ Arnulf responded, agreeing to assist with the attempt to avoid all-out war between Louis and Geoffrey.³⁶⁷ Meanwhile, Pope Eugenius III wrote to Suger to ascertain the severity of the situation, after Bernard of Clairvaux had informed him on behalf of Louis of Geoffrey’s attack on La Nue.³⁶⁸ In the midst of all this activity, it seems that Geoffrey turned up the heat on Louis by attacking Gerald, who the previous year had received a large sum of money from Louis, perhaps as a preliminary to strengthening the French/Aquitanian position on Anjou’s southern margins.³⁶⁹

Geoffrey’s sole surviving letter to Suger from this period appears to have been composed a little later, for it suggests that both Geoffrey and Louis were planning to meet in person in order to negotiate a settlement, though the situation was still on a knife-edge, with both sides keeping a military option open (*Terminus enim negotii regis adeo propinquus est, quod intente oportet negotia mea praeparare, ut exercitui regis advenienti, viribus meis collectis, possim obsistere*).³⁷⁰ In the letter, Geoffrey says that he will do whatever Suger suggests, saving anything that will offend his honour, in order to reach a settlement with Louis. Suger’s response indicates that Louis was still bellicose, and that Geoffrey’s brother-in-law Thierry of Flanders had stepped in to advise Louis to delay summoning his army.³⁷¹ Diplomatic activity, led by Suger and

³⁶³ Sassier, *Louis VII*, p.221.

³⁶⁴ Suger’s letters to and from Geoffrey are calendared in App. V.

³⁶⁵ Lindy Grant, *Abbot Suger of St-Denis: Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France* (London and New York, 1998), p.284, citing *RHGF* XV, p.520.

³⁶⁶ App. V, no.6; Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.284, citing *RHGF* XV, p.520; Sassier, *Louis VII*, pp.220-1.

³⁶⁷ Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.284; *The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux*, ed. and trans. Carolyn Poling Schriber (Lewiston, 1997), no.3.03 (= *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, ed. Frank Barlow, Camden Society, 3rd series, 61 (London, 1939), no.6).

³⁶⁸ Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.285, citing *RHGF* XV, p.461.

³⁶⁹ *RHGF* XV, p.499, cited by Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.285, who suggests that this money indicates that Louis was supporting Gerald during the siege, but this is impossible as the siege had not yet begun.

³⁷⁰ App. V, no.7.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, no.8.

Arnulf, continued. Suger, however, fell ill in the autumn of 1150, and died the following January.³⁷²

The diplomatic activity conducted by Suger, Arnulf and others meant that Louis' two stand-offs on the Norman border were not translated into serious military action. It also appears that the fall of Montreuil-Bellay to Geoffrey in June 1151 allowed a final phase of diplomacy to begin: now in Geoffrey's hands, Gerald was a bargaining-chip; Geoffrey accordingly travelled to Paris to meet Louis.³⁷³ The king was bound by his duty as Gerald's lord to secure his release. Although the settlement reached appears to have been skewed in Louis's favour – he received both Henry's homage for Normandy and control of the Norman Vexin – the Angevins had secured the king's acquiescence in their plans to promote Henry as heir to England. As King notes, Stephen's petition of Lent 1151 to the pope – not their first – to secure Eustace's succession failed, and this was proclaimed publicly by the pope at Easter.³⁷⁴ On balance, homage and the cession of the Vexin, though perhaps painful, was a worthwhile price to pay for the security of Henry's position as duke and French royal support for his claim to the English throne. Geoffrey and Henry certainly had cause to 'leave the city of Paris full of joy'.³⁷⁵

This joy was, however, short-lived. Robert of Torigny reports that while *en route* to Lisieux to meet the magnates of Normandy, summoned by Henry after the conclusion of talks with Louis, Geoffrey contracted a severe fever after swimming in the river at his castle of Château-du-Loir (Sarthe, arr. Le Mans) in south-eastern Maine.³⁷⁶ On 7th September 1151, after several days' illness, he died.³⁷⁷

Geoffrey's untimely death, at the age of just thirty-eight, marked a new phase in Angevin history. His son Henry succeeded as count of Anjou, adding Greater Anjou to his Norman territories; these lands were augmented in 1152 with the acquisition of Aquitaine by his marriage to Eleanor, the former wife of Louis VII who had reigned as duchess since 1137, and eventually Henry's succession to the English throne in 1154. The Angevin succession, however, was not without controversy: in 1156, Henry's younger brother Geoffrey rebelled against the king in a bid for rule of Greater Anjou,

³⁷² Grant, *Abbot Suger*, pp.286-7.

³⁷³ RT I, p.255.

³⁷⁴ King, *King Stephen*, pp.262-3, 265.

³⁷⁵ RT I, p.255.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., p.256; for the detail of the swim, *GCA*, p.72: 'nimio calore ipso urgente, balneo cujusdam fluvii usus, febri peracuta occupatus'.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.; *St-Aubin*, pp.36-7; *St-Serge*, p.147; *Aquaria*, p.173; *St-Florent*, p.191; *GCA*, p.72; JM, p.223; App. IV, no.2.

and was only placated by a grant of the county of Nantes, taken by Henry the previous year.³⁷⁸ Historians have frequently traced the roots of Geoffrey junior's claim to Geoffrey V's deathbed. Writing later in the twelfth century, the English chronicler William of Newburgh reported that Count Geoffrey ordered the bishops and nobles who attended his deathbed to make Henry swear an oath not to go against the terms of his will, in which he stipulated that Henry was to hold Greater Anjou only until England was gained, and that in the meantime Geoffrey junior was to be given the castles of Chinon, Mirebeau and Loudun.³⁷⁹ This evidence has been hotly disputed, and is reviewed at the end of Chapter 6. Geoffrey V's *acta* may shed a little new light on the debate, but his wishes for his patrimonial lands cannot be conclusively identified.

After his death, Geoffrey's body was taken for burial to the cathedral of Saint-Julien in Le Mans, as discussed in Chapter 4. The choice of a site in Maine was an apt reflection of his career, which built upon the gains of his father and saw his time and energy split between Anjou and Normandy. The themes, issues, priorities and pressures of that career are addressed in the following five chapters.

³⁷⁸ *St-Aubin*, p.38; RT I, p.297; Warren, *Henry II*, pp.45-8, and see Chapter 6.

³⁷⁹ William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy (2 vols., Oxford, 1988-2001) II, pp.30-1. RT I, p.256, writes that Geoffrey junior received four castles.

Chapter 2

Authority, aristocracy and administration in Greater Anjou

Geoffrey's reign was punctuated by unrest. In 1129, a group of barons preyed upon the weakness of the young, novice count; in 1135-6, barons again seized upon weakness – this time absence in Normandy – as an opportunity to further their own causes. In 1145, a more organised coalition of barons staged a serious rebellion with Geoffrey's brother Helias as their figurehead, and by 1151 Geoffrey had been occupied with besieging Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay for nearly two years. Meanwhile, local opportunism and small-scale ravaging continued in the background.

Geoffrey met these challenges head-on, besieging and destroying castles, and imprisoning and humiliating rebels. At the same time, figures described as barons (*barones*) can be seen in the *acta* to counsel Geoffrey and collaborate in judicial decisions. Baronial rebellion and collaboration with Geoffrey both raise important issues of the count's power, and the evidence is not clear-cut; not only was the term *baro* elastic, the role of high-ranking *barones* – the aristocracy – was ever-shifting.³⁸⁰ The evidence examined here raises the question of the nature and influence of the institutions and offices used by Geoffrey to administer the region, and whether his rule was uniformly administered throughout Greater Anjou.

This chapter is concerned with the extent and limits of comital authority and resources, while Chapter 3 examines the personnel who made up Geoffrey's household and administration, the individuals who embodied and represented comital rule. By examining the nature of Geoffrey's authority first, particularly the practical and theoretical differences between the count's demesne and baronial lands, the relationship between Geoffrey and the region's lords may be described. This examination suggests that Geoffrey's rule was not propped up by prominent barons, and that the consequences during a reign marked first by inexperience then by absenteeism could be serious. It also suggests that Geoffrey took a series of measures which allowed him to administer Greater Anjou effectively in the face of restricted authority and concomitant baronial power and unrest, and that these measures involved both a small but important group of loyal men and families of lesser means examined in Chapter 3, and the fostering of close

³⁸⁰ Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, p.141, argues that the Angevin barons of Geoffrey's reign did not have a cause 'such as to define an estate of baronial interest in Anjou'; see also Lemesle, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions', *passim*.

relations with the urban elites of the region who, along with monasteries, made substantial ordinary and extraordinary contributions to comital finance and resources, often with a specifically military purpose. Unlike his father, Geoffrey could not rely upon his wife to rule in his absence, and this combination of factors catalysed administrative change.

Geoffrey's rule of Normandy also raises questions surrounding the transmission of administrative and legal concepts and practices between the duchy and Greater Anjou. Chief among these was the recognition, or inquest by independent jurors or authorities, a tool central to Geoffrey's investigation and recovery of alienated lands and rights in the Norman diocese of Bayeux. The Bayeux inquests are discussed in Chapter 6, where it is shown that the procedure had its roots in the reign of Henry I and was also in use elsewhere in Europe during the period. Nevertheless, not least because the recognition has been a frequent subject for debate, evidence that it was known and used in Anjou prior to 1144 will be surveyed and analysed here alongside other aspects of the Angevin judicial system. The evidence suggests that Angevin judicial practice was pluralistic, embodying a variety of procedure and also, significantly, a variety of authorities, of which the count was just one.

This chapter, therefore, will attempt to describe and analyse both the mechanics of Angevin administration under Geoffrey, and the specific nature, manifestation and limits of his authority. Reconciliation of narrative accounts of baronial turbulence with the diplomatic evidence enables a real sense of the reasons for and consequences of the lack of extensive baronial integration into Geoffrey's government to be discerned, and ultimately leads to a picture of a reign which was a vital step in the transition from comital weakness and seigneurial strength to the inception of a new kind of royal rule with centralised and professional institutions.

Demesne, baronial estates, fortifications and urban centres

Guillot has calculated that by the end of Fulk IV's reign in 1109 the count had a maximum of only fourteen castles under his direct control in Anjou and Touraine, whereas castellans controlled forty four lordships.³⁸¹ Fulk V inherited demesne lordship of the castles at Angers, Tours, Loches, Loudun, Chinon, Brissac, Saumur, Baugé and Mouliherne; Langeais, Montrichard, La Tour Éblon and Segré were perhaps also in the

³⁸¹ Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.316.

count's immediate control; Vihiers may have been out of comital hands for a while, but was held by Fulk V in the 1120s.³⁸² During the course of the eleventh century, the counts had lost control of Vendôme – which however, along with its counts, remained subject to nominal Angevin overlordship – as well as Pouancé and their *domicilium* at Amboise. Elsewhere, such as at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil, Château-Gontier and Rochefort, they had negotiated relationships with castellans which, although leaving the counts theoretical lords, led sometimes to a loss of control in practice.³⁸³

Although Fulk V's marriage had brought all of Maine into Angevin hands in 1110, it was a weak legacy in terms of castles. Aremburga's father Helias held only La Flèche in demesne, although his wife's inheritance of her maternal grandfather's castles of Château-du-Loir, Mayet, Outillé and Le Grand-Lucé augmented comital power in the southeast of the county.³⁸⁴ Helias also took the city of Le Mans, with its two mottes, after the death of William Rufus in 1100.³⁸⁵ Even with these gains, what was to become Angevin demesne power in Maine was confined to Le Mans and the county's south-eastern corner. In common with Anjou, many of Maine's castles were in the hands of entrenched castellan dynasties; some, like the lords of Sablé and Laval, had held their fortifications since the turn of the eleventh century or soon after;³⁸⁶ others held multiple fortifications, most conspicuously the lords of Bellême, who controlled at least nine castles in north-eastern Maine, which had been refortified at the end of the eleventh century with William Rufus' assistance.³⁸⁷

Large lordships like those in parts of Maine – Craon and Mayenne in the west, for example, as well as Bellême – were, however, exceptional in Greater Anjou. The lords of Amboise controlled a compact territory bounded by the Loire, Cher and Indrois rivers; the lords of Montreuil-Bellay only had direct lordship over the area within a six-to seven-kilometre radius of their castle at Montreuil.³⁸⁸ Nonetheless, the lords of both Amboise and Montreuil proved to be two of Geoffrey's most consistent problems. By

³⁸² Ibid., p.316, suggests that it was not in comital hands in the late 11th century; cf. *Cartulaire de Saint Jouin-les-Marnes (Chartularium sancti Jovini)*, ed. A. Grandmaison, Mémoires de la Société de Statistique du département des Deux-Sèvres XVII, 2^e partie (Niort, 1854) p.32, where Fulk V founded a church dedicated to Saint-Nicolas within the castle.

³⁸³ Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.282-95.

³⁸⁴ Latouche, *Le comté du Maine*, pp.48-9

³⁸⁵ Ibid. p.49.

³⁸⁶ Ibid. pp.59-60.

³⁸⁷ Ibid. pp.46, 62, lists Blèves, Peray, Mont-de-la-Nue, L'Ortieuse, Aillières, Saosnes, Saint-Remy-du-Plain, La Motte-Gautier-du-Clinchamp and Mamers.

³⁸⁸ Boussard, 'Aspects particuliers de la féodalité', pp.38-9.

the twelfth century, these honours were no longer subject to comital grant or approval.³⁸⁹ Nevertheless, Boussard's study highlights the complex tenurial relationship these powerful lords had with the counts: although the lord of Montreuil-Bellay, for example, held most of his lands directly – in theory from the count, but in practice more or less independently – he also held estates from individuals such as the lord of Parthenay, who was under firmer comital control.³⁹⁰

Geoffrey's *acta* contain very little evidence indeed for tangible overlordship of non-demesne lands, but there are some indications that along with this collaboration came some limited control. In 1133, Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay founded a Tironensian priory at Asnières (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Montreuil-Bellay, comm. Cizay-la-Madeleine), within his lordship.³⁹¹ The grant was made up of pieces of land held by his tenants and his own demesne, yet was also assented to by Geoffrey (*qui hanc eleemosynam voluit et concessit*). Gerald's nominal need to seek permission evidently sits uncomfortably with his loyalties, however, for the charter is dated with reference to the reign of Louis VII, not only as king of France but also as duke of Aquitaine. The following year, after the death of a more minor lord, Reginald of Saumoussay, Geoffrey visited the abbeys of Fontevraud and Saint-Maur (Glanfeuil), which were both recipients of Reginald's patronage.³⁹² The text indicates that Reginald called those responsible for distributing his alms to his deathbed (*Videns exitum sui adesse, distributores sue elemosine advocavit ad hoc illa hora, pro divino amore*). Geoffrey, along with Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay, Joscelin Roonard and Reginald's *armiger* Geoffrey, witnessed the distribution of alms, and Joscelin – one of Count Geoffrey's key followers, *qui distributor elemosine erat* – was responsible for their delivery to the abbot and for witnessing Reginald's family's consent.

A similar act also suggests that Geoffrey exercised some power over the region's barons. On his deathbed, one William Martin of Grez promised estates and assets at Le Coudray (Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Sablé-sur-Sarthe, comm. Gastines) and Sablé to the priory of Saint-Martin of Le Mans, a dependent of Marmoutier.³⁹³ The grant was consented to by Count Geoffrey and Robert of Sablé, and sealed by the count. Robert

³⁸⁹ Boussard, *Le comté*, p.15.

³⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.36.

³⁹¹ App. VI, no.6.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, nos. 4, 10.

³⁹³ *Ibid.*, no.8.

was William's immediate overlord,³⁹⁴ and in theory Geoffrey was Robert's. This relationship forms the axis of John of Marmoutier's account of Robert's rebellions against Geoffrey: after his father's death, Robert 'received his land from the count's hand, did homage and liege [homage], and promised on oath not to withhold it'.³⁹⁵ Yet these two pieces of evidence should not suggest that Geoffrey had firm control over Robert. In practice, his repeated rebellions mean that it is highly unlikely that he would have sought Geoffrey's consent to grants, whether made by him or his vassals, and Geoffrey's consent here – in the form of his seal – appears instead be an attempt on the part of the monks to secure their title. The text, drawn up by the monks, refers to Geoffrey as their protector and expressly refers to them having obtained (*optinuimus*) his seal. Thus evidence which appears to speak of a 'feudal' relationship of power and constraint between lord and vassal is instead a reflection of a more complex reality in which beneficiaries located in an area of stronger comital influence sought assurances from the count, perhaps in part to mitigate any future claims by either Robert or William's family. Geoffrey and Robert's relationship here remains unclear.

Fortifications

As discussed in the Introduction, the region's main phase of territorial consolidation had taken place under Fulk III; during his long reign, he embarked upon an ambitious programme of castle building along the Loire Valley and on the margins of the county of Anjou.³⁹⁶ Although many of these castles subsequently entered the grasp of castellans, and formed the centre of potentially powerful lordships,³⁹⁷ Fulk's successors built few new fortifications to redress the balance of power. Though Fulk V inherited his wife's castles scattered throughout southern and eastern Maine, he seems to have built none of his own. He also seems to have placed demesne castles into the hands of custodians who proved ultimately unfaithful. In 1112 or 1113, for example, he was forced to lay siege to Brissac and remove its castellan, replacing him with his own seneschal, Archaloius.³⁹⁸

³⁹⁴ Boussard, *Le comté*, p.29.

³⁹⁵ JM, p.206: 'Robertus igitur, prefati Lisiardus filius, terram suam de manu consulis suscepit, hominagio et leigiatione facta, et sacramentis juratis non servaturus accessit.'

³⁹⁶ Bernard S. Bachrach, 'The Angevin Strategy of Castle Building in the Reign of Fulk Nerra, 987-1040', *AHR* 88 (1983), pp.533-60, which also gives an overview of the historiography of early Angevin castle-building.

³⁹⁷ And see Guillot, *Le comte* I, App. II, for the appearance of the castellan lordships of the region.

³⁹⁸ *St-Aubin*, p.33; *St-Florent*, p.190. At the end of the eleventh century, Hugh of Brissac and his brother Aubrey appear to have been Fulk IV's custodians, as discussed by Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.286; a charter

It is notable, then, that Geoffrey V built at least five new fortifications and unsuccessfully attempted to refortify a sixth. John of Marmoutier attributes these projects to the problems posed by Angevin barons. As well as Châteauneuf, an important fortification which protected the approach to Angers from the northwest and ‘the foul swords of Sablé’, John describes how Geoffrey built four castles in southeast Anjou and northern Poitou in response to the devastation which prompted the siege of Montreuil. *Burbanum* and *Rupem* appeared between Loudun and Montreuil-Bellay, whilst *Platea* and *Cosdretus* were placed further north, near Saumur.³⁹⁹ In addition, he unsuccessfully attempted to refortify the castle built by the counts in the eleventh century at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil, west of Angers on the Loire.⁴⁰⁰

Two of the castles, *Platea* and *Cosdretus*, are easily identified as Saint-Martin-de-la-Place (Maine-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Saumur) on the north bank of the Loire adjacent to Boumois, and Le Coudray-Macouard (arr. Saumur, cant. Montreuil-Bellay) on the road between Saumur and Montreuil. *Burbanum* can perhaps be identified as La Motte-Bourbon (Vienne, arr. Châtellerauld, cant. Les Trois-Moutiers, comm. Pouançay), which stands on the road between Montreuil and Loudun, commanding a crossing of the River Dive on the modern border between Maine-et-Loire and Vienne.⁴⁰¹ *Rupes* is trickier to identify, given the frequency of places named La Roche and Les Roches in the region, although there is a La Roche just south of Pouançay. Nevertheless, the siting of these four castles is testament to the fragmented structure of the comital demesne; they were erected in strategic areas bordering local lordships in southern Anjou.

By contrast with Châteauneuf, which impacted heavily on the surrounding economy as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, these structures do not seem to have been permanent in their twelfth-century guise, and they never attained the importance of the older demesne castles, which acted as centres of local administration as well as fortifications and residences. They were not locations for meetings of Geoffrey’s curia,

issued by Henry II in 1174×75 ‘confirms the customs of Brissac which the lord *Arcalos* gave to this church of Fontevraud for the sake of his soul with the assent of Count Fulk’ (‘consuetudines de Brachesach quas dominus Arcalos dedit ipsi ecclesie Font’ Ebr’ pro anima sua concedente comite Fulcone’; *Pl. Acta* no.1055; DB I, no.503). Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.122, suggests that Archaloius was Fulk V’s first seneschal, and he is the only figure attested to with this name in the Angevin sources.

³⁹⁹ JM, pp.215-6.

⁴⁰⁰ App. I, no.90, and see above, p.36.

⁴⁰¹ The history of La Motte-Bourbon prior to 1455, when a bridge as well as a motte were known to have been there, has not been traced: Louis Rédet, *Dictionnaire topographique de la France* 27. *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Vienne: comprenant les noms de lieu anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1881), p.282. Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.70, translates *Burbanum* as ‘Bourbe’ with no justification, and cannot locate it any more precisely than the description provided by John.

and there is no evidence of personnel attached to them; they are also never cause for local complaint, by contrast with Châteauneuf. Geoffrey was not building new residences or key fortifications, and it rather appears that these projects were staging posts, static siege engines which were short-term responses to localised but serious disruption.

Although these structures responded to an immediate need, their construction came hand in hand with keen efforts to regain castles and lands formerly held in demesne, by military means, paralleling earlier events at Brissac. Thus in 1130, after torching the castle at Blazon, Geoffrey pursued its lord Theobald to Mirebeau which had only relatively recently fallen out of the count's demesne and was being held by Theobald's father-in-law William.⁴⁰² Although the *Historia* says that after the 1130 siege Geoffrey had recovered Mirebeau into his *jus proprium*, the annals indicate that it was not until almost a decade later, in 1139, that Mirebeau was under Geoffrey's direct control (*in dominium*).⁴⁰³ That it was finally taken is attested to by the issue of a charter there in 1147.⁴⁰⁴ The recovery of castles like Mirebeau and Brissac strengthened the count's network of castles as well as the resources which he could directly exploit; moreover, unlike Brissac, Mirebeau was a border fortress which could act as a buffer to any threat from the south. It was a useful piece in the small jigsaw of lands in southern Anjou which had in the past acted as an apanage for cadet sons, and which was apparently passed on to Geoffrey junior.⁴⁰⁵ As Chapter 3 discusses, moreover, several of Geoffrey's key administrators were drawn from this frontier zone, underscoring its importance.

Urban settlements

The geography of comital power rested upon the fortified urban centres of Angers, Le Mans and, to a lesser extent, Tours. It was in the greater of these locations that Geoffrey kept his court at the key points of the year, including Christmas at Le Mans⁴⁰⁶ and Easter at Angers.⁴⁰⁷ As outlined below, chaplains served the count in all three locations. It was the older and larger demesne castles and towns, primarily

⁴⁰² Alfred Richard, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou, 778-1204* (2 vols., Paris, 1903) II, pp.13-4.

⁴⁰³ *St Aubin*, p.34.

⁴⁰⁴ App. I, no.55.

⁴⁰⁵ Warren, *Henry II*, pp.45-6, and see Chapter 6.

⁴⁰⁶ JM, p.211.

⁴⁰⁷ App. I, no.46 is dated 14th April 1135 at Angers; Easter Sunday in that year fell on 7th April; no.111 indicates that the court met at Baugé a week after Easter in 1146.

Angers,⁴⁰⁸ Le Mans, Saumur and Baugé,⁴⁰⁹ which were the most frequent venues for the meetings of Geoffrey's curia, although these assemblies were not always held within Geoffrey's castles or residences. Beneficiaries' estates and buildings were naturally often the venues for grants, and certain sites – notably Saint-Laud of Angers, the comital chapel – were particularly significant.⁴¹⁰

The curia could meet and charters could be issued in properties belonging to Geoffrey's officials,⁴¹¹ or to local burgesses or ecclesiastics,⁴¹² or even in one case outdoors, in a meadow (*in spacio curie sue prato*).⁴¹³ Whether this practice was exceptional is not clear in the context of the fragmentary charter evidence, but it may have had an immediate significance to the terms of the charter itself, which granted privileges pertaining to wine revenues to local men; it is clear, however, that this was a meadow at the heart of Geoffrey's demesne lands at Angers.⁴¹⁴ Other habitual meeting-places were all concentrated around Angers, in the area between Le Mans and La Flèche, and in strategic locations east of Angers along the Loire. Western Anjou, all of Bas-Maine (the modern département of Mayenne) and Haut-Maine (modern Sarthe) north of Le Mans appear untouched by demesne fortifications and are never evidenced as venues for curial assemblies. Geoffrey's administration was personal and peripatetic, and was dispensed within the demesne only.

The count's centrality to the urban centres of the region, and vice versa, is underscored by his key followers' urban assets and his relationship with non-noble urban elites. Joscelin Roonard, Geoffrey's seneschal and guardian of his son Geoffrey junior, had a property in Saumur, as did the chamberlain Simon of Châtillon.⁴¹⁵ Joscelin's predecessor as seneschal, Robert fitz Reginald, had a house in Angers, and Geoffrey's prévôt for Montbazou, Michael of Doué, had a house in Tours.⁴¹⁶ Prior to his coronation, Henry II confirmed Fontevraud's seisin of seventeen properties in

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., nos. 3, 4, 18, 87, all expressly mention the *curia*; others, such as nos. 7 and 9, indicate assemblies for judicial purposes.

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., nos. 5, 13.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., nos. 3 (in favour of Saint-Aubin but *judicium in capitulo Sancti Laudi factum recitavit ipse Gaufridus comes in claustris ejusdem Sancti coram superius nominatis personis*); 26 (in favour of Saint-Laud, *in ecclesia Sancti Laudi, ante altare Beate Marie in cripta*); 28 was drawn up in the house of one of the canons, Hugh of Chartres. See Chapter 4 for discussion of Saint-Laud.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., nos. 77, 89.

⁴¹² Ibid., nos. 58, 59.

⁴¹³ Ibid., no. 46.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., no. 30.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid., nos. 77 (Simon), 93 (Joscelin); for these figures, see Chapter 3.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., nos. 89 (Robert), 103 (Michael).

Saumur, one of which had been unjustly seized by Geoffrey: the confirmation makes it clear that these houses had been granted by Henry's men, and that there was scope for confusion over tenure; if any were discovered to be of the demesne, they were to be restored to the count.⁴¹⁷ Agreements with the men of Angers and Saumur show that considerable groups of burgesses held their customs and privileges directly from Geoffrey.⁴¹⁸ In Tours, Geoffrey and Archbishop Hugh petitioned Louis VII on behalf of the burgesses of the adjoining bourg of Châteauneuf not to increase their customary obligations;⁴¹⁹ that the burgesses were able to offer 30,000s. in exchange is testament to their wealth and power, and gives some indication of the influence of similar groups elsewhere.

Geoffrey was able to make use of urban wealth by granting privileges to local non-noble elites, and there is evidence that he did so at strategic times. The men of Saumur were exempted from *vinagium*, a tax on the sale of wine – a commodity which was a lucrative source of revenue in the Loire valley – in a charter issued during Geoffrey's journey to meet Matilda at Carrouges to launch the fourth invasion of Normandy in June 1138.⁴²⁰ The privileges were granted partly to mollify a group who had been at the sharp end of comital exactions, and expressly to secure their goodwill (*ad reprimendam servientum meorum perversitatem et ad captandam benivolentiam hominum meorum Salmuri*). There is little doubt that there was an expectation of a payment in return for the grant and the 3000s. given by the burgesses was a substantial contribution to the costs of the imminent campaign.

Though it is not stated, a similar payment may have been received from the men of Angers in exchange for similar privileges granted on 30th June 1135, a date by which Geoffrey may have already been at odds with Henry I over Matilda's inheritance and gathering his resources together.⁴²¹ It was to his local burgesses (*burgensibus suis*) in the church of La Trinité, next to Ronceray, that Geoffrey expressed his thanks following the fall of Montreuil-Bellay and the capture of Gerald in 1151, suggesting that he was indebted to their material support of the lengthy siege.⁴²² Geoffrey never seems to have

⁴¹⁷ App. IV, no.8.

⁴¹⁸ App. I, nos. 29, 93, both discussed below.

⁴¹⁹ App. VI, no.2.

⁴²⁰ App. I, no.93.

⁴²¹ Ibid., no.29.

⁴²² Ibid., no.19, dated thus: 'Hoc factum est anno quo Goffredus strenuissimus comes Andegavensis, vi et machina, Monsteriolum cepit et Giraudum Bellai at coadjutores suos apud Andegavim duxit in captionem. In illo die quo hec facta sunt, venit comes Gaufridus in ecclesiam S. Trinitatis agere gratias burgensibus suis de collato beneficio et honore.'

experienced serious conflict with urban groups, certainly not on the scale of his father's 'war' with the burgesses in 1114.⁴²³ That the region's urban elites, whom the evidence shows to have been at least partially under Geoffrey's direct authority and a lucrative source of revenue, could be particularly significant financial supporters in times of war as well as day-to-day is corroborated by evidence from elsewhere. In England, Henry I and Stephen had both fostered good relations with the London trading community, and Stephen's grant of a commune in 1135 seems to have guaranteed their financial support, even though it brought them into serious hardship.⁴²⁴

The situation of the count's mints provides a further indication of the importance of these key towns and their elites. Geoffrey controlled the mints in Angers and Le Mans, whereas the canons of Saint-Martin operated the mint at Tours.⁴²⁵ Coins at Angers and Le Mans were produced in the count's name and image, although the denier mansois was worth double that of Angers. It appears that either Fulk V or Geoffrey undertook a recoinage, in which the denier angevin came to bear a legend referring to Count Fulk, not Geoffrey.⁴²⁶ Geoffrey's firm control of minting is suggested by the imposition of the denier angevin upon Normandy in the 1140s and it is possible that this reform occurred simultaneously with the Angevin recoinage.⁴²⁷ There is also evidence that he employed a diverse body of moneyers and exchangers. Some were perhaps unfree men in the service of his officials, such as Letard *cambitor*, a servant (*famulus*) of the officials who collected Geoffrey's revenues from vineyards.⁴²⁸ Others could have been artisans with links to important local families: the moneyer Philip Aimer of Tours, brought to London by Henry II to overhaul the English penny in 1180, was undoubtedly related to the brothers Maurice and Reginald Aimer, and another of the family named Bartholomew, all burgesses of Tours who witnessed a chirograph for Geoffrey sometime after 1141.⁴²⁹ They were joined by two local goldsmiths, John and Nicholas, providing a valuable snapshot of the urban elites employed in metalwork and moneying in Geoffrey's domains. Although the Tours mint was not under Geoffrey's control, the skilled burgesses in the town who had links with the industries surrounding

⁴²³ *St-Aubin*, p.32: 'Guerra burgensium contra comitem'.

⁴²⁴ Judith Green, 'Financing Stephen's War', *ANS* 14 (1992), pp.91-114, at 106-7.

⁴²⁵ Barrie J. Cook, '*En monnaie aiant cours*: the monetary system of the Angevin Empire', *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500-1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, ed. Barrie J. Cook and Gareth Williams (Leiden and Boston, 2006), pp.617-86, at 621.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.631-41.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.635.

⁴²⁸ App. I, no.18.

⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, no.104.

it would have had counterparts in Angers and Le Mans, and it would have been necessary to foster excellent relations with them, just as Geoffrey seems to have done in Normandy with Robert, the father of Henry's exchanger and goldsmith Walter who may have inherited his trade and office from his father.⁴³⁰

Demesne castles, urban centres and control of the coinage, then, were the most visible facets of Geoffrey's comital power, where he could command tangible wealth and support. They also functioned as symbols of his authority. It was in Angers where Geoffrey and Matilda were received as Fulk's successors, and Geoffrey's chapel of Saint-Laud, where he was invested, was located at the centre of the town, within the castle walls and adjacent to the count's residence. As the discussion of household and personnel in Chapter 3 shows, he placed fortifications and towns in the custody of loyal men of modest means who were dependent on the count, rather than their own estates, for their livings.

These same men were also responsible for the collection of revenues from the count's estates, and the dues which were owed to him primarily by ecclesiastical institutions. John of Marmoutier devotes a large chunk of the famous story of the charcoal-burner to Geoffrey's dealings with his prévôts (*prepositi*), who were accused of burdening peasants with enormous customary revenues.⁴³¹ The account shows that the comital prévôt of Loches castle kept a store of cash for the count's use, though whether John's figure of 1,000s. is accurate is debatable. It indicates that they borrowed money from local lenders and accounted for the count's local expenses; they were also regarded as the 'foremost custodians' of the count's estates, and accounted for customary revenues owed to the count.

Gauging the value of the demesne's renders is impossible, as no accounting records exist for the period and the *acta* indicate that alienations of customary obligations had been made on a considerable scale under both Geoffrey and his predecessors. One indication, however, that demesne revenues may have been sizeable is the thirteenth-century list of customs pertaining to the count's demesne lordship of Château-du-Loir in southern Maine.⁴³² Geoffrey held the right to all renders in the castle and neighbouring bourg, unless an exemption had been granted.⁴³³ His renders *de Castellariis* are more detailed. Every time a wagon loaded with goods was brought into

⁴³⁰ App. IV, no.16.

⁴³¹ JM, pp.188-91.

⁴³² Paris BnF Latin 9067, ff.294.

⁴³³ Ibid., f.301r.

the town, the count received between 2d. and 4s. depending on the nature of its load; commodities such as grain, wine, salt and cloth were all taxable in this way.⁴³⁴ Similar taxes were also levied on locally produced goods and livestock sold in the count's markets, and renders drawn in kind; the count had the right to a penny in tax for every side of bacon sold in his market, and the heart of every slaughtered ox, and many similar food and cash sources; he also exploited the herring trade of the Atlantic coast.⁴³⁵ Just as at Angers and Saumur, the burgesses of Château-du-Loir were under the count's direct authority, and their activities were lucrative.⁴³⁶

Where demesne existed, then, Geoffrey had a tight grip on it and it was forced to work hard on his behalf. By contrast, prerogatives beyond the demesne which were essential to the running of the county, namely his ability to assemble an army and his judicial rights over the region, were more restricted and indicate that comital authority was extremely varied outside of the count's own estates.

Military prerogatives

It has been argued that, during the tenth and eleventh centuries, the obligation to perform military service for the Angevin counts 'was universal in the Angevin state'.⁴³⁷ Armies were raised and sustained not by a system of land held in exchange for military service, but by an older system of prerogatives inherited from the Carolingians in which it was each individual's duty to supply men, fodder and other resources both on an annual basis and as and when the need arose. Service in the construction of castles and the obligation to serve in 'public war' (*bellum publicum, proelium*) were the two most fundamental military prerogatives of the counts, although both were constrained by custom: both free and unfree landholders performed *bidamnum*, which consisted of fifteen days' annual building labour;⁴³⁸ the same men – tenants of both lay and ecclesiastical lords, and of the count himself – were all expected to join military expeditions, but only for a maximum of forty days and nights.⁴³⁹ The evidence of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Greater Anjou shows that the system was a remnant of Carolingian government and Fulk III's policies, and not, as Haskins claimed, a Norman

⁴³⁴ Ibid., f.306v.

⁴³⁵ Ibid., f.307v.

⁴³⁶ Ibid.

⁴³⁷ Bernard S. Bachrach, 'The Angevin economy, 960-1060: ancient or feudal?', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 10, ed. J. A. S. Evans and S. Unger (New York, 1988), pp.1-55, at 9.

⁴³⁸ Ibid, p.8; Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou* I, pp.384-91.

⁴³⁹ See below, pp.83-4.

import.⁴⁴⁰

Large-scale remission of these obligations has been regarded as a fundamental feature of the weakening of comital power under Geoffrey III and Fulk IV. In the second half of the eleventh century, the abbey of Marmoutier was exempted from all military service, whilst Cormery and the large priory belonging to Tournus at Cunault were both accorded complete freedom from *bidamnum*, and the same privilege was confirmed to Saint-Jouin de Marnes.⁴⁴¹ Under Geoffrey V, such alienations largely ceased, and military customs were often expressly reserved in his grants and confirmations. In 1129, for example, he permitted the abess of Ronceray to build upon land at Avrillé and exempted the area from all customs except the obligation to provide men at time of war (*hostis*); he later confirmed the abbey's right to exemption from all *bidamnum*, except in war time.⁴⁴² He confirmed the abbey of Saint-Serge's privileges, but whilst remitting the monks from *bidamnum* like Geoffrey II, he retained the right to military service (*proelium generali*) and fodder (*fodrium*).⁴⁴³ Similar reservations occurred in grants for Saint-Nicolas and Saint-Maur,⁴⁴⁴ while elsewhere monetary fines are set out for recusancy; the abbey of Cormery's men at Loches, for example, were to make amends for not joining the army by paying the hefty fine of 7 ½ s.⁴⁴⁵

This is not to say that Geoffrey did not alienate any such customs, nor that those who owed military services always acquiesced, as indeed the reference to fines at Loches suggests. Geoffrey relinquished the right to deal summarily with any of the abbey of Saint-Florent's men who refused to join the count's army when called by the local prévôt: instead, the abbot was to come to the comital court where a case would be heard to determine whether service was owed.⁴⁴⁶ By contrast with Cormery's men, those within Saint-Florent's jurisdiction were accorded an extra privilege which chipped away at Geoffrey's ability to summon an army.

⁴⁴⁰ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.20.

⁴⁴¹ Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.387-9.

⁴⁴² App. I, nos. 14 and 18 ('biennium totum nisi in expeditione exercitus vel expeditionis publice').

⁴⁴³ Ibid., no.22.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid. nos. 21, for Saint-Nicolas, in which the monks' estates are confirmed free from all customs except in time of war: 'Insuper eis concedo ut sui homines nullam mihi cosdumam faciant, nec ad aliquod meum negocium pergant, nisi solummodo ad bellum publice inditum aut denominatum', and 87, where *exercitu* and *equitatu* in all of Saint-Maur's lands in the Loudunais are reserved to the count.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., no.38.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid., no.93: 'si aliquando forisfecerint et de exercitu meo, vel successorum meorum, remanserint, nulli hominum inde respondeant, nec forisfactum aliquod emendent, nisi prius, in nostra, vel successoris nostri presencia, abbas et monachi in jus et hoc, apud Salmurum, vocati fuerint. Illud autem, quod, baronum meorum iudicio, emendatione dignum adjudicatum fuerit, Salmurensis prepositi erit, vel cui ego aut comes qui tunc dominabitur, dare voluerit'. See below for discussion of the Angevin prévôt.

Manpower was not always forthcoming when the summons (*submonitio*) was called. In 1144, Geoffrey returned to Angers from the siege of Rouen, perhaps with the express purpose of augmenting his army. He also settled a dispute with the prior of Cunault and Loudun, two houses in southern Anjou.⁴⁴⁷ Ostensibly, the prior had complained that the count's men had been harshly exacting customs from the priories' men, but the record reveals that the prior had refused to assist Geoffrey's campaigns in Normandy. The charter begins with Geoffrey noting that he:

...wishes it to be known to all, that from the cogent necessity of our wars, which we are managing in Normandy, it was necessary for us to seek an aid from the churches and religious of Anjou; the venerable Peter, abbot of Tournus, and Peter *de Aula*, at that time prior of Cunault and Loudun, refused to give help to us in this way⁴⁴⁸

The reason given for this refusal is that none of Geoffrey's comital ancestors demanded this kind of aid (*auxilium*), and that it contravened the priories' comital and royal privileges. Nevertheless, a compromise was reached and the prior recognised that the houses did owe service. Geoffrey confirmed the privileges granted by royal and comital donors, but expressly reserved the prerogative – previously retained by Geoffrey II – of commanding the abbey's men to join the host if it was summoned to deal with the county's enemies, only in war (*solum causa praelli*) as opposed, it seems, to conquest beyond Anjou's borders.⁴⁴⁹ Regardless of these caveats, it is significant that the prior eventually gave Geoffrey £100 angevin: like the 3,000s. handed over by the men of Saumur immediately prior to the 1138 campaign, this sum represents a substantial contribution to Geoffrey's war fund.

All of these examples concern religious establishments in their capacity as lords. Geoffrey's *acta* almost never allude to lay military service, and it is recognised that 'the majority of our sources, by their nature, give us no details of the service which knights and nobles could have owed to the count'.⁴⁵⁰ Comparison with earlier non-diplomatic evidence for baronial service is risky: although the *Gesta* lists in detail scores of

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., no.42.

⁴⁴⁸ 'Ego Goffredus...notum fieri volumus universes, quod cum cogente necessitate guerrarum, quas in Normannia habemus, ab ecclesiis et religionibus Andegaviae nos quaerere subsidia oporteret, venerabilis Petrus abbas Trenorchiensis, et Petrus de Aula tunc temporis prior de Cunaldo et de Lausduno, facere nobis hujusmodi auxilia recusarunt...'

⁴⁴⁹ 'Excepto hoc, quod sibi dictus comes [Geoffrey II] retinuit, videlicet quod quando in hostem contra inimicos nostros perrexerimus, et hoc solum causa praelli, tunc nostro jussu, vel missi a nobis, missi homines eorum in hostem pergant; nullo autem modo jussu ullius vicarii nostri eant aliter.'

⁴⁵⁰ Guillot, *Le comte I*, p.381.

Angevin, Manceaux and Tourangeaux barons amongst the ranks of Fulk V's army at the Battle of Alençon in 1118, it has been shown that this account primarily reflects the concerns of chroniclers writing in the context of rebellions against Henry II, and that it essentially amounts to a tract on the obligations of vassals to their lord.⁴⁵¹ Very few of the men named in the *Gesta* appear in Fulk V's *acta*, and indeed the presence of many of them at the battle is impossible. Chronicle evidence that the count could command or persuade the baronage to join his army is thus highly problematic.

Some shreds of evidence surrounding the possessions of the important Matheflon family in northern Anjou and southern Maine suggest that Geoffrey did have the capacity to deprive barons whose support was not as forthcoming as in the past of castles and jurisdictions.⁴⁵² It seems that Geoffrey had originally placed Hugh of Matheflon, who had served Fulk V at the Battle of Alençon in 1118, in his new and important fortification at Châteauneuf.⁴⁵³ The details of Hugh's life are particularly difficult to reconcile, but he seems to have been active until some time in the 1140s.⁴⁵⁴ In 1146, however, one of Geoffrey's chief followers, Fulk of Clefs, was rewarded for his service and the rendering of liege homage to Geoffrey with custody of Châteauneuf.⁴⁵⁵ This reward was part of the systematic promotion of the Clefs family, discussed in Chapter 3, who were not barons of the highest rank and who depended

⁴⁵¹ *GCA*, pp.151-66; Richard Barton, 'Writing Warfare, Lordship and History: the *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*'s Account of the Battle of Alençon', *ANS* 27 (2005), pp.32-51.

⁴⁵² For the Matheflons as high-ranking barons, see Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.26-27, 30.

⁴⁵³ Lemesle, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions', p.212, citing *CN*, no.194, Bishop Ulger's undated grant of permission for Hugh to build a church in the castle; for the battle and Hugh's role in it, *GCA*, p.157 and Barton, 'Writing Warfare', p.39.

⁴⁵⁴ Barton, 'Writing Warfare', p.39, n.34, cites Hugh's appearances in the Angevin diplomatic sources, though mistakenly naming Hugh as Fulk in the body of the text. By conflating Hubert IV of *Campania*, uncle of Geoffrey's follower Geoffrey of Clairvaux who was himself Hubert's heir to the lordship of Durtal, with Geoffrey of Clairvaux's son Hubert V of *Campania*, the Foundation for Medieval Genealogy entry for the family (http://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/ANJOU,%20MAINE.htm#_Toc278003119, accessed 20/10/10) also conflates this Hugh with Hubert V's son. This later Hugh of Matheflon was active in the later twelfth century (witnessing, for example, *CSA* II, nos. 811-3, all c.1190). Distinguishing between the earlier and later Hughs and Huberts substantially alters the Matheflon family tree. The *Parcé Chronicle*, as far as it may be trusted, indicates that Fulk of Matheflon, father to the Hugh who died in the 1140s, was Geoffrey II of Clairvaux's great-uncle; it seems that the Matheflon cognomen passed down the line of Fulk's first or second marriage to a certain Elizabeth, but that it could also be claimed by the descendants of what appears to have been Fulk of Matheflon's third marriage, described in the *Parcé Chronicle*, to Matilda, daughter of Matilda of Mayenne, who married Geoffrey I of Clairvaux. It seems that the rebellious Hugh of Matheflon's son Theobald either did not inherit his father's lordship, or died young. The charter cited below, *CN* no.194, shows that Hugh of Matheflon was married to Marquise, identified by FMG as Marquise of Craon, during Bishop Ulger's reign (1125-48); their son, Maurice, remembered a brother, Fulk of Matheflon, in a gift to La Roë. To confuse matters further, Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.32, states – with no evidence – that the Hugh who appears under Fulk V and Geoffrey V married Jeanne, sister of Lisiard of Sablé.

⁴⁵⁵ App. I, no.58.

upon Geoffrey for their careers. Another charter of the ducal period also shows that Geoffrey granted a variety of privileges ranging from pannage to confraternity and burial at Seiches, near Baugé, to one Fulk, a native of nearby La Roussière for his newly-pledged liege homage and his past military service (*pro servitio suo...hoc feci in remuneratione perpetua et in testimonio servitii quod ipse Fulco in bello mihi fecit*), perhaps given in Normandy.⁴⁵⁶

Both of these grants were connected to the Matheflon honour. Unless Hugh had died, Geoffrey had removed him from Châteauneuf during a period which may have coincided with a serious baronial revolt, either after Hugh and his son Theobald's encouragement of Robert of Sablé's bid for increased power during Geoffrey's absence in Normandy in 1135-6 or during the more serious, organised rebellion of 1145 in which Robert supported Helias.⁴⁵⁷ With regard to Fulk of la Roussière, the archives of Ronceray Abbey show that Seiches fell within the lordship of Matheflon; neighbouring La Roussière may have also been a Matheflon fief.⁴⁵⁸ Although Geoffrey granted Fulk his own demesne *métayage* at Seiches, the award of the right of burial within the local chapel and the honours accorded to its founders may have traditionally been the prerogative of the Matheflons. By the terms of the grant Fulk's burial was to take place within the church itself, which is interesting given that the cemetery which had been consecrated by Bishop Ulger in 1137 had been granted to Ronceray by another rebellious baron, Theobald of Blazon.⁴⁵⁹ Geoffrey was directly rewarding a man who had served in his army; Fulk's origins and his declaration of liege homage only in the ducal period suggests that his own lord, probably Hugh, had been circumvented. His apparent removal from Châteauneuf and the apparent transfer of allegiance of one of his tenants and comital encroachment upon local privileges are compelling when read in conjunction with Hugh's disappearance from Geoffrey's charters after June 1135. Although he only witnessed two extant charters for Geoffrey, he appears high in the witness lists of both, and in 1135 was described as one of the count's *barones familiares*.⁴⁶⁰ The suspicion that Hugh fell out of favour is heightened by the total

⁴⁵⁶ App. I, no.52.

⁴⁵⁷ JM, p.206. Robert's support of Helias in 1145 is mentioned in the *Historia* (JM, p.207), but John says nothing of Hugh's involvement, stating only that all the barons were involved ('totius consulatus barones sacramentis federatos sibi facit obnoxios').

⁴⁵⁸ *Ronceray*, nos. 125-59; see also Boussard, *Le comté*, p.26.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ronceray*, nos. 150, 151.

⁴⁶⁰ App. I, nos. 29 (30th June 1135) and 89 (1st July 1133). He was the second lay witness and was listed after Galvan of Chemillé in both charters.

absence of his son Theobald from the count's entourage, and the later transmission of the lordship of Matheflon through the female line.

The grants to the two Fulks speak of the affective relationship central to Angevin comital administration, and its particular importance in the context of baronial rebellion and autonomy. They do not suggest that Geoffrey awarded fiefs in exchange for service: this is certainly no *servicium debitum* on the Anglo-Norman model. The circumstances of each grant, moreover, demonstrate the problems attached to any service provided by the nobility – in this case the lords of Matheflon – and suggest that gifts were taken from the hands of the baronage and placed directly into those of Geoffrey's curial servants, a tactic also used during Geoffrey's quarrel with Bishop Ulger. In 1131, Geoffrey attempted to buy Ulger's acquiescence to the presence of Châteauneuf by granting him rights which he had confiscated from Theobald of Blazon. Like Hugh of Matheflon, Theobald was in practice beyond the count's authority, and had to be dealt with by risky military means.⁴⁶¹ Baronial involvement in the count's army and other military enterprises such as custody of castles was, in common with other areas of the administration, governed by the fluid political situation engendered by lords who were able to act against the count with impunity.

To illuminate the workings of the count's army itself, it is necessary to turn to evidence from the thirteenth century, which shows that the count's military prerogatives extended to the baronage after the inception of Anjou into French rule. A document of c.1260, which was deposited in the comital chapel at Saint-Laud, sets out the arrangements for baronial custody and guard of Angers, and although it contains the names of some barons who cannot be found in comital company in the twelfth century, it is suggestive of some earlier practices.⁴⁶² The lords of Beaupréau, Doué, Château-Gontier, Matheflon, Candé, and Pouancé, along with the castellan of Rochefort, were all assigned to different areas of the town and its suburbs as guards for forty days each year, at their own expense. The castellans of Iré, Montrevault, Montfaucon and Champtoceaux are named along with all the other barons, castellans and knights of the region as owing watch service (*vigilias per civitatem et suburbium*) under the supervision of the seneschal.

This document fleshes out the generalities of the thirteenth-century custumal

⁴⁶¹ And see Chapter 3. Geoffrey was forced to follow Theobald from Blazon to Mirebeau, on the southern margins of Anjou and held by Theobald's father-in-law, in 1130; fortunately for Geoffrey, the ensuing siege was a success and Mirebeau re-entered the count's demesne.

⁴⁶² 'De custodia et exercitibus civitatis Andegavensis', in Marchegay, *Archives d'Anjou* II, pp.253-4.

known as the *Établissements de Saint-Louis*, which provides evidence for the general, mechanical aspect of the Angevin army and confirms that fiefs were not held in exchange for military service. Instead:

The barons and the king's vassals must serve in his army, when he summons them; and they must serve at their own expense, forty days and forty nights, with as many knights as each is responsible for. And they owe him this service if he summons them and there is a need for it. And if the king wanted to detain them longer than the forty days and forty nights at their own expense, they need not stay unless they wanted to; and if the king wanted to keep them there at his own expense to defend the kingdom, they should remain by law; but if the king wanted to lead them out of the kingdom, they would not have to go unless they wanted to, once they had served their forty days and forty nights.⁴⁶³

The count was restricted in his use and control of the host by the fighting men's customary rights to short periods of service, especially if he attempted to leave the county with the army. The terms of service are similar to those current in areas such as Brittany and Normandy but, by contrast with the latter, there is no evidence from Anjou to suggest that there was a systematic system of correspondence between the size of a fief and the level of service owed.⁴⁶⁴

Although both of these later texts outline general comital rights to call barons and their men to the army and to demand customary services such as the watch, there is no evidence – in common with ducal prerogatives in Brittany during the same period – that Geoffrey could demand obligatory military service from a baron.⁴⁶⁵ A handful of charters issued by Geoffrey while on campaign survive, and those for which the witness lists are preserved seem to indicate that very few barons were within the entourage.⁴⁶⁶ When launching the fourth campaign in Normandy in 1138, Geoffrey was largely accompanied by minor lords, many of whom such as Pagan of Clairvaux held positions in his household; Angevins of the same standing and background, such as Hugh of Pocé, were also placed in alongside Normans in Matilda's entourage for the same campaign.⁴⁶⁷ In 1146, the majority of witnesses to an agreement drawn up *in exercitu* were local men

⁴⁶³ *Établissements*, ed. Akehurst, c.65, pp.41-2.

⁴⁶⁴ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, p.20; cf. the discussion of Norman military service in Chapter 5.

⁴⁶⁵ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, p.20. Cf. charters issued by Geoffrey for ecclesiastical beneficiaries which stipulate that he reserves the right to call the *submonitio*: App. I, nos. 18, 37, 86, 91.

⁴⁶⁶ App. I, no.67, was issued at the siege of Montreuil-Bellay but the cartulary copy only lists Bishop William of Le Mans *et multis aliis* as witnesses.

⁴⁶⁷ App. I, no.94. The exceptions are Aimery of Avoir, a minor lord who seems to not have been employed in the household, and Andrew of Doué, a higher-status lord; both Aimery and Andrew rebelled against Geoffrey and are discussed below.

with an interest in the transaction; only Aimery of Loudun, lord of Trèves, can be considered a baron.⁴⁶⁸ The list of sureties preserved in Henry's confirmation of Geoffrey's concessions to the citizens of Rouen is composed primarily of Norman barons and Geoffrey's household men.⁴⁶⁹ Only the Crispin brothers were Angevin lords from outside the core household – and indeed Geoffrey had besieged their castle at Champtoceaux in 1142 – but they, unlike the majority of Angevins, had long standing dynastic interests in Normandy.⁴⁷⁰

Lists of service owed by the vassals of the southern Manceau lord of La Suze survive in early thirteenth-century customals, alongside documents detailing customary rights held by the counts of Maine – including Geoffrey – in their neighbouring demesne estates.⁴⁷¹ As already indicated, these lists show that the count's rights over his demesne in the region were considerable, and included control of all military customs.⁴⁷² The La Suze lists' primary concern is to record the details of dozens of minor lords, bound by homage, who were obliged to perform castle guard at La Suze. They also show that the lord's rights to other services were considerable: amongst other services, the same men had to supply building labour (*biennium* and *corvée*) and mounted and unmounted service (*exercitus et equitatio*).⁴⁷³ These vassals owed their liege homage to the lord of La Suze, not the count. The count's nominal overlordship of the honour yielded only relatively minor customary benefits such as some control of the lord's access to living and dead wood and of pannage revenues. It is made explicit that these were the customs current during Geoffrey's reign, when La Suze was held by the lords of Sablé, first Lisiard then Robert. The practical differences engendered by the demesne and non-demesne status of lands is striking.

The count's weak control of local non-demesne customs is particularly interesting given the evidence for Geoffrey's reaction to Lisiard and Robert's

⁴⁶⁸ App. I, no.39.

⁴⁶⁹ App. IV, no.14.

⁴⁷⁰ Miles Crispin's account of his family's rise outlines their Norman estates, including possessions at Neaufles held by Amalric Crispin during Geoffrey's reign: *The Normans in Europe*, ed. and trans. Elisabeth van Houts (Manchester, 2000), pp.84-9. *Cartulaire Tourangeau et sceaux des abbés [de Marmoutier]*, ed. C. Chantelou (Tours, 1879), p.55, records a grant to Marmoutier in the 1130s by Amalric Crispin, lord of 'Saint Crispin' and Champtoceaux, and his wife Ermengarde.

⁴⁷¹ Paris BnF Latin 9067, printed in *Cart. Château-du-Loir*, nos. 90-9. No.94 details the baron's right to customary payments, and specific mention is made of the peaceful operation of these prerogatives by Herbert of La Suze, his son-in-law Robert of Sablé, and his son Lisiard, one of the most prominent rebels of Geoffrey's reign.

⁴⁷² Barton, *Lordship in the County of Maine*, p.204.

⁴⁷³ *Cart. Château-du-Loir*, nos. 94, 95, 96.

involvement in the events of 1129, 1135-6 and 1145. As shown above, Geoffrey was forced to seize Lisiard's estates by military means, only restoring them to his foster-brother (*collactaneus*) Robert in exchange for liege homage. Three points emerge. First, that Geoffrey's confiscation of Lisiard's lands – in common with Blazon lands and perhaps Matheflon possessions – had to be effected by military force points up the absence of recognised comital overlordship in practice, and the concomitant inability to distrain a vassal without recourse to 'stonethrowers, mangonels and other siege engines'.⁴⁷⁴ Second, when the opportunity came to renegotiate the Anjou-Sablé relationship after Lisiard's death by receiving Robert's promise of liege homage (*hominagio et leigiatione facta*) in exchange for the return of his father's lands, Geoffrey exacted Robert's submission but in practice it mattered little. Robert immediately rose up again, ravaging a vast area between Angers and Le Mans; any claim to Robert's military resources implied by his liege homage to Geoffrey was null and void. Finally, and no less important, the affective relationship fostered between Geoffrey and Robert from their childhoods had broken down and had no apparent effect upon Robert's behaviour.

The absence of lords like Robert of Sablé from the comital host, therefore, cannot be regarded as recusancy in the same sense as the refusal of individuals or groups of tenants to answer the summons in the estates of Cormery and Saint-Florent. Even where this relationship does appear to have been defined in the past, it could not guarantee that the obligation would be fulfilled, as evidenced in a startling document of 1080×1082 which records the complaints of the monks of Saint-Aubin's priory of Méron against Reginald, lord of Montreuil-Bellay.⁴⁷⁵ The monks alleged that Reginald had imposed 'bad customs' on them, including abuse of his prerogative to command the priory's men to perform castle guard at Montreuil. Reginald regularly despatched his voyer to bring Méron's men to the castle when it was threatened by the viscount of Thouars or indeed by the count of Anjou, contrary to the custom which made provision for castle guard only when the lord of Montreuil's knights served in the count's army within the borders of the county.⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷⁴ JM, p.206.

⁴⁷⁵ CSA I, no.220, analysed by Guillot, *Le comte* I, pp.390-1.

⁴⁷⁶ CSA I, no.220: 'Quotiens habent Mosterolenses metum de Toartio vel de alia aliqua parte, statim mittit viarius de Mosterolo propter homines de Mairono ad custodiendum castellum, et hoc facit etiam cum habent guerram cum comite Andecavensi, cujus abbatia est. Sed consuetudo non est antiquitus ut castellum custodiant, nisi tunc solummodo cum caballarii de Mosterolo vadunt in hostem cum comite Andecavensi foras suam terram.'

As noted above, the *Établissements* show that in the thirteenth century baronial prévôts were responsible for organising the response to the military summons and bringing their contingents to the count's regional prévôt. This was in place in abbatial estates, and it is easy to see how in a baronial context this system could turn against the count; Reginald's use of castle guard against the count was just one form of abuse on a spectrum of misappropriation of military power. Whether other barons committed similar transgressions against both their tenants and the count seems likely, though to what extent is open to question; that they may have done certainly provides an insight into how the episodic uprisings of Geoffrey's reign, particularly those of 1129, 1135-6 and 1145, may have been organised.

The weight of evidence strongly suggests that Everard's conclusions about the frail dependency of the dukes of Brittany upon the personal loyalty of local magnates are just as apposite for Greater Anjou during Geoffrey's reign.⁴⁷⁷ Accordingly, it is extremely difficult to determine how Geoffrey managed to build up the military resources which made the conquest of Normandy possible. Undoubtedly his loyal followers who were of lesser status than the region's great barons and who were dependent on Geoffrey for their livelihoods played a key role.⁴⁷⁸ Abbeys were perhaps, in common with those of England under Stephen, 'soft targets' when aids were needed to fund campaigns; such contributions which may have been used to pay mercenaries were also made by the urban elite, but at the cost of lucrative customs such as *vinagium*.⁴⁷⁹ The little evidence there is suggests that Geoffrey was dependent upon a precarious system of revenue and manpower to fuel his ambitious military exploits. Measures were taken as far as possible to ameliorate any reliance upon barons with whom his relationship was only loosely defined, who had their own interests as well as considerable independent power. As we will see, Geoffrey was able to secure the loyalty of multiple lesser lords by promoting them within his household and affinity, but such promotion was neither desirable nor profitable for the greater barons of the region.

Thus far, discussion has shown the serious practical differences between the count's control of his demesne on one hand and local lordships on the other, and how this affected his military abilities. Discussion will now turn to another key area of comital authority, the ability to dispense justice and collect the profits it generated.

⁴⁷⁷ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, p.20.

⁴⁷⁸ See Chapter 3.

⁴⁷⁹ Green, 'Financing Stephen's War', p.105.

Judicial prerogatives and practices

Whether the tangible baronial autonomy seen so far had consequences upon the dispensation of justice by the count is only one part of a discussion on justice in Anjou. The *acta* provide some glimpses of an apparent baronial element to the gatherings in the comital court: Geoffrey's decision on how to deal with a dispute which had arisen at Cormery, for example, was taken in the presence of his barons (*in presentia mea consilio baronum meorum hoc modo terminavi controversiam*), and the oath taken by the parties was made before him and his court (*in presentia mea et curia mea*).⁴⁸⁰ Yet only one case in which *barones* explicitly meant the higher aristocracy who rebelled against Geoffrey can be cited, and all other mentions of baronial counsel are vague.⁴⁸¹ The only individual to be explicitly named as a comital advisor (*consiliarius*) is the modest, loyal landholder Geoffrey of Clefs, discussed in the next chapter.⁴⁸² The extent of Geoffrey's personal involvement, and that of his household, in the dispensation of justice, requires examination along with changes which occurred in this sphere during his reign.

Geoffrey inherited a loose judicial system which by the thirteenth century came to distinguish between 'high' (*haute*) and 'low' (*bas*) justice; high justice dealt with serious crimes including murder, homicide, rape and arson, all of which could incur the death penalty, while low justice dealt with more prosaic crimes which, with the exception of theft, were punishable by fines rather than death.⁴⁸³ As Haskins outlined in relation to eleventh-century Normandy, however, the distinction between a ruler's control of high justice and vassals' prerogatives over low justice was not sharply defined before the thirteenth century, and the same caveat applies to Greater Anjou under Geoffrey.⁴⁸⁴

This patchwork of legal and customary prerogatives meant that Geoffrey did not have a monopoly on certain judicial tools or sentences such as the death penalty. In the court (*curia*) of the lords of Montreuil-Bellay, for example, petitioners could offer to

⁴⁸⁰ App. I, no.38.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid., no.42, in which Geoffrey is advised in 1144 by *nobilis nris fidelibus nostris*, Maurice of Craon, Lisiard of Sablé (perhaps in error for Guy or Robert) and Theobald of Matheflon over a dispute with the priories of Cunault and Loudun. Cf. *ibid.*, nos. 7 and 89, which refer to the counsel of *barones* or, in the case of nos. 91 and 93, *hominum meorum* or *fidelium meorum*.

⁴⁸² Ibid., nos. 5 and 6.

⁴⁸³ These definitions are provided by Akehurst in the Introduction to the *Établissements*, pp.xxx-xxxi.

⁴⁸⁴ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.27-8.

undergo trial by combat,⁴⁸⁵ and the lord's prerogatives included the punishment (and receipt of the fines) of serious crimes such as rape, arson and theft.⁴⁸⁶ One of Geoffrey's own *acta* shows that he unsuccessfully claimed the right to hang men who had committed theft in Bishop Ulger's estates at Chalonnes.⁴⁸⁷ There is, however, evidence that Geoffrey managed to recover control over some high justice crimes. The so-called Méron Chronicle indicates that after the fall of Montreuil in 1151, Geoffrey restored all customs to the monks, but retained the three important forfeits of homicide, theft and arson, previously controlled by Gerald.⁴⁸⁸ That he took the forfeits back in hand reinforces the point made above about Geoffrey's necessary recourse to military means to gain the upper hand over local barons. Gerald is the most notorious case, but it seems likely that others followed his example, and that Geoffrey recovered profitable customs such as high justice jurisdiction when military success provided an opportunity to do so.

Similar overlaps of justice can be found in the ecclesiastical sphere: Geoffrey had to agree, for example, to the use of the duel – a method of proof which in the thirteenth century pertained to high justice – by local abbeys to settle cases themselves. At Saint-Nicolas of Angers the authority to which those involved in duels were to be accountable was very clearly delineated in 1136, as part of a negotiation which prohibited the count's officers from distraining the abbey's men without the permission of the monks:

...no comital prévôt or vicar may dare distrain them for any forfeit, unless the monks themselves are unable to do so. But if it happens that a duel (*bellum*) arises between the monks' men, it is to be settled in their court. And likewise if [it involves] one of their men and an outsider. If one of their men provokes one of mine to a duel, it is to be settled in my court. But if their man falls defeated, they will bring him back with them, quit. On the other hand, if my man should be defeated, let him be restored to me, quit.⁴⁸⁹

Conversely, Geoffrey agreed to restore customary judicial rights to the canons of Saint-

⁴⁸⁵ CSA I, no.144.

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid, no.221 (1080×82), in which Berlay and his son Gerald renounce all of their bad customs at Méron, reserving to themselves *raptum, incendium, sanguis, furtum, lepus* and *pedagium*.

⁴⁸⁷ App. IV, no.11.

⁴⁸⁸ *Chron. des églises*, p.89.

⁴⁸⁹ App. I, no.21: 'concedo atque precipio quod omnes homines ipsorum quieti, liberi et absoluti sint ne prepositus meus vel vicarius audeat penitus dstringere illos pro ullo forisfacto, nisi sit aliquis talis quem monachi dstringere non possint. Si autem evenerit ut duellum inter homines monachorum oriatur, in ipsorum curia finiatur. Et si cum uno suorum hominum et alio extraneo, similiter. Si vero homo ipsorum meum hominem ad bellum provocaverit, in curia mea finiatur. Quod si homo illorum victus ceciderit, quitum eum secum reducent. Si autem meus suum provocaverit, in curia sua finiatur. Si vero meus homo victus fuerit, quietus mihi restituetur'.

Hilaire of Poitiers which had been appropriated by Fulk III, but retained control (*custodia*) of duels (*duellum, juisium*) in the lands in question.⁴⁹⁰ A further contrast is found on the occasion when the ‘barons’ of his court sanctioned a duel between the abbot of Noyers and John of Montbazou, one of Geoffrey’s vassals, who in fact defaulted.⁴⁹¹

This evidence indicates that Geoffrey did not have a monopoly on either justice or procedures pertaining to more severe crimes. Bruno Lemesle has recently shown that this extended to the tool of recognition or sworn inquest, a system which utilised the testimony of non-partisan witnesses – normally senior local men – as the decisive form of proof in legal cases, usually disputes over land or customs.⁴⁹² Lemesle charts the rise of the inquest against the relative decline of the ordeal and shows that it sat alongside methods such as the duel as one tool amongst many at the disposal of both the counts and ecclesiastical courts for the resolution of disputes: as well as its use by Fulk V c.1114-16, a sworn inquest was also used by the archdeacon of Angers cathedral around the same time to settle a dispute between the monks of Le Loroux and Robert of Sablé over lands originally given to the abbey by Robert.⁴⁹³ This evidence directly contradicts Chartrou’s conclusion that the inquest arrived in Anjou only under Henry II in 1154.⁴⁹⁴

The *acta* indicate that Geoffrey also used the sworn inquest to deal with Angevin cases. During Geoffrey’s reign, the nuns of Ronceray were in dispute with Nivard of Rochefort, who claimed the abbey’s demesne land in the wood of Lattay as his own.⁴⁹⁵ Nivard brought the claim to Geoffrey but was unsuccessful, emerging with only his right to collect wood for heating his tower intact. In the notice recording this case, it was stated that ‘the count took the charter [proving the nuns’ right] from the abbess’s hand and read it’ (*comes accepit cartam illam de manu abbatisse et legit*), which proved the case. Later, Geoffrey issued a charter of general confirmation for the nuns.⁴⁹⁶ It is

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., no.78; for the canons’ grant of *custodia duelli et monomachie, quam vulgo juisium dicimus*, cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium* IV, col. 446C, <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/IUISIUM> [accessed 20/07/09].

⁴⁹¹ App. I, no.76.

⁴⁹² Lemesle, ‘Les enquêtes contre les épreuves: les enquêtes dans la région angevine (XII^e-début XIII^e siècle), *L’Enquête au Moyen Âge*, ed. Claude Gavard (Rome, 2008), pp.41-74.

⁴⁹³ Ibid., pp.42, 45-6, 48-9, 56, citing BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou 5 (IV), no.1417 (Le Loroux) and Chartrou, p.j. no.42. Following Chartrou, Lemesle dates Fulk’s use of the inquest to 1109×25, but it must in fact be redated 1114×16, as the verdict was assented to by both Geoffrey and Helias, who could have been born at the absolute earliest in May 1114, and witnessed by Hervey *Rondel* or *Rotundellus*, a prévôt who had been murdered before or during 1116 (CN, no.99; for Hervey as prévôt, *Ronceray*, no.269).

⁴⁹⁴ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.154.

⁴⁹⁵ App. I, no.17.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid., no.18.

only the revival of Nivard's claim in 1154 which reveals the processes which made up the initial resolution of the case under Geoffrey. Henry commissioned his dapifer, Joscelin of Tours, to deal with the claim; by 'the testimony of honest men' (*testimonio proborum hominum*) he found in favour of the nuns.⁴⁹⁷ These men were the same as those who witnessed Geoffrey's initial resolution of the case, and if we turn to another act in the cartulary, it becomes clear that they in fact formed a body of jurors who participated in a sworn inquest or recognition (*recognitio*) under Geoffrey:

Know that it has been recognised and recorded in my court, that it was recognised and conceded by legal vavassors of Brissac, in the presence of my father and lord, Geoffrey count of Anjou, that the wood of Lattay is the demesne of Saint-Marie de Charité [i.e. Ronceray]...And therefore I wish and confirm in this charter that the aforementioned church and its nuns, the servants of God, have and hold the aforesaid wood, with pannage and all other liberties and their free customs, well and in peace and quiet, fully and freely and honourably just as it was recognised in the presence of my lord and father the count of Anjou and afterwards recorded in my court by the same vavassors who were present at that recognition, namely: Choan of Brissac, Warin of Belême, Enores *de Sorel*, Ralph of Saint-Saturnin, Raanus vi(c)arius, (and) Friso *mestivarius* of Varennes; all of whom are my sworn liege men...⁴⁹⁸

Comparison of this procedure with that discussed in relation to the Norman diocese of Bayeux in Chapter 6 shows that in both cases the men who acted as jurors were vavassors – in Normandy, a group of tenants of lords and barons whose lands bordered the territory in question, while here, tenants of the castle of Brissac, whose custodian had been placed there by the count. Although Geoffrey was involved in the case, he was not a party and the jurors – some of whom acted in the same capacity in a trial to decide whether the priory of Saint-Melaine owed fodder to Geoffrey – were chosen for their local knowledge, status and reputation.⁴⁹⁹

⁴⁹⁷ App. I, no.17 contains an account of these events.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ronceray*, no.184; DB I, no.83. Vincent, 'Sixteen New Charters', pp.21-2, 35 (no.13), dates this to September 1151×54. The original text is as follows: 'Sciatis recognitum et recordatum fuisse in curia mea, per legales vavassores de Brachesac, quod fuit recognitum et concessum, coram domino et patre meo comite Andegavensi Gaufrido, quod boschum de Lateio est dominicum ecclesie B. Marie de Caritate Andegavensi... Et ideo volo et presenti carta confirmo quod predicta ecclesia et moniales ibidem Deo servientes predictum boschum habeant et teneant, cum pasnagio et omnibus aliis libertatibus et liberis consuetudinibus suis, ita bene et in pace et quiete et plenarie et integre et honorifice sicut recognitum fuit coram domino et patre meo comite Andegavensi et postea recordatum in curia mea per eosdem vavassores qui interfuerunt illi recognitioni, scilicet: Choan de Brachesac et Garinus de Beleme et Enores de Sorel, Radulfus de Sancto Saturnino, Raannus viarius, Friso mestivarius de la Varenna; isti omnes sunt homines mei ligii et jurati...'. The translation of *Mestivarius* is uncertain.

⁴⁹⁹ For Saint-Melaine, App. I, no.23.

Although Geoffrey did not monopolise certain kinds of judicial procedure, the *acta* show that his personal dispensation of justice was extremely important. The dapifer, who is discussed in detail in the next chapter, had not yet attained the judicial prominence later gained under Henry II, and Geoffrey can frequently be found dispensing personal justice or directing proceedings. One of the most prominent cases is that of Les Alleuds. In 1143 the monks sent their prévôt, Oliver, to Geoffrey's court at Angers to present their complaints against Geoffrey's seneschal at Brissac, Engressus, who had been extorting exactions from the monks' harvest.⁵⁰⁰ Geoffrey initially simply ordered his seneschal to cease harassing the monks, but this was ineffective; Engressus challenged the order, saying that he 'would not allow himself to be burdened by the count or his vicary to be diminished' (*se a comite gravari et vicariam quam ab eo acceperat minui prohibuit*). Accordingly, Geoffrey changed his approach, nominating Geoffrey of Clefs, Hugh of Pocé and Reginald of Roche, prévôt of Le Mans – all men at the centre of the administration – to investigate impartially (*media equitate*) whether the count had done Engressus an injustice. Engressus very quickly changed his mind, retracting his claim. He was now at Geoffrey's mercy (*in voluntate comitis*) and, as the notice states, made the verdict himself (*ipse adversarius iudicium fecerat*). The verdict was reached in the comital palace (*thalamus*), within the castle, and its subsequent recording by the monks makes it clear that it was Geoffrey's *voluntas* which had been the decisive force in the settlement.

Similarly, in 1139 a knight, Gosbert Alelini, came before Geoffrey's court claiming the monks of Saint-Aubin's land at Précigné was his by hereditary right.⁵⁰¹ Gosbert was the widower of the younger daughter of Reginald the dean; Reginald's elder daughter, also deceased, had been the wife of Geoffrey's seneschal Robert Fitz Reginald. Robert's death had prompted Gosbert to claim Précigné, which his father-in-law had held from Saint-Aubin in common with Joscelin the archdeacon. To decide whether Gosbert's claim was valid or if the land was to revert to the monks, Geoffrey retired in private (*surrexit et secedens in locum secretum*) with Bishop Ulger and other high-ranking men. The arguments of both sides were considered, and the verdict decided in the monks' favour, although Gosbert and his new wife were free to ask the monks to swear in support of their claim on a charter if any doubts remained.⁵⁰²

⁵⁰⁰ App. I, no.9.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid., no.3.

⁵⁰² 'Decretum autem in eodem iudicio fuit quod si Gosberto Alelini et uxori ejus placeret, ad tollendam de illorum cordibus dubietatem, monachi Sancti Albini cartam suam secundum canones jurejurando

Boussard argued that the comital court was reserved for the most important matters, and that the count's officials dealt with less pressing matters.⁵⁰³ It is certainly significant that in the thirteenth century, the Old French term for low justice was *vaarie*, or vicary, and that *vicarii* (voyers) were still active in the administration under Geoffrey.⁵⁰⁴ Geoffrey's direct involvement is most easily explained in cases involving his demesne or the officials deputed to administer it, such as the complaints of Les Alleuds against the seneschal of Brissac.⁵⁰⁵ His involvement in Saint-Aubin's case against Gosbert, however, is more obscure. This case may have been of particular importance as it was connected with Geoffrey's own deceased seneschal, but Geoffrey's involvement is nevertheless striking. This personal dispensation of justice is also manifest in the determination of some parties to seek Geoffrey out – even whilst on campaign – to settle matters or declare them ended.⁵⁰⁶

John of Marmoutier's characterisation of Geoffrey as first and foremost 'a friend of the law' (*juris amicus*), though couched within an improbable anecdote, thus appears to contain an important grain of truth.⁵⁰⁷ John makes the account of Geoffrey's meeting with a charcoal-burner whilst lost in the forest near Loches the principal part of a major strand of the *Historia*, in which Geoffrey was 'prudent and wise, justly pious and piously just [and] corrected crimes by moderate laws and pieties [and] emerged as neither remiss in giving justice nor cruel in striking [criminals] down', an example which princes of John's time would do well to follow.⁵⁰⁸ It is notable that this passage contains one of the few Biblical quotations of the entire *Historia*, the opening chapter of the Book of Solomon consisting of the exhortation to 'Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth' (*Diligite justitiam qui judicatis terram*).⁵⁰⁹

*

probarent.'

⁵⁰³ Boussard, 'Les institutions', p.42.

⁵⁰⁴ *Établissements*, ed. Akehurst, p.xxxi.

⁵⁰⁵ App. I, no.3, and nos. 2 (triggered by a complaint of Saint-Aubin against the prévôt of Beaufort), 24 (a verdict delivered by Geoffrey over the theft of cattle belonging to Toussaint by the prévôt of Beaufort), and 100 (an agreement with Marmoutier abolishing unjust customs levied by Geoffrey's officers).

⁵⁰⁶ As well as the case of Engressus, see also *ibid.*, nos. 39 (the termination of a dispute between Cormery Abbey and Ulger of Brayes, drawn up *in exercitu* in 1146) and 66 (concerning the sale of a house to the cathedral chapter of Le Mans, issued at the siege of Montreuil-Bellay).

⁵⁰⁷ JM, pp.185, 190.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p.191: 'Patet luce clarius quam prudens, quam discretus vir iste fuerit, quam juste pius, quam pie justus exstiterit, qui, quodam juris et pietatis temperamento vitia sanans, nec remissus exstitit jura reddendo nec in feriendo crudelis.'

⁵⁰⁹ Wisdom 1:1.

This examination points up the distinctive features of Geoffrey's administration as far as they can be discerned from the limited extant evidence. Although monasteries sought Geoffrey out to resolve disputes with third parties, the examples of judicial cases heard with the comital court all pertain to the comital demesne, underlining the evidence that customary revenue and military assistance were drawn from Geoffrey's own possessions: this was where substantive comital power lay. High-ranking barons appear only occasionally in the *acta*. Geoffrey's experience was not unique. Even in the second half of the twelfth century, as outlined above, the dukes of Brittany exercised little real power beyond their demesne. In his *gesta* of Louis VI, Suger remarked that 'a king's power should never be thought of as being limited only to the narrow boundaries of any part of his lands, "for kings are known to have long arms"', yet elsewhere in the text he shows that the French kings faced serious difficulties in dealing with lords only a few hours' ride away from Paris, who refused on the basis of custom to pledge their homage or pay revenues to the king.⁵¹⁰

This chapter, more than any other, also points up the shortcomings of the Angevin evidence. The most obvious lacuna relates to financial accounting. It is impossible to estimate Geoffrey's annual revenues, although comparison with other French counties and duchies suggests that it was perhaps in the region of £10-20,000 a year.⁵¹¹ The *acta* only permit glimpses of customary revenues such as tolls, but provide no annual totals; extraordinary revenues, including aids – whether *auxilia* or counter gifts – also appear, and one suspects that this was an important source of revenue in a reign characterised by an abundance of campaigns and sieges. There is no explicit evidence of financial hardship in Geoffrey's reign, but this is a possibility which must be considered. One possible manifestation of hardship, discussed in Chapter 4, is the marked slackening of comital patronage of religious houses.

This patchwork of tenurial, administrative, financial, military and legal prerogatives and practices was inextricably linked with the structures of power in Greater Anjou during Geoffrey's reign. One very visible consequence of this was the way in which Geoffrey had to populate the offices and positions connected with power

⁵¹⁰ Suger, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, ed. and trans. Richard C. Cusimano and John Moorhead (Washington DC, 1991), p.109, citing Ovid; cf. p.41, amongst other incidents, which shows King Philip's problems with numerous castles within 12-25 miles of Paris.

⁵¹¹ John F. Benton, 'The Revenue of Louis VII' *Speculum* 42 (1967), pp.84-91, at 85, does not mention Anjou but gives the following figures: Normandy, c.1204, c.£20,000 angevin per annum; Flanders, c.1187, less than £10,000 Fleming per annum; Champagne, c.1233, c.£27,000 parisis per annum. Similar figures can be cited for Provence and Burgundy. All of these figures have large margins of error.

locally, regionally and in his household. This, along with the role his family played in such affairs, is the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Family, friends and followers in Greater Anjou

Discussion so far has shown Angevin comital power, although indisputable, to have been somewhat fragile in practice. Geoffrey's authority was not uniform throughout Greater Anjou, and this impacted upon justice, revenues and administration. The character of the count's authority and the existence of a significant degree of baronial autonomy also left their mark upon the body of individuals and families who are named by the chroniclers and appear most frequently in Geoffrey's *acta*; this group carried out administrative tasks and together made up both household and court. Equally as important in any consideration of who administered Greater Anjou for the count, and why, is Geoffrey's absenteeism – first as conqueror, then as duke – further underlined by Matilda's infrequent appearances south of Normandy.

This chapter thus examines the overlapping fora of household, entourage and court, and the body of local officials employed by Geoffrey. This nexus was the key locus for lay patronage; important relationships were forged here, and individuals and families could rise in the count's service. The witness-lists to the *acta* clearly indicate that Geoffrey patronised and utilised men of lesser rank, creating a distinct group of administrators and comital followers, many of whom held modest but strategically significant estates. Some attention has been paid to these men before,⁵¹² but a more detailed examination of the *acta* reveals much new information about their roles, the relationships they had with each other, and the generational element of their service.⁵¹³ The *acta* also indicate that the region's most powerful barons were largely, though not entirely, absent from Geoffrey's company. This is not to say that Geoffrey's followers and officials stood in opposition to a higher aristocracy – indeed these men were part of the same spectrum of lordship – but that some distinction can be made between those who can be found regularly at court, often exercising official functions for Geoffrey, and those who were able to remain more distant and act more self-sufficiently. There is evidence that the higher aristocracy were involved in Geoffrey's administration, but only selectively and irregularly. Geoffrey's ability to attract service, at least to some extent, 'was based not on command and obedience, but on mutual faith between lord

⁵¹² Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pp.97-106.

⁵¹³ For a similar approach and a discussion of the problems of the prosopographical analysis of charters, see Bates, 'Anglo-Norman Royal Charters' and Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II'.

and vassal', and he was like other lords and rulers who 'looked to utilize their vassals as instruments of government, but they were not always able to do so'.⁵¹⁴ The previous chapter has shown that although some barons appear to have done homage for their lands, this proved only a weak incentive to remain loyal; this chapter contends that those who did bind themselves loyally to Geoffrey were more dependent on him for their careers and livelihoods, and that in return the smooth running and security of his administration was fundamentally rooted in their support. Rigid models of lord/vassal relations do not fit the evidence for Anjou under Geoffrey, and this chapter identifies those who can most accurately be described as Geoffrey's followers or friends, a group alluded to by Hildebert of Lavardin in his letter to the count in 1131, in which he is advised to listen to the counsel of his friends in order to govern his lands properly (*Sicut igitur praesenti pagina commoneris, utere tuorum consilio amicorum*).⁵¹⁵

Examination of the court is also important in the context of Geoffrey's marriage and the Anglo-Norman succession crisis, which engendered a lengthy separation from Matilda and multiple absences in Normandy. Rule in Anjou, like elsewhere, was peripatetic and personal, and the impact of Anglo-Norman politics and the ducal reign must be taken into account when appraising Geoffrey's administration. Matilda's role also requires examination: it is recognised that she appears to have regarded the title of countess with disdain, yet the effect her own interests and activities had upon the traditions of Angevin administration has not hitherto been studied.⁵¹⁶ The Angevin evidence suggests that Matilda's Anglo-Norman concerns deprived Geoffrey of a key figure, sitting in stark contrast to the personal control of the administration exercised prior to 1129 by Fulk and Aremburga, who governed in her husband's absence on pilgrimage in 1120. Likewise, the count's mother and children had played important and prominent roles at court prior to 1129, and the evidence of Geoffrey's reign indicates that although certain practices continued, the particular circumstances of the reign also affected the activities and presence of the heir and cadets, and those charged with their care, at court. Discussion will begin with the count's immediate family, before moving on to examine other followers and officials.

It is first necessary to consider briefly the question of terminology. The

⁵¹⁴ Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004), pp.102-3.

⁵¹⁵ App. V, no.2.

⁵¹⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.70; idem, 'Charters of the Empress', p.277.

difficulty of defining the ‘court’ in relation to the ‘household’, is well known.⁵¹⁷ French historians have used the term ‘entourage’ in their discussions of the count’s household and lay and clerical followers of all ranks, whilst those tackling the subject from an English point of view have drawn distinctions between a domestic household (*domus*), a court exercising legal functions (*curia*), and those with whom the ruler habitually surrounded himself (retinue or court).⁵¹⁸ ‘Household’ will be used here to describe the group of men frequently found in Geoffrey’s company who, with very few exceptions, held domestic offices, rather than local officials, though there is some overlap between former and the latter, some of whom were amongst the most frequent witnesses to the *acta*. Like those of his contemporaries, Geoffrey’s court, broadly defined,⁵¹⁹ was not a formal institution but an itinerant, fluid body of people brought together in the count’s presence and given a ‘material infrastructure’ by the household.⁵²⁰ It hosted individuals and groups not in regular attendance on the count, including numerous knights, servants, family members, adoptive kin and guardians, intellectuals, and clerics. Household, retinue and *curia*, along with visitors, made up the court. This discussion will concentrate on the most frequent witnesses to the *acta*, identifying their roles, backgrounds and networks in order to build up a picture of the demography of the core elements of the court in its broad sense.

Family

According to John of Marmoutier, Geoffrey returned to Angers with Matilda immediately after the marriage, and the couple appear to have been there together when Fulk left for Jerusalem.⁵²¹ Matilda, however, has left little trace in Geoffrey’s Angevin administration, first because of the couple’s separation and later because of concerns in England and Normandy. Accordingly, Matilda rarely witnessed her husband’s charters. Only two of Geoffrey’s own *acta* contain her name in their witness lists, in 1133 in Angers and 1138 in Carrouges, while a third alludes to her consent to Geoffrey’s grant

⁵¹⁷ Malcolm Vale, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001), ch.1.

⁵¹⁸ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, chapter 5; Guillot, *Le comte* I and II, passim; cf. Judith Green, *The Government of Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986), pp.19-20.

⁵¹⁹ Cf. Norbert Elias, *The Court Society* (Oxford, 1983), p.35: ‘At such a ‘court’ hundreds and often thousands of people were bound together in one place by peculiar restraints which they and outsiders applied to each other and to themselves, as servants, advisers and companions of kings...’.

⁵²⁰ Vale, *The Princely Court*, p.15.

⁵²¹ JM, p.181.

of land to Mortemer in Normandy, which was issued in October 1148.⁵²² A charter issued by Geoffrey's uncle, Duke Conan of Brittany, in favour of Saint-Nicolas of Angers between 1129 and 1136 attests to Matilda's presence alongside her husband in Angers during this period, and her attestation of an agreement between Geoffrey and Bishop Ulger between 1136 and 1138 appears to be further proof of time spent at Angers.⁵²³ Matilda herself confirmed her father's grant, issued in May 1129, of revenues from Rouen, London and Winchester to Fontevraud; Chibnall suggests that this confirmation was given in Anjou, and the apparent presence of Hugh of Pocé – one of Geoffrey's followers, discussed below – strengthens this possibility.⁵²⁴

As countess of Anjou Matilda stands in striking contrast to her predecessor. Aremburga was a frequent witness to her husband's charters, and also issued charters both jointly with Fulk and in her own name; altogether, an astonishing thirty of the ninety-eight extant *acta* assembled by Chartrou for the period before Fulk's departure to Jerusalem involved Aremburga, a total which is even more remarkable given that the countess died in 1126, three years prior to her husband's departure.⁵²⁵ It was probably Aremburga who took the reins of government during Fulk's pilgrimage in the early 1120s, and Fulk's *acta* show that she was deputed by her husband, who was apparently in Anjou but 'occupied with his own affairs', to oversee the comital court's resolution of a dispute between the lord of Rillé and the abbey of Marmoutier.⁵²⁶ Aremburga's duties appear to have been greater than those of her predecessors,⁵²⁷ and her skilled involvement in Fulk's administration was passed on to their daughter Sybil, who ably managed the county of Flanders during her husband Thierry's absences first on pilgrimage in 1138-9 and then crusade in 1147-9, when she was forced to defend the county against an attack by Philip of Hainaut.⁵²⁸

The importance of countesses in Anjou in the twelfth century must not therefore be underestimated. Matilda's absence was potentially problematic, stripping Geoffrey

⁵²² App. I, nos. 74, 89, 93.

⁵²³ App. VI, no.3 and App. III, no.3.

⁵²⁴ *RRAN* II, no.1581; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.58-9 (wrongly citing *RRAN* II, no.1580), noting the presence of one *Hugo de Boceio*, 'whose name does not occur in any royal charters, [who] may have been a member of [Matilda's] household'.

⁵²⁵ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 12, 22, 23, 29, 33, 37, 41, 43, 45-9, 53-5, 59, 61, 63, 71-8, 80-2.

⁵²⁶ *Ibid.*, p.273, n.1 and cat. no. 72, dateable only to 1109×26. And cf. arrangements in Normandy after 1066, Judith Green, 'Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State', *Historical Research* 63 (1989), pp.115-34, at 117.

⁵²⁷ Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, p.133.

⁵²⁸ Karen S. Nicholas, 'Countesses as Rulers in Flanders', *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, ed. Theodore Evergates (Philadelphia PA, 1999), pp.11-37, at p.123.

of a deputy who was not just a figurehead but also a skilled administrator who could oversee the running of the county in his absence; that Geoffrey's officials managed to do this throughout the period after 1135 is testament to his choice of personnel and the expertise they possessed, both of which had been effectively fostered by Fulk V. Matilda's brief and infrequent appearances in Anjou were also perhaps an important contributory factor, along with Geoffrey's own absences in Normandy, to the evolution of the comital administration, particularly in the office of dapifer, as discussed below. The assertion that Geoffrey, after the difficult start to the marriage, 'learnt to treat his wife as a partner necessary for the maintenance and extension of his inheritance' makes less sense in an Angevin context than it does in an Anglo-Norman one; it is in his absences and those of his wife that it can be seen that Geoffrey was a far more isolated ruler than his father.⁵²⁹ On the other hand, as discussed in Chapter 6, it is not correct to conclude that 'Matilda exercised an autonomous historical agency completely outside the conjugal jurisdiction of the marriage' to Geoffrey.⁵³⁰

Matilda is referred to as countess of Anjou in two of the *acta* in which she appears, despite her own apparent indifference to the title.⁵³¹ She played some part in Angevin life, displaying a particular interest towards the abbey of Saint-Nicolas, witnessing grants made to the monks by Conan of Brittany, as well as Geoffrey – who elsewhere also made provision for the care of his wife's soul at the abbey – and herself confirming its extensive English possessions.⁵³² This pales, however, in comparison with the collaborative patronage exercised by Fulk and Aremburga; indeed, Aremburga made grants out of her dower to institutions such as Fontevraud.⁵³³ She also perambulated with her husband around Greater Anjou, witnessing charters at important places at a variety of key locations including Tours, Le Mans and Angers.⁵³⁴

The Angevin *acta* show that historically the count's children as well as his wife played an important and visible role in the household and administration, often from a

⁵²⁹ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.60.

⁵³⁰ Charles Beem, "'Greater by Marriage': The Matrimonial Career of the Empress Matilda", *Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln NE, 2009), pp.1-15.

⁵³¹ App. I, no.93 and App. III, no.3; cf. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.70, and the note here in App. I, no.89, correcting the dating ascribed to it by Chibnall; Beem, 'Matrimonial Career', p.5.

⁵³² App. VI, no.3 (Conan); App. I, nos.20 (*pro anima* for Matilda) and 21 (Geoffrey's charter of 1136 witnessed by Matilda); *RRAN* III, no.20 (Matilda's confirmation, 1133x1139).

⁵³³ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.71. The land referred to was at Ponts-de-Cé near Angers, and the term *ex cuius dote erat* must refer to Aremburga's dower rather than her dowry.

⁵³⁴ *Ibid.*, cat. nos. 22 (Tours), 54 (Saumur), 78 (Le Mans and La Flèche). No.23 is a charter issued by Aremburga alone, at Fontevraud.

very young age. The presence of the heir and sometimes his siblings in the witness-lists or bodies of charters is the most visible Angevin facet of the practical aspect of what has been termed ‘anticipatory association’ by Andrew Lewis, but Lewis’s conclusions regarding Angevin association must be modified, and have important consequences not only for understanding Geoffrey’s own upbringing but also for disentangling the importance of his children at court.⁵³⁵

In the first half of the twelfth century, the recent history of the dynasty meant that precedents for the involvement of heirs in the comital administration were not all positive. Geoffrey IV was only made co-ruler after staging a rebellion following his disinheritance in favour of his younger half-brother, Fulk.⁵³⁶ The form of Geoffrey IV’s association in 1103 was unusual, and did not provide a template for later practice. More direct antecedents for Geoffrey’s role prior to 1129, and for his children’s activities after 1133, were arguably the experiences of Geoffrey IV prior to 1100 and Fulk V in the first two decades of the twelfth century. Geoffrey IV began to both witness and confirm his father’s acts in or around 1090, and potentially much earlier.⁵³⁷ By the age of twelve or fourteen, in 1104, Fulk is recorded as having assented to a quitclaim issued jointly by Fulk IV and Geoffrey IV in favour of Saint-Aubin, and in early 1105 he publicly confirmed his assent by placing a knife on the church’s altar.⁵³⁸ He also appears to have made grants prior to his father’s death; a confirmation issued for Ronceray in 1109 notes that the grants in question were made during his boyhood (*pueritia sua*).⁵³⁹

Geoffrey V can be found acting alongside his parents in charters from the age of three, considerably earlier than his father or uncle.⁵⁴⁰ Contrary to Lewis’s assertion that

⁵³⁵ Andrew W. Lewis, ‘Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France’, *AHR* 83 (1978), pp.906-27.

⁵³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.917.

⁵³⁷ Guillot, *Le comte* II, nos. C362 (Fulk IV in favour of Beaulieu-les-Loches, 1069×90, confirmed by Geoffrey, apparently in 1090), C363 (Fulk IV in favour of Saint-Maur, 24th April 1090, with the assent of Geoffrey and Countess Bertrada), C367 (Fulk IV and Geoffrey jointly confirm Archembald fitz Ulger’s grant to Marmoutier, 1092), C377 (confirmation of a quitclaim by Fulk IV in favour of Notre-Dame of Pontlevoy, 20th May 1083 × 27th March 1093), C393 (Hugh of Chaumont and Aimeri *de Curron* obtain the consent of Fulk IV and Geoffrey for a grant to Pontlevoy prior to their departure for the First Crusade, March 1096); C397 (Fulk IV grant to Angers cathedral, 1096, witnessed by his three children, Geoffrey, Fulk and Ermengarde); C398 (Fulk IV in favour of Saint-Nicolas, 22nd August 1096, confirmed by Geoffrey two days later in return for £30).

⁵³⁸ *CSA* II, no.111; catalogued as two separate acts in Guillot, *Le comte* II, nos. C425, C434. The date of Fulk’s birth is uncertain: see Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.1.

⁵³⁹ *Ronceray*, no.313.

⁵⁴⁰ Up to 1120, Geoffrey appeared in the following ten texts: Chartrou, *L’Anjou* cat. nos. 33 (15th September 1116), 38 (20th September 1117, and printed as *CSA* II, no.114, unnoticed by Chartrou), 43 (1113×18), 45 (14th January 1118), 46 (1119), 47 (c.1119), 48 (1120), 71 (*p.j.* no.27; *Biennu* II, no.862, 1116×25, though the designation of Geoffrey as *puerulus* suggests that he may have been fairly young), 93 (*p.j.* no.42, redated to 1114×16, for which see below); *Cartulaire de Saint Jouin*, pp.27-30 (30th April

he was only formally associated in Fulk's rule in 1127-8, the process of involving Geoffrey in the administration and familiarising him with the mechanics of comital rule was a long one, not triggered simply by the prospect of Fulk's abdication.⁵⁴¹ As early as 1116, at the age of three, Geoffrey was consenting to and collaborating in Fulk's acts, such as that in which he granted the monks of Saint-Serge *fodrium* at Thorigné, in which both Aremburga and Geoffrey gave their consent (*filius meus Goffridus qui et dedit et concessit*).⁵⁴² Sometime between the birth of Helias c.1114 and the death of Hervey Rondel in 1116, Geoffrey and Helias are described as being consulted by Fulk during a dispute over customary privileges in Maine.⁵⁴³ As Lewis notes, the comital (or royal) title was not necessary for an heir to be associated in his father's acts, nor applied consistently in examples from the period, and evidence that Geoffrey was identified as count in two pre-1129 texts but simply as *filius comitis* in others accords with this.⁵⁴⁴ Fulk made a grant to Nyoiseau abbey in which he was referred to as 'count Fulk, father of count Geoffrey' (*Fulco comes pater Gaufridi istius comitis*) in 1113×1117.⁵⁴⁵ A decade or more later, Geoffrey again appears as count in a charter issued by Fulk in favour of Saint-Florent of Saumur, in which Fulk and his two sons added their *signa*: the first subscription, before the crosses of Fulk and Helias, was that of Count Geoffrey (*crux Gaufridi comitis*).⁵⁴⁶

On the day that he took the cross, Fulk issued a text recording an agreement between the archbishop of Tours and Hugh of Amboise, made in the presence of his entire court (*in curia plenaria comitis*) and a host of high-ranking ecclesiastics and laymen.⁵⁴⁷ This would appear to have been a prime opportunity to promote his heir apparent as count designate: Geoffrey, however, is simply noted as Fulk's son (*Fulco comes Andegavensis et filius ejus Gaufridus*). It is not satisfactory to ascribe this choice of words to the lack of a system of association within the Angevin dynasty. The most obvious explanation is two-fold. First, as Lewis notes, the rules on use of a title by an associated heir were not rigid; and second, this lengthy notice of the agreement was

1120).

⁵⁴¹ Lewis, 'Anticipatory Association', p.917.

⁵⁴² Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.33 (*p.j.* no.12).

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*, cat. no.93 (*p.j.* no.42). For the redating of this text, see above p.90, n.492. Fulk took the advice of both his men and his sons over whether to accept the decision of the twelve men who conducted the inquest: 'Cum hoc audivi, nolui contendere cum homine meo, sed omnem contencionem et quiete concessi, et Gaufridum et Helyam, filios meos, ei concedere feci...'.
⁵⁴⁴ Lewis, 'Anticipatory Association', p.919.

⁵⁴⁵ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.37; *p.j.* no.15.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, cat. no.84; *p.j.* no.37.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, cat. no.87; *p.j.* no.39.

drawn up by a beneficiary scribe, whose choice not to employ the title does not necessarily indicate a lack of awareness on his or the other participants' part of Geoffrey's position.

The comital title, therefore, has only limited value as an index of associative activity, but its appearance, albeit infrequent, indicates that contemporaries perceived of Geoffrey and other Angevin heirs as counts during their fathers' lifetimes. Indeed, the evidence suggests that Geoffrey took an active role in administration from an early age. He makes twenty-five appearances in Fulk's ninety-eight extant *acta*, and his presence is consistent throughout the reign.⁵⁴⁸ Some time between 1118 and 1126, on the Sunday after a settlement was reached by Fulk concerning a dispute between his men and the monks of Saint-Florent, Geoffrey was approached by the abbey's cellarer, whereupon he assented to proceedings by adding his *signum* to the document (*signo propria manu imposito*).⁵⁴⁹ This example is not unique. It has already been shown above that Fulk V was expected to do the same during his childhood, and this evidence accords with recent observations that the young heirs of German ruling families were schooled in administration by such activities as attending sittings of the court and taking part in charter ceremonies.⁵⁵⁰ Geoffrey clearly provided his consent to his parents' acts,⁵⁵¹ and collaborated with his father in the issue of letters and in dealing with documents.⁵⁵²

Geoffrey's younger brother Helias also appears in Fulk V's charters, and like Geoffrey was required to provide his assent to grants and agreements. The difference between the brothers' appearances, however, is primarily quantitative: where Geoffrey appears twenty-five times, Helias is only noted in six texts.⁵⁵³ In common with his brother, Helias's role extended beyond witnessing his father's *acta*, but the relative infrequency of his appearances suggests that he was not being schooled as intensively as Geoffrey in the ways of rulership.

Geoffrey's marriage to Matilda and the eruption of the succession crisis in 1135

⁵⁴⁸ In addition to the nine texts cited above, Geoffrey appears in Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 45, 53, 63, 73, 74, 76, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 90, 93, 94, 98, 103.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid., cat. no.80; *p.j.* no.33.

⁵⁵⁰ Jonathan R. Lyon, 'Fathers and sons: preparing noble youths to be lords in twelfth-century Germany', *JMH* 34 (2008), pp.291-310.

⁵⁵¹ E.g. Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 53 (1122×24), 71 (1116×25), 76 (1115×26), 93 (1109×25), 94 (1113×29).

⁵⁵² Ibid., cat. nos. 63 (*p.j.* no.24, a letter in favour of La Trinité of Vendôme, issued at Tours in 1124) and 45 (*p.j.* no.18, the foundation charter of La Fontaine-Saint-Martin, confirmed on 14th January 1118 by Fulk and Geoffrey at La Flèche, under 'our seal').

⁵⁵³ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, *pièces justificatives* nos. 29, 35, 37, 40, 42, 45. It must be noted that this total may increase should further charters of Fulk V be discovered.

engendered a different context for the upbringing of the couple's children. Henry, Geoffrey junior and William all appear in their father's *acta*, but relatively infrequently, and in Henry's case, in a context which is arguably exclusively Norman. His earliest appearance is in a three-part charter issued by Geoffrey in favour of the men of Saumur, drawn up while en route to Normandy to launch the fourth attack on the duchy in June 1138.⁵⁵⁴ Henry witnessed the charter's second stage, in which Matilda confirmed Geoffrey's grant. This took place at the Norman castle of Carrouges, where the five year-old Henry was stationed with his mother and youngest brother, William, who was not yet two. It is significant that both children did not merely witness the charter, but also, with their mother, added their *signa* to it, in continuation of the practices established by their Angevin comital predecessors. Likewise, in the charter's third stage, Geoffrey and Matilda's middle son Geoffrey junior inscribed his *signum*, but only after the charter had returned to Saumur, where he was in the care of one of his father's key followers, Joscelin Roonard, discussed below.

Although this charter was issued for Angevin beneficiaries, Henry's approval of it was given in a Norman context. His only other appearance in Geoffrey's *acta* prior to the fall of Rouen in April 1144 occurred in Anjou, when Henry assented to Geoffrey's confirmation of the privileges of the priories of Cunault and Loudun.⁵⁵⁵ Although this text was issued near Angers, for an Angevin beneficiary, its circumstances were shaped by events in Normandy, for it not only refers to the need for additional aid to complete the conquest of the duchy, but was also issued during the course of the siege of Rouen, and in this context this rare meeting of father and son is significant. As Poole suggests, it seems that Geoffrey sent for his son – who since 1142 had been in England with his uncle, Robert of Gloucester – during the final weeks of the main phase of Norman campaigning.⁵⁵⁶ Henry was perhaps being involved in matters relating to Normandy even at this early stage; he had already collaborated with Matilda in grants for her Anglo-Norman supporters, including Henry I's dapifer for England and Normandy, Humphrey of Bohon, since 1141.⁵⁵⁷ His remaining four appearances in Geoffrey's charters all occur during the ducal period, and show that he collaborated in the

⁵⁵⁴ App. I, no.93.

⁵⁵⁵ Ibid., no.42, with dating notes.

⁵⁵⁶ Poole, 'Early Visits', p.451, though as discussed in App. I, no.42, this charter dates from the weeks immediately prior to the fall of Rouen, rather than following it.

⁵⁵⁷ *RRAN* III, nos. 111, 274, 275, 372, 634, 635; Chibnall, 'Charters of the Empress', p.288, also citing in n.63 Worcestershire Record Office MS 192. 154, no.1, printed there as Appendix 1, no.1, dated to either 1144 or 1146-7.

dispensation of ducal duties prior to his own investiture in 1150, jointly confirming charters with Geoffrey as well as providing his consent.⁵⁵⁸

The Norman bias to Henry's attestations is a clear reflection of both his position as heir to Normandy (and the Anglo-Norman realm), and his preparation for the assumption of the duchy's administration.⁵⁵⁹ The difference between Henry's appearances and those of his brothers in Geoffrey's charters is striking. Geoffrey junior and William both appear in their father's *acta*, sometimes together, but nearly always in Anjou. The only exceptions are William's attestation of the 1138 charter in favour of the men of Saumur, granted at Carrouges, less than a year after William's birth, and the brothers' appearance at the entire family's confirmation of Mortemer Abbey's privileges on 11th October 1148.⁵⁶⁰ Otherwise, by contrast with Henry, Geoffrey and William tended to remain in Anjou, both witnessing their father's charters,⁵⁶¹ and even acting in his stead, as in the case of Geoffrey junior 'granting' (*concessit*) his father's gifts to the new priory of Château-l'Hermitage while the count was detained in Rouen in 1144, or the two brothers' assent to a grant made by a comital vassal to Fontevraud some time between 1136 and 1149.⁵⁶² In spite of these variations in the frequency and nature of appearances between the heir and cadets, it appears that the Angevin counts had a well-established practice of associating their children in their acts, by contrast, as John Hudson has noted, with other neighbouring rulers, including Stephen, whose heir Eustace witnessed and/or consented to his acts only very infrequently.⁵⁶³

Practicalities

The presence of these children and the need to instruct and care for them gave rise to a group of individuals who rarely appear in the *acta*, but who must have been an important element within the court. These guardians or tutors (*nutricii*) and masters (*magistri*) supervised and educated the children of the household in an apparently wide

⁵⁵⁸ App. I, nos. 32, 33 (both for Bec, undated, apparently issued jointly), 45 (for Fécamp, perhaps 11th October 1148 × Spring 1149, or December 1149 × January 1150, issued jointly), and 74 (for Mortemer, at Rouen, 11th October 1148, consented to by Henry along with Matilda, Geoffrey junior and William).

⁵⁵⁹ Discussed in Chapter 6.

⁵⁶⁰ App. I, nos. 93, 74.

⁵⁶¹ App. I, nos. 7, 91, 92. It is possible that the latter two grants were witnessed some time after they were issued; see dating notes.

⁵⁶² App. I, no. 34; Bienvenu I, no. 507.

⁵⁶³ John Hudson, 'Legal aspects of seignorial control of land in the century after the Norman Conquest', unpublished D. Phil thesis (Oxford, 1988), pp. 198-9.

range of areas.⁵⁶⁴ Prestigious *magistri* such as Adelard of Bath and William of Conches have not left any trace in the *acta*, and indeed have Anglo-Norman backgrounds; they are known to have schooled Henry through the dedication of their works on philosophy and astrology to him. Other masters were apparently selected from Anjou, and can be traced, although only tentatively, at court. Two of them, Peter of Saintes and an individual named Matthew – who schooled Henry II and Geoffrey’s sisters – appear to have been brought to the family’s attention via their local connections and backgrounds in the cathedral schools of western France, rather than any Anglo-Norman networks. The activities of these *magistri* fall beyond the scope of this study, but it is clear that they played a key part in the instruction of Geoffrey and Matilda’s children at the Angevin court and in England under the guidance of Robert of Gloucester. Significantly, both Peter and Matthew appear to have come from cathedral school backgrounds, and acted in clerical capacities which brought them into contact with Geoffrey.⁵⁶⁵

Nutricii were also an important presence in the comital children’s lives and a discernible presence at court. They appear to have been charged with the day-to-day care and practical education of the count’s children. These figures were not unique to Anjou; the Anglo-Norman chronicles, for example, attest to similar figures charged with the care of royal/ducal heirs, including William the Conqueror, Robert Curthose and William Adelin.⁵⁶⁶ An individual named Adam – who appears to have been a minor local landholder who had married the daughter of another minor lord, Hugh of Erigné – acted as *nutricius* to both Fulk V and Geoffrey V prior to his death in 1127.⁵⁶⁷ The charters outlined above in which both Fulk and Geoffrey were required to add their consent explicitly state that Adam was charged with overseeing this process: in the case of the former, Adam ensured that Fulk placed the knife which symbolised the transaction on the altar correctly, before doing the same himself; in the latter case, Geoffrey had been counselled by the many men who had come with the cellarer of Saint-Florent, but most especially by Adam (*expetens precibus plurimorum qui ibi*

⁵⁶⁴ And see Kathryn Dutton, ‘*Ad erudiendum tradidit*: the upbringing of Angevin comital children’, *ANS* 32 (2010), pp.24-39.

⁵⁶⁵ This subject deserves further study in the future. For detailed analysis of Peter and Matthew, see *ibid.*, pp.33-9.

⁵⁶⁶ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum* I, pp.758-61; OV VI, pp.304-5. David C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact upon England* (London, 1964), p.37; Aird, *Curthose*, p.37; Dutton, ‘Upbringing’, pp.27-8.

⁵⁶⁷ Dutton, ‘Upbringing’, pp.28-31.

aderant et maxime Ariani nutricii sui exortationi adquiescens).⁵⁶⁸ Adam was a regular presence at court from the time of his earliest appearance alongside Fulk in 1105 to his death in 1127, witnessing a further seven extant charters for the counts.⁵⁶⁹ Another *nutricius* named Bigat can also be found attesting one of Fulk's acts alongside his charge, Geoffrey, who in turn entrusted his own two younger children to the care of various *nutricii*, amongst whom Joscelin Roonard and a Master Hugh can be identified.⁵⁷⁰

These men perhaps also had the sons of local barons under their supervision; evidence of baronial children at court under Geoffrey is not forthcoming, but Fulk IV's *acta* and the *Historia* both indicate that this system was practiced, and that prominent heirs such as Robert of Sablé were brought up alongside future counts.⁵⁷¹ Such children and youths were part of the fabric of the court.⁵⁷² In the case of Anjou there was a strong precedent for heirs and cadets to remain within the comital court, gaining the skills necessary for rule; under Geoffrey, however, this system could not continue in the same form. The Anglo-Norman realm had entered the equation, and the emphasis was on preparing Henry for rule of his maternal rather than patrimonial inheritance.

Other members of Geoffrey's immediate family were few. Aremburga had died in 1126, removing yet another figure whose predecessor had been prominent under Fulk, whose own mother Bertrada was a frequent witness to her son's charters, and can be seen to have interceded with him on behalf of local religious houses.⁵⁷³ Geoffrey's elder sister Matilda had entered Fontevraud in the early 1120s, while his other sister Sybil married Thierry of Flanders within a few years of Geoffrey's accession, and only one example of an attestation for her brother, in 1133, survives.⁵⁷⁴ His illegitimate son, Hamelin, created earl Warenne by Henry II in 1164, never appears in his father's *acta*.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁶⁸ *Ronceray*, no.313; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.80 (*p.j.* no.33).

⁵⁶⁹ *CSL*, nos. 55 (8th June 1104), 9 (14th April 1109; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.3), 17 (28th June 1116); *Ronceray*, no.60 (1110); Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 53 (*p.j.* no.21, 1122×24), 58 (*p.j.* no.23, 1123), 83 (*p.j.* no.35, 15th January 1127).

⁵⁷⁰ *Bienvenu I*, no.507, dated 1136×49, discussed above.

⁵⁷¹ *CSA I*, no.111 (Guillot, *Le comte II*, C434); *JM*, p.206; Dutton, 'Upbringing', pp.29, 32.

⁵⁷² Vale, *The Princely Court*, p.22.

⁵⁷³ Of the charters printed in full in Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, Bertrada witnessed cat. nos. 8 (*p.j.* no.3), 20 (*p.j.* no.5), 24 (*p.j.* no.6 *bis*), 28 (*p.j.* no.9), 29 (*p.j.* no.9 *bis*), 32 (*p.j.* no.11), 36 (*p.j.* no.14) and 37 (*p.j.* no.15). In cat. no.39 (*p.j.* no.16), Bertrada interceded on behalf of the abbey of Villeloin. Bertrada also brought her other sons, by King Philip, with her: Fulk's half-brother Philip witnessed cat. nos. 1 (*p.j.* no.1, in the company of his *nutritor*, Richard), 32 (*p.j.* no.11), 38 (*p.j.* no.14) and 40 (*p.j.* no.17, again in the company of Richard, this time described as his *pedagogus*); Fulk's other half-brother, Florius, witnessed cat. no.71 (*p.j.* no.27).

⁵⁷⁴ *App. I*, no.89.

⁵⁷⁵ For Hamelin, see Thomas K. Keefe, 'Warenne, Hamelin de, earl of Surrey (*d.* 1202)', *ODNB* (Oxford

His brother Helias, however, had perhaps at this time returned to Anjou from Perche, after the death of his wife Philippa, daughter of the absent Count Rotrou.⁵⁷⁶ It seems that Helias, who cannot have been much younger than Geoffrey, had been married soon after his brother. Philippa's premature death prompted Rotrou's return from Spain and his remarriage to Hawise of Salisbury, depriving Helias of any *iure uxoris* claim to the county of Perche.

Helias, the count's brother

The chronicles and annals make it clear that Helias led a rebellion against his brother, apparently in collaboration with Robert of Sablé, in 1145. Despite this episode's prominent place in Angevin historiography, Helias' motives and his activities after Philippa's death have not been fully explored. He rarely attests Geoffrey's charters, though his appearance alongside his nephew Geoffrey junior at Mayet on 28th January 1144 for the confirmation of Count Geoffrey's grant to support the re-foundation of Château-l'Hermitage indicates that he had not fallen out of favour prior to Geoffrey's ducal investiture.⁵⁷⁷ He can also be found amongst the sureties to the concessions made to the men of Rouen by Geoffrey at the conclusion of the siege of the town, strongly suggesting that he had been physically involved in at least the final stages of the siege.⁵⁷⁸

Apart from his consent to Geoffrey's agreement with Saint-Florent in 1133, Helias is not attested to at the comital court prior to 1144, and it seems likely – although it is not verifiable – that he was elsewhere. The next thing that is known of Helias coincides with what the Angevin annals call the 'war of the barons', which occurred in 1145 and was perhaps not concluded until 1146.⁵⁷⁹ Helias' rebellion must be dated to this period, as John links it to Robert's third major strike against Geoffrey, when he secured the support of all of the great men of the region, who bound themselves to him by oath.⁵⁸⁰ In his addition to the *Gesta* John states that Helias, 'by the counsel of wicked men, often attacked his own brother, demanding the consulship of Maine'.⁵⁸¹ A

2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28732> [accessed 28/07/11].

⁵⁷⁶ Helias attests the same charter simply as *frater comitis*. For Philippa, Thompson, *Border Lordship*, pp.75-6, and Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.351, n.61.

⁵⁷⁷ App. I, no.34.

⁵⁷⁸ App. IV, no.14.

⁵⁷⁹ *St-Aubin*, p.35.

⁵⁸⁰ JM, p.207.

⁵⁸¹ GCA, p.71.

thirteenth-century chronicler also writing in Tours, most likely Pagan Gatineau, a canon of Saint-Martin, apparently agrees with John's attribution of the rebellion to Helias' demand for Maine, by naming him as count of Maine.⁵⁸² All three accounts concur that Geoffrey captured and then imprisoned his brother in Tours, and that he died as a result, though John says that he was released and died a few days later from a fever, and Pagan notes only that he was imprisoned until his death. The L'Evière annals record his death in 1151, while a precise date of 15th January is supplied by the necrology of Fontevraud's priory of Fontaines.⁵⁸³

Despite the link between this large baronial uprising and Helias' rebellion, his claim to Maine has always been cited as the sole cause of the events of 1145. That we should be wary of the apparent unanimity in the chroniclers' accounts, however, is suggested by their references to Helias' imprisonment and death. By contrast with John and Pagan's remarks, Geoffrey's *acta* show that Helias was not permanently imprisoned at Tours. On 12th January 1148 or 1149, he accompanied his brother to Le Mans, and he was perhaps also present at a session of the comital court in Angers on 9th September 1149 or 1150.⁵⁸⁴ Salmon's work on Pagan's chronicle has shown that he was familiar with John's work in the *Gesta* – itself the basis of the *Historia*'s account of events – which cast serious doubts on the chronicle's value as independent corroboration of John's account.⁵⁸⁵ Geoffrey's lengthy imprisonment of Helias, therefore, seems to be an embellishment created by John and replicated by Pagan in the thirteenth century.

This has implications for the chroniclers' remarks on the causes of the rebellion, and Helias' claim to Maine was perhaps not as sudden as their accounts seem to suggest. Indeed, the county would have been ideal compensation for the loss of the Perche brought about by Philippa's death. As the Introduction has shown, Maine had a recent history of detachment from the rest of Greater Anjou, and Helias would have been aware of the prominence of his namesake and grandfather, Helias of La Flèche. It is also possible that Helias already had interests in or on the Angevin border with Maine.⁵⁸⁶

⁵⁸² 'Chronicon Turonense magnum', *Chroniques de Touraine*, ed. Salmon, p.131. For the chronicler's identity and the proof that he was not John of Marmoutier, see the introduction to the same volume, pp.xvii-xxii.

⁵⁸³ *Aquaria*, p.173; *Recueil des historiens de la France, obituaires de la province de Sens*, ed. Auguste Molinier and Auguste Longnon (4 vols. In 5, Paris, 1902-23) IV, p.188.

⁵⁸⁴ App. I, nos. 61 and 28.

⁵⁸⁵ *Chroniques de Touraine*, ed. Salmon, p.xxii.

⁵⁸⁶ App. I, no.28, mentions Helias' name in conjunction with the forest of Chambiers, between Durtal and Seiches, just to the southwest of La Flèche. It is impossible, however, to conclude anything further as the document is extremely fragmentary, and this particular section is riddled with large holes. As noted above, App. I, no.34, indicates that Helias accompanied his nephew to the southern Manceau castle of

Maine, however, does not appear to have been the cause of the rebellion, merely the target: for the former, we must look towards Normandy.

Geoffrey's charter for the citizens of Rouen indicates that Helias was present at the siege, while the grant to Château-l'Hermitage suggests that he may have played a role in the dispensation of comital duties during Geoffrey's absences while campaigning. In these circumstances, Helias may well have expected a reward when the duchy was finally conquered. Instead, there is no evidence that either Helias or other Angevin barons received Norman honours, and in Helias' case the disappointment may have been sharpened by the political manoeuvrings stirred up by the death of Rotrou of Perche at the siege of Rouen. Although it has been suggested that his daughter Beatrix may have been married around this time to John, heir to William Talvas' southern Norman and Manceau estates, there is no evidence to confirm this.⁵⁸⁷ By contrast, in the wake of the siege, Louis VII married his younger brother Robert to Rotrou's widow Hawise and thus established a royal presence in an important border area threatened by Theobald of Blois.⁵⁸⁸ Geoffrey seems to have played a key role in this marriage, solemnised in early 1145.⁵⁸⁹ A chirograph made between Abbot Aimery of Saint-Julien of Tours and the family of a local prévôt, Henry, is dated with reference to Geoffrey's knightng of Robert, the king's brother (*Facta sunt hec eo tempore quo Gaufredus, comes, fecit militem Robertum, fratrem regis Ludovici*).⁵⁹⁰ The chirograph is no more precisely dated, but the circumstantial evidence of Rotrou's death and Hawise's remarriage to Robert, aged twenty-one in 1144 and not yet necessarily a knight, suggests that Robert was knighted by Geoffrey as part of a wider agreement between the new duke and Louis.

Any residual disappointment over the loss of the Perche may thus have finally erupted in the wake of the siege of Rouen. Louis VII's rapid implantation of his brother as Count of Perche meant that any hope Helias may have harboured of regaining the county was lost. Geoffrey, moreover, does not seem to have compensated his brother

Mayet in 1144.

⁵⁸⁷ Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship*, p.84. Evidence for the marriage comes from RT II, p.28, which notes but does not date it in the context of William Talvas' obituary.

⁵⁸⁸ Sassier, *Louis VII*, p.196; RT I, p.234, notes Rotrou's death and Robert's marriage. Cf. Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship*, pp.86-7: 'Geoffrey was clearly too pre-occupied to give the newly-widowed countess much support. In these circumstances it is natural that she should seek the protection of a second husband and she made an almost immediate remarriage...It is impossible to know who advised Hawise during the period immediately following her husband's death.'

⁵⁸⁹ For the date, see Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship*, p.87.

⁵⁹⁰ CSJ I, no.92. That it is Geoffrey of Anjou who is the count in question is certain by both the context (Tours) and a reference to Malet, the count's prévôt, who also appears in App. I, nos. 28 and 75.

with either land or a marriage either before or after 1144; his support of Robert of Perche's marriage and dubbing of him to knighthood were in this context potentially highly objectionable. The specific circumstances of Geoffrey's treatment of his brother in 1144-5 seem to have been part of a general attitude towards Anjou's baronage. Helias, like the greatest lords of the region, appears to have had little reason to attend or reside at the court on a regular or even sporadic basis. He had been enticed to assist with the conquest in 1144 and perhaps earlier, and it seems that rewards which may have been promised were not forthcoming.

Family, therefore, had traditionally been a central support for the counts but the character of familial involvement changed under Geoffrey, and could, as in the past, prove to be a vexed issue. Fulk V's reign in particular was distinguished by the frequent appearances of Countess Aremburga alongside her husband, and by her ability to sustain the administration in his absence. Simultaneously, Geoffrey, and to a lesser extent Helias, collaborated with their parents in various capacities, learning the skills necessary to rule Anjou along the way. These associative practices continued under Geoffrey, but were conspicuously changed by the impact of the Anglo-Norman political situation, in terms of both inheritance and the absence of the countess. As a result, Geoffrey had to establish and maintain a strong, loyal body of officials to administer the region. This task was especially pressing in the face of baronial aggrandisement and rebellion, not least that which involved his own brother.

Local administration and officials

Geoffrey V inherited a mature but still developing system of administration characterised by three officials.⁵⁹¹ *Prévôts* or provosts (*prepositi*) were installed in the count's castles and acted as local officials on his behalf, dealing primarily with the administration of properties, the collection of revenues, public order – both in terms of policing and in dealing with the punishment of lesser crimes – and with the summoning of the Angevin army as outlined in the previous chapter. Under the *prévôts* were the voyers or vicars (*vicarii*), the region's oldest officials who, during the twelfth century, were still active but largely superseded by the *prévôts*. These two officials performed similar duties to local seneschals, but appear to have been of lesser status. The seneschal was also a demesne agent, but possessed greater judicial powers as well as

⁵⁹¹ Halphen, 'Prévôts et voyers du XI^e siècle dans la région angevine', *Moyen âge* 15 (1902), pp.319-30; Boussard, 'Les institutions', pp.41-4. The following paragraph is a summary of these investigations.

responsibilities for castle-guard.⁵⁹² He must be distinguished from the chief seneschal personally attached to the count in a role described by Boussard as ‘the great seneschal of Anjou’, and often described in both contemporary sources and by historians as *dapifer*, who was a member of the household who will be dealt with below.⁵⁹³

Prévôts’ and voyers’ authority was restricted to the comital demesne, and accordingly *prepositurae* and *vicariae* had formed around the count’s castles. Geoffrey’s *acta* attest to prévôts in Angers, examined below, as well as Saumur,⁵⁹⁴ Tours,⁵⁹⁵ Beaufort,⁵⁹⁶ Baugé,⁵⁹⁷ Montbazou,⁵⁹⁸ Loudun,⁵⁹⁹ and Loches.⁶⁰⁰ Local seneschals were installed at Brissac, La Flèche and Le Mans.⁶⁰¹ The *acta* show that the prévôts were responsible for the count’s lesser officials, such as foresters and huntsmen, who would have husbanded the demesne.⁶⁰² They can be found throughout the county, particularly – as the previous chapter shows – in relation to the collection of customs due to the count from other lordships, most often ecclesiastical, and in order to coordinate the military host.

The anecdotes in the *Historia* suggest that these officials were prone to frequent abuses, and indeed a substantial proportion of Geoffrey’s *acta* are occupied with the resolution of problems arising from such transgressions.⁶⁰³ It seems that some of these problems could be deeply entrenched: exactions made by the prévôt of Beaufort against the monks of Saint-Aubin, for example, were the latest in a long line of transgressions, and the foresters who perpetrated these injuries and who were within the prévôt’s control seem to have inherited their roles from their fathers. They were brought up in the forest, and perpetuated the claims and wrongful exactions of their predecessors.⁶⁰⁴ Attention has already been drawn to the heritability of prévôtés in the region during the

⁵⁹² Boussard, ‘Les institutions’, p.44; Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.122.

⁵⁹³ Boussard, ‘Les institutions’, p.44; Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.122. ‘Dapifer’ will be used here to identify this seneschal.

⁵⁹⁴ App. I, no.93.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., nos. 28, 38 and 106, the latter addressed to multiple prévôts (*prepositis suis*).

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid., no.10; here the prévôt’s area of responsibility is described as a *prefectura* rather than a *prepositura*; cf. ibid., nos. 8, witnessed by Engelard, *prefectus* of Angers and 49, witnessed by Pippin (of Tours), described as *Andegavensis prefectus*.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid., no.10.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid., nos. 102, 107.

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid., no.39.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid., no.100.

⁶⁰¹ Ibid., nos. 9, 13, 16, 57, 60.

⁶⁰² E.g. Ibid., no.2: ‘comes...cum preposito ipsius castri [Beaufort], segrearii et forestarii Valeie’, also witnessed by Bernard the huntsman (*venator*) and John the forester (*forestarius*), described as witnessed *de ministris siquidem comitis et forestariis et sagittariis*.

⁶⁰³ Ibid., nos. 2, 9, 10, 19, 24, 42, 67, 100, 102.

⁶⁰⁴ App. I, no.2: ‘segrearios et forestarios, qui ab infantia nutriti erant in predicta silva’.

eleventh and twelfth centuries, with specific examples from Geoffrey's reign such as Walter Faitmaut (*Facit malum*) cited as proof of an unaccountable and notorious set of officials, comital in name but not necessarily in deed.⁶⁰⁵

Geoffrey may have attempted to solve some of the problems presented by local officials and administration by installing *familiares* in key positions. Pagan of Clairvaux, a member of a family with important attachments to the dynasty and one of Geoffrey's key followers, appears as prévôt of Loches in 1136, when he witnessed Geoffrey's assurance to the monks of Marmoutier that the count's foresters would no longer be able to extort arbitrary customs from, nor waste, the abbey's forest of Chénevoise.⁶⁰⁶ Geoffrey of Clefs, the count's former seneschal at La Flèche, appears in the capacity of voyer in a charter of 1151, which corrects the behaviour of comital officials who had been wrongly subjecting Ronceray's men to *benagium*, a tax on vines.⁶⁰⁷ Geoffrey of Clefs was one of a group of sworn men (*antiquorum et proborum virorum*) tasked with deciding whether the levy could be collected. Like Pagan of Clairvaux and Pippin of Tours, whose family consistently filled the office of prévôt of Angers, Geoffrey was a member of a family placed in a number of important administrative positions, perhaps through inheritance; all were consistently loyal supporters of the count. Furthermore, as outlined below, many of these prominent administrative families were not only of relatively minor status, but also originated from strategic areas within and often on the fringes of the Greater Anjou region.

This evidence suggests that familial patterns in prévôtés and other offices should not necessarily be interpreted as a sign of Geoffrey's weakness or fundamental inability to control his officials in the localities. The *acta* show that prévôts ranked amongst the count's knights, suggesting some measure of control engendered by affective as well as tenurial ties.⁶⁰⁸ The system may also have been a lucrative source of revenue, suggested

⁶⁰⁵ Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, pp.134-6. Cf. Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.136-7, who cites the evidence for families of prévôts but does not conclude that they were unaccountable. Under Geoffrey, the Faitmauts can be found as prévôts at Loches and Montbazou.

⁶⁰⁶ App. I, no.100.

⁶⁰⁷ App. I, no.19. For *benagium*, see the entry for *jallagium* in '1 galo', du Cange, *Glossarium* IV, col.18b, at <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/GALO1> [accessed 01/02/11]. It is clearly different from *vinagium*, the privilege granted to the men of Angers and Saumur: this charter alludes to 'homines... manentes nullum benagium, nullum vinagium debere assuerunt'. The seneschalcy of La Flèche will be discussed below, in the section dealing with Geoffrey's household and *familiares*. It must serve as a case study of sorts for the other local seneschalcies, for which the evidence is less rich. The Clairvaux and Clefs families are both discussed further below.

⁶⁰⁸ App. I, no.103, witnessed by Walter Faitmaut, *de militibus*, as well as Hairic the prévôt, unattested to elsewhere.

by comital precedent, such as Geoffrey II's price of 300s. for the prévôté of Loches,⁶⁰⁹ and by Geoffrey V's own tactics in staffing his Norman administration, which on at least one occasion involved significant sums of cash.⁶¹⁰ There is also evidence that Geoffrey could turn potential rapacity to his advantage. When Geoffrey forced Bishop Hugh of Le Mans into exile for refusing to back the Angevin cause in Normandy in 1136, it was the count's officials (*ministri*) who were instructed to pillage and sell off the cathedral's assets.⁶¹¹

Evidence unnoticed in previous discussions best illustrates the prévôt's responsibilities and the trust in which he must have been held to be 'the executive bridge between the lord and his demesne interests'.⁶¹² Garoth *pretor* – a title whose meaning on both sides of the Channel is synonymous with *prepositus* or *prefectus* – appears in two acts of 1125×1148.⁶¹³ In the settlement of a dispute between a local family and Ronceray Abbey in Bishop Ulger's court, the witness list refers to Garoth, 'who, at that time prévôt, controlled the city in the count's place' (*Garoth qui, tunc temporis pretor existens, loco comitis huic preerat civitati*).⁶¹⁴ He was accompanied by two of Geoffrey's chief officers, Pippin and Joscelin of Tours, the former himself also a prévôt of Angers.

This example of an officer acting explicitly *in loco comitis* echoes Geoffrey's deputation of Pippin of Tours to Bishop Ulger of Angers to assent on his behalf to a grant made by the lord of Rochefort. During one of Geoffrey's absences on campaign c.1140, Pippin went to the bishop bearing a letter from the count instructing Ulger to 'trust him with no doubt', and look upon his confirmation 'as if it comes from my own mouth'.⁶¹⁵ This explicit instruction perhaps suggests that such a deputation was still

⁶⁰⁹ Cited by Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, pp.134-5, though remitted by the count in exchange for the prévôt's promise to cease harassing monasteries.

⁶¹⁰ Spear, *Personnel*, p.35.

⁶¹¹ *APC*, p.446, and see Chapter 4.

⁶¹² Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, p.167.

⁶¹³ *Ronceray*, nos. 28, 418. For *pretor*, Du Cange, *Glossarium* VI, col.475a, <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/PR%C3%86TOR> [accessed 31/06/10] which describes the office as *urbis praefectus*; R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources, with Supplement* (Oxford, 2004), p.371, identifies its twelfth-century meaning as 'reeve, provost'. Pippin of Tours is titled *prefectus* in one of Geoffrey's charters, App. I, no.50; the prévôt of Beaufort was also described as *pretor* during Geoffrey's reign, App. I, no.24. The synonymy of the terms is also discussed in the Perche and in England and Normandy in Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship*, p.67, and Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, p.167.

⁶¹⁴ *Ronceray*, no.28; on p.299, Marchegay dates this notice to the period before 1140. It was certainly during Ulger's episcopacy (1125-48). No.418 is dated on p.376 to c.1143.

⁶¹⁵ App. III, no.10, a lengthy notice citing the brief document brought by Pippin to Ulger: 'Ulgerio, Dei gratia Andegavensi episcopo et praecordiali amico, Gaufridus, Andegavensis comes, salutem. Quicquid vobis Pipinus praepositus pro concessione ecclesiae sancti Petri dixerit, hoc totum confirmo et ei, quasi ex

comparatively rare.⁶¹⁶ The apparent intersection of Garoth and Pippin's careers suggests that a prévôté was not necessarily held continuously or exclusively, though Pippin is extremely prominent in Geoffrey's *acta*, unlike Garoth. Pippin likewise appeared in an untitled capacity as the first of a group of witnesses to a verdict passed in Geoffrey's court; the second witness was one Bargius, *tunc temporis prepositus Andegavis*.⁶¹⁷ No more can be determined of Garoth and Bargius, but Pippin was clearly part of a select group of men who transcended the boundary between household and administration, and is discussed at length below.

The prévôt, local seneschal and, to a lesser extent, the voyer were the chief officers of local comital administration, but the *acta* also attest to the existence of other, more obscure figures including bailiffs (*baillivi*) and town or village administrators (*villici*).⁶¹⁸ In common with the three more prominent officers, other lords, particularly ecclesiastical establishments with large estates, also counted these figures among their ranks of administrators. Nevertheless, it is clear that some of these officials were attached to the comital administration, and operated within a wider network of comital officials (*ministri*).⁶¹⁹ Pagan Nardoc, for example, was *villicus* of Le Mans in 1146, and witnessed a charter amongst Geoffrey's other administrators and household officials, including his Le Mans seneschal, butler and keeper of the tower.⁶²⁰ Along with other Le Mans officials – although untitled – he witnessed *ex parte comitis* a settlement to a dispute between the count's *villici* and the canons of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour.⁶²¹ The canons, who held profits of local markets in common with the count, contended that Geoffrey's *villici* and their servants – both groups referred to as *ministri* within the same text – had been fraudulently accounting for the count's share of the revenues. The *villicus* thus appears to have had local accounting duties, and later evidence shows that these were directly connected to provisioning the count's household; in the thirteenth

ore meo vobis visibiliter concederem, sine dubitatione credatis. Vale.'

⁶¹⁶ It also highlights a key difference between the Anjou of Count Geoffrey and the Normandy of Duke Geoffrey, namely the use of formulaic writs.

⁶¹⁷ App. I, no.28.

⁶¹⁸ See 'villicus' in Du Cange, *Glossarium* VIII, col. 334c, at <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/VILLICUS> [accessed 29/04/10], where an overview of *villici* in a French context is provided, showing that in some regions they were known as *maiores*. Cf. App. I, nos. 37 and 38, in favour of Cormery, which share as a witness Geoffrey, mayor of Azay.

⁶¹⁹ The foresters and archers discussed above, referred to in App. I, no.2, were referred to as the count's ministers: 'de ministris comitis siquidem et forestariis et sagittariis'.

⁶²⁰ App. I, no.57. As well as these regional officials, the charter was also witnessed by the seneschal of La Flèche, the chief dapifer (though untitled), a comital chamberlain, and the keeper of the wardrobe, discussed below.

⁶²¹ App. I, no.67.

century the *villicus* of Château-du-Loir, for example, purchased costly fish on the count's behalf.⁶²²

Bailiffs appear in the *acta* only infrequently, but this should not suggest that they were unimportant. The prior of Cunault and Loudun claimed that Geoffrey's bailiffs at Loudun and Brissac – both demesne castles under prévôts or seneschals – as well as baronial bailiffs were oppressing the priories' men to such an extent that they were prevented from cultivating the land.⁶²³ As a result, Geoffrey had to delineate the circumstances under which the priories' men could be taxed (*talliare*), to grant that his bailiffs could deal with the prior's complaints within the bounds of the priories' parishes but not elsewhere, and to order his bailiffs to guard and defend the priories' properties as if they were the count's own demesne, and only to make exactions on his order.

It has been suggested that it was Geoffrey and his successors who 'superimposed upon the local government of Normandy the new area of the *bailliage*'.⁶²⁴ As Chapter 6 shows, no new evidence emerges from the Norman *acta* in this regard, but from an Angevin perspective it is striking that local bailiffs rarely appear, and that *bailliaiges* (*bailiae*) as a unit of administration are not evidenced at all.⁶²⁵ Such discrepancies perhaps point up key differences between the comital and ducal diplomatic evidence rather than administrative differences. The Norman bailiffs acquire a prominence in the *acta* impossible for their Angevin counterparts to attain, as they are the frequent recipients of ducal writs and writ-charters, diplomatic forms which employ address clauses and which are overwhelmingly absent from the Angevin *acta*, and which moreover occur in the context of the Bayeux inquests, which warranted large-scale, *bailliage*-wide investigation.

Familiar men: household and retinue

The *acta* attest to a large body of household officers and knights during Geoffrey's reign, for whom it is possible in some cases to construct detailed biographies. Analysis of the *acta* shows that Geoffrey surrounded himself with

⁶²² Paris BnF Latin 9067, f.307v.

⁶²³ App. I, no.43: 'praetendebant quod baillivi nostri de Lausduno et de Brachesac, et alii baillivi baronum nostrorum homines eorum exactionibus et gravaminibus contra libertates praefatas opprimerent totiens eis frustratorie terminus ponentes, quod terrae remanebant incultae, cum homines sic essent a suis laboribus disturbati, unde terra ipsorum pene deserta remanserat, et homines at tantam paupertatem devenerant, quod nec nobis, nec ipsis poterant in aliquo subvenire.'

⁶²⁴ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.151.

⁶²⁵ Cf. *ibid.* p.152, for the first occurrence of the term in Normandy, during Geoffrey's reign. This text is App. II, no.3.

familiares who were largely dependent on him for their careers and livings, whether or not they held castles or modest estates of their own. These men formed the core of Geoffrey's knightly retinue; the greater of them were elevated to defined domestic roles like that of dapifer, while others held prominent positions in the most important central and regional estates. Under Geoffrey, a precedent for the later Angevin tendency for conferring upon lesser men both duties and 'a trust which they denied to the majority of their barons' is detectable.⁶²⁶ This is in keeping with recent and contemporary practices in both England and France.⁶²⁷ Unlike the groups favoured by his royal descendants, however, Geoffrey's *familiares* were mostly laymen, aside from the clerks employed in the chapel and chancery.⁶²⁸ These clerks will be dealt with at the end of this chapter, while other churchmen – though touched upon here – are discussed in Chapter 4.

The evidence of the *acta* is largely consistent with what is known of the previous counts' households. Chamberlains, chaplains and butlers – some attached to specific urban centres such as Le Mans – all witnessed Geoffrey's charters and are discussed below. There are also signs that the household was evolving, such as the existence of men with duties in the count's wardrobe. In common with the reign of Fulk IV, there is evidence that the count had a chancellor (*cancellarius*), in Geoffrey's case the much-discussed Thomas of Loches. This evidence, however, proves to be problematic, and requires re-examination with reference to a particular Angevin institution, the college of Saint-Laud of Angers, the apparent site of Geoffrey's investiture and one source of comital chaplains. This evidence is discussed in Chapter 4.

Some important absences must also be noted. Geoffrey does not appear to have had a constable or a marshal, by contrast with the dukes of Normandy, raising the question of how the army was organised and provisioned, and of who acted as the comital standard-bearer, a title which appears elsewhere in the corpus of Angevin charters. There has been confusion in the past about the existence and functions of both the Angevin constable and standard-bearer. Saint-Florent's account of the Battle of Pontlevoy (1016) refers to Sigeband of Chemillé as the count's *signifer*, and the

⁶²⁶ Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, p.175. Cf. Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', p.291, which suggests that many lay magnates and important lay officials were excluded from Henry II's witness lists either because they were not deemed worthy of inclusion, despite their presence, or because they were absent as they were actively fulfilling their duties.

⁶²⁷ Green, *Government*, p.143; Éric Bournazel, *Louis VI le Gros* (Paris, 2007), p.209.

⁶²⁸ Of the 116 most frequent witnesses to Henry II's charters, 100 are ecclesiastics, and 99 out of these 100 were promoted to bishoprics or archbishoprics, illustrating not only the king's control of ecclesiastical appointments but also the prominence of religious at his court. Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', p.293.

appearance nearly a century later of another Sigebrand as Fulk IV's *comes stabulis*, led Port and Marchegay to conclude that *signifer* referred to the office of constable and was a hereditary post held by the lords of Chemillé.⁶²⁹ Halphen, however, has pointed out that *signifer* should be translated as standard-bearer, and that Fulk IV's constable was probably not the lord of Chemillé.⁶³⁰ It has since been argued that Fulk IV created the constable, who went on to be his most frequent titled witness and – if his presence at agreements and pleas is significant – seems to have had a judicial function.⁶³¹

A later agreement over rights in Matheflon made with Ronceray by Marquise of Matheflon, her husband Pagan of Vaiges and their son Fulk refers to the count's standard-bearer (*signifer comitis*), Joscelyn.⁶³² Although the privileges which required settling had originally been granted by Geoffrey II, this dispute can perhaps be dated to the end of Geoffrey V's reign or the early years of Henry II's reign, prior to the English succession. Marquise had previously been married to Hugh of Matheflon, who as discussed in the previous chapter had probably died in the 1140s, and the resolution was reached some time before the child of her new marriage was knighted.⁶³³ Several men named Joscelyn were central to comital administration in the 1140s and 1150s, such as the dapifer Joscelyn of Tours, or Joscelyn Roonard, who in 1138 was entrusted with custody of the count's son. That Joscelyn of Tours may have been standard-bearer is perhaps suggested by the dapifer's origins as a military commander and his later responsibilities for castle-guard, but this possibility remains speculative.⁶³⁴

None of Geoffrey's charters was attested by a titled constable, and it is here that the shortcomings of the evidence are exposed. One of Geoffrey's few consistent baronial followers, Brian of Martigné, attested a charter for Geoffrey's son, Geoffrey junior, at Amboise in 1152, in the capacity of constable.⁶³⁵ Whether he performed the same function for Geoffrey V cannot be determined, but his eight attestations mark him out as one of the most frequent baronial witnesses, though his activity is confined to Angers, Saumur and Baugé.⁶³⁶ Other officers such the cellarers who performed domestic functions for Geoffrey's predecessors are likewise unattested to, more a

⁶²⁹ The debate is summarised by Halphen, *Le comté*, pp.103-4.

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶³¹ Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.426.

⁶³² *Ronceray*, no.129.

⁶³³ 'Postea vero prefatus Fulco, suscepto militari habitu...' Cf. the dating notes provided by Marchegay, *ibid.* p.320.

⁶³⁴ Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.423; for castle-guard, see Boussard, *Le gouvernement d'Henri II*, p.358.

⁶³⁵ DB I, no.25*.

⁶³⁶ App. I, nos. 5, 6, 7, 25, 77, 89, 92 and 93 (with his brother, Maurice).

reflection of the scope of the witness lists than the lapse of any office.⁶³⁷ The limitations of the prosopographical approach to Geoffrey's witness-lists are highlighted here, just as in the case of the *nutricii* and *magistri* who only rarely – and in some cases never – appear in the count's charters, despite the vital duties they performed, as evidenced by the frequent appearances Geoffrey's own *nutricius*, Adam, in charters issued prior to 1129. Fortunately, many of the elements of Geoffrey's household can be explored.

The dapifer

Pre-eminent amongst the men of Geoffrey's household was the chief seneschal or dapifer. In Chartrou's estimation, during Geoffrey's reign the dapifer became 'a veritable vice-count' with full judicial powers in the count's name as well as a role in finance.⁶³⁸ Boussard suggests that this development occurred in the mid-1140s, after the conquest of Normandy, and continued under Henry II.⁶³⁹ Though there is strong evidence in support of this argument, it must be re-examined. On one hand, despite the evolution of the dapiforate in the mid-twelfth century, the dapifer's importance can already be detected in the middle of Fulk IV's reign. If Fulk's vassals sought a hearing in his court, they might have found him seated in his hall flanked by his dapifer, Geoffrey Fulcradi, as Geoffrey of Preuilly did in 1093.⁶⁴⁰ On the other, the chronology of the evolution of the office under Geoffrey does not match up as neatly as previously supposed with the conquest of Normandy, and indeed Geoffrey's rule remained highly personal, despite his frequent absences.

The scraps of evidence for the dapifer's role in the eleventh century suggest an office consisting of domestic and ceremonial privileges as well as undefined judicial duties. The first dapifer of Geoffrey's reign, Robert fitz Reginald, appears only infrequently in the *acta*, but it is clear that his function had begun under Fulk V and continued under Geoffrey.⁶⁴¹ His house was the venue for an important agreement

⁶³⁷ Ibid. p.426, discusses these unfree individuals in the eleventh century.

⁶³⁸ Chartrou, p.126.

⁶³⁹ Boussard, 'Les institutions', p.39.

⁶⁴⁰ Halphen, *Le comté*, p.194, n.1, citing the Livre Blanc of Saint-Florent (catalogued by Halphen as cat. no.258, 1087×91); for the correct dating and manuscript tradition, cf. Guillot, *Le comte* II, no. C384. The identification of Geoffrey as dapifer only occurs in the Saint-Florent cartulary, and is not reproduced in the printed text of the notice in Bélisaire Ledain, 'Chartes de la Trinité de Mauléon', *Archives historiques du Poitou* 20 (1889), pp.1-94, no.III (not no.7 as per Guillot).

⁶⁴¹ Under Fulk, he witnessed Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.84 (*p.j.* no.37, dated September 1127); under Geoffrey, he witnessed App. I, no.65, issued in Le Mans, January 1133, and also no.63, again issued in Le Mans, 1129×35, though here he is not titled. *Robertus dapifer* also witnessed *Ronceray*, no.56, a settlement brokered on 15th January 1132 by Bishop Ulger between Ronceray and St-Nicolas, in the

between the count and the abbey of Saint-Florent, indicating that he perhaps had a judicial function.⁶⁴² Geoffrey's second dapifer, Joscelin of Tours, assisted the count with the dispensation of justice, such as the settlement of the bitter dispute between the nuns of Ronceray and Nivard of Rochefort.⁶⁴³ He seems to have been a skilled negotiator; the nuns of Fontevraud noted that he 'took great pains' in order to forge a settlement with a hostile claimant to some of the abbey's land.⁶⁴⁴ By the early years of Henry II's reign, Joscelin was authorised by writ to act in the king's place in settling a revival of the same quarrel,⁶⁴⁵ and less than a decade later he was operating his own court which dealt with the king's judicial business in Angers.⁶⁴⁶

The dapifer can be found witnessing charters and resolutions which ostensibly had nothing to do with the count, and his presence may have acted as comital representation, sometimes with other officers.⁶⁴⁷ Joscelin of Tours was also called upon for advice, not only by Geoffrey and later Henry II, but also by local ecclesiastics such as the abbess of Ronceray, suggesting that he had detailed knowledge of both local affairs and legal and customary procedure.⁶⁴⁸ Joscelin's career accords with evidence discussed below that other key individuals exercised multiple functions under Geoffrey, a phenomenon that continued under Henry II after his English coronation.⁶⁴⁹

Joscelin can be found witnessing Geoffrey's charters from the third quarter of the 1130s, and perhaps earlier.⁶⁵⁰ He is titled seneschal or dapifer from 1148/9 onwards, and it appears that he was the count's treasurer (*tunc impense mee administratore*) in 1146, suggesting that he perhaps had a role in the chamber.⁶⁵¹ Evidence from the later twelfth century indicates that financial administration was a central part of the dapifer's duties.⁶⁵² In the light of the absence of an official titled seneschal or dapifer between

presence of many of Geoffrey's officials, as noted in Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.124, n.6.

⁶⁴² App. I, no.89.

⁶⁴³ App. I, no.17.

⁶⁴⁴ App. I, no.47: 'Josleni de Turonis qui multum ut hoc fieret laboravit'.

⁶⁴⁵ *Ronceray*, no.185.

⁶⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, no.291 and p.353 for dating.

⁶⁴⁷ E.g. *Ronceray*, nos. 56, 277, 287, 359.

⁶⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 320, where Henry II is counselled by Joscelin and Hugh of Clefs, and 401, where Joscelin and Hugh advised the abbess and her own seneschal Isembert over certain properties.

⁶⁴⁹ Nicholas Vincent, 'Hugh de Gundeville (fl. 1147-1181)', *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm: Papers Commemorating the 800th Anniversary of King John's Loss of Normandy*, ed. idem (Woodbridge, 2009), pp.125-52.

⁶⁵⁰ App. III, no.3 (1136×38); App. I, no.48 (1129×1144, probably before 1140); cf. Chartrou, p.125, who claims that he appears as early as 1129 but cites no evidence prior to the first charter noted here.

⁶⁵¹ App. I, nos. 62 (1148/9, titled dapifer), 77 (1150, titled seneschal); cf. no.57. For the suggestion that Joscelin had perhaps been chamberlain, see Boussard, *Le gouvernement d'Henri II*, p.357, n.3.

⁶⁵² Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire*, p.198; Gillingham, *The Angevin Empire*, p.77.

1133×1135 and 1148/9 this financial connection suggests that Joscelin has taken on the role of seneschal by 1146 at the latest and perhaps much earlier, a possibility strengthened by the inconsistent use of the seneschal/dapifer intitution after even 1148/9.⁶⁵³

Evidence from the entire twelfth century shows that the dapiforate was not hereditary.⁶⁵⁴ During Fulk V's reign, it passed from Geoffrey of Clairvaux to Archaloïus, then Hardouin of Cinq-Mars, Stephen Baucan and Robert fitz Reginald, who held it under Geoffrey until at least 1133.⁶⁵⁵ After Henry II's death, Richard immediately replaced Stephen of Marçay with Robert of Turnham, and the office remained subject to royal appointment after 1204.⁶⁵⁶ The roots of this practice perhaps extended back to the mid-eleventh century, when Geoffrey III appointed Isembard, first lord of Thouarcé, as his seneschal.⁶⁵⁷ Fulk IV's choice of dapifer reflected the need for support from new men dependent on the count, rather than the greater barons; Geoffrey Fulcradi had recently been installed as lord of Trèves, a seigneurie whose castle Fulk had destroyed in 1091.⁶⁵⁸ The choice of Joscelin and his predecessor Robert as dapifer, therefore, must be viewed in the context of a long line of appointments rather than accession to a hereditary office.

This evidence accords with Everard's work on the seneschals/dapifers introduced to Brittany by Henry II prior to 1173.⁶⁵⁹ Like his Breton counterparts, Joscelin was personally attached to the count, and he was a full-time servant, who despite his judicial expertise was permanently involved in comital business of apparently any kind. Everard characterises the Breton seneschals as 'the principal agents' of the king as opposed to his *alter ego*, and argues that this was the case in Anjou during Geoffrey's reign.⁶⁶⁰ This was indeed the case for Geoffrey's three local seneschals, but Joscelin was the *dapifer comitis*, personally attached to the count, whose remit was wider and arguably more important than his local counterparts. Although

⁶⁵³ E.g. App. I, no.7, also noted by Chartrou, p.125, n.7.

⁶⁵⁴ Cf. Boussard, *Le gouvernement d'Henri II*, p.358.

⁶⁵⁵ Chartrou, pp.122-4 (omitting Geoffrey of Clairvaux). Hardouin of Cinq-Mars may have also been Fulk IV's dapifer: CSA I, no.111 (1104 and 1105) was witnessed by Hardouin, the count's dapifer. Cf. Halphen, *Le comté*, p.192, which suggests that Hardouin was Geoffrey's IV's dapifer.

⁶⁵⁶ Gillingham, *The Angevin Empire*, pp.77,

⁶⁵⁷ Guillot, *Le comte I*, p.423.

⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p.345.

⁶⁵⁹ Judith Everard, 'The "Justiciarship" in Brittany and Ireland under Henry II', *ANS* 20 (1998), pp.87-105, at 90-2. Everard notes that Henry's policy changed after the revolts of 1173, and he introduced local magnates rather than familiar administrators as seneschals.

⁶⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p.93.

most of the sources make this distinction clear, the duties of the count's dapifer and local seneschals were apparently similar enough for the author of the Méron 'chronicle' to designate Joscelin of Tours and Geoffrey and Hugh of Clefs all comital seneschals (*siniscalli*).⁶⁶¹

The evidence pertaining to Joscelin does not end here. He was, it seems, part of a large, important – though not baronial – family, which can be found attached to the counts before, during and after Geoffrey's reign. Examination of Joscelin's family background and circumstances shows his career was probably founded on the prominence his kinsmen had already acquired in the Angevin court as well as his own skills and loyalty. This family's experience, moreover, was not unique, and is therefore the ideal point of departure for examination of a crucial strategy employed by Geoffrey, namely the appointment of relatively modest, loyal families in important positions in the household and the localities.

Families of administrators and officers

Joscelin was one individual amongst a group of several sets of close kinsmen who outstrip nearly all other administrators, castellans and barons in the frequency with which they witnessed Geoffrey's charters. They formed the central core of administration and counsel, and in some cases followed familial precedent in doing so. The most prominent are Joscelin and Pippin of Tours; Geoffrey, Hugh and Fulk of Clefs; Pagan and Geoffrey of Clairvaux; and finally Absalon and Joscelin Roonard.

Let us remain first with Joscelin of Tours. John of Marmoutier names him in the *Historia*, and makes it clear that he acted on Geoffrey's behalf as dapifer (*senescalcus*), holding Poitevin prisoners at his castle of La Fontaine-Milon (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Seiches-sur-le-Loir).⁶⁶² Although nothing can be found in the *acta* which explicitly identifies Joscelin's origins or kinship, the coincidence of his career with that of Pippin of Tours, Geoffrey's prévôt in Angers, may indicate a relationship. Both Joscelin and Pippin consistently used the Tours toponymic (*de Turonis*, *Turonensis*) and frequently appeared together in Geoffrey's *acta*. Pippin's family circumstances can be traced in detail, and may therefore assist in adding to what is already known of Joscelin.

Pippin's father was Hugh of Tours, who is documented as a juror between 1106

⁶⁶¹ *Méron*, p.88.

⁶⁶² JM, pp.194-6.

and 1120 and whose other son Nicholas was active c.1120.⁶⁶³ Hugh was perhaps the same individual as the Hugh, son of Rigaud, who appears once in Fulk V's *acta* as the count's prévôt.⁶⁶⁴ Pippin's own son, another Hugh of Tours, also went on to be prévôt of Angers under Henry II after spending time as a knight in the entourage of Chalo or Gilo, also prévôt of Angers.⁶⁶⁵

This evidence may have a bearing on the identity of Joscelin's successor as dapifer. It is largely agreed that Henry II's Angevin dapifer Stephen of Marçay was the same individual as Stephen of Tours, and that he used the Tours toponymic in the second half of his career.⁶⁶⁶ Stephen's nephew or grandson (*nepos*) was Bernard, seneschal of Mayenne under Henry II; although this seneschal has been identified as Bernard Calo, the sources in fact show that he was Bernard fitz Chalo (*Chalonis*).⁶⁶⁷ It has already been shown that Pippin's son Hugh was a knight attached to Chalo, whom he succeeded as prévôt of Angers. If we identify Bernard's father with this prévôt, the possibility that all of these officials were part of the same extended kin-group arises, meaning that at least three generations of counts consistently used multiple members from no less than four generations of this putative family in the most important positions in their administration.

As well as the dapiferate, then, it seems that several generations of the Tours family held the prévôté of Angers, though this did not preclude others from being appointed between these generations, including William of Moulins and Garoth between

⁶⁶³ For Pippin's parentage, App. VI, no.7; for Hugh of Tours, *CSA* II, no.741; for Pippin's brother Nicholas, *Ronceray*, no.354 (pp.214, 365).

⁶⁶⁴ *CSL*, no.8 (c.1110), noted by Chartrou, p.114, though with no suggestion of a link with Pippin.

⁶⁶⁵ *CSA* II, no.489 (1157×89) was witnessed by Hugh of Tours, prévôt of Angers and his brother, Nicholas of Linières (St-Jean-de-Linières, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. St-Georges-sur-Loire; see Célestin Port, *Dictionnaire historique, géographique et biographique du Maine-et-Loire* (3 vols., Paris, 1874-8) III, pp.384-5). App. VI, no.8, records Geoffrey V's successful petition to the abbot of Saint-Nicolas of Angers to grant Linières to Pippin and his heirs; Pippin's son Nicholas pledged his homage to the abbot. This grant was witnessed by Joscelin of Tours. Gilo *pretor* of Angers dealt with a case at Saint-Aubin in 1171 (*CSA* II, no.485), deputing some of the work to Hugh of Tours *qui est miles suus*, but who is also named as a lord (*donnum*). Gilo, unattested elsewhere, must be the Chalo, prévôt of Angers, who along with Hugh of Tours witnessed the settlement of another case also involving Saint-Aubin at Henry's court, *CSA* II, no.759 (1154×89, unnoticed by Vincent et al). Chalo is also recorded in two of Henry's charters in the late 1150s and early 1160s, *Pl. Acta* nos. 1039 (for Fontevraud, perhaps 1156×62) and 2249 (for Ronceray, 1159).

⁶⁶⁶ Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.114-6, with a full summary of the debate. The reason for the change of toponymic is not known.

⁶⁶⁷ *Pl. Acta* (unpublished charters of Henry's courtiers) summarises Paris AN L977, no.1254, where *Ben' Chalonis*, seneschal of Mayenne, confirms a settlement between Savigny and William Fitz Hamelin; cf. Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.70-1, for Bernard and the identification of him as Bernard Calo, which also agrees that Stephen of Marçay was the same individual as Stephen of Tours.

the first Hugh of Tours and Pippin.⁶⁶⁸ The use of successive generations of one family in this role in practice, though not by hereditary right, accords with Boussard's findings on families of comital prévôts elsewhere in the region.⁶⁶⁹ Unlike local prévôts, however, Pippin of Tours was one of Geoffrey's chief familiars. He had a long career under the count, and is the most frequent witness to the *acta*, witnessing no fewer than thirty charters for Geoffrey throughout the reign.⁶⁷⁰ The conclusion that hereditary offices, whether *de facto* or *de jure*, could be a source of comital strength again arises.

This assessment of the careers of both Pippin and Joscelin is somewhat at odds with arguments, cited above, that Geoffrey's conquest and rule of Normandy stimulated the development of deputies *in loco comitis*. Although it might be argued that Joscelin accrued greater responsibilities in the 1140s, as did others such as the Clefs brothers who are discussed below, Geoffrey's Norman *acta* show both Joscelin and Pippin in attendance upon the new duke. Both witnessed his confirmation of the verdict of an inquest in the diocese of Coutances, and Joscelin accompanied Geoffrey to Rouen in October 1148.⁶⁷¹ Joscelin also witnessed a charter in Rouen for Henry in the months after Geoffrey's death, precisely when one might expect to see the comital dapifer attending to Angevin matters.⁶⁷² Though they both exercised power on Geoffrey's behalf during his absences, this practice was yet to be systematised.

The possibility of Joscelin and Pippin's kinship and their prominence at Geoffrey's court is paralleled by the careers of other key administrative families, which attest to a conscientious effort to maintain a skilled core of administrators. One of these administrators was Pagan of Clairvaux, the younger brother of Geoffrey of Clairvaux, lord of Durtal, himself dapifer at the beginning of Fulk V's reign.⁶⁷³ Geoffrey of Durtal appears to have held far more extensive lands than his younger brother, for although John of Marmoutier describes him as a baron (*baro*), the notice of the resolution of a

⁶⁶⁸ For William of Moulins, Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.114.

⁶⁶⁹ Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.136-7, and see above.

⁶⁷⁰ App. I, nos. 3, 7, 15, 17, 19, 20 (in which Pippin seized the abbot of St-Nicolas with rights at Roches-Berhuart), 21, 24, 26-9, 40, 47-9, 51, 63, 69, 77, 89, 92; App. III, nos. 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11; App. VI, no.10, as well as no.8 (in Pippin's favour, not included in this total).

⁶⁷¹ App. I, nos. 40 (undated; issued at St-Lô, and also witnessed by Geoffrey of Clefs who, however, definitively resigned his duties as seneschal of La Flèche by this point; see discussion below) and 74 (Joscelin).

⁶⁷² *RRAN* III, no.306a; cf. *Ronceray*, no.185 (*RRAN* III, no.725), a continuation of App. I, no.17, which shows that Joscelin dealt with the case between the abbey and Nivard of Rochefort whilst Henry was *en route* to England to be crowned in 1154.

⁶⁷³ *CSL*, no.8, c.1110, a grant by Fulk V to Saint-Laud witnessed by Geoffrey of Clairvaux, 'tunc dapifer'. For Durtal, see Burkholder, 'Lords of Durtal'.

claim by Saint-Aubin against Pagan and another of Geoffrey's men, Hugh of Pocé, describes them as 'powerful men' (*potentes viri*), but also as knights (*milites*) rather than lords.⁶⁷⁴ The cartulary of the Poitevin abbey of Saint-Cyprien indicates that Pagan had estates at Bellefont (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Vouneuil-sur-Vienne) in northern Poitou, as well as a modest castellany at Scorbé-Clairvaux (arr. Châtellerault, cant. Lencloître).⁶⁷⁵ Pagan's landed power may have been especially significant in spite of its modesty, for it was situated on the margins of Poitou and Anjou, and it maintained the Angevin sphere of influence east of Mirebeau, in an area west of Châtellerault, where Geoffrey exercised some rights but had lost others.⁶⁷⁶

Pagan was not the only comital follower to hold lands in this area. His co-transgressor against Saint-Aubin, Hugh of Pocé, appears in a further six of Geoffrey's *acta*, while his brother Geoffrey was a co-donor with the count to Château-l'Hermitage, and another family member, Robert, witnessed charters for Geoffrey and Matilda in both England and Normandy.⁶⁷⁷ Although the seat of the family's power appears to have been just to the south of Saumur, Hugh's consent to his vassals Ganelon and Walker's grant of tithes in Cragon (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Moncontour, comm. St-Jean-de-Sauves) indicates that his estates extended much further south, to the area around Mirebeau.⁶⁷⁸ That the act was then confirmed 'in the count's tower' at Saumur (*apud castrum de Salmur in turre consulis*) indicates that Hugh had a close connection with Geoffrey, and perhaps that these lands were in turn held from him. The cultivation of close ties with men from this marginal area may have been particularly significant given the hostility of both powerful lords to the south, such as Thouars, and of local Angevin barons, such as Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay, some of whose influence and estates lay scattered in northern Poitou.⁶⁷⁹ The *acta* outlined above indicate that

⁶⁷⁴ App. I, no.4. The forfeits at *Bor* near Fontevraud successfully claimed by the pair were won by compromise, rather than any genuine claim, it seems.

⁶⁷⁵ *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Cyprien de Poitiers, 931-1155*, ed. Louis Rédet, Archives historiques du Poitou (Poitiers, 1874), no.225; Rédet, *Dictionnaire de la Vienne*, p.125, notes that the lords of Clairvaux were still castellans in 1393, only attaining baronial status perhaps as late as 1522. Cf. the mis-identification of Pagan – always named in the sources as *de Claris Vallibus* – as Pagan of Clervaux in both *CSA* and *CN*, both of which index the location as Clervaux, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Ponts-de-Cé, comm. Juigné-sur-Loire.

⁶⁷⁶ App. I, no.99, in favour of Tiron's priory of Russé (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Lencloître, comm. Orches) indicates that Geoffrey and Fulk had vassals in the region; cf. App. I, no.77, in which Geoffrey renounced the authority, initially imposed by Fulk III, to judicial rights over the chapter of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand of Poitiers' lands at Pouant (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Monts-sur-Guesnes).

⁶⁷⁷ App. I, nos. 9, 12, 14, 26, 77, 89. Geoffrey also appears in no.12 for St-Macé, and no.34 for Château-l'Hermitage; Robert appears in nos. 89 and 93.

⁶⁷⁸ *Cartulaire de Saint-Cyprien*, no.122, dated there to 1142×51.

⁶⁷⁹ See e.g. *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Laon de Thouars*, ed. Hugues Imbert (Niort, 1876), no.37, an

Geoffrey too held scattered lands and limited rights in these marchlands, and any means of maintaining his influence there could have been sought.

Pagan was a habitual figure at court, and amongst his seventeen attestations for Count Geoffrey he can be seen acting as the count's prévôt at Loches.⁶⁸⁰ Geoffrey also sent him to Matilda's court in the critical period following the capture of Stephen in 1141. Along with Guy of Sablé, a junior member of the baronial family who – as Chapter 5 suggests – was prominent in the administration of Normandy, Pagan witnessed two charters issued by Matilda for Tiron and Fontevraud during the week of 25th July 1141, and may have been instrumental in conveying messages from Geoffrey to his wife in this crucial period after Stephen's capture at Lincoln.⁶⁸¹

The Clefs brothers are another clear case of a family in the count's service. Geoffrey of Clefs witnessed twenty-seven of Count Geoffrey's extant *acta*, some of which were issued in Normandy, and collaborated in the count's establishment of a leper-house;⁶⁸² Hugh witnessed twelve;⁶⁸³ the youngest brother, Fulk, four,⁶⁸⁴ and the three brothers frequently appeared together. The brothers have acquired a particular prominence as the result of Hugh's authorship of a tract for Henry II in support of his claim as count of Anjou to be hereditary seneschal of the king of France.⁶⁸⁵ This text was not written until Henry II's reign, however, and Hugh's importance under Geoffrey was as an Angevin administrator who followed in his elder brother's influential footsteps. Indeed, Geoffrey of Clefs is second only to Pippin of Tours in terms of attestations, and his rise at Geoffrey's court can be traced in some detail. Achille Luchaire has suggested that he was seneschal of the southern Manceau demesne castle

agreement of c.1130 between the monks of Saint-Laon and William of La Tour, brokered by Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay.

⁶⁸⁰ App. I, no.100 (1136), 'tunc temporis de Lochis prepositus'. Pagan also had rights at *Bor*' (App. I, no.4).

⁶⁸¹ *RRAN* III, nos. 328 and 899. Other charters perhaps from this week or the following year in favour of Miles of Gloucester, Aubrey de Vere and Geoffrey de Mandeville are discussed further below and in Chapter 5.

⁶⁸² App. I, nos. 4, 5 (referred to as *consiliarius meus*), 6-9, 13, 16 (as seneschal), 17, 19 (as voyer), 25, 27, 34, 35, 40 (at St-Lô), 52, 54 (at Rouen), 57, 59, 60, 62, 67, 81 (at Rouen), 101; App. II, no.11; App. IV, no.14 (at Rouen); App. VI, no.2. For the foundation of the leper-house, App. IV, no.6.

⁶⁸³ App. I, nos. 4-7, 13 (as seneschal), 27, 35, 52, 57 (as seneschal), 67, 101, 111 (as *dapifer comitis*); see also the notes to *ibid.*, no.96, for Hugh's role in the ducal court in the process which led to this document.

⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 4, 7, 25, 27.

⁶⁸⁵ 'De majoratu et senescalcia Franciae', *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, pp.239-46. The tract's authorship is debated in Charles Bémont, 'Hugues de Clers et le *De senescalcia Franciae*', *Etudes d'histoire du moyen âge dédiées à Gabriel Monod* (Paris, 1896), pp.253-60, who argues in favour of Hugh expressing an authentic claim, and Achille Luchaire, 'Hugues de Clers et le « *De senescalcia Franciae* », *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge* III, ed. Achille Luchaire (Paris, 1897), pp.1-38, who argues against the tract's authenticity.

of La Flèche as early as 1128, but also that he only witnessed Fulk V's charters extremely infrequently, and as a witness of local rather than curial importance.⁶⁸⁶ If he was elevated to the seneschalcy c.1128, this is perhaps significant in the context of Fulk's imminent departure, and it is only in Geoffrey's reign that his real rise can be charted.

At one point in the reign, perhaps as early as 1131, he is named only as one of the count's knights.⁶⁸⁷ In 1133 he appears to have been in possession of the seneschalcy of La Flèche, witnessing in this capacity a charter for Saint-Aubin with his brother Hugh.⁶⁸⁸ By 1142 he was without doubt in the office.⁶⁸⁹ From this point onwards his attestations gather pace, and a year later he is explicitly named as Count Geoffrey's advisor (*consiliarius meus*).⁶⁹⁰ By 1146, however, he was no longer seneschal of La Flèche and his brother Hugh, who still held the position at the end of Geoffrey's reign, had taken it up, alongside the same office at nearby Baugé.⁶⁹¹ Geoffrey of Clefs nevertheless continued in the count's service, witnessing two charters in 1151, appearing in one for Ronceray Abbey in the capacity of voyer.⁶⁹² The Méron chronicler names him as a comital seneschal after the capture of Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay in 1151, though it is unclear whether this referred to his former office.⁶⁹³ He also assisted the count in founding a leperhouse in La Flèche, which as shown in the next chapter was the only outright religious foundation that Count Geoffrey is known to have made.⁶⁹⁴

By contrast with Joscelin of Tours, Geoffrey of Clefs perhaps ceded his office to Hugh expressly to accompany the count to Normandy, for he was present at the siege of Rouen, and later witnessed three ducal acts.⁶⁹⁵ His brothers, on the other hand, appear to have remained in Anjou. Although the brothers' careers may have diverged, their importance as a family unit in Geoffrey's administration is clear, and the *acta* leave the impression of a loyal and dependable family who were able servants throughout

⁶⁸⁶ Luchaire, 'Hugues de Clers', pp.5-6, citing BnF Coll. Baluze 77, f.101, a charter for Saint-Julien of Tours witnessed by 'Gaufridus de Deers qui dapifer consulis erat', correcting *Deers* to *Cleers*. This is perhaps the text briefly summarised as *CSJ* I, no.74.

⁶⁸⁷ App. I, no.25.

⁶⁸⁸ Luchaire, 'Hugues de Clers', citing BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou no.1568, not printed in *CSA*.

⁶⁸⁹ App. I, no.16.

⁶⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, no.5.

⁶⁹¹ Hugh appears as seneschal in *ibid.*, nos. 57 (1146) and 13 (1151). In no.111 (8th April 1146), Hugh is identified as 'qui tunc erat dapifer Lislæ et Balgiaci'; *Lisla* appears in error for *Fissa* (La Flèche).

⁶⁹² App. I, nos. 13, 19 (as voyer).

⁶⁹³ *Méron*, p.88.

⁶⁹⁴ App. IV, no.6.

⁶⁹⁵ App. I, nos. 40, 54, 81; App. IV, no.14.

Geoffrey's newly-enlarged domains. Although the youngest, Fulk, only witnessed four of Geoffrey's charters, all alongside his brothers in the period between 1142 and 1151, it has already been seen that he was granted custody of the strategic fortification of Châteauneuf in 1146 in return for liege homage.⁶⁹⁶ The pledging of homage coincided with Hugh's promotion to his elder brother's former seneschalcy and, by contrast with Joscelin of Tours' absence in Normandy, provides important evidence that Geoffrey was actively increasing the duties within this and other families' remits during the ducal period. By 1146, the Clefs brothers commanded at least three of the count's demesne castles in northern Anjou and southern Maine – one of which had been removed from the custody of the rebellious lords of Matheflon – thus controlling a considerable buffer between Angers and hostile lordships to the north.⁶⁹⁷

The Clefs family did not entirely owe their rise to the Angevins. Their estates lay on the margins of southern Maine and northern Anjou, at Clefs (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Baugé), 8km south of La Flèche, and their patron prior to 1110 was Helias of La Flèche, count of Maine.⁶⁹⁸ The brothers' father Gerald was a frequent witness to Helias' charters in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, and in 1087 he accompanied the young Helias to witness a grant by his father, John of La Flèche, and was present at Helias' confirmation of grants to Saint-Aubin on the day of John's burial.⁶⁹⁹ It has been argued that the family had been the hereditary seneschals of La Flèche since 1060, but there is no evidence to confirm this.⁷⁰⁰ They ranked amongst John and Helias' knights, and perhaps acted as seneschals in the restricted sense of household officers one would expect in the eleventh century. The Clefs brothers could still be described as knights during Fulk and Geoffrey's reigns, and it was only at the end of Fulk's reign that their accelerated rise within the Angevin comital household occurred.

The importance of modest families as comital administrators during this period is further confirmed by the frequent attestations of Geoffrey's charters by the Roonaud brothers, Joscelin, Absalon and Peter. The family had risen to prominence in the

⁶⁹⁶ App. I, no.57.

⁶⁹⁷ Châteauneuf, already discussed in Chapter 2, above, as well as La Flèche and Baugé.

⁶⁹⁸ Cf. Port, *Dictionnaire* I, p.718, for the assertion that the castellany of Clefs had probably been detached from Angevin comital demesne at Baugé.

⁶⁹⁹ CSA II, nos. 746, 749. Gerald also witnessed nos. 747, 752 and 753 for John and Helias; in the latter, he is named as one of the count's men (*de hominibus comitis*). Although the document is dated several months after Helias' death, it seems that Helias is the count in question, whilst illustrating Gerald's move from Helias' to Fulk's service.

⁷⁰⁰ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.122, citing Luchaire, 'Hugues de Clers', who in fact claims nothing of the sort.

eleventh century, holding Boumois (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Saumur-Nord, comm. Saint-Martin-de-la-Place) from the counts and dispensing castle-guard at Saumur.⁷⁰¹ In the 1060s, Joscelin I was described as the *oppidanus* of Saumur castle, which was a demesne possession.⁷⁰² In the twelfth century, the three brothers and their father Maurice were all knights who frequently appeared in Fulk V's entourage.⁷⁰³ By contrast with the Clefs brothers, the Roonards do not appear to have held defined administrative offices.⁷⁰⁴ Despite this, their frequent attestations and the narrative character of the *acta* reveal their place at the core of Geoffrey's administration.

Absalon, the middle brother, is the third most frequent Angevin witness to Geoffrey's charters after Geoffrey of Clefs and Pagan of Clairvaux, witnessing eighteen or nineteen extant acts.⁷⁰⁵ Like these contemporaries, he was one of Geoffrey's knights, and can be found on campaign (*in exercitu*) with the count and was present at the fall of Rouen in 1144.⁷⁰⁶ His family had also risen in service to the counts, controlling only modest lands and exercising custody of key fortifications on both sides of the crossing of the Loire at Saumur. Absalon also held land outside of Anjou, at Lavardin (Loir-et-Cher, arr. Vendôme, cant. Montoire-sur-le Loir).⁷⁰⁷

The life and career of Absalon's elder brother Joscelin illustrates how the brothers' fortunes were intimately linked with their position at the comital court. Although he was a vassal of the lord of Doué, Joscelin appears to have been brought up in Fulk IV's household alongside Fulk V, perhaps sharing his *nutricius* Adam.⁷⁰⁸ Along with other children of minor lords brought up at court, he remained a part of the household under Fulk V, by contrast with at least one higher-ranking *nutritus*, Robert of Sablé, who had been brought up with Geoffrey and went on to be one of the chief

⁷⁰¹ Christian Cussonneau, 'Une famille de chevalerie saumuroise: les Roinard de Boumois', *Archives d'Anjou* 7 (2003), pp.5-23. The family's links with the important town of Saumur were long-standing: in 1102, for example, Maurice Roonard (*Rotunnardus*) renounced his revenues from the church of Neuville in a ceremony in Saumur; he also witnessed an important charter in the late-eleventh or early-twelfth century whereby Fulk IV renounced customs to the abbey of Saint-Florent of Saumur (Guillot, *Le comte*, nos. C422 and C431).

⁷⁰² Ibid., p.9, citing ADML H3712, f.109v, no.204.

⁷⁰³ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, 99; Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', 9.

⁷⁰⁴ And cf. Vincent, 'The Court of Henry II', pp.297-8.

⁷⁰⁵ App. I, nos.4-6, 19, 37-9, 45, probably 46 though with no cognomen, 77, 90, 92, 101, 103, 112; App. III, no.7; App. IV, nos. 2, 4.

⁷⁰⁶ App. I, nos. 4, 40, 104; App. IV, no.13.

⁷⁰⁷ Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', p.10, citing *Cartulaire de Marmoutier pour le Vendomois*, ed. M. de Trémault (Paris and Vendôme, 1893), no.308, which refers styles him *Absalonis Rotonardi de Salmuro*.

⁷⁰⁸ Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', p.19, citing CSA I, no. 111 (catalogued in Guillot, *Le comte*, II, nos. C425 and C434), a charter of 1104.

troublemakers of the reign.⁷⁰⁹ Joscelin witnessed far fewer of Geoffrey's charters than Absalon, only four in total between 1133 and 1144, but this record belies his importance.⁷¹⁰ In a charter of 1138, issued by Geoffrey at Le Mans and sent to Saumur in order that Geoffrey junior add his consent, the count's son is described as being brought up (*nutriebatur*) by Joscelin in the castle at Saumur.⁷¹¹ This charter provides valuable evidence that Joscelin was one of the select handful of men employed by Geoffrey to assist in the upbringing of his children, and that such a duty was linked to his importance at a key location like Saumur. Absalon and Joscelin's brother Peter also witnessed the same charter whilst with Geoffrey at Le Mans, suggesting that he took an active part in Geoffrey's campaigns in Normandy. Peter witnessed a further two charters which Geoffrey issued for the Tourangeau abbey of Cormery, perhaps on the same occasion and both in the company of Absalon.⁷¹²

The Roonards of the early- to mid-twelfth century rose to important offices, such as the archdeaconry of Le Mans cathedral in the case of Absalon's son Maurice, and the family presided over a considerable enlargement of the lordship of Boumois in the thirteenth century.⁷¹³ It is striking, however, that members of the family fall almost entirely out of the comital *acta* after Geoffrey's death.⁷¹⁴ A Joscelin Roonard, the son of either the Joscelin or Peter who served Geoffrey,⁷¹⁵ witnessed two of Henry's charters, both issued in the Saumurois in 1162 and c.1169.⁷¹⁶ These attestations speak of local, transactional importance rather than a place in Henry's Angevin household; indeed, in the latter charter he is listed amongst a group of Angevins, including Hugh of Clefs, separate from the king's great barons (*de curia regis*). No other member of the family,

⁷⁰⁹ E.g. Chartrou, cat. nos. 8 (*p.j.* no. 3, Saumur, 1110), where he witnesses *ex parte comitis* with Joscelin of Champchevrier, who also appeared with the young Fulk in the charter of 1104 cited above; 20 (*p.j.* no.5, April 1115 or earlier); 71 (*p.j.* no.27, 1116×25); 78 (*p.j.* no.32, 1115×26). Cf. *CSL* no.8, Fulk V's charter of c.1110 in favour of Saint-Laud, where Joscelin and Peter Roonard are in the company of their father Maurice, Hardouin of Cinq-Mars and Joscelin of Champchevrier, all *milites comitis*.

⁷¹⁰ App. I, nos. 42, 89, 93; App. II, no.1; he also participated alongside Geoffrey in the distribution of Reginald of Saumoussay's alms, App. VI, nos. 4 (with Absalon), 9.

⁷¹¹ App. I, no.93.

⁷¹² App. I, nos. 37, 38.

⁷¹³ Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', pp.19-23. John Roonard, perhaps a fourth brother, was also a canon of Saint-Laud: Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', p.19, and *CSL* no.15 (28th September 1112).

⁷¹⁴ Cf. Pavard, 'Le personnel d'origine angevine', pp.50-1, where it is claimed that the Roonards remained influential under Henry, and p.89, which pinpoints – contrary to the evidence cited here – their fall from favour to 1165-70.

⁷¹⁵ Cussonneau, 'Les Roinard', p.20, details this Joscelin (IV)'s biography, though the reference to Etienne Pavard's prosopography shows that Pavard confused the appearance of Joscelin III in the 1138 Saumur charter discussed above with that of his son/nephew Joscelin IV.

⁷¹⁶ *Pl. Acta*, nos. 1622 (dated to the period June 1160×73, probably 1169), in favour of Fontevraud, and 2353 (1162), in favour of Saint-Florent.

as far as the *acta* show, was in regular or even sporadic attendance upon the king.

The apparently swift decline in Roonard attestations after Geoffrey's death underscores the importance of such a family in the system of essentially local administration exercised by Geoffrey, and the changes which occurred with the inception of Henry II's cross-Channel reign. This stands in contrast to some of the changes brought about by the transfer of the county from Fulk V to Geoffrey. All four of the families discussed here were prominent at court prior to 1129. Pagan of Clairvaux and his elder brother Geoffrey, Fulk's dapifer c.1110, both witness several of Fulk's charters from at least 1116, and perhaps much earlier.⁷¹⁷ The Clefs brothers forged their ascent under the counts of Maine prior to 1110 and, although slightly less prominent under Fulk V, enjoyed a remarkable continuity of fortune well into Henry II's reign. Pippin and Joscelin of Tours, perhaps, and the Roonard brothers, certainly, followed in their fathers' footsteps as comital administrators and knights.

These, then, were the key families of Geoffrey's administration, characterised by their relatively modest holdings, dependence upon the count, and operation as family units within the household, at court and in the count's service more widely. Some of them retained their importance within Anjou after Geoffrey's death, but the case of the Roonards demonstrates the extent to which their fortunes were tied to comital and then royal favour and patronage. The fortunes of these families parallel (and indeed in the case of the Tours kin-group, encompass) the practice of the transfer or reappointment of prévôtés within families which Boussard observed in the region since at least the late eleventh century. These trends are further echoed in Geoffrey's domestic arrangements.

Domestic officers

In addition to successive dapifers, Geoffrey had in his service at least four chamberlains, two butlers and two keepers of the wardrobe, all laymen. Two of the chamberlains, Fulk and Gorron, frequently witnessed charters for Geoffrey in Angers itself, sometimes in the count's palace or chamber (*thalamus*).⁷¹⁸ Their colleague Simon of Châtillon also attended Geoffrey in and around Angers, and travelled with the count

⁷¹⁷ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 27 (*p.j.* no.10, Geoffrey and Pagan, 1116 or earlier), 33 (*p.j.* no.12, Pagan, 15th September 1116), 36 (*p.j.* no.14, Geoffrey, 1109×17), 78 (*p.j.* no.32, Pagan, 1115×26), 81 (*p.j.* no.34, Pagan, 1118×26).

⁷¹⁸ The pair witnessed six charters together, all but the first in Angers (App. I, nos. 5, at Baugé, 6, 18, 26, 27, 28); Gorron witnessed Geoffrey's consent to the marriage of Fulk the chamberlain to Loysim, daughter of Fulk V's chamberlain Bigot (App. I, no.51). Fulk the chamberlain witnessed a further charter for Geoffrey in Le Mans in 1138 (App. I, no.93, alongside Simon).

to Le Mans.⁷¹⁹ He also had a property of his own at Saumur, which was used on at least one occasion as the venue for the issue of a comital act.⁷²⁰ Geoffrey fitz Durand witnessed charters for Geoffrey as chamberlain at Baugé, Angers, Le Mans and Vendôme.⁷²¹ As discussed below, he may have been related to Geoffrey's butlers and wardrobe staff, yet another case of a kin-group of relatively modest means occupying a prominent role within the household.

The Angevin chamberlain's origins have been traced back to 1056-60, when the officers begin to appear in pairs in Geoffrey II's charters.⁷²² Guillot attributes a primarily financial function to them, and explains their appearances in pairs as protection against incorrect accounting. The twelfth-century *acta* indeed indicate that the chamber (*thalamus*, *camera*) was a venue for the issue of charters, a place of business and administration.⁷²³

The backgrounds of Geoffrey's chamberlains are obscure, though a close-knit network of current and former chamberlains and their families is hinted at in the sources. The marriage of Fulk the chamberlain to Loysim, daughter of Fulk V's chamberlain Bigot, stands out in particular.⁷²⁴ Former chamberlains continue to appear as witnesses to comital charters after their service had ceased; Reginald Rufus, who was in Fulk V's service, attested an important confirmation of Saint-Laud's privileges issued by Geoffrey in his chamber itself.⁷²⁵ Family and kin ties amongst the chamberlains may have also had consequences for generational service. Geoffrey fitz Durand was probably the son of Fulk V's chamberlain Durand, who himself may have been Count Helias' chamberlain at the turn of the twelfth century, or the Durand Burrell who witnessed a charter for Geoffrey V in the 1140s; indeed, these two individuals may

⁷¹⁹ App. I, nos. 5, 6, 26, 51. He appears with Geoffrey in Le Mans in App. I, no.93 and probably also in no.60.

⁷²⁰ App. I, no.77, a charter in favour of Saint-Hilaire of Poitiers, was issued in Simon's house. He also witnessed App. VI, no.5, the foundation in 1133 of Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay's priory of Asnières, near Saumur.

⁷²¹ App. I, nos. 5, 6, 57, 112.

⁷²² Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.424-5.

⁷²³ App. I, nos. 9 and 27 were both issued at Geoffrey's *thalamus* in Angers; no.65 at his *camera* in Le Mans. For the definition of *thalamus* as chamber rather than palace in a more general sense, Du Cange, *Glossarium*, VIII, col. 93c, under *thalamus* (1). Latham, *Revised Word-List*, p.483, notes the use of the term to denote 'treasury' in England by the 1190s. Cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium*, col. 93b, *thalamum* (1), <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/THALAMUS%201> [accessed 14/06/09] a term used in Geoffrey's charter for the men of Angers (App. I, no.30) in place of *chalanium* or *chalannum*, a boat used for the carriage of wine on the Loire.

⁷²⁴ App. I, no.51.

⁷²⁵ *Ibid.*, no.27.

themselves have been related.⁷²⁶

The case of Durand Burrell demonstrates the prominence which the chamberlainship could afford families. The necrology of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour, the count's chapel in Le Mans, remembers Durand as Geoffrey's butler (*pincerna*), confirming a promotion from chamberlain under Fulk V not attested to elsewhere,⁷²⁷ while the Le Mans cathedral necrology confirms that his service in this capacity continued under Henry II.⁷²⁸ His service as royal butler continued until at least 1174, and it has been argued that Durand was the same individual as Durand of Outillé, Henry's chamberlain until 1185 and perhaps beyond.⁷²⁹ Durand had ties to Le Mans, very near Outillé, founding a chapel within Saint-Pierre and granted vessels for dispensing chrism and holy oil to the cathedral.⁷³⁰

His generosity towards the canons of Saint-Pierre no doubt influenced or reflected the election of his son William as dean, a trajectory which eventually led to William's investiture as the bishop of Avranches.⁷³¹ Another William Burrell, perhaps Bishop William's nephew, was the cathedral's treasurer.⁷³² Durand's relationship to Geoffrey and Henry, and his patronage of the counts' key religious institutions in Le Mans, suggests that we must rethink how far his Angevin curial connections influenced his son's election to the see of Avranches.⁷³³ The evidence set out below, moreover, suggests that Bishop William may have been a part of Henry's wider kin-group, by virtue of Geoffrey's illegitimate children. Durand's career thus demonstrates the possibilities for movement and promotion within the itinerant household and over long periods of time.

Geoffrey's *acta* also suggest that the count employed several butlers in the localities, and that they had important antecedents. Boterius, who had been in Geoffrey's service since at least 1135, witnessed a charter with several other household

⁷²⁶ Under Fulk, he witnessed Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.74 (*p.j.* no.29, 1115×26), and p.130. For Helias' chamberlain Durand, see Latouche, *Le comté du Maine*, p.72, citing *Saint-Vincent*, no.20. For Geoffrey's chamberlain Durand Burrell, see App. I, no.35. Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.131, mistakenly identifies Geoffrey (fitz) Durand in the 1146 charter he witnessed for Geoffrey in Le Mans (App. I, no.57) as two separate individuals.

⁷²⁷ *St-Pierre*, p.cxliv.

⁷²⁸ Delisle, *Recueil* (introduction), p.363.

⁷²⁹ Durand *pincerna* witnessed one extant charter of Henry prior to 1154 (*RRAN* no.323, 1151×2, for La Fontaine Saint-Martin) and a further five after 1154 (*Pl. Acta* nos. 1055, 1096, 1729, 1730, 1739).

⁷³⁰ *St-Pierre*, p.cx; Delisle, *Recueil* (introduction), p.363.

⁷³¹ *St-Pierre*, pp.cxliv, cxlvi (where Durand is remembered in the necrology as William's father). For William's career, Spear, *Personnel*, p.6.

⁷³² Spear, *Personnel*, p.12.

⁷³³ Cf. Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.155.

officials in 1146 where he is specifically named as the count's butler in Le Mans (*pincerna meo Cenomannis fealiter*), and another in which he is styled butler.⁷³⁴ He can be traced in Fulk and Aremburga's *acta* in the 1110s and 1120s, where in one instance he is specifically named as Boterius of Le Mans (*de Cenomagnis*).⁷³⁵ Investigation of the Manceau evidence indicates that Geoffrey's butler Boterius had important Manceau origins, for his father Engelbald appears to have risen under the counts of Maine prior to 1110; the evidence also indicates that he was part of a group of Manceau who were subsumed into the Angevin court. An Engelbald *Butarii* or *Botarius* appears in several Manceau acts of the late-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries, on one occasion adding his *signum* to a grant by Count Helias to the monks of Saint-Vincent of Le Mans.⁷³⁶ On one of these occasions, at a sitting of Helias' court, Engelbald was accompanied by his son Boterius, and the pair are grouped together in the witness-list with Guy fitz Hugh.⁷³⁷ This is significant as three of Geoffrey's *acta* contain Boterius and Guy together in the witness-lists; as well as permitting the identification of Boterius the butler in three untitled appearances, these texts also show that the pair attended the count in areas other than Le Mans.⁷³⁸ One of these, in favour of the canons of Geoffrey's chapel of Saint Laud in Angers, is particularly significant, for it was witnessed solely by Manceaux, all of whom are named as his knights (*militibus meis*).⁷³⁹

A third set of domestic officials appear in Geoffrey's *acta*, and the Manceau context is again significant. Two *gardaerobae*, William of Outillé and Gilbert, were active in the second half of the 1140s. As the term *gardaroba* suggests, these men must have had responsibilities for the count's wardrobe, and their association with chamberlains and butlers indicates that they performed both domestic honorary functions and financial duties, perhaps dispensing money from a chamber/wardrobe organisation. Gilbert witnessed two charters for Geoffrey at Le Mans in 1146 and 1148/9, and a third at Vendôme in 1147, whilst William was present at an assembly of

⁷³⁴ App. I, nos. 57 (1146), issued in Le Mans, and 63 (1129×35), a charter for the monks of Saint-Victeur of Le Mans, most probably issued in the town.

⁷³⁵ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, nos. 23 (*p.j.* 7, a charter issued by Aremburga in favour of Fontevraud, prior to 1116, which refers to him as *de Cenomagnis*) and 73 (*p.j.* 28, issued by Fulk for La Boissière, at Le Mans, 1113×26; also witnessed by Boterius' son Boterius).

⁷³⁶ *St-Vincent*, nos. 16, 89, 73; *St-Pierre*, no.10.

⁷³⁷ *St-Vincent*, no.89.

⁷³⁸ App. I, nos. 25 (at Saint-Laud, in Angers), 61 (in Le Mans), 65 (in the count's chamber in Le Mans).

⁷³⁹ *Ibid.*, no.25, witnessed by Garsilius of Bignon, identified as Le Bignon-du-Maine, Mayenne, arr. Laval, cant. Meslay-du-Maine, in Léon Maître, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Mayenne, comprenant les noms de lieu anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1878), p.29. It was also witnessed by Geoffrey of Clefs, Guy fitz Hugh, and Boterius and his father Engelbald.

the comital court at Saint-Laud on 9th September 1149.⁷⁴⁰ Gilbert went on to be Henry's *gardaroba*, witnessing charters in Anjou and Normandy until c.1175, always in the company of William.⁷⁴¹ William of Outillé was frequently in the king's company, witnessing forty charters during the reign, mostly in the 1170s and 1180s, though he is never named as *gardaroba*.⁷⁴²

One of the charters witnessed by William supports the argument that Geoffrey and Henry's chamberlain and butler Durand Burrell was a member of the Outillé family, perhaps William's brother.⁷⁴³ The toponymic is significant, as it has been argued that Geoffrey fathered his illegitimate daughter Marie, abbess of Shaftesbury, with the wife of the lord of Outillé (Saint-Mars-d'Outillé, Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Écommoy), near Le Mans.⁷⁴⁴ Evidence for Marie's brother Guy of Outillé coincides with the presence of William and Durand in Henry's household, both in England and France. Bullock-Davies shows that William frequently attested charters not only with Durand, but also with Henry's master chamberlains Ralph Fitz Stephen and his brother Eustace, and that he himself may have been a royal chamberlain.⁷⁴⁵ By virtue of their appearances together, she also suggests that Geoffrey's other *gardaroba*, Gilbert, was Durand and William's brother, though the evidence is slight.

The argument that William, Durand and perhaps even Gilbert – three of Geoffrey and Henry's core household officers – were Marie's half-brothers, and therefore Angevin kin, cannot be absolutely proven but is nevertheless a feasible possibility. If this is the case, it is further proof of inter-generational service in the comital then royal households, which expanded from service within Anjou to cross-Channel livings.⁷⁴⁶ Whatever the case, the evidence of Fulk V and Geoffrey V's reigns shows that their service after 1150 may have had roots at the beginning of the century, perhaps even to the annexation of Maine in 1110. Much here rests on Durand Burrell,

⁷⁴⁰ App. I, nos. 57, 61, 112, 28 (William).

⁷⁴¹ *Pl. Acta* nos. 55, 1042, 1055, 1096, 2667, all issued between 1156 and 1175.

⁷⁴² *Ibid.*, nos. 47-50, 55, 556, 643, 681, 936, 1042, 1047, 1048, 1055, 1060, 1062, 1063, 1096, 1204, 1222, 1356, 1357, 1460, 1461, 1496, 1670, 1732, 1735, 1737, 1742, 1877, 1920, 1924, 2025, 2221, 2429, 2436, 2667, 2691, 2728, 2743.

⁷⁴³ *Ibid.* no.1732, issued by Henry at Le Mans, perhaps in 1183, and witnessed by William of Outillé and Durand of Outillé, chamberlain(s).

⁷⁴⁴ Constance-Bullock Davies, 'Marie, Abbess of Shaftesbury, and her Brothers', *EHR* 80 (1965), pp.314-22.

⁷⁴⁵ *Ibid.* pp.317-8. The charter Bullock-Davies refers to is no.1732; Vincent *et al* expand *camer*' in the singular, therefore referring to Durand only, whereas Bullock-Davies follows Round in opting for the plural, whereby it applies to both Durand and William.

⁷⁴⁶ It is of course also possible that Durand, William and Gilbert were not three brothers, but related in some other way.

but the possibility of a large kin-group which began to rise under Fulk V and reached its apogee as servants and bishops under Henry II, aided in large part by the way Geoffrey assembled his household, cannot be ignored.

Much remains unknown with regard to this group of men; Geoffrey perhaps had other butlers at key locations such as Tours, for example, where unfortunately the evidence does not survive; there is also no evidence that the butlers of Geoffrey's reign were unfree men (*servientes*) like their eleventh-century predecessors.⁷⁴⁷ In spite of these lacunae, however, it is significant that the domestic officials identifiable in the *acta* nearly all appear to have had definite Manceau origins, and all were part of networks of family members and associates who entered Geoffrey's circle by a Manceau route. This strengthens the hypothesis outlined above that Geoffrey actively sought to utilise men of middling status from areas beyond the traditional Angevin sphere – particularly south-eastern Maine, but also the marchland with Poitou, as well as Tours – in the process perhaps mitigating the power built up by higher-ranking lords in Anjou and western Maine.

⁷⁴⁷ Halphen, *Le comté*, p.101, cites evidence for Fulk III's butler Dodo, a serf.

Chapter 4

Geoffrey and the Church in Greater Anjou

Certain aspects of Geoffrey's attitudes and actions towards Norman bishops and monasteries are well known: as Chapter 6 shows, his reputation there has been shaped by the views of contemporaries who were often at the sharp end of his campaigns or later attempts to assert his ducal prerogatives. The same cannot be said of Greater Anjou and what follows will examine, first, his relations with the local episcopate, and, second, his interactions with the abbeys, priories and collegiate churches of the region.⁷⁴⁸

The Greater Angevin episcopate

Comital relations with both the archbishop of Tours and the suffragan bishops of Angers and Le Mans have received some attention recently, but the period between 1109 and 1140 has largely escaped analysis.⁷⁴⁹ Examination of the evidence from Geoffrey's reign indicates that both the complexity and extent of the count's involvement in key moments such as the election of a new prelate have been seriously underestimated, but conversely that Geoffrey's reign also marked an important moment of transition in the count's ability to interfere in episcopal affairs. What emerges from re-analysis of the evidence is that Geoffrey did not exercise uniform authority at any level across the three dioceses of Greater Anjou. Both the neglect of comital-episcopal relations during this period and, where they have been studied, the underestimation of their complexity is thrown into sharp relief by comparison with Geoffrey's voracious pursuit of certain ducal prerogatives over Norman bishops, reviewed in Chapter 6.

The histories in the eleventh and twelfth centuries of all three Greater Angevin sees are naturally intertwined with the process of Gregorian Reform. The increasing importance and autonomy of cathedral chapters in the election of their prelates is the most obvious sign of this. This is not to say, however, that attempts by the counts to stamp their authority upon episcopal elections were simply responses to reform. Moreover, although they are a focal point of the extant evidence, elections were not the only interface between count, prelate and chapter. Geoffrey, like his predecessors and successors, had numerous points of contact with the prelates of the region, not all of

⁷⁴⁸ I.e. everything except bishops, cathedrals and cathedral chapters; although some of these institutions housed secular canons, they will be collectively termed 'monastic institutions' for convenience.

⁷⁴⁹ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, passim.

which were positive. The present focus is on episcopal elections and relations; analysis of Geoffrey's relations with the region's cathedral chapters is not possible. In the case of Angers, Geoffrey's relations with Bishop Ulger are examined in detail; no new evidence pertaining to Bishop Norman of Doué (1149-53) has been found.

Angers

The count's influence over elections at Angers had diminished during the course of the eleventh century: he had been the loudest voice in the election of Eusebius Brunon (1047-81) and Geoffrey of Tours (1081-93), but the cathedral chapter had elected Geoffrey of Mayenne (1093-1101), and in the early twelfth century, Bishop Reginald of Martigné (1102-25) was elected by a large group of local nobles, under the influence of Bishop Marbod of Rennes, former schoolmaster of Angers cathedral.⁷⁵⁰ Despite the unusual circumstances of Reginald's election, the chapter gained strength during the following decades and it was the canons who exercised the sole right to elect Bishop Ulger (1125-48) and his successor Bishop Norman, both of whom were prominent members of the chapter.⁷⁵¹

At Angers, an enlargement of temporalities matched the cathedral's accumulation of electoral autonomy. Bishop and chapter controlled extensive lands to the north of Angers – around Morannes (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Durtal), Selonnes and Cherré (arr. Segré, cant. Châteauneuf-sur-Sarthe) – as well as the Mauges region which bordered Nantes and Saint-Maurille d'Esme, the bishop's *bourg* on the left bank of the Loire.⁷⁵² The cathedral's thirty canons were skilled in administration, and took custody of the bishop's possessions if he was absent, as Bishop Ulger was on several occasions.⁷⁵³

The strength of the chapter and its unity with the bishop meant that by Geoffrey's reign election by the chapter was accepted practice, and that the chapter itself was a rich pool of potential bishops. Geoffrey II's remarkable implantation in the mid-eleventh century of several members of the Langeais-Montreuil Bellay family – of which his wife was a member – in prominent ecclesiastical positions at Angers and

⁷⁵⁰ Guillot, *Le comte* I, pp.252-62; Bienvenu, 'Renouveau de l'église angevine', pp.26-8.

⁷⁵¹ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.195; see also Avril, *Le gouvernement des évêques* I, p.101.

⁷⁵² Avril, *Le gouvernement des évêques* I, pp.3-48.

⁷⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp.105-7.

Tours was not to be repeated by his successors.⁷⁵⁴ Fulk IV may have attempted to buy the canons' loyalty during the vacancy between the episcopacies of Geoffrey of Tours and Geoffrey of Mayenne, but it seems that his efforts made little impact, and the chapter elected their own choice of bishop.⁷⁵⁵ Local noble families still dominated the chapter, but it was the canons not the count or local baronage who had the deciding vote in the election of bishops.

This is the current consensus espoused by Guillot and Peltzer. A shred of evidence from the thirteenth century, however, brings into question the argument that the count had no influence over the election of the bishop by the end of the eleventh century, and suggested that electoral rights continued to be contested. According to the *Chronicon Turonense magnum*, in 1098 King Philip granted Fulk IV the right to elect the bishop of Angers in return for illegally marrying Fulk's own wife Bertrada (*comes vero pro recompensatione uxoris suae habuit electionem episcopi Andegavorum*).⁷⁵⁶ Philip's promise may have been known to Henry II when, following the death of Norman of Doué in 1153, he sent envoys to the pope to argue that he had the right to choose from three candidates selected by the chapter.⁷⁵⁷ There is no evidence, however, that Geoffrey V sought to influence Norman's election, after the sole vacancy of his reign. What is obvious instead is that, along with other lay and ecclesiastical lords of the region, he struggled to maintain the upper hand over Bishop Ulger (1125-48), whose episcopacy was marked by a determined campaign to increase and defend the cathedral's temporalities and jurisdiction.

At the time of Fulk V's departure, Ulger had been bishop for five years, having been elected by the canons alone after rising through the chapter to the position of schoolmaster.⁷⁵⁸ Dealings between Geoffrey and Ulger do not surface in the sources until 1131, when evidence of serious tensions suddenly erupts in the cathedral's cartulary. The trigger was Geoffrey's new castle, Châteauneuf-sur-Sarthe, which had been constructed in response to the hostility of the lord of Sablé at the beginning of the

⁷⁵⁴ Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.252-5.

⁷⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.256-9.

⁷⁵⁶ 'Chronicon Turonense magnum', p.129; Alphonse Dieudonné, *Hildebert de Lavardin, Évêque du Mans, Archevêque de Tours (1056-1133): Sa vie, ses lettres* (Paris and Mamers, 1898), p.91. Bienvenu, 'Renouveau de l'Eglise Angevine', p.29, argues that Reginald of Martigné, elected in 1101, 'was probably supported by the count' but – as Guillot, *Le comte I*, p.261, n.292, notes – he cites no evidence. Bienvenu also points out that Reginald was invested by Fulk IV.

⁷⁵⁷ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.197. Henry was ultimately unsuccessful, in procedural terms, but the chapter's choice of William, abbot of Saint-Florent, as bishop in 1156 was perhaps a concession to political pressure exerted by the king (*ibid.*, pp.199-200).

⁷⁵⁸ Avril, *Le gouvernement des évêques I*, pp.101-2.

reign.⁷⁵⁹ The castle encroached upon the bishop's and chapter's estates at Selonnes (*in Solumnensi parochia, partim in terra, partim juxta terram sancti Mauricii Andegavensis*),⁷⁶⁰ and Ulger immediately sought recompense. Before mid-autumn, he had procured a papal bull taking the cathedral's possessions under Pope Innocent II's protection.⁷⁶¹ In the same year, Geoffrey granted the canonical church of Saints-Jean-et-Lézin in Angers to the bishop and chapter to make amends 'for the injuries and abuses' his actions had caused.⁷⁶² This was a clever move, intended to appease the bishop by restitution of a church under lay proprietorship, but that of the rebellious Theobald of Blazon not Geoffrey himself; indeed, there is no evidence that Geoffrey patronised Saint-Lézin, despite his ancestors' connections with it. In one fell swoop, Geoffrey confiscated Theobald's dynastic church and assisted Ulger in his restitution of churches to episcopal authority without alienating any of his own demesne or privileges.⁷⁶³ In return, Ulger gave Geoffrey 10,000s. and received a confirmation of the transaction from Innocent II whilst at Reims.

The matter, however, did not end there. Châteauneuf proved to be a drain upon the economy of the lower Sarthe valley: Geoffrey drew tolls from a new bridge he had built over the river, and a market sprang up in the castle; both diverted revenues from Ulger's principal estate at Morannes, reducing its annual renders, Ulger claimed, to only £10.⁷⁶⁴ Geoffrey dug in his heels, seizing other cathedral revenues at Seiches and Chalonnnes for himself.⁷⁶⁵ He refused to come to a compromise with the bishop, despite repeated requests to do so, and eventually Ulger 'resolved to place an interdict upon his lands'.⁷⁶⁶

The threat of interdict was not enough to bring Geoffrey to terms, and Ulger duly anathematised the count and his lands, forcing the situation to be brought to the attention of the papal legate Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, probably in 1134 or very

⁷⁵⁹ *St-Aubin*, p.33; JM, p.208.

⁷⁶⁰ App. III, no.4.

⁷⁶¹ *RPR* I, no.7494 (5375), printed in *CN*, no.225, dated 29th October 1131.

⁷⁶² App. III, nos. 1 and 2.

⁷⁶³ Henk B. Teunis, *The Appeal to the Original Status: Social Justice in Anjou in the Eleventh Century* (Hilversum, 2006), p.129. As discussed below, until the end of Fulk III's reign (987-1040), the counts of Anjou were lay abbots of Saint-Lézin, but even in the eleventh century, the majority of the college's prebends were in the hands of the Blazon family: François Comte, 'Le quartier de la collégiale de Saint-Lézin d'Angers', in *Les chanoines dans la ville: recherches sur la topographie des quartiers canoniaux en France*, ed. Jean-Charles Picard (Paris, 1994), pp.109-14, at 109.

⁷⁶⁴ App. III, no.4; Port, *Dictionnaire* II, p.737. Morannes is less than 10km upriver of Châteauneuf.

⁷⁶⁵ App. III, no.3.

⁷⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, no.4.

early in 1135.⁷⁶⁷ Along with the newly ordained archbishop of Tours, Hugh, and King Henry I, the legate fostered an agreement between Ulger and Geoffrey.⁷⁶⁸ In recompense for the damage done through his castle building, Geoffrey was to transfer to Ulger all of the possessions and rights of the monks of Beaulieu in Selonnes and nearby Cherré. If he could not convince the monks to agree, he was instead to hand over 3,000s. plus whatever amount the bishop had lost in revenues in the interim, to be judged by four local men. Henry acted as Geoffrey's guarantor, promising – astonishingly – to pay the sum in his son-in-law's stead if Geoffrey himself proved unable. Henry's role as mediator is not surprising,⁷⁶⁹ but his financial commitment suggests that Geoffrey's actions risked damaging not only Anjou, but also Henry himself, not to mention Matilda and the couple's two young children. Geoffrey's famous arrogance perhaps gave rise to his obstinacy and it was only Henry who could resolve the situation; the king's involvement is perhaps testament to Ulger's own power and reputation.

Satisfied with the results of this meeting, Ulger lifted the interdict. The cathedral's cartulary, however, indicates that multiple transactions behind the scenes had been necessary for a resolution. Revenues from the movement of wine over the River Mayenne as well as market profits in Angers were ceded to the bishop;⁷⁷⁰ further east, Geoffrey granted Ulger demesne lordship over the *curtis* of Ramefort (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Longué-Jumelles, comm. Blou).⁷⁷¹ The latter grant is particularly interesting. It was ostensibly made as reparation for Geoffrey's appropriation of revenues in Ulger's vill of Morannes,⁷⁷² but another charter indicates that he also had a market of his own at nearby Longué which attracted custom at the expense of Ramefort, paralleling the earlier Châteauneuf/Morannes situation.⁷⁷³ In this

⁷⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁸ Ibid. Archbishop Hugh's predecessor, Hildebert, died in 1133, though there is uncertainty over the precise date. Geoffrey of Lèves, bishop of Chartres, left northern France for the Council of Pisa, which had been called by Innocent II in March 1135 and was held during May. Henry left England for Normandy in early August 1133, and was joined in Rouen by Matilda during her pregnancy in spring 1134. This could have been the occasion on which Henry learnt of Geoffrey's dispute with Ulger. Recent work on Geoffrey of Chartres (Lindy Grant, 'Geoffrey of Lèves, Bishop of Chartres: "famous wheeler and dealer in secular business"', *Suger en question: Regards croisés sur Saint-Denis*, ed. R. Grosse (Munich, 2004), pp.45-56) does not take into account his contact with Henry I over this matter, and does not allow us to fix its date any more precisely; see App. III, no.2, for further dating notes.

⁷⁶⁹ Hollister, *Henry I*, pp.450-1.

⁷⁷⁰ App. III, no.5.

⁷⁷¹ Ibid., nos. 4, 8, and 9.

⁷⁷² According to *ibid.*, no.8.

⁷⁷³ Ibid., no.5. The charter identifies the location of Geoffrey's market as *Longum Vadum*; Port, *Dictionnaire II*, pp.538, shows that this is the modern Longué-Jumelles (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur).

case, however, Geoffrey undertook to close down (*destruo*) the market. Geoffrey's castle building was perhaps again a factor; he constructed at least two castles on the right bank of the Loire, at Saint-Martin-de-la-Place and Blou.⁷⁷⁴

Both parties manipulated the struggle over local rights. Ulger extracted proprietary rights to the canonical college of Saint-Mainboeuf, Angers, and the church within Baugé castle – part of the comital demesne – from Geoffrey; he also received a prebend at Saint-Laud, arguably the religious institution closest to Geoffrey's heart and his administration.⁷⁷⁵ Geoffrey, as we have seen, received several large sums of money from Ulger, which he may have diverted to building projects such as Châteauneuf itself or the campaigns in Normandy.⁷⁷⁶

Châteauneuf's impact upon the bishop and chapter's collective resources was at the centre of this long-running dispute, but there is strong evidence of other tensions between Geoffrey and Ulger. On one occasion, they engaged in a bitter dispute over the right to prosecute several thieves detained on the bishop's bridge at Chalonnes, which witnessed Geoffrey seizing the men after Ulger had imprisoned them, in order to punish them himself.⁷⁷⁷ The case of Galvan of Chemillé, discussed in Chapter 3, has already shown that Ulger was determined to assert his own rights as an Angevin suzerain, which may have run contrary to Geoffrey's will.

Ulger possessed further temporal and spiritual rights, properties and privileges elsewhere which may have curtailed Geoffrey's ability to deal with local problems. In 1145, Adelard of Château-Gontier granted the chapel he had built in his castle to Ulger and his successors, to possess 'not just as bishops, but also as lords, abbots and deans'; local burgesses were also to transfer their service and renders to the bishop.⁷⁷⁸ Ulger had previously been granted a house at the castle,⁷⁷⁹ and his interests there even prior to 1145

⁷⁷⁴ JM, pp.215-6.

⁷⁷⁵ App. III, nos. 5 and 7.

⁷⁷⁶ Cf. Bruno Lemesle, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions', p.212, n.55, suggests that Geoffrey began the construction of Châteauneuf with the initial sum granted by Ulger in App. III, no.1, but it is evident from the text that some form of fortification had already been constructed. Teunis, *Original Status*, p.129, argues that money and temporalities, rather than the assertion of spiritual authority, was the primary concern of both parties.

⁷⁷⁷ App. III, no.10. Cf. CN, nos. 4 and 6, which attest to Chalonnes being at the centre of the bishop's estates, and no.216, a document issued by one Geoffrey Charpi c.1138×48, which confirms his grant to Ulger and the chapter of the bridge at Chalonnes, witnessed by Pippin of Tours (*Pipinus tunc prefectus*). Along with Pippin, Galvan of Chemillé – one of Geoffrey's key supporters but a vassal of the bishop – and Adam of Rochefort – whose son Abbo unsuccessfully claimed rights to the bridge in 1145 (CN no.202/App. III, no.10) – were called upon to advise Geoffrey of the validity of his claim to the bridge.

⁷⁷⁸ CN, no.206.

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid. no.188, dated 1125×48 by Urseau, which may be modified to 1125×45 on the evidence of no.206, which refers to the bishop's house.

were substantial enough for him to complain that Geoffrey's destruction of a tower at Château-Gontier affected episcopal interests.⁷⁸⁰ Similar interests, this time in the form of a church with six canons and an adjacent bourg under the cathedral's control, meant that Ulger could also object to Geoffrey's attack on the castle of Montrevault – at the centre of episcopal territory in the Mauges – on the same occasion.⁷⁸¹ Geoffrey's attempts to keep the lords of Château-Gontier and Montrevault in check were presented by Ulger as a personal injury (*querimoniam de injuria quam faciebat ille michi*), and used as ammunition during the 1130s in the Châteauneuf dispute.⁷⁸²

Although the struggle was at times fraught it was not fatal for relations between count and bishop and in fact may have paved the way for Geoffrey to persuade Ulger to represent Matilda in the papal curia in 1139, and possibly in 1136.⁷⁸³ Chartrou suggests that Ulger lifted the interdict and came to final terms with Geoffrey after his return from Pisa in late winter or spring 1136: a trip to the papal curia with a purpose – other than the representations on local ecclesiastical matters recorded in papal bulls – advantageous to Geoffrey (and Matilda) may have been a condition of Geoffrey's agreement to back down over his abuses of episcopal lands and privileges.⁷⁸⁴ Elsewhere, Ulger can be seen advising Geoffrey, in the resolution of a dispute with the priories of Cunault and Loudun in 1144.⁷⁸⁵

Nevertheless, these struggles served to further delineate the separate spheres that had already been sharply defined by the exclusion of the count from episcopal elections; this distance, moreover, was not merely procedural. Bishop Reginald (1101-25), for example, although elected by the chapter had close ties to the count and accompanied Fulk V on his pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1120.⁷⁸⁶ By contrast with his father, Geoffrey was a far less demonstrably pious ruler, notwithstanding his failed attempts at pilgrimage and crusade; he seems also to have been less of a mediator, and more prone to extremes of position. Similarly, Bishop Ulger's large personality has also been

⁷⁸⁰ App. III, no.7.

⁷⁸¹ Ibid. Cf. CN, nos. 63, 77 and 81 for the bishop and chapter's possessions at Montrevault. For the Mauges, Avril, *Le gouvernement des évêques* I, p.40.

⁷⁸² App. III, no.7.

⁷⁸³ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.68-9, 75-6, shows that Ulger argued against Arnulf of Lisieux's defence of Stephen's usurpation at the Second Lateran Council, and suggests that his trip to Pisa in early 1136 was not for the same purpose, and rather for local business; cf. his appeal to Innocent II at Pisa on 25th January 1136 on behalf of La Roë, RPR I, no.7755 (5535).

⁷⁸⁴ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.187.

⁷⁸⁵ App. I, no.42: 'Nos autem habito consilio cum venerabili Ulgerio Andegavensi episcopo'.

⁷⁸⁶ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.183.

stressed:⁷⁸⁷ a hard line was taken as much in the defence of his personal and corporate rights as in the defence of Geoffrey and Matilda's claim to the pope. Much of Geoffrey's time in Anjou prior to 1149 was spent dealing with the pugnacious bishop of Angers, and it is significant that he was not alone in this task. Ulger pursued his claim against Abbess Petronilla to some of Fontevraud's temporalities with equal zeal, and in 1142 was temporarily suspended by the pope as a result.⁷⁸⁸ Ulger's involvement in temporal affairs was not unusual, but the clash of his ambitions and character with Geoffrey's were a constant source of friction, and in this respect he is distinguished from his contemporaries.

Far less can be discerned of Norman of Doué (1149-53), invested on 5th March 1149, several months after Ulger's death on 17th October 1148.⁷⁸⁹ It is unclear whether Geoffrey played a part in this short vacancy, but the cathedral cartulary indicates that Norman had been archdeacon of Outre-Loire for the preceding twenty five years, and was therefore indubitably the chapter's choice.⁷⁹⁰ Norman was a scion of the Doué family, related by marriage to the lords of both Montreuil-Bellay and Montsoreau, and his ancestral castle had been besieged by Geoffrey as recently as 1147.⁷⁹¹ His episcopacy was uneventful by comparison with that of Ulger, whose conflict with Geoffrey was not to be repeated under Norman. It was only under Henry II that trouble again erupted in the cathedral, for upon Norman's death Henry claimed the right to nominate the new bishop, instigating a three-year vacancy.⁷⁹² Norman may, however, as bishop-elect and the chapter's favoured choice in the months between Ulger's death and his own investiture, have secured one important right for the bishop which was replicated at Tours and Le Mans, and a continuation of the process of diocesan autonomy. Geoffrey's obituary in the necrology of Angers cathedral, although garbled, refers obliquely to an agreement with the bishop and chapter not to seize episcopal possessions upon the bishop's death.⁷⁹³ Prior to Geoffrey's reign, seizure of movable goods upon the death of a prelate appears to have been a comital prerogative; the cession of this right will be discussed further below, in the light of more explicit

⁷⁸⁷ Ibid, p.184.

⁷⁸⁸ Jean-Marc Bienvenu, 'Le conflit entre Ulger, évêque d'Angers, et Pétronille de Chemillé, abbesse de Fontevraud', *Revue Mabillon* 58 (1972), pp.113-32.

⁷⁸⁹ *St-Aubin*, p.36. It is unclear whether Norman was elected in 1148 or 1149, as the annals only state that he was invested (*consecratur*) on II nones March; cf. Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.195.

⁷⁹⁰ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.195, citing *CN*, pp.xlvi-xlvii.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid., pp.195-7, and see Chapter 1.

⁷⁹² Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.197.

⁷⁹³ App. IV, no.2.

evidence from Tours and Le Mans.

Le Mans

The diocese of Le Mans is even less studied during this period than that of Angers. Although rich biographies of its bishops are provided by the twelfth-century continuations to the *Actus pontificum Cenomannis*, the cathedral's cartulary yields far less evidence than its southern counterpart.⁷⁹⁴

It has been argued that, in the context of the struggles between the counts of Anjou, the dukes of Normandy, and Maine's own troubled comital dynasties for power in the eleventh century, the bishops of Le Mans were, with the counts of Le Mans, 'the most important political and social figures of the region'.⁷⁹⁵ The claimants to Maine also claimed the right to elect and invest its bishops;⁷⁹⁶ yet in common with Angers, it seems that the Le Mans cathedral chapter exercised from at least the last quarter of the eleventh century the right to elect their own bishop, though they were not the sole voice. Bishop Hildebert (1096-1125) had been schoolmaster and then archdeacon of the cathedral before being elected with the assent of the chapter and 'the commoners' (*communi cleri plebisque assensu*).⁷⁹⁷ After being translated to the archbishopric of Tours in 1125, he was succeeded by Bishop Guy (1126-35), Bishop Hugh (1136-43) and Bishop William (1145-87).

Geoffrey's relationship with the bishops of Le Mans must be viewed in the context of Fulk's determined public efforts to align the Angevin dynasty with the cult of Saint Julien and promote himself as a benefactor of the cathedral, newly built in the 1110s, consecrated by Bishop Hildebert on the octave of Easter 1120, in the presence of a host of Greater Angevin and Breton prelates who each consecrated an altar.⁷⁹⁸ On the same day, Fulk and Aremburga granted revenues to the cathedral from the countess's dowry; a few days later, they returned to Saint-Julien with a large group of their leading men, and granted the bishop and chapter an annual fair, and all attendant revenues, to be held on the anniversary of the cathedral's consecration.⁷⁹⁹

This was more than a mere gift. Fulk used this opportunity to publicise his

⁷⁹⁴ And see the Introduction for details of these continuations.

⁷⁹⁵ Barton, *Lordship in the County of Maine*, p.33.

⁷⁹⁶ E.g. the claim of William Rufus, *APC*, p.400.

⁷⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.398.

⁷⁹⁸ *APC*, p.415.

⁷⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.416-7.

imminent pilgrimage, and – in an extraordinary passage in the *Actus pontificum Cenomannis* – to parade the young Geoffrey before his vassals:

The count himself, taking his son Geoffrey, and lifting him up in his arms, placed him on the altar dedicated to Saint Julian, offering the boy to him and, through this, the gift itself; with the people listening, he added: ‘Saint Julian, I commend my son and my land to you; may you be the protector and defender of them both’. Thus leaving the boy on the altar, and withdrawing – overwhelmed by profuse weeping – he departed after a short time for Jerusalem, just as agreed.⁸⁰⁰

The choice both of Le Mans as Fulk’s staging post for his journey to Jerusalem, and Julien as the saint to whose care his son and heir was placed, sits in contrast to Fulk’s attitude to the community of Angers cathedral. Although Bishop Reginald accompanied him on the pilgrimage, the cathedral was not the venue for his departure – although Angers was the count’s most important city – and there is no suggestion that the local saint, Maurice, was invoked in a similar manner to Julien.

The attachment to Julien was assiduously cultivated. A Julien relic may have been displayed at Saint-Laud in Angers in 1124.⁸⁰¹ In common with the events of 1120, when Fulk chose to abdicate in 1128 his future departure was announced at the cathedral in Le Mans, where Bishop Guy bestowed the cross upon him.⁸⁰² Geoffrey’s marriage was likewise celebrated at the cathedral; Henry was baptised there, and in a similar manner to his father, offered up to Julien’s care, becoming his ‘spiritual son’.⁸⁰³ Julien’s importance to the Angevin dynasty meant that, when Henry was baptised, Henry I granted the bishop extensive English lands. Similarly, Matilda offered a pall to Saint Julien after Henry’s birth, and when she was close to death in Rouen after the birth of Geoffrey junior in 1134, she chose the cathedral in Le Mans as the recipient of expensive curtains and tapestries given in alms.⁸⁰⁴

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid: ‘Ipse comes, assumens filium suum Gaufridum, et de terra elevans inter brachia sua, posuit super altare beatissimi Juliani, offerens ei et ipsum puerum, per eum et in ipso, prefatum beneficium; adjungens hoc, audiente populo: ‘Tibi, sancte Juliane, meum filium commendo et terram meam; tu, utriusque sis protector et defensor’. Reliquens igitur prefatum puerum super aram, atque uberrimis perfusus lacrimis recessit, brevi intervallo Ierosolimam, sicut disposuerat, profecturus.’

⁸⁰¹ *CSL*, no. 68; cf. no.77, a suspect letter transcribed within a fourteenth-century copy of the cartulary, notifying the canons that Fulk IV was sending them Julien’s chin. The letter is discussed by Léopold Delisle, ‘Notice sur un manuscrit de Saint-Laud d’Angers appartenant à M. le marquis de Villoutreys’, *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* (1898), pp.533-49: 548-49, who concluded that ‘it has all the characteristics of an apocryphal document’.

⁸⁰² Chartrou, p.24 and *p.j.* no.39. Henry’s baptism was also recalled in his Saint-Julien obituary: *Nécrologe-obituaire de la cathédrale Saint-Julien du Mans*, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru (Le Mans, 1906), pp.155-6.

⁸⁰³ *APC*, p.432.

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid, pp.432-3.

Soon after Geoffrey's death, Henry viewed his father's grave and granted the cathedral canons an annual sum of 100s.⁸⁰⁵ After his coronation he also made provision for two chaplains to pray for his father in perpetuity.⁸⁰⁶ In a departure from dynastic precedent, Geoffrey was the first person to have been buried within the cathedral itself, in the north-east corner of the nave and next to the altar of the cross, although his tomb is no longer extant.⁸⁰⁷ It has recently been shown that Geoffrey was entombed in the part of the nave occupied by the choir of regular monks, rather than the secular canons of the chapter; he was at the heart of the group who prayed most fervently for his soul, and remained in this prominent position until a reorganisation of the cathedral in 1768 translated the tomb to the north arm of the transept.⁸⁰⁸

Geoffrey's tomb is no longer extant, but the sources make it clear that it was situated in the nave, with the enamel that still survives hanging on a pillar above it.⁸⁰⁹ The enamel itself was nearly lost during the Revolution, only reappearing in the new Sarthe département museum in 1816-17.⁸¹⁰ John of Marmoutier claims that Bishop William commissioned the tomb soon after Geoffrey's death, although it has been argued that Matilda commissioned the enamel plaque depicting her husband and that Henry II was the driving force behind Geoffrey's burial arrangements.⁸¹¹ No description of the tomb itself survives, leaving a question mark over its style. On one hand, it may have been a *gisant* – a depiction of Geoffrey in death – like the mid-twelfth century statue commissioned for Fulk III's tomb at Beaulieu and those placed on the later dynasty's tombs at Fontevraud, and popular during this period.⁸¹² On the other, it may –

⁸⁰⁵ *RRAN* III, no.440.

⁸⁰⁶ DB I, no.70 (*Pl. Acta* no.1727 [1514H], dated 1154 × August 1158).

⁸⁰⁷ JM, p.224; Marcel Deyres, *Maine roman* (La Pierre-qui-Vire, 1985), p.215.

⁸⁰⁸ Delphine Christophe, 'La plaque de Geoffroy Plantagenêt dans la cathédrale du Mans', *Hortus artium medievalium* 10 (2004), pp.75-80.

⁸⁰⁹ *Ibid.* p.77, citing the record provided by a cathedral canon that prior to 1768 Geoffrey's body was buried 'auprès du pénultième pilier de la nef, à main gauche, en montant au chœur, son effigie, gravée en émail sur une lame de cuivre est attachée à ce pilier': André René Le Paige, *Dictionnaire topographique, historique, généalogique et bibliographique de la province du diocèse du Maine* (2 vols., Le Mans, 1777) II, pp.174-5.

⁸¹⁰ *Ibid.* p.75.

⁸¹¹ JM, p.224. Deyres, *Maine roman*, p.215, argues that Bishop William in fact commissioned the plaque, and that it must have been in place by 1158, following the renovation of the cathedral. Cf. Erwin Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on its Changing Aspects*, ed. H. W. Janson (New York, 1992), p.50, on the role of Matilda; on Henry's influence, see Lindy Grant, 'Aspects of the Architectural Patronage of the Family of the Counts of Anjou in the Twelfth Century', *Anjou: Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. J. McNeill and D. Prigent (Journal of the British Archaeological Association, Leeds, 2003), pp.96-110, at 103.

⁸¹² Fulk III's tomb was drawn by Gaignières, reproduced in J. Adhémar and G. Dordor, 'Les Tombeaux de la Collection Gaignières', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 6th series, 84 (1974), p.17, no.40. David Crouch, *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300* (London and New York, NY, 1992), p.194, contends that the

like the enamel – have been a depiction of a living Geoffrey, in common with the sculpture placed at the tomb of his grandfather Helias.⁸¹³ Helias was sculpted in a standing pose with full mail, helmet and shield. The juxtaposition of tomb and enamel, however, may suggest that Geoffrey was commemorated in a *gisant*, represented in both death and life.

The enamel was made at Limoges, and perhaps took as its immediate precedent the now-lost enamel made for Bishop Ulger's wooden tomb in Angers cathedral.⁸¹⁴ The two images are of similar dimensions and proportions, Geoffrey's measuring 63×33cm, Ulger's approximately 45×26.5cm.⁸¹⁵ Like Geoffrey, Ulger is shown as a living figure, wearing richly draped and trimmed clothes; he is set against a patterned background, contained within an elaborate border. Both plaques contain a commemorative inscription in the border, although Ulger's runs around the entire image.

Geoffrey's interment set a precedent. His grandson Henry, the Young King, had died whilst rebelling against his father in Aquitaine, and while his body was being transported though Maine for burial in Rouen, as he had requested, the citizens and ecclesiastics of Le Mans forcibly seized the corpse and buried it within the cathedral.⁸¹⁶ The crowd unanimously agreed that 'the relics of the holy man [Henry] ought to be united to [those of] Saint Julien'.⁸¹⁷ The Angevin comital attachment to the cathedral and its saint finds a further echo in John of Marmoutier's dedication of the *Historia* to Bishop William, and the closing passage of Book I, which dwells at length on Geoffrey's burial.⁸¹⁸

In the light of Geoffrey's attachment to the cathedral and the cult of Saint Julien, it is curious that no document survives detailing grants by Geoffrey to the cathedral; agreements with the cathedral's canons over local earthworks and buildings are extant,

gisant was commissioned over a century after Fulk's death in 1040; cf. Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra*, pp.244-9, who deems the sculpture to be contemporary with Fulk's death.

⁸¹³ Like Fulk III's tomb, this statue is no longer extant but was drawn in the seventeenth century by Montfaucon: Philippe Le Bas, *L'Univers. France: dictionnaire encyclopédique* (15 vols., Paris, 1840-5), *planches* II, plate 242, fig.1.

⁸¹⁴ The casket itself is still in the cathedral. Seventeenth-century drawings by Gaignières show the casket with the main enamel, an image of Ulger, still *in situ*: Oxford Bodley MS Gough Drawings Gaignières 14, fols. 190, 191; Paris BnF Latin 17030, fols. 65, 67. The image is discussed briefly by Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture*, p.50.

⁸¹⁵ Deyres, *Maine roman*, p.214; the measurements of Ulger's plaque have been taken as accurately as possible from the scale provided by Gaignières' Bodley MS.

⁸¹⁶ Thomas Agnellus, 'De morte et sepultura Henrici Regis Junioris', in *Radulphi de Coggeshall chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series, 66 (1875), pp.268-69.

⁸¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.269.

⁸¹⁸ JM, pp. 172, 224.

but that is all.⁸¹⁹ There is also evidence for serious conflict between successive counts and bishops. In 1125, Bishop Hildebert was translated at the behest of Louis VI to the archbishopric of Tours, and before the election of Guy – a Breton who had studied under Anselm of Canterbury – Fulk seized the entire episcopal territory along with Hildebert's possessions.⁸²⁰ Archbishop Hildebert soon reprimanded Fulk, pointing out that he was setting a bad example for his followers and, significantly, that he and his ancestors neither had rights to episcopal possessions nor the power to invest new bishops.⁸²¹ It was only after Aremburga's intercession that Fulk restored the new bishop's possessions.

This failed attempt at seizing key episcopal properties during a vacancy – even though the previous incumbent had not died – finds echoes in Angers, as we have seen, as well as Le Mans, and a similar document survives in favour of Saint-Julien as the one suggested by Geoffrey's obituary at Angers.⁸²² Henry II, apparently before his succession to the English throne, agreed to prevent his followers (*famuli comitum*) from seizing the bishop's goods upon his death, confirming a concession already made by Geoffrey (*prout pater concesserat*). Successive counts, therefore, exercised arbitrary seizures during vacancies, but there is evidence that Geoffrey did not follow his father's example in this respect. On the day of his funeral, Bishop Guy's wine, provisions and possessions were distributed to local paupers.⁸²³

This peaceful co-existence, however, was shattered almost immediately. Guy's successor Hugh had been archdeacon under Hildebert and was elected and universally accepted by the chapter in 1136.⁸²⁴ Guy, it seems, had died in February 1136.⁸²⁵ By this time, Geoffrey was desperately attempting to extend the foothold he and Matilda had gained in southern Normandy following Henry I's death. He appealed to the archbishop of Rouen and other Norman prelates, but they declared in favour of Stephen.⁸²⁶ Geoffrey then turned to Hugh, asking the bishop to swear an oath to help him in his claim; Hugh, however, fearing the censure of the church, boldly denied (*audacter resistens denegavit*)

⁸¹⁹ App. I, nos. 64, 65.

⁸²⁰ *APC*, p.427.

⁸²¹ *Ibid.*

⁸²² App. IV, no.11.

⁸²³ *APC*, p.441.

⁸²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.442, 445.

⁸²⁵ *Ibid.*, p.421.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, p.446. The *APC* continuator who wrote Bishop Hugh's *gesta* attributed what follows directly to Geoffrey's frustration with the Norman episcopate.

Geoffrey's entreaties.⁸²⁷ An angry Geoffrey immediately consigned the bishop to exile, taking his and the chapter's lands and assets in hand.

The exile which Geoffrey had imposed lasted for eight months, and the continuator of the *Actus* makes it clear that the bishop had been excised from daily life in Le Mans. Geoffrey's men traded episcopal assets in local markets, and he sanctioned the pillage of the canon's cellars and granaries. It was only, according to the continuator, the prospect of excommunication which eventually prevented locals from buying up the bishop's property. This in turn brought Geoffrey to terms, and he promised to restore the seizures he had made. Although a severe fire soon engulfed the abbey of Saint-Vincent in the town, the bishop of Le Mans was quickly able to fulfil his duties, beginning with the translation of the relics of Saint Julien back to the cathedral, itself the victim of fire in 1134,⁸²⁸ on 17th October 1136.⁸²⁹

The evidence provided by the *Actus* suggests that although the counts of Anjou relinquished their claim to seize assets on a bishop's death, the process was a powerful tool which was deemed legitimate in the context of political necessity. Although Geoffrey did not control the chapter's choice of bishop, he in practice enforced a considerable vacancy.

An eleven-month vacancy followed Hugh's death in 1144, and it was probably not until mid-January 1145 that William of Passavant was ordained bishop.⁸³⁰ William had been the archdeacon of Reims cathedral, and other than an enumeration of his virtues, the *Actus* says nothing of precisely why or how he was elected by the canons of Le Mans.⁸³¹ It is known that he was the nephew of Bishop William of Saintes, former cellarer of Saint-Martin of Tours, and a cousin (*consobrinus*) of Reginald of Martigné, the bishop of Angers who had been translated to the archbishopric of Reims in 1124.⁸³² William's origins in the marchland which joined southern Anjou and northern Poitou, combined with the hand of the king of France in both Reginald's translation and, most likely, the career of William of Saintes at Tours, makes it difficult to assess Geoffrey's influence in the 1145 election at Le Mans.⁸³³ It has been posited that William's 'family

⁸²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.446.

⁸²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.435-6.

⁸²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.447.

⁸³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.454, states that the vacancy followed Hugh's pontificate which lasted 7 years, 4 months and 17 days; calculated from the beginning of October, the approximate time Geoffrey restored Hugh to the city, this means that Hugh died in mid-February 1144.

⁸³¹ And see Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.186-7.

⁸³² Chartrou, p.181; Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.186-7.

⁸³³ APC, p.455. Marcel Pacaut, *Louis VII et les élections épiscopales dans le royaume de France, 1137-*

connections may have played a crucial role' in his election, but precisely how has not been investigated.⁸³⁴

William's eleventh-century predecessors had been knights in the comital retinue, and had perhaps later held the position of constable under Fulk V.⁸³⁵ They held the castle of Passavant (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Vihiers), on the southern margins of Anjou, and perhaps controlled land near Montreuil-Bellay in the twelfth century.⁸³⁶ William's father witnessed a charter granted by Fulk V to the priory of L'Evière on an important occasion in 1124.⁸³⁷ A William of Passavant, apparently a layman though whether father or son is unclear, also witnessed Geoffrey's agreement of 1131 with Bishop Ulger of Angers.⁸³⁸ Though William's connection with Bishop Reginald is significant, it has also been suggested that his mother was herself the daughter of the lord of Martigné, a family which, as discussed above, enjoyed prominence at Geoffrey's court.⁸³⁹ The evidence suggests that the counts' long-standing ties with the lords of Passavant and their kin, who were one of the few consistently loyal baronial families of Geoffrey's reign, were a factor in William's election to the see of Le Mans.

As discussed previously, John of Marmoutier dedicated the *Historia* to William, who in turn had some influence in the arrangements for Geoffrey's burial and commemoration. It may also have been William who was the beneficiary of Geoffrey's relinquishment of the right to seize episcopal property.⁸⁴⁰ The absence of documented

1180 (Paris, 1957), p.106, notes the difficulty of determining the factors in Reginald of Martigne's transfer to Reims, but this archdiocese was firmly in royal control.

⁸³⁴ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.186.

⁸³⁵ *Livre noir* of Saint-Florent, in Marchegay, *BEC* 36 (1875), nos. 100-5, esp. nos. 100, 105 (a charter of 1053 in which a William of Passavant renounces some rights in favour of Saint-Florent prior to a campaign with Geoffrey II against the count of Poitou). These texts and *Ronceray*, nos. 1, 3 and 131, show that the seigneurial family employed a strong pattern of naming their male offspring William and Sigeband, and although the latter is not entirely unusual, it is perhaps significant that Fulk IV's constable, inherited by Fulk V, was called Sigeband: Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.426; Chartrou, pp. 131, 345. *CSA* II, no.414, is a charter of Fulk IV issued 1096×1106 and witnessed by Sigeband of Passavant.

⁸³⁶ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.186-7, and *APC*, p.455, n.2. Courchamps (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Montreuil-Bellay) was in the possession of Samson of Passavant, *miles*, in 1138: *CSA* I, no.215 and II, nos. 710-1, 713.

⁸³⁷ *CTV* II, no.449 (Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no. 59). For Bishop William's father, see Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.187; William made provision for his father to be remembered by the cathedral canons, *APC*, p.470. Cf. Christophe, 'La plaque de Geoffroy', p.75, who contends that it was Bishop William who could be found at Fulk V's court; his death almost eighty years after the start of Fulk's reign makes this impossible.

⁸³⁸ App. III, no.1. That he was a layman is suggested by his appearance amongst other prominent comital laymen in the witness list.

⁸³⁹ Port, *Dictionnaire* III, p.58.

⁸⁴⁰ Christophe, 'La plaque de Geoffroy', p.76.

grants and concessions by Geoffrey in favour of William, or the canons during his episcopacy, belies a relationship which was not only apparently peaceful but also cordial and even intimate, an apt reflection of the privileged place Le Mans and Saint-Julien had come to occupy for the Angevins.

Tours

Geoffrey's career witnessed three legitimate archiepiscopacies at Tours, those of Hildebert (1125-33), Hugh (1133-47) and Engelbald (1147-57). As discussed above, Hildebert was translated to the see in 1125, apparently as part of a complex set of movements orchestrated by Louis VI. During the twelfth century, however, French royal influence waned at Tours; direct control of archiepiscopal elections appears to have been lost, although continuing influence at the college of Saint-Martin, 'a potential supplier of candidates for bishoprics', ensured some royal sway.⁸⁴¹ Indeed, members of the Montreuil-Bellay family held important positions in the college during Geoffrey's reign.⁸⁴² The counts of Anjou were also an influential voice at Saint-Martin: Geoffrey – like the kings of France – was an honorary canon of the college, and as discussed below, he issued two charters of protection for the canons, including a pledge to guard their assets 'in the borough of the king of France'.⁸⁴³

The ability of the count of Anjou in this period to interfere in archiepiscopal affairs has perhaps been underestimated, and underscores his apparent gains in Tours at the expense of the French king. The translation of Hildebert in 1125 meant that the continuators of the Le Mans *Actus* had a particular interest in the metropolitan see, and Bishop Guy's biographer records a revealing episode connected to Hildebert's death in 1133. With Hildebert dead, the author tells us that his canons were unable to conduct a proper election as 'for a long time' (*diu*) they had been expelled from the church by Geoffrey.⁸⁴⁴ The canons found themselves in this situation at the height of the papal schism which raged between Innocent II and the antipope Anacletus, and some of them intruded their candidate, Philip, the cathedral's dean and supporter of Anacletus, into the archiepiscopal see, prompting Pope Innocent to charge Bernard of Clairvaux with

⁸⁴¹ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.172.

⁸⁴² Quentin Griffiths, 'The Capetian Kings and St. Martin of Tours', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* n.s.9 (1987), pp.85-133, at 126, and see App. I, no.107.

⁸⁴³ App. I, nos. 107, 108.

⁸⁴⁴ *APC*, p.434.

conducting an inquiry into the election.⁸⁴⁵ Meanwhile, the other canons favoured Hugh, who was consecrated not in Tours but in Le Mans by Bishop Guy, eventually prompting Philip to flee with some of the cathedral's treasures. Once Hugh had been consecrated and Philip had fled, the new archbishop ceremonially processed from the college of Saint-Martin to his 'seat' (*sedem suam*), in the presence of the count of Anjou and the people, 'as is the custom' (*ut mos est*).⁸⁴⁶

The continuator's account firmly places a link between Geoffrey's expulsion of the canons and their disputed election. Another description – whose origins are uncertain, but which should not be dismissed out of hand – also exists of the election.⁸⁴⁷ It indicates that after Hildebert's death, Hugh was elected against the wishes of Louis VI, before giving details of a group of Tourangeaux barons who had traditional roles to play in the ceremonies which occurred on the day of an archbishop's consecration.⁸⁴⁸ Although Geoffrey is not listed amongst these figures, this account suggests that the French king's control over archiepiscopal elections at Tours was weak; read in conjunction with the *Actus*, it appears that Geoffrey backed one candidate, and Louis another, and that Geoffrey forcefully and successfully imposed his will on the chapter. Louis himself had done the same in 1125. In 1133, Tours was still a battle-ground on which the struggle between comital and royal power was fought, with the added complication of a papal schism in the background.

Other evidence further suggests that on balance Geoffrey was able to influence the election of the archbishop to a greater degree than both his predecessors and the French king. Engelbald of Vendôme, one of Geoffrey's chaplains, witnessed his agreement with the monks of Saint-Florent in 1133.⁸⁴⁹ Archbishop Hugh also witnessed the chirograph, and this attestation, along with the re-identification of Hugh's successor Engelbald as not a native of Preuilly but of Vendôme, suggests that the Engelbald who

⁸⁴⁵ *Letters of St. Bernard*, ed. and trans. Bruno Scott James, intro. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Stroud, 1998), no.155.

⁸⁴⁶ *APC*, p.434.

⁸⁴⁷ Stanislas Bellanger, *La Touraine ancienne et moderne* (Paris, 1845), pp.192-3, citing 'le procès-verbal de l'une des séances de la société des *Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres* d'Indre-et-Loire rend compte de la cérémonie qui avait lieu à cette occasion'. This in turn is cited by Boussard, *Le comté*, p.49.

⁸⁴⁸ These barons included the lord of Marmande, who oversaw the preparation of food for the feast; the lord of Amboise set the table and was entitled to take the gold and silver drinking vessels after the meal; the lord of Preuilly oversaw the baking; the lord of La Haye acted as butler, filling the archbishop's cup; the lord of Île-Bouchard washed the archbishop's hands and received a ring from him. These five barons carried the archbishop to the cathedral after the celebration of the *Te Deum*.

⁸⁴⁹ App. I, no.89.

served Geoffrey as chaplain was in fact the future archbishop.⁸⁵⁰ Engelbald was treasurer of the cathedral in Tours, and is known to have been a prévôt there.⁸⁵¹ His election c.1147 has been described as ‘probably a local choice’;⁸⁵² this is indeed likely, but his former position as comital chaplain, even in an *ad hoc* capacity, presents the possibility that Geoffrey had some input into this election. The evidence provided by the *acta* and the Le Mans *Actus* adds a new dimension to what is already known about the way in which the archbishops were elected, and suggests that in the mid-twelfth century, the Angevin counts were able to play a particularly important role. The evidence relating to archiepiscopal elections is patchy, but strongly suggests a need to reconsider the recent argument that ‘no secular ruler enjoyed control of the archiepiscopal elections by the mid-twelfth century’.⁸⁵³

Geoffrey granted at least one privilege to the cathedral chapter in Tours, a yearly gift of 20s. drawn from the profits of his tower in the city.⁸⁵⁴ Agreements were also made with the archbishop, in which the count and prelate shared or jointly agreed to remit customs and revenues in Tours and Chinon.⁸⁵⁵ Most striking of all, however, is a charter in favour of the archbishops that reproduces almost exactly the agreements made with the bishops of Angers and Le Mans. In the period between Geoffrey’s death and his accession to the English throne, Henry confirmed an agreement made by his father not to seize the archbishop’s household goods.⁸⁵⁶

The existence of such concessions for each of the dioceses of Greater Anjou suggests both that Geoffrey, under pressure from the episcopate, acted on the recently reiterated Chalcedon canon which prohibited the seizure of episcopal goods in this manner, and that the counts of Anjou had traditionally had access to such goods.⁸⁵⁷ This is entirely expected at Angers and even Le Mans; it is perhaps a little surprising at Tours, given the continued influence of the French kings,⁸⁵⁸ but provides further valuable evidence to support Pacaut’s feeling that although the archiepiscopal seat was

⁸⁵⁰ For the re-identification of Engelbald, see Dominique Barthélemy, *La société dans le comté de Vendôme de l’an mil au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1993), p.771, though the Angevin evidence is not cited.

⁸⁵¹ Ibid.

⁸⁵² Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.172.

⁸⁵³ Ibid.

⁸⁵⁴ App. I, no.106.

⁸⁵⁵ Ibid., nos. 104, 105.

⁸⁵⁶ App. IV, no.18.

⁸⁵⁷ H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis, 1937), pp. 195-213.

⁸⁵⁸ And see App. VI, no.2, for Louis VII’s control of Châteauneuf, and Geoffrey’s ability to intercede for the burgesses.

‘effectively royal’, actual kingly influence waned during the course of the twelfth century.⁸⁵⁹

The growth of Angevin influence in Tours tentatively identified by Pacaut is interesting if considered in the light of an episode in the *Historia*. According to John, arguments (*controversia*) frequently flared up between Geoffrey and the archbishop, who on this occasion threatened the count, his ‘parishioner’ (*parochianus*), with excommunication.⁸⁶⁰ Geoffrey, however, reminded the archbishop that he had no dominion over the canons of Saint-Martin and the monks of Marmoutier; Geoffrey was both a canon and a monk, and informed the prelate that his writ did not run in either house.

The evidence of the charters suggests that the Greater Angevin episcopate, although crucially important to the count politically, was kept at arm’s length: of the bishops of Angers, Ulger witnessed only one, possibly two, of Geoffrey’s charters,⁸⁶¹ and Norman makes a solitary appearance in an important charter issued in the wake of the victory at Montreuil-Bellay.⁸⁶² The bishops of Le Mans’ appearances prior to 1146 are equally sparse, with Guy appearing once,⁸⁶³ and Hugh not at all, although Geoffrey issued a charter in Hugh’s house in Le Mans which suggests his presence.⁸⁶⁴ Both of these charters dealt with local matters. Archbishop Hugh of Tours ranged beyond his archiepiscopal seat, witnessing a charter for Geoffrey at Angers in 1133, as well as the confirmation issued by Geoffrey of Cluny’s privileges granted by Henry I and augmented by Stephen.⁸⁶⁵ His attestations during his fourteen-year prelacy are nevertheless exceptionally sparse, a situation underscored by the absence of both Archbishop Hildebert and Archbishop Engelbald – despite his previous service as comital chaplain – from the witness-lists of Geoffrey’s charters.⁸⁶⁶

By contrast, William of Passavant was a more frequent witness to Geoffrey’s charters and can be seen travelling out of Le Mans to attend the comital court. He is recorded as a witness to four documents between his investiture in 1146 and Geoffrey’s

⁸⁵⁹ Pacaut, *Louis VII et les élections*, pp.64-5.

⁸⁶⁰ JM, pp.192-3.

⁸⁶¹ App. I, nos. 42 and perhaps 70, a problematic copy of a charter from Notre-Dame of Loches which was purportedly sealed by Ulger. He also appears in App. I, no.3, but in the capacity of a judge.

⁸⁶² *Ibid.*, no.7.

⁸⁶³ *Ibid.*, no.63.

⁸⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, no.59.

⁸⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 89, 36.

⁸⁶⁶ As noted above, App. I, no.89 was witnessed by Engelbald of Vendôme, who went on to become archbishop of Tours.

death in 1151, including one drawn up at Baugé and another in which Geoffrey confirmed the sale of a house near Montreuil-Bellay to William's clerk Eustace, which was issued at Montreuil during the course of the siege.⁸⁶⁷ There is no evidence that William, however, or his counterparts at Angers and Tours, fulfilled any duties at the court.

Although the erratic survival of *acta* makes this kind of analysis difficult, and the impact of episcopal absences – particularly those of Ulger in 1136, 1139 and 1142-3 – must be taken into account, the evidence confirms that though Geoffrey had a hand in the election and subsequent careers of the Greater Angevin episcopacy, these prelates were not his creatures. The picture offered by the Angevin evidence differs markedly from that which has been drawn for the Anglo-Norman realm during this period, where bishops, like the cream of the aristocracy, were in frequent attendance at the royal and ducal courts, and were given key administrative positions.⁸⁶⁸ Angevin prelates, like Angevin barons, maintained a certain independence vis-à-vis the count. Geoffrey expected them to act in their own spheres, to occasionally mediate on his behalf, and to acquiesce to his larger political wishes. As the case of Hugh of Le Mans shows, they were not always willing to do this; as the case of Ulger shows, their independence could have serious consequences for both sides. Geoffrey was engaged in a struggle with the French kings for power and influence in Tours, and the evidence outlined here and below suggests that he may have gained the upper hand in the 1130s.

Monastic patronage

The twelfth century in Greater Anjou has been justly described as 'an epoch of great religious fervour'.⁸⁶⁹ The Loire valley was not only host to rich, long-established monasteries like Saint-Aubin of Angers, Saint-Florent of Saumur and Marmoutier, but was also the cradle of monastic reform. In 1101, Robert of Arbrissel founded Fontevraud just upriver of Saumur – but in the diocese of Poitiers – and along with his disciples established smaller, Augustinian priories such as La Roë in the woods of Maine.⁸⁷⁰ Similar reformist houses and orders at Tiron and Savigny both lay just beyond

⁸⁶⁷ App. I nos. 13 (at Baugé) and 66 (at Montreuil-Bellay), as well as nos. 57 and 61, both issued in Le Mans.

⁸⁶⁸ Hollister and Baldwin, 'The Rise of Administrative Kingship', pp.874-6.

⁸⁶⁹ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.163.

⁸⁷⁰ Henrietta Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism: A Study of Religious Communities in Western Europe, 1000-1150* (London, 1984), p.34.

the borders of Greater Anjou, in Perche and the Avranchin respectively, and several affiliated priories were founded within Greater Anjou during the first half of the twelfth century.

The sponsorship of Fulk V and Aremburga had been an important factor in the success of many new and existing foundations in the region, and built visibly upon the reputation for patronage established by Fulk III and Geoffrey II but which had lost its lustre under Fulk IV. Geoffrey's parents were avid patrons of several religious orders, founding – amongst others – Benedictine houses at Turpenay, Trôo and La Fontaine Saint-Martin,⁸⁷¹ a Savignac priory at La Boissière,⁸⁷² and a Cistercian priory at Le Loroux,⁸⁷³ as well as lesser-known churches such as those of Saint-Jean and Saint-Nicolas at Fulk's castle at Vihiers, which were both affiliated to a daughter house of the Poitevin abbey of Saint-Jouin de Marnes.⁸⁷⁴ The couple were also important patrons of Fontevraud during its earliest years, and there is even evidence that they attempted to appropriate the role of founders for themselves.⁸⁷⁵

It is therefore striking that Geoffrey has recently been described as a 'tight-fisted' patron, at least with regard to material gifts.⁸⁷⁶ A dynastic precedent of impressive patronage, not to mention kingship in the Holy Land, had been set, yet Geoffrey seemingly inherited neither his father's piety nor his commitment to the material support of monasticism. While Fulk was memorialised as 'catholic in faith [and] benevolent towards God's worshippers', the chroniclers do not once refer to Geoffrey's Christian zeal or his patronage of religious institutions.⁸⁷⁷ As discussed above, even apparently privileged cathedrals such as Saint-Julien received little from the count. The picture supplied by the chronicles, however, is incomplete, and although Grant's survey of Angevin architectural patronage supplies some further details it fails to note others. Moreover, important caveats to her argument emerge in the light of new evidence and a re-examination of familiar material. Although it is difficult to assess how programmatic any rulers' patronage may have been during this period, the augmented body of evidence of Geoffrey's reign allows us to posit some suggestions as

⁸⁷¹ App. I, no.109; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 62, 45 (p.j. no.18).

⁸⁷² Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.73 (p.j. no.28).

⁸⁷³ App. I, no.57.

⁸⁷⁴ *Cartulaire de Saint-Jouin*, pp.31-2; Port, *Dictionnaire* III, pp.717-8 (although the founder of Saint-Jean is incorrectly identified as Fulk IV).

⁸⁷⁵ For patronage of Fontevraud, Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 1, 16, 22-34, 40-1, 71, 76-8, 90, 92. For the couple's claim to be founders, Grant, 'Architectural Patronage', p.98.

⁸⁷⁶ Grant, 'Architectural Patronage', p.98.

⁸⁷⁷ *GCA*, p.67.

to possible ‘strategies’ of patronage, as well as how the pressures of his reign had a knock-on effect on sponsorship of the church, and how his treatment of the monastic network of Greater Anjou differed from that of Normandy.

As Lindy Grant notes, Geoffrey made an annual gift of £8 to the Cistercians at Le Loroux – which his parents had founded, and where his mother was buried – for lighting their abbey.⁸⁷⁸ A re-reading of the extant *acta*, however, indicates that the scale of grants to Le Loroux was far larger than this text suggests. Le Loroux’s archive was destroyed during the Hundred Years War, but Richard I’s confirmation of the dynasty’s grants to the abbey since its foundation suggests that it received many high-value grants before 1189, including the combined annual sum of £66 from Fulk and Geoffrey.⁸⁷⁹ Geoffrey also granted £60 per annum to his parents’ Benedictine nunnery of La Fontaine Saint-Martin, situated between La Flèche and Le Mans, which was confirmed by Henry soon after his father’s death.⁸⁸⁰

The most obvious motivation for these gifts, which are the most generous examples of their kind in Geoffrey’s Angevin *acta*, is the recent familial importance of Le Loroux and La Fontaine. The location of La Fontaine is also interesting in the light of other evidence: Geoffrey was involved in the foundation of two institutions in southern Maine that have remained overlooked. First, he was the driving-force in the conversion of Château-l’Hermitage, which lay immediately east of La Fontaine, from a hermitage into an Augustinian priory, c.1144 (a process which involved Geoffrey personally laying the foundation stone of the new priory church).⁸⁸¹ Second, he and his dapifer Geoffrey of Clefs jointly founded a leper hospital at La Flèche.⁸⁸² Although the texts which record both of these foundations are problematic, there is nothing to suggest that they are inauthentic.

Elsewhere in Maine, Geoffrey also assented to minor building projects by the monks of La Couture, Saint-Vincent and Saint-Victor in Le Mans, alienating either demesne or customary revenues in the process.⁸⁸³ The Angevins’ marked attachment to Maine, already seen in relation to Saint-Julien, is underlined by the relatively high

⁸⁷⁸ Ibid.; App. I, no.57.

⁸⁷⁹ App. IV, no.9. For the destruction of the archive, Gaëtan Sourice, ‘L’abbaye cistercienne du Loroux (1121-1370): Essai de reconstitution du patrimoine (formation et gestion)’, *Mémoire de maîtrise d’histoire* (2 vols., University of Angers, 1996), I.

⁸⁸⁰ App. IV, no.7.

⁸⁸¹ App. I, no.34.

⁸⁸² App. IV, no.6.

⁸⁸³ App. I, nos. 58, 61, 63.

number of grants for these abbeys, but more particularly by the choice of La Flèche and its environs as the site of new institutions. Not only was Geoffrey building in the lands inherited, via his mother, from Helias of Maine, but he was also strengthening the dynasty's visible attachment to the county and to local men who under both Fulk and Geoffrey formed the core of the administration of Greater Anjou. These projects forged spiritual ties with locally venerated saints, and it is particularly striking that Geoffrey's grant to Château-l'Hermitage was confirmed by Bishop William of Le Mans three years later, on 27th January 1147, the feast of Saint Julien.⁸⁸⁴ References to Geoffrey as the custodian or protector of Manceau houses suggest that his patronage was sought by these institutions, many of which lay in areas administered by local lords hostile to Angevin overlordship.⁸⁸⁵

The favour shown to these institutions, particularly the modest reform-type houses founded by his parents – itself underlined by evidence that Geoffrey personally patronised individual hermits⁸⁸⁶ – is a stark contrast to Geoffrey's attitude to the great and old monasteries of the region, many of which had depended on the Angevin counts for their patronage in the eleventh century. The two clearest examples are Saint-Aubin of Angers, which had supported the dynasty's rise in the tenth century and which was then subsequently reformed by the eleventh-century counts, and La Trinité of Vendôme, founded by Geoffrey II and his wife Agnes.

Of the twelve extant *acta* in favour of Saint-Aubin only one is a grant;⁸⁸⁷ another restores important privileges usurped by Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay to the abbey but adds nothing new;⁸⁸⁸ the remaining ten are either confirmations of rights granted before Geoffrey's reign, or records of orders made by Geoffrey to prevent destruction of the abbey's rights or possessions, or judicial proceedings settled in the comital court.⁸⁸⁹ These judicial and administrative documents, moreover, often show that it was Geoffrey's own men who were violating the monks' rights. Evidence from the

⁸⁸⁴ 'Hec autem carta facta est anno ab incarnatione domini. M.c.xl.vi. ipso die beatissimi JULIANI'. Le Mans, AD Sarthe, MS H520, reproduced AN MS MM894, no.1. The coincidence of the 27th and 28th January as the dates on which the two charters were made is striking, and it is a possibility that Geoffrey's gift was in fact also made on Saint Julien's feast day.

⁸⁸⁵ App. I, no.68 (protection for La Roë, which lay in western Maine); App. VI, no.8 (confirmation of grants made by Robert of Sablé's vassal William Martin of Grez, at the request of the monks, which refers to Geoffrey as their protector).

⁸⁸⁶ App. IV, no.17, indicates that Geoffrey granted customs at Nitray, Brechenay and Leugny to a hermit named Reginald.

⁸⁸⁷ App. I, no.6.

⁸⁸⁸ Ibid., no.7.

⁸⁸⁹ Ibid., nos. 2-5, 8-13.

beginning of Henry's reign as count, moreover, indicates that Geoffrey himself seized local monastic assets, which Henry was forced to restore to Fontevraud and Saint-Florent.⁸⁹⁰

Historically, Saint-Aubin had been the dynasty's most important abbey. Guillot has shown that when Fulk I began to rule Anjou as viscount he inherited the abbacy of Saint-Aubin from his wife Roscilla.⁸⁹¹ The abbey supported Fulk's claim to the county, successfully realised in 929.⁸⁹² After becoming counts, the dynasty reformed Saint-Aubin, replacing its canons with monks and exercising their lay abbacy by nominating an actual abbot. Fulk III is even described in one text as *archiabbas* of Saint-Aubin and the nearby Saint-Lézin.⁸⁹³ During the course of the eleventh century, the monks' own right to elect an abbot came to the fore, but the count retained the right of investiture, at least until it was challenged by Albert, abbot of Marmoutier, in the third quarter of the eleventh century.⁸⁹⁴ The pace of reform quickened in the 1070s, and the count's influence was further weakened, and is perhaps reflected in the defacement of and excisions from the abbey's cartulary.⁸⁹⁵

The case of La Trinité is similar. Even though the abbey was a major, prestigious house of around 100 monks and had been founded by the dynasty, Geoffrey appears to have granted it nothing save his continued protection and his assistance in dealing with successive counts of Vendôme.⁸⁹⁶ Geoffrey's importance as the monks' protector was of the highest order, underlined both by their consistent use of *Dei gratia* to describe the count in charters they produced for him, and by his own exhortations to the young Henry to continue this advocacy established by Geoffrey II. Nevertheless, an overall lack of material patronage sits in uneasy contrast to Fulk IV's deathbed grant to the abbey and his burial at its priory of L'Evière in Angers, as well as at least four outright grants, some of which were of commemorative importance, made to the abbey and its priory in Angers by Fulk V.⁸⁹⁷

⁸⁹⁰ App. IV, nos. 15, 16.

⁸⁹¹ Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.131-2.

⁸⁹² Ibid. pp.133-8.

⁸⁹³ CSA I, no.178 (Guillot, *Le comte II*, no. C30); Guillot, *Le comte I*, pp.153-4.

⁸⁹⁴ Ibid. pp.154-60; Olivier Guillot, 'A Reform of Investiture before the Investiture Struggle in Anjou, Normandy, and England', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.81-99.

⁸⁹⁵ Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou I*, p.160 and *ibid.* Appendix I, section B.

⁸⁹⁶ App. I, no.110, App. V, no.1; Penelope Johnson, *Prayer, Power and Patronage: The Abbey of La Trinité, Vendôme, 1032-1187* (New York, 1981), pp. 43, 83.

⁸⁹⁷ These grants are noted by in *ibid.*, p.73; cf. Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. nos. 9, 12, 46 (a grant to L'Evière on the anniversary of Fulk IV's death), 59 (a grant which stipulated that the monks of both La Trinité and L'Evière celebrate the anniversaries of Fulk IV, Helias of Maine and other donors; the monks are also to

Saint-Aubin and La Trinité, moreover, were not unusual; evidence for the three other important Benedictine abbeys founded by the dynasty in Angers is similar. The nunnery of Ronceray had continual recourse to Geoffrey's court to deal with the infractions of both his men and local magnates, and secured a confirmation of the grants previous counts had made to them, but receiving nothing substantial from Geoffrey.⁸⁹⁸ Geoffrey likewise confirmed Saint-Serge's privileges, but added nothing new.⁸⁹⁹ Saint-Nicolas fared slightly better, receiving rights to establish a fishery on a tributary of the Loire, as well as confirmations of its existing river privileges.⁹⁰⁰ The monks of Saint-Nicolas also benefited from the patronage of Matilda, who confirmed its English possessions during the 1130s,⁹⁰¹ and Geoffrey's cousin Duke Conan of Brittany, who granted a demesne islet and other privileges on the Loire, downriver of Angers.⁹⁰²

La Trinité's use of *Dei gratia* is paralleled in the charters issued by Geoffrey for Saint-Florent of Saumur, a house not founded by the dynasty but in the important town of Saumur. Three out of the four extant acts characterise him as *comes Dei gratia*,⁹⁰³ as does a fifth text – Geoffrey's charter of June 1138 in favour of the men of Saumur – which was drawn up by Reginald of Le Pin, a monk of Saint-Florent, in collaboration with Geoffrey's notary, Thomas of Loches.⁹⁰⁴ It is only Geoffrey's chirograph of July 1133, which recorded the agreement made with the monks not to refortify the castle at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil, that does not contain this intitulation, and here it can be seen that the document was drawn up by Master Matthew, Geoffrey's sisters' tutor, rather than one of the abbey's monks.⁹⁰⁵ Both La Trinité and Saint-Florent thus appear to have had an internal diplomatic tradition of using *Dei gratia*, and although there is not space in this study to consider at length the diplomatic of Geoffrey's charters, the pattern suggested by these charters is one of institutional petitioning of the count, rather than any conscious effort on Geoffrey's part to characterise himself as a ruler by the grace of God.⁹⁰⁶ Other instances of the formula in the *acta* are rare, and are confined to Angevin charters, with the exception of a missive sent to Geoffrey by Reginald of Saint-Valéry in

erect a tomb statue of Fulk IV at L'Evière).

⁸⁹⁸ App. I, nos. 14-19; App. IV, no.1.

⁸⁹⁹ App. I, no.22.

⁹⁰⁰ App. I, nos. 20, 21.

⁹⁰¹ *RRAN* III, no.20 (1133×1139).

⁹⁰² App. VI, no.3.

⁹⁰³ App. I, nos. 90-92.

⁹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, no.93.

⁹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, no.89.

⁹⁰⁶ And see Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca NY and London, 1992), pp.26-34.

connection with the Bayeux inquests.⁹⁰⁷ Two of these examples are in texts which appear to have been drawn up by the same comital scribe, Gerald of Beaufort, a canon at Geoffrey's chapel of Saint-Laud, discussed below.⁹⁰⁸

To return to patronage, of more recent dynastic importance was Fontevraud. Although the abbey's later status as a dynastic mausoleum arose through circumstance rather than design, the favour accorded to the abbey by Fulk V was a clear precedent for his son, and the plans for his departure in 1128 planted seeds that ought to have guaranteed Geoffrey's continued attachment to the abbey. The nave Fulk appears to have funded was probably completed during the first year of Geoffrey's reign.⁹⁰⁹ Moreover, Fulk's eldest daughter Matilda, after several years as a young novice within the abbey, finally took the veil in 1128/9, and Fontevraud was the venue for a final meeting between Fulk and his children.⁹¹⁰ In 1149, Matilda was elected abbess, and it is possible that during Geoffrey's reign his niece, also Matilda – daughter of Sybil and Thierry of Flanders – entered the abbey, for she was elected successor to her aunt in 1189.⁹¹¹ The 1149 election was perhaps a political manoeuvre in the context of the conflict with Louis VII and then Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay.⁹¹² Despite these strong links, Geoffrey's reign ushered in a period of 'great poverty' for Fontevraud which was only lifted by Henry II.⁹¹³ Geoffrey's apparent reluctance to grant assets of substance to the abbey is reflected, in common with Saint-Aubin, in his extant *acta*, only one of which makes a grant.⁹¹⁴

The same trend could be enumerated for other institutions which feature in the corpus of *acta*, and is underscored by the complete lack of extant charters in favour of houses which had some significance under previous counts, such as Saint-Sauveur, founded by Fulk III within his castle at Langeais and granted to the Augustinians by

⁹⁰⁷ App. I, nos. 6 and 7 for Saint-Aubin, in 1143 and 1151; 16 for Ronceray, in 1142; 22 for Saint-Serge, 1131×23rd April 1144; 34 for Château-l'Hermitage, 28th January 1144; 36 for Cluny, 23rd April 1144 × 1147; 67 for Saint-Pierre of Le Mans, during the period while count but not duke; 77 for Saint-Hilaire of Poitiers, also while count but not duke. Reginald's use of the title in connection with Geoffrey appears in App. II, no.6.

⁹⁰⁸ App. I, nos. 16, 34.

⁹⁰⁹ J.-M. Bienvenu, *Les premiers temps de Fontevraud, 1101-1189: Naissance et evolution d'un ordre religieux* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Sorbonne, 3 vols., 1980) I, p.355.

⁹¹⁰ See Chapter 1.

⁹¹¹ Bienvenu, *Les premiers temps de Fontevraud* I, p.339.

⁹¹² Grant, *Suger*, p.284, arguing that the bishop of Poitiers claimed the right to control the election but citing no source.

⁹¹³ Bienvenu, *Les premiers temps de Fontevraud* I, pp. 354, 359, citing (p.359, n.61) the abbey's necrology entry for Henry: 'Ecclesiam nostram nimia paupertate depressam, manutenendam et protegendam, confovendam, ampliandam benigne suscepit'.

⁹¹⁴ App. I, no.46, granting additional customs at the abbey's mills on the Loire.

Fulk V,⁹¹⁵ or its parent, the Augustinian priory of Toussaint in Angers, founded by Geoffrey II.⁹¹⁶ The same conclusions arise at Beaulieu, founded by Fulk III near the demesne castle of Loches,⁹¹⁷ the vast college of Saint-Martin of Tours, to which Geoffrey gave his protection but apparently nothing material,⁹¹⁸ and the abbey of Saint-Julien of Tours, which received a substantial gift of the forest of Chédon from Aremburga and Geoffrey himself during his childhood.⁹¹⁹ Much of this material represents the ordinary business of administration – particularly dispute settlement – though Geoffrey's role as protector of Saint-Martin is noteworthy, especially in the light of the archiepiscopal evidence outlined above.

Geoffrey's relationship with other important institutions is impossible to determine. The college of Saint-Martin of Angers, for example, was reconstructed and thirteen canons provided for by Fulk III, but its archives are lost.⁹²⁰ Parts of the college were built in the Romanesque style of the mid- to late-twelfth century, and it is simply unknown whether the counts patronised this project.⁹²¹ Another institution dedicated to Saint Martin, the abbey of Marmoutier in Tours, fostered Geoffrey's biographer John, but traces of patronage are scanty. The two extant *acta* concerning Marmoutier deal with agreements or verdicts granted by Geoffrey's curia in the abbey's favour against the claims of both his own officers and the lord of Montbazou.⁹²² The case of Marmoutier, which is known to have had a vast archive, raises the problem of the survival of Geoffrey's *acta*, an issue which to a greater or lesser extent affects evaluation of his patronage of every Greater Angevin (and Norman) religious institution.

⁹¹⁵ Saint-Sauveur became a priory of Toussaint c.1122, upon Fulk's return from pilgrimage, and was the recipient of relics from the Holy Land (Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, cat. no.53; *p.j.*, no.21). For the foundation by Fulk III, see Boussard, *Le comté*, p.25, n.2.

⁹¹⁶ Toussaint's cartulary does not attest to any contact with Geoffrey, except for a judgment in the comital court over a theft (App. I, no.24).

⁹¹⁷ For which see Bernard S. Bachrach, 'The Combat Sculptures at Fulk Nerra's 'Battle Abbey' (c.1005-1012)', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.63-80, which reviews the evidence for the foundation at 66-7.

⁹¹⁸ App. I, nos. 107, 108.

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, no.102; App. IV, no.17.

⁹²⁰ Luce Pietri and Jacques Biarne, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule: dès origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle V: Province ecclésiastique de Tours (Lugdunensis Tertia)* (Paris, 1987), p.80.

⁹²¹ George H. Forsyth Jr., 'The Church of St. Martin at Angers: Roman, Merovingian and Carolingian Constructions', *Antiquity, a Quarterly Review of Archaeology* 11 (1937), pp.400-8, at 402.

⁹²² App. I, nos. 100, 101. As noted in *ibid.*, no.108, the pledge of protection sworn by Geoffrey and attributed by Chartrou to pertain to Marmoutier in fact refers to the college of Saint-Martin of Tours.

A personal choice? Burial and piety

Despite the problems associated with the survival of Geoffrey's *acta*, this survey of the extant evidence strongly suggests that generous religious patronage, particularly towards the large, established abbeys so important to his ancestors, had been reined in. This change in attitude is also reinforced by the choice of a cathedral, rather than an abbey, as his final resting place. The reasons why Geoffrey may have chosen Saint-Julien have already been appraised, but the importance of the cathedral, the cult of Saint Julien, and the importance attached to Maine by Fulk V, do not entirely itself explain this shift. The burial sites of Geoffrey's ancestors are relatively well-attested amongst the primary sources: according to Fulk IV, Geoffrey I was buried in Saint-Martin of Tours, Fulk III at his own foundation dedicated to the Holy Sepulchre at Beaulieu, and Geoffrey II at Saint-Nicolas of Angers, founded by his father;⁹²³ Fulk IV, as discussed above, was buried at L'Evière in Angers, founded by his uncle;⁹²⁴ Geoffrey IV, who predeceased his father, was buried alongside his great-uncle at Saint-Nicolas.⁹²⁵ Where and under what circumstances Geoffrey III was interred is unknown, as are the burial sites of the earliest counts, Fulk I and Fulk II. John of Marmoutier made the claim that they rested at Saint-Martin which, although likely in the light of their contacts with the college, may have been part of an attempt to strengthen the dynasty's tie with its saint.⁹²⁶

It has been suggested that Saint-Nicolas was the family's mausoleum.⁹²⁷ The evidence set out above, however, suggests that personal choice – largely amongst family foundations – was the deciding factor. It is striking that Geoffrey appears to have chosen a burial site that was neither regular, nor in Angers: if proximity to the site of Geoffrey's death had been the sole deciding factor, Henry and Matilda could easily have interred him at the Benedictine abbey of La Couture, where Geoffrey's grandfather Helias was buried, or at any of Le Mans' other prominent monastic foundations. Geoffrey's attachment to Saint-Julien instead suggests that he had made a wish to be

⁹²³ 'Fragmentum historiae Andegavensis', *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, pp.232-8, at 233, 234-5, 236. Geoffrey II's burial, after being accepted as a monk at Saint-Nicolas, is also attested in the annals of *St-Serge*, p.137, *Aquaria*, p.167 and *St-Florent*, p.189.

⁹²⁴ *Aquaria*, p.172.

⁹²⁵ *St-Aubin* pp.16, 31; *St-Serge*, 142.

⁹²⁶ Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, p.89 and n.30, citing *GCA*, pp. 31, 34, 37.

⁹²⁷ Grant, 'Architectural Patronage', p.102, also cited in agreement by Rose Walker, 'Leonor of England, Plantagenet queen of King Alfonso VIII of Castile, and her foundation of the Cistercian abbey of Las Huelgas. In imitation of Fontevraud?', *JMH* 31 (2005), pp.346-68: 364. Grant, however, notes that the women of the family from the late eleventh century onwards were often buried in reformed houses, such as Aremburga at Le Loroux and Bertrada, Fulk IV's estranged wife, at the Fontevraudine priory of Hautes-Bruyères (Yvelines, arr. Rambouillet, cant. Montfort-l'Amaury, comm. Saint-Rémy-l'Honoré).

buried there known, and is a reflection of the creeping sense of his indifference towards long-established and more recent monastic institutions implied in the sources.

Although it has been questioned, a move away in this period from traditional, Benedictine monasticism – or at least patronage of it, spurred on by the rise of the monastic orders – may partially explain Geoffrey's actions with regard to both gift-giving and burial.⁹²⁸ We have already seen that his larger grants as well as his foundations were largely for the fashionable orders of the day, particularly the Cistercians and Augustinians. These grants, however, were confined to a small number of institutions, and many of the reformed or new houses of the region – even those founded by his parents – received very little or nothing, including Fontevraud. Another strand to this explanation is therefore required.

As noted above, the chronicles are essentially silent with regard to Geoffrey's religious life; the outlook and attitudes John of Marmoutier attributes so convincingly to his subject are secular, and more particularly, martial and judicial. Glimpses of piety emerge only occasionally. The *Historia* contains a story, perhaps apocryphal, of a Christmas at Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour in Le Mans, where a boy joyfully informed Geoffrey of the birth of Christ, and was duly rewarded by the count with a prebend in the college.⁹²⁹ Elsewhere, there is evidence that Geoffrey made a ceremonial visit to the priory of Cunault in 1145, in order to give thanks to the Virgin Mary for his victory in Normandy, suggesting that he had perhaps prayed to the Virgin for assistance.⁹³⁰ Beyond these instances, however, evidence of overt piety is scanty: Geoffrey's religiosity was, at best, conventional; prayers as thanks for military victory suggest that, at worst, it was purely practical. A broad spectrum of behaviour towards local monastic institutions can be detected, and although it can be argued that Geoffrey's patronage was comparatively meagre, this does not appear to have been remarkable to contemporaries.

Pressures on patronage

So far, the effects of long-term and more immediate familial trends in patronage, the importance of creating a footprint in Maine, and personal choice and piety have all been examined as factors in Geoffrey's support of the monastic houses of the region.

⁹²⁸ For an overview of the debate, and the view that Benedictine monasticism did not 'decline' as some historians have claimed, see John Van Engen, 'The "Crisis of Cenobitism" Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150', *Speculum* 61 (1986), pp.269-304.

⁹²⁹ JM, pp.211-2.

⁹³⁰ App. I, no.41.

Other specific circumstances of Geoffrey's reign must also be taken into consideration. The previous chapters have stressed the effect of frequent and sometimes serious baronial aggression or transgression upon Geoffrey's reign; the suggestion that the conquest of Normandy had a negative impact upon Angevin affairs was also made, and Chapter 5 will show in further detail just how the conquest consumed Geoffrey's time and resources. The evidence suggests that these two significant pressures could have also impacted negatively upon religious patronage and relations with Angevin religious institutions.

In spring 1144, during the critical months of the siege at Rouen, Geoffrey returned to Angers with his eldest son. Whilst there, he met with Peter, prior of Cunault and Loudun, and his superior Peter, abbot of Tournus.⁹³¹ The diploma recording the meeting explains the precise reason for Geoffrey's return to Angers, stating that the count:

...wishes it to be known to all, that from the cogent necessity of our wars, which we are managing in Normandy, it was necessary for us to seek aid from the churches and religious of Anjou; the venerable Peter, abbot of Tournus, and Peter *de Aula*, at that time prior of Cunault and Loudun, refused to give help to us in this way⁹³²

The reason given for this refusal is that none of Geoffrey's comital ancestors demanded this kind of *auxilium*, and that it contravened the liberties bestowed upon the houses by both the counts of Anjou and the kings of France. This complaint clearly provided an occasion for an outpouring of general grievances concerning the impositions made upon the houses by Geoffrey's officials, who in turn claimed that it was not they who were placing undue pressure on the monks' men, rather it was the monks themselves who were taxing (*talliabant*) their own poverty-stricken men.

The charter, therefore, deals with two distinct, though related matters: the priories' abilities to tax their own men, and under what circumstances, versus the count's rights to customary exactions; and the immediate concern of Geoffrey to extract a lump sum of cash to help finance his Norman enterprises, and to secure his rights to the abbey's contribution to the comital army. Though Geoffrey confirmed the exemptions granted by his predecessors, he successfully reserved to himself the right to

⁹³¹ App. I, no.42.

⁹³² 'Ego Goffredus...notum fieri volumus universes, quod cum cogente necessitate guerrarum, quas in Normannia habemus, ab Ecclesiis & Religionibus Andegaviae nos quaerere subsidia oporteret, venerabilis Petrus Abbas Trenorchiensis, & Petrus de Aula tunc temporis Prior de Cunaldo & de Lausduno, facere nobis hujusmodi auxilia recusarunt...'

call upon the priories' men during periods of open warfare, a right which he claimed Geoffrey II also retained.⁹³³ The monks are assured that their lands would not be interfered with at any other time. Finally, it is stated that:

Moreover, the venerable Abbot Peter, not unmindful of the benefits [he has] accepted, gave to us out of the charity of the monastery of Tournus, one hundred pounds of the money of Anjou, and one horse to Henry, our firstborn.

This generous counter gift, couched in the language of exchange, is significant in the context of Geoffrey's original complaint of the priories' denial of *auxilium*. It was surely destined for Geoffrey's war coffers, and outstripped all of his known annual grants to the abbeys of Greater Anjou.

It has already been shown above that Geoffrey had used the tactic of extracting cash from ecclesiastics in his dealings with Bishop Ulger in the 1130s, and others have argued that the large amounts of money promised were used to fund castle-building. In the early years of his reign, Geoffrey also extracted 10,000s. from the monks of Saint-Florent by relinquishing his plans to refortify the motte at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil.⁹³⁴ As argued above, this planned castle was ostensibly part of a project of fortifications necessary to deal with baronial aggression, perhaps in this case to protect a crossing of the Loire from both the lords of Candé to the north and their Montrevault kin to the south. On the other hand, Geoffrey must have been conscious of his ancestor Geoffrey III's promise in 1061 to relinquish his rights over the motte and its wooden fortification, and may have used a claim to the site as an effective way of raising funds, by forcing a counter payment in exchange for a quitclaim.⁹³⁵

Geoffrey's programme of castle-building coupled with his search for large sums of money to tackle both the actions of local barons and provide for the conquest of Normandy may appear of small consequence for his religious patronage, but the evidence for pressure on comital resources suggests that priority had to be given to both defence and Norman matters, at the expense of gift-giving and abbey-building. The scale of the impact of the conquest and other military expenditure upon patronage is extremely difficult to gauge, but it must be recognised as a possible factor which had the

⁹³³ 'Concedimus...omnes donationes & libertates, seu concessiones quas...antecessores nostri fecerunt & concesserunt...Excepto hoc quod sibi dictus Comes [Geoffrey II] retinuit: videlicet quod quando in hostem contra inimicos nostros perrexerimus, & hoc solum causa praelli; tunc nostro jussu, vel missi a nobis, missi homines eorum in hostem pergant; nullo autem modo ullius vicarii nostri eant aliter.'

⁹³⁴ App. I, no.89.

⁹³⁵ Guillot, *Le comte* I, pp.302-4 (analysis) and II, no. C226, printed in Marchegay, *BEC* 36 (1875), p.396.

power to mould the character of Geoffrey's religious patronage.

This survey of Geoffrey's dealings with the Church in Greater Anjou shows that, in spite of a decline in material gifts, episcopal and monastic institutions remained central to comital life. Geoffrey was engaged in a process of negotiation and struggle with both the episcopate and the French kings for power and influence, and it appears that he was fairly successful in his pursuit of prerogatives. He appears to have moved away from large-scale patronage, turning his attention instead to smaller, reformist institutions, with a particular emphasis on southern Maine and Le Mans, arguably areas in which he needed to impose his authority. One particularly important institution to Geoffrey, though neither large nor renowned, was the chapter of Saint-Laud, situated within the walls of his castle in Angers. The last part of this chapter will examine the role Saint-Laud played in the dispensation of comital authority, primarily by means of document production, but also through investiture, patronage and devotion.

Saint-Laud of Angers

The final area connected to Angevin religion and patronage is that of the chapter of Saint-Laud of Angers, a small house of secular canons situated within the walls of Angers castle and which served as Geoffrey's chapel. The evidence connected to Saint-Laud is patchy, and the chapter's cartulary and scattered body of *acta* require more detailed investigation than can be achieved in this study, but it can be seen that the chapter played an important role in comital devotion and spirituality, investiture and document production.⁹³⁶ Of particular importance is evidence to suggest that previous conclusions about the role of Thomas of Loches, who is frequently cited by historians as Geoffrey's 'chancellor' (*cancellarius*) must be revised. Before examining Saint-Laud's and Thomas's role in the production of the few *acta* which can be identified as non-beneficiary-produced, it is necessary to outline the chapter's function and importance more generally.

Saint-Laud has been described as a small and poor college of only eleven canons, but it appears to have been pre-eminent amongst the secular colleges founded in Angers during the eleventh century.⁹³⁷ It was situated within the walls of the original

⁹³⁶ Dr Nicholas Paul plans to pursue this subject in his future research.

⁹³⁷ On the number of prebends, see *CSL*, p.xi. Planchenault states that the college was 'one of the poorest' in Angers, and frequently plundered during the Middle Ages. On the other hand, it had been given a generous parcel of lands, lucrative rights over boats and mills along the stretch of the Loire at Angers, and the right to the *decimae* of Angers by Geoffrey II, and this was augmented by Henry II's later

Merovingian *castrum*, and had been restored by Geoffrey Martel towards the end of his lifetime and endowed with lands and privileges around Angers and in Maine.⁹³⁸ It contained the comital chapel of Sainte-Geneviève, and together the chapel and college housed the relics of Saint-Laud,⁹³⁹ a fragment of the True Cross and a small relic of Saint Julien of Le Mans.⁹⁴⁰ John of Marmoutier attests to the importance of Saint-Laud to Geoffrey V, in a ‘direct speech’ where the count identifies it as *capella mea*.⁹⁴¹

In 1131, the dean, Guy of Athée, appears to have codified a set of rules outlining aspects of the college’s relationship with the count.⁹⁴² In this document, he described a ceremony whereby a new count (*comes vero qui de novo creatus fuerit*), his wife and their children were to be ‘received solemnly and with due ceremony’ by the canons and dean. This appears in fact be the count’s investiture to office: the count was to process to the college, where he would be welcomed by the chapter, with what appears to be either a cloak or cloth of some sort or a written document (*textu*), burning incense and holy water, and given the *thau eboraum*.⁹⁴³ This was a T-shaped ivory staff originally belonging to the sultan of Babylon, which Fulk V had allegedly sent from Jerusalem to Saint-Laud.⁹⁴⁴ By contrast with the rods (*virgae*) and sceptres commonly associated

confirmation. Within Angers, there were also secular canons at Saint-Lézin and Saint-Martin. As noted above, there is no evidence of patronage by Geoffrey of Saint-Martin, and Saint-Lézin was restored by Geoffrey to Bishop Ulger as part of an agreement their respective rights and jurisdictions within Angers (App. III, nos. 1 and 2).

⁹³⁸ CSL, no.25 (Guillot, *Le comte*, C215).

⁹³⁹ Bishop of Coutances (530-75).

⁹⁴⁰ CSL, no.68 (c.1124) details a gift given by Bishop Ulger of Angers to the college on the occasion of the display of Saint Julien’s chin. CSL, no.26 is a copy of the preface to the eleventh-century *vita* of Saint Julien by Letardus, a monk of Saint-Aubin.

⁹⁴¹ JM, p.192.

⁹⁴² CSL, no.3. Guy of Athée (*de Atheus*) may have been an ancestor of Gerard of Athée, who, along with his Tourangeaux relatives, was dismissed from his office as King John’s bailiff; Magna Carta cap. 50: J.C. Holt, *Magna Carta* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1992), p.465, and commentary, p.344. Nicholas Paul has expressed serious doubts over the identity of Guy, but this requires investigation in the future.

⁹⁴³ ‘Comes vero qui de novo creatus fuerit, cum ad ecclesiam venerit, processionaliter recipietur a capitulo et clericis sollempniter Sancti Laudi, et eciam quoscienscumque a peregrinatione longa sive ab absencia redierit idem comes quod eciam comitissa eorumque liberis observabitur, et recipientur a decano sive ab illo qui primus erit prior ejusdem ecclesie, cum textu et turibulo et aqua benedicta, tradens dicto comiti similiter in dicta receptione *thau eboraum*...’. For *textus* as a book, see ‘1 textus’, du Cange, *Glossarium* VIII, col.91b at <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/TEXTUS1> [accessed 12/08/2011].

⁹⁴⁴ CSL, no.3, note 2 identifies the *thau* as the reliquary containing a fragment of the True Cross, also sent by Fulk to the canons. However, Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997), pp.181-2, identifies it as a staff: ‘Ivory *tau* staffs were quite commonly carved in the Medieval East. Fulk obviously intended it to be used in much the same way as those sceptres which denoted lordship when presented to property owners. He wished it to be a symbol of the authority of the son he had left behind and of his future descendants in the county of Anjou, and an expression of their patronage of a family religious foundation’. Riley-Smith dates the gift of the staff to Fulk V’s first pilgrimage in 1120, which means that Geoffrey could have been created count in this manner, and that the 1131 rule reflected recently established practice. The use of *recepimus* in the statement that the college was given the staff ‘so that we received the counts in this way’ also suggests that such a ceremony had already taken

with lay rulers, this kind of staff was the preserve of bishops and abbots.⁹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the ceremony shares certain features with other contemporary rites of investiture. Geoffrey of Vigeois' description of how Richard, Henry II's son, was invested as duke of Aquitaine states that the ceremony took place at the abbey of Saint-Hilaire where the counts of Poitou were lay abbots.⁹⁴⁶ The duke sat in the abbatial throne, and was symbolically invested through the bestowal of lance and ring by the bishops of Bordeaux and Poitiers, and made a procession to Limoges. A thirteenth-century revision of the ceremony shows that, at some point, the dukes began to receive a silk mantle, a crown, a banner, and his military accoutrements.⁹⁴⁷

Guy's document states that Fulk gave the college this staff in order that the canons and dean would receive the counts in this way in the future, and that he wished 'for this to signify that the counts of the Angevins, before all [other] churches are the lords and abbots of Saint-Laud'. These titles were certainly used by the count himself. In a charter of 1144×1149, Geoffrey confirmed the privileges and lands of the college, stating that:

For the church of Saint Laud, above all others, is of my right and those of my ancestors, and pertains by hereditary right to the counts of Anjou. And the counts of Anjou are lords and abbots of this [church], and it has been specifically established that they possess its temporal goods in life and also the *spiritualia* in death, without limit.⁹⁴⁸

Both documents assert that Saint-Laud was held 'above all other' churches (*pre omnibus ecclesiis, supra omnes alias*) in Geoffrey's regard. In the charter, Geoffrey

place.

⁹⁴⁵ Crouch, *Image of the Aristocracy*, pp.211-4, discusses the uses of and differences between the rod and sceptre. The extant ivory tau-staffs detailed in *English Romanesque Art, 1066-1200*, ed. George Zarnecki, Janet Holt and Tristram Holland (London, 1984) can all be attributed to ecclesiastics or churches (nos. 179, 181, 194, 195, 205), though their uses and individual users are not fully known. In his *Lives of the Offas*, Matthew Paris depicted King Warmund sitting, crowned, with a tau-staff (MS BL Cotton Nero D. I, f.2, reprinted in Suzanne Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora* (Aldershot, 1987), fig. 232, p.389). This is the only example I could find of secular use of this kind of staff. Egerton Beck, 'The Crozier in Heraldry and Ornament', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* (1914), pp.335-40, at 336, tentatively suggests that Paris's drawing was based on his observations of Henry III.

⁹⁴⁶ *RHGF* XII, pp.442-3. What follows on this coronation rite is taken from Daniel F. Callahan, 'Eleanor of Aquitaine, the Coronation Rite of the Duke of Aquitaine and the Cult of Saint Martial of Limoges', in *The World of Eleanor of Aquitaine: Literature and Society in Southern France between the Eleventh and Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. Marcus Bull and Catherine Léglu (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.29-36.

⁹⁴⁷ Callahan, 'Eleanor of Aquitaine', p.30. Callahan notes that by the thirteenth century, the venue for the ceremony was the church of Saint-Martial, Limoges.

⁹⁴⁸ App. I, no.27: 'Ecclesia enim Sancti Laudi supra omnes alias mei juris est et antecessorum meorum, et ad Andegavie comites hereditario jure pertinet. Et comites Andegavie sunt domines et abates illius, et specialiter est statutum sicut illa cujus bona temporalia in vita et spiritualia etiam post mortem sine fine possidebunt.'

also refers to ‘my clerics of Saint-Laud’, reinforcing his position as the notional head of the college. This apparent lay abbacy was augmented by possession of a prebend at the college.⁹⁴⁹ Although it is not explicitly stated that Geoffrey was a canon of the college, the right to the prebend suggests that this would have been the case. As outlined above, Geoffrey granted Bishop Ulger a prebend at Saint-Laud as part of the settlement over Châteauneuf.⁹⁵⁰

A later charter of Henry II, in which he confirms the rights and privileges of Saint-Laud, does not identify the count as abbot.⁹⁵¹ There is, however, strong evidence that close links between count and Saint-Laud continued under Henry II in the context of his attempts to exert control over the cathedral chapter following the death of the bishop of Angers, Norman of Doué. As discussed above, Henry appealed to the pope over the episcopal election in 1155, and it is striking that the prelates who were chosen to travel to Rome were key figures in the Anglo-Norman and Angevin ecclesiastical world: the bishops of Évreux and Le Mans, the abbot of St. Albans, and the dean of Saint-Laud.⁹⁵²

Chancery and chapel

The question of the Angevin ‘chancery’ has been considered in both eleventh and twelfth century contexts, and there is a general consensus that the counts relied upon their chaplains to produce documents on the occasions that this task was not entrusted to the beneficiaries themselves.⁹⁵³ Reassessment of the evidence produces a picture of how the chapel and chancery were populated during Geoffrey’s reign.

In spite of Chartrou’s analysis of the clerks and chaplains employed by the counts, it has not been recognised that it was Saint-Laud which provided Fulk IV and Fulk V with these men. These included the successive counts’ chaplain and chancellor Geoffrey Caiphas, recorded as a canon over the course of more than fifteen years.⁹⁵⁴ The same period saw Geoffrey of Restigné, also a canon of Saint-Laud, act alongside

⁹⁴⁹ *CSL*, p.xi, citing no.74, states that one of the eleven prebends was reserved to the count, and that by the end of the eleventh century another pertained to the abbot of Saint-Nicolas.

⁹⁵⁰ App. III, nos.5, 7.

⁹⁵¹ *Pl. Acta*, no.55, where it is dated September 1174 × February 1175, perhaps January 1175; DB II, no.509; *CSL*, no.8.

⁹⁵² Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.197.

⁹⁵³ For the eleventh century: Halphen, *Le comté*, pp.192-3; Guillot, *Le comte*, I, p.422. For the twelfth: Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, pp.108-13.

⁹⁵⁴ *CSL* nos. 5, 10, 15, 17, 18, 41, 44, 45, 55, 82. Geoffrey’s earliest appearance is 1100 or thereabouts (nos. 10, 18), and latest is 1116 (no.17). He is largely titled canon, but nos. 10 and 41 (c.1100) record an exchange of properties with Fulk IV, where Geoffrey is identified as the count’s clerk and chaplain.

Geoffrey Caiphas as chaplain.⁹⁵⁵ The activity of Master Foucois or Fulcoius as Fulk V's chaplain coincided with Caiphas' death or retirement from service c.1116; like his predecessor, Fulcoius acted in a clerical capacity, sealing a charter for the count in 1118, though he is only recorded as a canon from the beginning of the 1130s.⁹⁵⁶ Another canon, Gilbert, is described as chancellor in a grant he drew up for Fulk in 1116 (*meusque cancellarius qui et hoc scriptum fecit*).⁹⁵⁷

There was a strong precedent, therefore, for the use of canons of Saint-Laud as comital chaplains, clerks and chancellors. Geoffrey V undoubtedly continued this practice. A Fulcoius appears as canon in the college's charters during this period, including several of Geoffrey's *acta* for the canons, where he twice takes the title of chaplain.⁹⁵⁸ Another canon, Gerald of Beaufort, seems to have acted regularly as Geoffrey's notary in the 1140s before entering the service of William of La Mouche, bishop of Angers, as chaplain during the 1160s.⁹⁵⁹ Gerald was responsible for three of Geoffrey's charters – one under the supervision of Thomas in his sole Angevin appearance as chancellor – and witnessed a further two charters issued by the count in favour of Saint-Laud.⁹⁶⁰

This is not to say that the counts sourced their clerks exclusively from Saint-Laud. Geoffrey also utilised scribes connected with other institutions in Greater Anjou: an individual named Burgeric is described as the count's notary in an act he drew up in favour of the abbey of Cormery while Geoffrey was in the field with his army; he also witnessed Geoffrey's act for Le Loroux in the capacity of comital notary.⁹⁶¹ Although

⁹⁵⁵ Noted by Guillot, *Le comte* I, p.422, n.371, but without mention of Saint-Laud.

⁹⁵⁶ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pp.109-10, notes his (*Fulcodius*, *Fulcoius*) in two charters (cat. nos. 28 (*p.j.* no.9, a text of 1116 or earlier where he is titled *magister capellanus*), and 74 (*p.j.* no.29, from the period 1115×26, as chaplain only)). Her identification of *Fulconis*, i.e. *Fulco*, Fulk, in a charter of 1117-8 (cat. no.45; *p.j.* no.18, printed from an 18th-century copy by Gaignières), as a different chaplain seems misplaced. This is the only evidence for such an individual, and it seems likely that this is a scribal or copyist error for *Fulcoius*, an easy rearrangement of minims. Here Fulcoius is described as chaplain (*capellanus noster*) to Fulk and the young Geoffrey V; he sealed a charter for the pair before it was signed by their own hands.

⁹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, cat. no.33 (*p.j.* no.12).

⁹⁵⁸ App. I, nos. 15 (canon), 25 (chaplain and canon), 26 (canon), apparently 58 (for La Couture, witnessed by *Fulchonis capellanus comitis*); App. III, no.7, is witnessed by a canon of Saint-Laud named as *Fulcoius fulconiarus*; Fulcoius also appears in *CSL* nos. 39 (*magister*) and 57 (canon). All of these charters fall in the period between c.1131 and c.1150.

⁹⁵⁹ For Gerald's later career, *CSL* nos. 30, 42, 51, 73 (as the bishop's chaplain) and 74, all dated c.1160-77.

⁹⁶⁰ App. I, nos. 16 (1142, as scribe [*'cujus manu hec carta bullata est'*] and with Thomas the chancellor), 26 (1145×46, as canon); 27 (1144×49, as canon); 28 (9th September 1149/50, as scribe [*'qui hanc cartam scripsit'*]); 34 (28th January 1144, *'tunc temporis illius comitis notario'*, and see accompanying note for previous doubts over the transcription of Gerald's name).

⁹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, nos.39, 57.

drawn up in different locations, these acts share a dating clause which identifies the year as that in which Louis VII took the cross; both acts also share an address clause – *omnibus tam futuris quam presentibus et qui litteras ipsas viderint audierint vel legerint* – with Geoffrey’s grant to Fulk of La Roussière.⁹⁶² This formula does not appear elsewhere in Geoffrey’s *acta*, but a variant (*universis qui paginam istam viderint, legerint vel audierint*) can be found in an act issued by Bishop Guy of Le Mans, which was copied into the *Actus pontificum Cenomannis* in the twelfth century.⁹⁶³ Chartrou suggested that Burgeric was the chanter of Le Mans cathedral, and although the evidence she cited is erroneous, the shared diplomatic features of this body of charters, Burgeric’s presence alongside other Manceaux, and the existence of several individuals named Burgeric amongst the dignitaries of Saint-Julien all suggest that Geoffrey turned to the chapter for clerical assistance.⁹⁶⁴ It is conceivable that Burgeric was even the *magister scholarum* of Saint-Julien.⁹⁶⁵ Geoffrey certainly made use of skilled individuals such as Master Matthew, tutor to his sisters and his son Henry, and Engelbald of Vendôme, the future archbishop of Tours, as *ad hoc* scribes and chaplains.⁹⁶⁶

Thomas of Loches

It is accepted by historians that Thomas, prior of Notre-Dame of Loches and one of the authors of the *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*, was Geoffrey’s chaplain and chancellor in both Anjou and Normandy.⁹⁶⁷ The evidence of the *acta*, however, suggests that Thomas of Loches was not always the individual designated by mentions of Thomas *capellanus* or *notarius*, and that some of these instances in fact represent a different Thomas, associated with Saint-Laud.

The identification of Thomas as Geoffrey’s notary, chaplain and, on occasion, chancellor (*cancellarius*) is in part justified by the chronicle and charter evidence, but

⁹⁶² Ibid., no.52.

⁹⁶³ *APC*, p.438.

⁹⁶⁴ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.110, citing App. I, no.57, where the second and fourth witnesses are in fact two separate individuals, *Roberto Bugerico cantore...Bugerico notario meo*. Cf. *CSV*, nos. 112 (witnessed by Boieric, chanter, 1148×78), 329 (witnessed by Bulgeric, chanter, late 11th-early 12th-century); 680 (witnessed by Burgeric, canon, issued 1135×42).

⁹⁶⁵ A Bulgeric is named in this capacity in App. I, no.25, Geoffrey’s chirograph for Saint-Laud.

⁹⁶⁶ App. I, no.89, and see above.

⁹⁶⁷ *Coutumes et institutions de l’Anjou et du Maine antérieures au XVIe siècle: textes et documents*, ed. C.-J. Beaupré (8 vols., Paris, 1877-97) II (I), pp.221-2; Port, *Dictionnaire* III, p.50; *Chroniques*, ed. Marchegay and Salmon, pp.xvi-xvii (introduction by Mabille); *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, p.xxviii; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.136-7; Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, p.111; *RRAN* III, p.xxxiii, n.3.

has become orthodoxy primarily due to the influence of the nineteenth-century historiography. Although Halphen and Poupardin challenged much of the contextual annotation of the *Gesta* provided by Émile Mabille in an earlier edition, they agreed with Mabille that Thomas, who was employed by Fulk V as a notary and promoted by him to the vacant priory of Loches, was Geoffrey's chaplain and chancellor.⁹⁶⁸ The authority for this identification is the brief chronicle of Notre-Dame of Loches, which states that Fulk endowed Thomas *de Paccio*, a notary, with the priory.⁹⁶⁹ Recent work has shown that this chronicle was composed in the fifteenth century – as opposed to late-twelfth century, as previously thought – in response to litigation over the college's prebends.⁹⁷⁰ While the chronicle's authority is questionable, there is no question that the twelfth-century prior was named Thomas, and he was a notary.

The twelfth-century evidence for the identification of the same Thomas as Fulk and Geoffrey's chaplain and clerk is slight. For proof of Thomas's chaplaincy, Chartrou points towards Fulk's assent on 18th November 1128 to a grant made to Tiron Abbey by Fulk of Montfaucon and witnessed by Thomas the chaplain, who appeared in the count's entourage.⁹⁷¹ She also cites the appearance of a comital 'secretary' (*secretarius meus*) in a grant by Fulk to two hermits near Montbazou in 1120. Contrary to this assertion, however, the text of the grant in fact names the secretary as John, and indicates that he was a hermit himself.⁹⁷²

Nonetheless, Prior Thomas certainly appears in Geoffrey's charters, and is

⁹⁶⁸ The brief chronicle of Notre-Dame of Loches notes that Fulk gave the position to *Thomas de Paccio notario*, who did not reside at the priory for a long time after his nomination: 'Chronicon ecclesiae beatae Mariae de Lochis', *Chroniques de Touraine*, ed. Salmon, p.377, and discussion, pp. cl-cli. The chronicle does not state that he was Fulk's chaplain, but on the strength of earlier chaplains undertaking notarial duties, historians have presumed that this was the case with Thomas; see especially Halphen and Poupardin, *Chroniques*, p.xxviii. This version of events has been influential well into the twentieth century, and in addition to the citations in the previous note, see Henri Martin, 'Autour de Thomas Pactius, prieur de la Collégiale de Loches', *Bulletin Trimestriel de la Société Archéologique de Touraine* 41 (1986), pp.389-95, and Robert-Henri Bautier, 'Chancellerie et culture au moyen âge', *Cancellaria e cultura nel Medio Evo: Comunicazioni presentate nelle giornate di studio della Commissione [Internazionale di Diplomatica]*, ed. G. Gualdo (Vatican, 1990), pp.1-75, repr. Bautier, *Chartes, sceaux et chancelleries: études de diplomatique et de sigillographie médiévales* (2 vols., Paris, 1990), I, pp.47-121, at 8.

⁹⁶⁹ *Chronicon ecclesiae beatae Mariae de Lochis*, p.377.

⁹⁷⁰ Martin, 'Autour de Thomas Pactius', p.392.

⁹⁷¹ Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.111, n.5; *CTV* I, no.90.

⁹⁷² Recorded in a *vidimus* of 1439, recounting a record drawn up in 1127 of a grant originally made in 1120 (*p.j.* no.38, from Paris BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), nos.1489, 1491) to found Saint-Jean-du-Grais: 'Hujus elemosinae donum factum est eo anno quo mihi Hierosolimam ire contigit, presente et rogante Johanne, secretario meo, qui in locis heremetice professionis animas habitasse perhibebat, et, longe ante, Dei servitio ibidem vitam suam devovisse'. Examination of the microfilm indicates that John is the correct transcription.

explicitly described in 1138 as both prior of Loches and Geoffrey's notary, responsible for drafting an act (*hec carta data est per manum Tome prioris Lochensis, notarii comitis*), though its final version was drawn up by Reginald of Le Pin, a monk of Saint-Florent, who appears to have been designated by the beneficiaries, the men of Saumur, to provide scribal services.⁹⁷³ Prior Thomas also witnessed Geoffrey's 1133 agreement with the abbey of Saint-Florent, which was drawn up by Master Matthew.⁹⁷⁴ The first act indicates that Prior Thomas was associated with comital document production, but none of the remaining twenty-one or twenty-two occurrences of a Thomas described as either chancellor, chaplain or notary identify these figures with the prior of Loches.⁹⁷⁵ Of these texts, seven describe Thomas as simply chaplain (*capellanus*);⁹⁷⁶ three further texts describe him as the comital chaplain,⁹⁷⁷ while an act issued in favour of Cormery points out his notarial role (*data per manum Thome notarii mei*).⁹⁷⁸ An act issued in favour of Pagan Arnald, a canon of Saint-Julien of Le Mans, indicates that Thomas the chaplain and Thomas the notary were the same individual.⁹⁷⁹ The remaining six texts give the title of chancellor (*cancellarius*) to Thomas; all of these occurrences are in texts issued in Normandy during the ducal period,⁹⁸⁰ with the exception of an act drawn up for Ronceray in 1142, in which Thomas is again noted to have delegated the task of writing, in this case to Gerald, the notary and canon of Saint-Laud.⁹⁸¹

Amongst these *acta* is evidence both that there was more than one individual named Thomas active in Geoffrey's chapel/chancery. At some point during the reign, Geoffrey appears to have granted the priory of Loches tithes from the comital demesne; the gift was received by Prior Thomas, and the accompanying act drawn up by two notaries, Master Guy and Thomas.⁹⁸² Here, then, appears to be two separate individuals named Thomas. A closer look at the *acta* which mention Thomas suggests that Geoffrey employed a second individual who was a canon of Saint-Laud to act as chaplain, and perhaps therefore as clerk: two of the *acta* state that Thomas the chaplain

⁹⁷³ App. I, no.93.

⁹⁷⁴ Ibid., no.89.

⁹⁷⁵ Ibid., nos. 3, 7, 15, 16, 25, 29, 31, 37, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 65, 70, 72, 73, 79, possibly 86 (Thomas *clericus*), 92, 103, 107.

⁹⁷⁶ Ibid., nos. 7, 15, 25, 29, 31, 46, 92.

⁹⁷⁷ Ibid., nos. 3, 103, 107.

⁹⁷⁸ Ibid., no.37.

⁹⁷⁹ Ibid., no.65.

⁹⁸⁰ Ibid., nos. 43, 53, 72, 73, 79.

⁹⁸¹ Ibid., no.16.

⁹⁸² Ibid., no.70.

was either a canon of Saint-Laud or at the very least associated with the chapter,⁹⁸³ while another in which he is named as count's chaplain was issued in the cloister of the college itself.⁹⁸⁴ Together with the evidence for the historical precedent and contemporary practice of using Saint-Laud as both chapel and chancery, and the identification in the act for Pagan Arnald of Thomas 'our chaplain and notary', the acts suggest that a canon called Thomas played a role in comital document production and spiritual well-being, alongside other canons like Gerald of Beaufort. The complex question of chancery- and beneficiary-produced documents cannot be addressed in full here, but it appears that, of those cases in which Geoffrey did supply his own scribes, a considerable number were drawn from his chapel, one of the smallest but arguably most important institutions from the comital perspective in Greater Anjou.

⁹⁸³ Ibid., nos. 15 (described as chaplain, *de canonicis*; issued in Angers, 1140) and 25 (chaplain, witnessed *ex parte vero canonicorum* in an act issued for Saint-Laud).

⁹⁸⁴ Ibid., no.3.

Chapter 5

The conquest of Normandy

This chapter examines Geoffrey's conquest of Normandy in detail, identifying and analysing the processes which led to Angevin rule of the duchy, while Geoffrey's ducal reign itself is addressed in Chapter 6. It is possible to reconstruct how a solid foundation for Angevin rule of the duchy was established. Normandy was not won by force alone: Geoffrey had to spend nearly a decade winning the support of Anglo-Norman magnates, making promises for the future and dispensing his growing authority in as delicate a manner as possible, as well as taking castles and regions of the duchy by military force. The territorial and political advantages gained by securing magnate support were as important a part of the conquest as Geoffrey's command of military techniques, which will not be examined in technical detail here. Defection was a fundamental dynamic of the conquest, instrumental in translating military advantages into actual power, and the defection of key magnates was the trigger for substantial Angevin progress in 1135, 1138 and 1141.

Three cases – Stephen's county of Mortain and the Avranchin and Cotentin; the estates of Robert of Gloucester; and the land and patronage networks controlled by the Beaumont twins Waleran of Meulan and Robert of Leicester – will be returned to throughout this chapter, for they create a vivid picture of how the tide turned against Stephen.⁹⁸⁵ Comparison of chronicle accounts with charter material and inquests into military service and knights' fees in 1133 and 1172 indicates the scale of Geoffrey's progress in these three particular cases, and suggests a model for how the conquest was achieved in areas of the duchy which are less well-documented. This methodology also shows that the defection of individuals could bring over entire kin-groups whose networks of castles and alliances were put beyond Stephen's use, and when examined in conjunction with the chronicle evidence, suggests that the Angevin foothold in Normandy prior to 1141 was larger than previously supposed. Recourse to these sources and this method is necessary in order to build up a fuller picture than that provided by the chroniclers – particularly Orderic, but also Robert of Torigny, John of Marmoutier and the English chroniclers – whose accounts have hitherto been the foundation of all other modern accounts of the conquest.

⁹⁸⁵ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.58.

The capture of King Stephen at the Battle of Lincoln in 1141 has been identified as a fortuitous turning-point, and decisive in transforming Angevin fortunes in Normandy, largely through the defection of Waleran of Meulan.⁹⁸⁶ This chapter explores the ways in which Geoffrey could begin to dispense *de facto* authority from this point onwards, and argues that although his influence can be detected in certain areas, primarily episcopal elections, his will was not imposed nor the ducal title adopted prior to the fall of Rouen in April 1144, an attitude which can be traced in the charter evidence until the immediate eve of Rouen's capture. Rather, his assumption of certain ducal prerogatives has to be understood to have been part of a process of negotiation. The Norman aristocracy and episcopacy held the keys to power, and the evidence suggests that Geoffrey was acutely aware of a need to approach the assumption of rule delicately. Even though some of his supporters applied the ducal title to him prior to his investiture, Geoffrey was more circumspect. Historians have emphasised the tendency of the Anglo-Norman aristocracy to protect their interests during the succession crisis, and recently baronial neutrality, self-interest and self-preservation have been detected amongst even Geoffrey's earliest supporters, such as Juhel of Mayenne and William Talvas.⁹⁸⁷ This chapter engages with baronial attitudes towards Geoffrey – and interactions with him – both before and after 1141, and suggests that the 'pleas and promises' he had to make to gain their support formed a key dynamic of the conquest.⁹⁸⁸ Patronage through land, title and influence underpinned first Geoffrey's *de facto* then his *de jure* ducal authority.

This chapter, therefore, seeks to determine why Geoffrey was ultimately the most attractive contender for the ducal title, and to identify the forces which came into play during the process of Geoffrey and Matilda establishing themselves as 'real alternatives to Stephen', a conspicuously absent king-duke whose duchy was deemed leaderless by its inhabitants as early as 1136.⁹⁸⁹ It shows that the conquest's course and

⁹⁸⁶ See especially Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, pp.49-55; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.105-6.

⁹⁸⁷ David Crouch, 'A Norman *'conventio'* and bonds of lordship in the middle ages', *Law and government in medieval England and Normandy*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp.299-324; Edmund King, 'King Stephen and the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy', *History Journal* 59 (1974), pp.180-94; Paul Dalton, '*In neutro latere*: the armed neutrality of Ranulf II earl of Chester in King Stephen's reign', *ANS* 16 (1992), pp.39-59; idem, 'Allegiance and Intelligence in King Stephen's Reign', *King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Dalton and White, pp.80-97; Annie Renoux, 'Châteaux, maisons fossoyées et baronnie dans le comté du Maine au XII^e et XIII^e siècles', *Les seigneuries dans l'espace Plantagenêt (c.1150-c.1250)*, ed. Martin Aurell and Frédéric Boutoulle (Bordeaux, 2009), pp.225-53, at 233-4; Thompson, 'William Talvas', p.172.

⁹⁸⁸ OV VI, pp.514-5.

⁹⁸⁹ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.62 (with reference to the events of 1136-7); OV VI, pp.456-7.

success were absolutely bound up with the actions of the Anglo-Norman elite, whose support was won in a variety of ways. It also shows that Geoffrey was able to begin dispensing *de facto* ducal authority prior to 1144, but that this was done sensitively. Normandy's significance in the wider struggle between Stephen and Matilda has been increasingly recognised in recent work, and this chapter provides an account of events, issues and dynamics in the duchy from an Angevin perspective.⁹⁹⁰

1135-41: defection, unrest and the Angevin foothold

The first five years of the conquest witnessed limited but nonetheless significant Angevin success. Geoffrey and Matilda had to work hard to establish and maintain a Norman presence, and the natural location for this was the Maine-Normandy border, their entry-point into the duchy and the site of Matilda's dowry castles, some of which had been refortified by Henry I.⁹⁹¹ From this foothold, the couple extended their power north, west and east. Although Stephen's capture at Lincoln on 2nd February 1141 was the catalyst which transformed regional stalemates achieved during this period into a winnable conquest, Geoffrey's activities in the 1130s first require examination. Stephen's visit to Normandy in 1137 is traditionally viewed as the nadir of Angevin fortunes,⁹⁹² and although what follows does not dispute that the situation was difficult, it suggests that Angevin progress was not utterly halted, for Geoffrey was able to tap into local networks of power and influence to maintain and extend a foothold in southern and south-western Normandy which posed a significant threat to Stephen's authority. This examination also extends to Robert of Gloucester, who defected to the Angevins in 1138, and whose support was instrumental in solidifying a convincing presence in central Normandy.

Aristocratic support and the scale of the Angevin foothold in the south-west

Geoffrey and Matilda allied themselves with dissatisfied magnates and gained local support in Normandy to further their cause even prior to Henry's death, and this tactic continued after 1st December 1135. The alliance with William Talvas was mutually beneficial, boosting the couple's presence along the Maine border, where

⁹⁹⁰ See, for example, Marjorie Chibnall, 'Introduction', *King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Dalton and White, pp.1-9, at 3 and 5.

⁹⁹¹ Green, *Henry I*, p.219, for Argentan.

⁹⁹² Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.66; Heather J. Tanner, 'Reassessing King Stephen's Continental Strategies', *Medievalia et humanistica* n.s. 26 (1999), pp.101-17.

castles were claimed, and giving weight to Talvas' claim to Sées and other confiscated estates.⁹⁹³ As soon as Henry died, the couple capitalised upon the support they already had in the region, placing castles into the hands of the Bohon brothers from the Cotentin, and gaining access to the apparatus of local administration through Wigan Algason, vicomte of Exmes.⁹⁹⁴ According to John of Marmoutier, Alexander and Engelger of Bohon were granted Argentan and Domfront with the express aim of ravaging the countryside around Mortain, the Cotentin and elsewhere.⁹⁹⁵ Juhel of Mayenne, whose interests straddled the Maine-Normandy border, also received custody of Gorron, Colmont and Ambrières, the three castles which probably had formed Geoffrey's sister Matilda's dowry.⁹⁹⁶ In Juhel, they gained a high-profile ally with substantial resources from a lordship whose bounds measured around sixty by twenty-five kilometres, taking in castellanies such as Ernée along the southern border of Mortain and the Avranchin.⁹⁹⁷ This was particularly important for, as the previous chapters have shown, Geoffrey's Manceaux barons only came under weak comital authority and were eminently capable of using their resources against their overlord.

Settling these three castles into the custody of a loyal follower was particularly important in the case of Gorron, which had been in the hands of the counts of Mortain in the late eleventh century.⁹⁹⁸ The *Infeudationes militum* – the survey into knights' fees conducted by Henry II in 1172 – indicates that Achard of Ambrières alone owed eleven fees, a relatively high total in a Norman context, and one which represented a substantial military asset which Stephen may have expected to exert control over.⁹⁹⁹ It has been argued that Juhel wavered in his support for Geoffrey on at least one occasion, apparently adding his *signum* to a charter granted by some of his vassals to Savigny in August 1137, and dated with reference to 'Stephen, king of the English and duke of the

⁹⁹³ OV VI, pp.444-7.

⁹⁹⁴ Ibid, pp.454-5. For Wigan, see K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, 'Two studies in northern French prosopography', *JMH* 20 (1994), pp.3-37, and Mark Hagger, 'The Norman vicomte, c.1035-1135: what did he do?', *ANS* 29 (2007), pp.65-83, at 72.

⁹⁹⁵ JM, p.225: 'Argentomagum et Damfruntum, non sine discriminis difficultate captos, Ingelgerio de Bohon et Alexandro, duobus fratribus, commendavit. Hii frequenti excursu in valle Moritonii et in Constantiniensi pago et in circumadjacenti Normannia ferro, flamma, rapinis, stragem non minimam exoptantibus faciebant'. WM, *HN*, p.26 emphasises the importance of Domfront.

⁹⁹⁶ RT I, pp.199-200.

⁹⁹⁷ Renoux, 'Châteaux', pp.238-9; Boussard, *Le comté*, pp.58-61.

⁹⁹⁸ Power, 'What did the Frontier of Angevin Normandy comprise?', *ANS* 17 (1995), pp.181-201, at 187.

⁹⁹⁹ *RB* II, p.639. Only one of these knights was required to serve in the ducal army. For detailed discussion of the *Infeudationes*, see below. For Achard of Ambrières and Stephen's grants to the family, see Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.386.

Normans'.¹⁰⁰⁰ Renoux's argument, however, is problematic, as the document in question is in fact two separate texts, the first a notice of a charter issued by Joscelin *de Poe*, dated 1137 and by Stephen's reign; it is the second, an undated notice of a charter issued by Philip of Landivy, which has Juhel's *signum* inverted at the bottom. This evidence is therefore inconclusive, and although Juhel does not reappear in the chronicles after the early stages of the conquest, he was named as a surety on Geoffrey's behalf in the negotiations between Matilda and her English followers in 1141.¹⁰⁰¹ Like William Talvas, discussed below, his continued importance to the succession crisis appears to have been greater than the extant sources suggest.

Geoffrey and Matilda's line of castles thus extended 80km from Exmes in the east to Domfront and Gorron in the west, and they commanded the support of two major local magnates, at least one of Henry I's former officials and a Cotentin family. They were further served by a group of barons from the Cotentin, many of whom had ties to Baldwin of Redvers, earl of Devon who, the *Gesta Stephani* states, was exiled from England in 1136 and,

‘complained bitterly to his friends and relations [...] And those very distinguished men, showing tender compassion for his complaints, aided him so vigorously with deed and counsel that they admitted him and his followers into their own castles and granted him without reserve the service and respect due to a lord. So he himself, with very numerous supporters, began to cause strife in the whole of Normandy, directed especially against the king's adherents; he did not refrain from plunder or violence; he did not shrink from the sword or from arson; by sudden pillaging raids he carried everything away without pity; creating disorder everywhere he made himself a terror to all.’¹⁰⁰²

Baldwin's defection brought with it the support of his brother William, lord of Vernon (Eure, arr. Évreux) and Néhou (Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville, cant. Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte), and their cousin, Stephen of Magneville/Mandeville.¹⁰⁰³ A Cotentin neighbour, Samson Foliot, also lent his support to Baldwin as early as 1136.¹⁰⁰⁴ All

¹⁰⁰⁰ Renoux, 'Châteaux', pp.233-4, citing Paris AN L971, no.560.

¹⁰⁰¹ *RRAN* III, nos. 275, 634.

¹⁰⁰² *GS*, pp.44-7.

¹⁰⁰³ *OV* VI, pp.510-3. As Chibnall points out in *OV* VI, p.511, n.7, Stephen's family was originally from Magneville (Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville, cant. Briquebec), and had settled – as the Mandevilles – in Erlestoke (Wiltshire; given by Chibnall as Earl Stoke), near Devizes, and near Baldwin of Redvers' earldom of Devon.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Robert Bearman, 'Baldwin de Redvers: Some Aspects of a Baronial Career in the Reign of King Stephen', *ANS* 18, pp.20-46, at 35.

three remained loyal to Geoffrey in 1137 despite Stephen's visit to the duchy.¹⁰⁰⁵ Orderic also states that Matilda's half-brother Reginald of Dunstanville also played a role in organising this group of men, though whether he had lands in western Normandy is unknown.¹⁰⁰⁶ After Stephen had left Normandy in December 1137, these lords banded together and killed Roger fitz Nigel, vicomte of the Cotentin, who had been placed in charge of the duchy by Stephen; they then raided the Cotentin.¹⁰⁰⁷

Orderic states that Stephen's demesne castle of Saint-Pois (Manche, arr. Avranches) in the north-west of Mortain was fortified, perhaps as early as 1135, by a certain Richard Silvanus who 'after the death of King Henry...assembled bandits from all sides and violently slaughtered the people of God', raiding around the region until he was killed by Stephen's men in 1137.¹⁰⁰⁸ In the same year Gilduin of Dol, the lord of Combours (Ile-et-Vilaine, arr. Saint-Malo, chef lieu de cant.), raided the abbey of Mont-St-Michel, an institution with which the counts of Mortain had little contact but which lay on the fringes of the Avranchin.¹⁰⁰⁹

This mixture of apparently random violence and deliberate aristocratic support is the extent of the information provided by the chronicles, and led Heather Tanner to argue that 'Geoffrey's allies were of limited use in establishing his authority in Normandy, since they were outsiders in Norman governance'.¹⁰¹⁰ A re-examination of the evidence, however, indicates the strength and practical value of the networks of support – of which these figures were the most prominent – in the region around

¹⁰⁰⁵ OV VI, pp.490-2, 510-13; JM, p.225; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.74.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.74; OV VI, pp.510-1. Cf. Kathleen Thompson, 'Affairs of State: the illegitimate children of Henry I', *JMH* 29 (2003), pp.129-51, at 143-6, where Reginald's parentage is discussed in an English context. Reginald took Cornwall, a former Mortain possession, in 1140 (*GS*, pp.100-3).

¹⁰⁰⁷ OV VI, pp.510-13; Tanner, 'Stephen's Continental Strategies', p.105.

¹⁰⁰⁸ OV VI, pp.490-3. Helmerichs, 'Norman Itinerary', p.96, notes that contrary to the itinerary provided in *RRAN* III, Stephen did not travel to Saint-Pois himself. For the extent of the county and the count of Mortain's outlying possessions in the Cotentin – including Coutances itself – see Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.58-9.

¹⁰⁰⁹ OV VI, pp.492-3; Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.388-9. For the count of Mortain's ambivalence to Mont-St-Michel, despite patronage of its English dependency at St. Michael's Mount, see Brian Golding, 'The religious patronage of Robert and William of Mortain', *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. Richard Gameson and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford, 2001), pp.211-30.

¹⁰¹⁰ Tanner, 'Stephen's Continental Strategies', p.103; see also the assertion that 'after 1136, the house of Anjou had occupied the duchy more by force than by persuasion', Aurell, *Plantagenet Empire*, p.209. Cf. King, *King Stephen*, pp.181-2, who argues that from early 1142, 'the takeover of Normandy...was not an event but a process, one which stretched over three years. Normandy was lost to Stephen not in battle but as a series of Norman lords and Norman garrisons followed the example of the garrisons of the frontier castles of Verneuil and Nonancourt'; Green, 'Unity and Disunity', notes at p.133 that local loyalty to the duke had been central to the maintenance of his authority prior to 1135.

Stephen's own county of Mortain. Here, Stephen directly commanded several strongholds and was owed substantial amounts of military service; although opinion has been split over the political value and wealth of western Normandy, the Avranchin and Mortain was one area to which Stephen could have turned to quell the threat posed in 1135.¹⁰¹¹ As King has noted, commentators such as Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis attest to Stephen's important role at the head of a substantial army which served Henry I, and the implication that he commanded substantial military resources as count is confirmed by the 1172 *Infeudationes militum*.¹⁰¹²

Henry II's 1172 assessment of Norman knights' fees indicates that Stephen probably had nearly thirty fees in demesne at Mortain, and could draw upon service owed from his scattered Avranchin and Cotentin holdings; together, these estates could yield a powerful force grounded near the Maine border.¹⁰¹³ In Crouch's estimation, they would probably have been equivalent to around a hundred English knights' fees.¹⁰¹⁴ A significant number of those named by the chroniclers as being amongst Geoffrey's earliest supporters also owed knight service to Stephen as both count and duke. Thus in 1172 Engelger of Bohon, whose seat of power lay in the Cotentin to the north, had seven knights in his service, of which he owed two and one-seventh in military service to the duke,¹⁰¹⁵ his relative, Humphrey of Bohon, had two knights' fees, and owed

¹⁰¹¹ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.151, suggests that 'the political value of Avranches was relatively small compared with that of other Norman dioceses'; Richard Allen, 'Five charters concerning the early history of the chapter at Avranches', *Tabularia «Documents»* 8 (2008), pp.1-33, at p.4, suggests that Curthose's grant of the Avranchin and Cotentin to Henry (I) 'had dramatic consequences for the region, which was essentially severed from the rest of the duchy'. Richard Allen was kind enough to let me consult his unpublished *addenda* and *corrigenda* to this article, which do not affect its argument with respect to this broad point or to the circumstances of the events in the Avranchin in 1142 and 1143. Cf. Jacques Boussard, 'Le comté de Mortain au XI^e siècle', *Moyen Age* 58 (1952), p. 253-279, at p.257; Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.469: 'large lordships of the Talvas...and the Saosnois or the counties of Mortain and Eu...gave their holders the potential to exert effective local hegemony'. For a detailed examination of Mortain's military infrastructure, see Jean Pouëssel, 'Les structures militaires du comté de Mortain (XI^e-XII^e siècles)', *Revue de l'Avranchin et du Pays de Granville* 58 (1981), pp.11-74, 81-156; for a limited account Stephen's activities as count of Mortain prior to 1135, see Edmund King, 'Stephen of Blois, Count of Mortain and Boulogne', *EHR* 115 (2000), pp.271-96.

¹⁰¹² King, 'Stephen of Blois', p.275, citing Suger, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, ed. and trans. Richard C. Cusimano and John Moorhead (Washington DC, 1991), p.111.

¹⁰¹³ These figures are from *RB* II, pp.624-45, at p.643. Essential to understanding the roll's treatment of the Mortain fees (in the king-duke's hand in 1172) is F. M. Powicke, 'The Honour of Mortain in the Norman *Infeudationes Militum* of 1172', *EHR* 26 (1911), pp.89-93. According to Keefe, *Feudal Assessments*, pp.4-5, the amount of service owed in the 1172 roll is 'traditional', representing earlier practice rather than a rise during Henry II's reign. There is not space here to examine this question further, but see also Nicholas J. C. Smith, *Servicium Debitum and Scutage in Twelfth Century England with Comparisons to the Regno of Southern Italy*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Durham University (2 vols., 2010) I, passim, for discussion of the issues associated with the *Infeudationes*.

¹⁰¹⁴ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.20.

¹⁰¹⁵ *RB* II, p.627.

service to the duke for both.¹⁰¹⁶ Richard of Vernon, William of Vernon's son, had thirty knights in his service in the Cotentin, ten of which from the lordship of N  hou were expected to serve in the ducal army; a further five knights' fees were held within the county of Mortain.¹⁰¹⁷ Of the three knights' fees held by Roger of Magneville in the *baillia* of the Cotentin, two and a half were owed in military service, resources which could feasibly have been under the control of Stephen of Mandeville in the 1130s.¹⁰¹⁸

In 1172, moreover, a Richard Silvanus or Silvain was responsible for the coordination of the dozens of knights the count of Mortain owed to the duke from Mortain and C  rences for forty days service *en marche* each year, and surfaces again at the end of Richard I's reign as an escheator of Norman estates.¹⁰¹⁹ The earlier Richard's access to one of Stephen's demesne castles suggests that he may have dispensed the same duties, and was therefore not the 'minor castellan' historians have deemed him.¹⁰²⁰ Although Stephen's men arrested the threat posed by Richard by, as Orderic tells us, besieging and killing him at Saint-Pois, this episode suggests that, for a time, parts of the military apparatus of the county of Mortain was put beyond Stephen's use.¹⁰²¹ Orderic also wrote that 'after the death of King Henry [Richard] assembled bandits from all sides and violently slaughtered the people of God'; these 'bandits' were in fact, at least in part, Richard's own affinity, for he is described as their lord. Although Orderic makes it clear that other Mortanais opposed Richard, stating that '[I]t happened that one day when the brigand Silvanus was in pursuit of booty a troop of knights from the neighbouring strongholds set fire to the village of Saint-Pois', it seems that the same process of exploiting ties of lordship and friendship employed by Baldwin of Redvers to Geoffrey's benefit were at play here.¹⁰²² Orderic's presentation of these events as apparently random and isolated conceals Richard's probable role at the heart of Mortain's military apparatus; whether this was through ignorance or part of a strategy to

¹⁰¹⁶ Ibid., p.628. Humphrey was Stephen's steward in England, and joined the Angevins in 1139: *RRAN* III, pp.xviii, xxxi; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.100.

¹⁰¹⁷ *RB* II, p.630. Delisle, *Recueil* I, no.34, a confirmation charter issued by Henry II in favour of the abbey of Blanchelande in 1157 indicates William and Richard's relationship.

¹⁰¹⁸ *RB* II, p.635; *eadem baillia* appears to refer to the *baillia* of Osbert of La Heuse in the previous section.

¹⁰¹⁹ Ibid., p.643; W. E. Wightman, *The Lacy Family in England and Normandy, 1066-1194* (Oxford, 1966), pp.223-5; cf. J. C. Holt's review of Wightman's book in *Economic History Review* 20 (1967), pp.385-6, which points out at 385 Wightman's errors in calculating the Lacy estate's value, and the fact that Richard acted as escheator for several other Norman estates during this period.

¹⁰²⁰ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.389.

¹⁰²¹ *OV* VI, pp.490-3.

¹⁰²² Ibid.

downplay Angevin success is hard to determine, but when considered in the light of a much clearer anti-Angevin rhetoric, discussed below, it seems likely that Orderic worked hard to minimise the potentially devastating effect of events in the south-west on Stephen's comital and ducal authority.

Geoffrey and Matilda continued to rely heavily on the support of western Norman barons. In June 1138, Alexander of Bohon was named as the leader of Matilda's troops in a charter issued at Carrouges, and the Bohon brothers and William of Vernon stood surety for Geoffrey's promises to the citizens of Rouen in 1144.¹⁰²³ Matilda's agreements with the earls of Essex and Oxford indicate that many of Geoffrey's earliest supporters, including Juhel of Mayenne and Baldwin of Redvers, were named as guarantors for Matilda's promises in 1141.¹⁰²⁴ It is significant that Geoffrey's route to Rouen in 1144 was taken via the castle of Vernon; Richard of Vernon's support enabled Geoffrey to cross the Seine.¹⁰²⁵ As discussed below, Alexander and Engelger of Bohon's brother Richard, the dean of Bayeux cathedral, was made ducal chancellor in 1144.¹⁰²⁶

Central Normandy

Further east, William Talvas was key to efforts to regain and hold castles in an area which extended beyond the border with Maine. In 1135 Henry had confiscated his castles at Almenêches, just north of Sées, and Alençon; the confiscation probably also took in Vignats and Fourches (both Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Morteaux-Couliboeuf), both much further north near Falaise.¹⁰²⁷ By 1143, and probably much earlier, William's charters in favour of the Savigniac abbey of Saint-André-de-Gouffern at Vignats suggests that he was in possession of both Vignats and Fourches, and it is likely that this restoration was achieved as early as 1138, during Geoffrey's campaign in the Bessin and around Caen with Robert of Gloucester.¹⁰²⁸ Almenêches may have been taken much earlier, probably in 1135 or 1136, and along with Argentan and Sées would have acted as a valuable stronghold on the River Orne. Although not explicit in the sources, it

¹⁰²³ App. I, no.93; App. IV, no.14.

¹⁰²⁴ *RRAN* III, nos. 275, 634.

¹⁰²⁵ RT I, p.233.

¹⁰²⁶ Spear, *Personnel*, p.35.

¹⁰²⁷ OV VI, pp.446-7, naming 'Alençon, Almenêches and the other castles held by Talvas'; the family had constructed both Vignats (which they held in 1119, as noted in OV VI, pp.224-5) and Fourches (which they held in 1101, OV IV, pp.228-9), as discussed by Gérard Louise, *La seigneurie de Bellême, X^e-XII^e siècles* (2 vols., Flers, 1992) II, pp.203-4, 218.

¹⁰²⁸ *Pontieu actes*, ed. Brunel, no.27.

appears that Geoffrey recovered several Bellême-Talvas castles very early on, depriving Stephen – who had personally held Sées and Almenêches, along with Gorron, as recently as 1119 – of obvious targets near Mortain and the border with Maine.¹⁰²⁹ Thompson has noted that Talvas appears not to have played an active military role after 1136, but he seems to have held his many fortifications as an Angevin partisan, making the Angevin foothold larger than previously thought.¹⁰³⁰

Again, it is Orderic who provides the most detailed account of events in central Normandy, but his local perspective does not guarantee a truthful account of the scale of the Angevin foothold, and it is here that a more subtle dimension to his vehemently anti-Angevin rhetorical strategy can be detected. His description of events in 1136 indicates that whilst Geoffrey's military success in the Lieuvin was severely limited, the devastation caused by Roger of Conches/Tosny and William of Pacy, heir to Breteuil, diverted Stephen's resources and fostered a climate of chaos which played into Geoffrey's hands around Évreux.¹⁰³¹ This local power struggle locked Stephen's commander Waleran of Meulan into campaigns away from the main arena of Angevin sieges further west. Waleran was distracted again in 1138, abandoning his pressure on Robert of Gloucester at Caen to return to Breteuil in order to deal with Roger of Tosny's sack of the town.¹⁰³²

It is in this context that indirect evidence for the implantation of an Angevin presence into central Normandy should be read. It seems that Geoffrey and Matilda had taken the castle at Gacé, east of Argentan, in the early stages of their second campaign, for in June 1136 Richer of L'Aigle's men attacked the castle whilst campaigning around Saint-Évroul.¹⁰³³ Orderic's account suggests that the attack was unsuccessful, and that the Angevins kept possession of the castle. Despite defeat at Le Sap and Lisieux three months later, Gacé was one of a handful of castles gained in the region which remained in Angevin hands, including Annebecq, Les Moutiers-Hubert and (albeit temporarily) Carrouges.¹⁰³⁴

¹⁰²⁹ Louise, *Bellême* II, pp.196, 217, citing OV VI, pp.196-7, 224-5.

¹⁰³⁰ Thompson, 'William Talvas', p.177. *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.53, a letter of Archbishop Hugh to Pope Eugenius III, also suggests that he continued to be influential after 1144. The letter indicates that Geoffrey refused to allow William to attend the archiepiscopal court in 1147 to answer charges that he had seized estates from the abbey of Troarn (Calvados, arr. Caen), suggesting that Geoffrey was willing to shield his follower from non-ducal authority, by contrast with Robert of Gloucester, whose Bayeux appropriations were at the centre of ducal inquests in the diocese, as discussed in Chapter 6.

¹⁰³¹ OV VI, pp.462-3, 474-5; Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, pp.30-3.

¹⁰³² OV VI, pp.524-5; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.83.

¹⁰³³ OV VI, pp.462-3; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.61.

¹⁰³⁴ See Chapter 1.

Gacé is significant as it appears that one of Geoffrey's Angevin followers, Guy of Sablé, was granted custody of the castle, and that either Guy or his son Lisiard married into the resident lineage.¹⁰³⁵ Guy has been identified as the only Angevin 'imported' by Geoffrey into Normandy for administrative purposes, which after 1144 comprised duties as a justice around both Caen and the Vexin castles of Nonancourt and Verneuil.¹⁰³⁶ Guy and his kinsmen's involvement in the earlier stages of the conquest is attested to by his presence in Matilda's retinue when she met Geoffrey in order to launch the fourth Norman campaign at Carrouges in June 1138; other Angevins such as Guy's nephew or brother William, lord of Sillé-le-Guillaume (Sarthe), and Robert of Pocé, were also in attendance alongside other early Norman supporters.¹⁰³⁷ Guy also attested for Matilda again in 1138-9 at Argentan, further suggesting that he had local ties.¹⁰³⁸ Like Geoffrey's early western Norman supporters, he was also a surety for Matilda in England in 1141, and appears amongst a group of Norman magnates instrumental in the final stages of the conquest.¹⁰³⁹

In common with his description of events in Mortain, Orderic's account of the chaos caused in the region around Saint-Évroul appears to attest simply to an opportunity for local gains provided by the weakness of Stephen's position and the unrest elsewhere in the duchy.¹⁰⁴⁰ A closer reading of the evidence, however, suggests that the unrest of 1136-8 was less random than it appears. In January 1138, Robert Giroie made his castle at Échauffour (Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Le Merlerault) over to Simon the Red, who used it as his base of operations for his attacks on Earl Robert of Leicester.¹⁰⁴¹ Simon's activities continued into the spring, spilling out from Échauffour into the surrounding region; Robert of Leicester's men responded by burning not only Simon's brother Ribold's castle of Pont-Échanfray¹⁰⁴² but also Robert Giroie's castle at

¹⁰³⁵ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.501.

¹⁰³⁶ For Guy's Angevin background, see *ibid.*, pp.393, 501; for his activities as justice, App. I, no.43 and App. II, no.4, which appears to refer to St-Aignan-de-Cramesnil ('Crasmesnil') and Rocquancourt immediately south of Caen (cant. Bourguébus) and addresses Guy and Robert of Courcy as *justicii*.

¹⁰³⁷ App. I, no.93. Cf. *RRAN* III, no.323, a charter of Henry as duke and count for La Fontaine Saint-Martin issued at Baugé and witnessed by Guy and his *nepotes* Geoffrey and William *de Silliac*. That *Silliacum* is the Manceau Sillé-le-Guillaume (Sarthe, arr. Le Mans), and not Silly-en-Gouffern (Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Exmes) near Gacé, is confirmed by *Pl. Acta* no.1733 (DB II, no.355), a writ issued by Henry II in 1156×73 to William of Sillé concerning affairs in Le Mans.

¹⁰³⁸ *RRAN* III, no.567, which erroneously dates this act to 1126-35; cf. Chibnall, 'Charters of the Empress', p.295, for the correct dating.

¹⁰³⁹ See above, and *RRAN* III, nos. 275, 634; App. IV, no.14.

¹⁰⁴⁰ OV VI, pp.458-63, 512-3.

¹⁰⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp.512-3.

¹⁰⁴² Now Notre-Dame-du-Hamel, Eure, arr. Bernay, cant. Broglie.

Montreuil.

Robert also held the castle of Montreuil-l'Argillé (Eure, arr. Bernay, cant. Broglie), just to the north of Orderic's abbey of Saint-Évroul, and was lord of Saint-Céneri (-le-Gerei, Orne, arr. Alençon), situated next to Alençon on the Maine border. Robert's control of Saint-Céneri would have brought him into contact with his neighbour William Talvas, and the Talvas and Giroie families appear to have established a relationship in the twelfth century.¹⁰⁴³ As Chibnall points out, the Giroies had also been long-standing benefactors of Saint-Évroul, and had founded a dependent priory at Saint-Céneri; in the 1130s, Robert Giroie was the head of the only set of early patrons still in a position to act as the abbey's protectors.¹⁰⁴⁴ Robert's patronage of Saint-Céneri is important, for it may provide one reason why Robert of Torigny asked its prior, Gervase, to compose Geoffrey's *gesta*.¹⁰⁴⁵

The *Infeudationes militum* provides no evidence for the practical value of Robert's support, nor indeed for control of castles like Gacé, but there are other indications that even this apparently scattered support was valuable. Both of Robert's more northerly castles were situated in the region around Gacé, and together this complex of fortifications allowed Geoffrey to push further east. Later charter evidence suggests that ties were forged between the Giroies and the lords of Gacé, who jointly patronised the Angevin comital foundation of La Fontaine-Saint-Martin in Maine.¹⁰⁴⁶ Although this evidence only indirectly informs our knowledge of the events of the second half of the 1130s, it underscores the need to rethink the gains made by Geoffrey prior to 1141. If Guy was entrusted with Gacé as early as 1136, this suggests that partisans may have been stationed deeper within the duchy than merely along the border, in castles under direct Angevin control, complementing the strongholds under the control of William Talvas and Robert Giroie, and thus that considerable progress

¹⁰⁴³ Pierre Bauduin, 'Une famille châtelaine', pp.319-23, shows that although the family had been vassals of the Mayenne dynasty in the eleventh century, they took the side of Robert of Bellême against Henry I, and that the Giroie and Bellême estates were confiscated and then restored together. Cf. Kathleen Thompson, 'Family and influence to the south of Normandy in the eleventh century: the lordship of Bellême', *JMH* 11 (1985), pp.215-26, at 219; *Pl. Acta*, no.2345 (1819H).

¹⁰⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p.xxvii. The priory was founded c.1050: Bauduin, 'Une famille châtelaine', p.334.

¹⁰⁴⁵ RT II, pp.339-40. Cf. Leah Shopkow, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington DC, 1997), p.207, who comments that the reasons for choosing Gervase are not known, suggesting that he was perhaps either from Bec or had business dealings with Robert of Torigny, or that he was known for having an interest in historiography.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.501 and n.11 (noting that Mabel of Gacé's daughter was abbess of La Fontaine, and citing AD Sarthe H 1545, an act of 1180 issued by William of Saint-Céneri for La Fontaine, witnessed by Mabel of Gacé in the hall of Amaury of Gacé), and 515 (which notes that William's sister Odelina was a nun at La Fontaine).

was made prior to 1141. Orderic was naturally reluctant to comment on the extent of the Angevin foothold, not least because it had been achieved in part with the assistance of an important local patron. Robert Giroie is not censured, but his importance appears to have been played down and his role in Geoffrey's campaigns omitted, in keeping with Orderic's overall rhetorical strategy.¹⁰⁴⁷

Robert of Gloucester

In spite of these gains and the significant foothold that they represent, Geoffrey's progress was arrested by Stephen's tour of most of the duchy in 1137. The situation was precarious for both sides, and to gain a more detailed insight it is necessary to look at Robert of Gloucester, who becomes the prism through which many of the chroniclers write at this time. He offered his defiance (*diffidatio*) to Stephen in the late spring of 1138, and the evidence suggests that the process of defection was lengthy and by no means clear-cut.¹⁰⁴⁸ This was arguably as important a turning-point in Geoffrey's fortunes as the defection of Waleran of Meulan three years later, but what Robert's support actually meant in practice has not been examined, except with reference to his assistance with Geoffrey's campaigns in 1138 and, in particular, 1142.¹⁰⁴⁹ A re-evaluation of the evidence permits a further insight into the processes by which Geoffrey could attract defectors, and how they could assist with the conquest.

Robert had to be compelled to come to the royal court in 1136, and appears to have missed the gathering of magnates on Easter Day itself.¹⁰⁵⁰ The following year, Stephen's mistrust of Robert appears to have led him to set a failed ambush to capture the earl after landing in Normandy.¹⁰⁵¹ Nevertheless, Robert was in Stephen's company in Normandy, witnessing charters at Bayeux and Évreux during mid-March 1137.¹⁰⁵² Robert thus probably accompanied Stephen to the siege of Rabel of Tancarville's castle

¹⁰⁴⁷ Shopkow, *History and Community*, p.135: 'Orderic Vitalis was probably the most concerned of any of the Norman historians about history's truth, for he assures the reader continually that he is telling the truth...[and] never reported anything he considered to be untrue'.

¹⁰⁴⁸ David Crouch, 'Robert earl of Gloucester, and the Daughter of Zelophehad', *JMH* 11 (1985), pp.227-43, also suggests this, reacting against both Robert B. Patterson, 'William of Malmesbury's Robert of Gloucester: a re-evaluation of the *Historia novella*', *AHR* 70 (1965), pp.983-97, and Joe W. Leedom, 'William of Malmesbury and Robert of Gloucester Revisited', *Albion* 6 (1974), pp.251-65.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Davis, *King Stephen*, p.71; Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda*, pp.135-6; Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.193-4.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Leedom, 'Robert of Gloucester', pp.255-6; King, *King Stephen*, p.61; RRAN III, no.944; GS, p.25; WM, HN, p.33.

¹⁰⁵¹ WM, HN, p.39.

¹⁰⁵² RRAN III, nos. 594, 69; for the dating, Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.64, n.36, discounting the Easter New Year style suggested by Helmerichs, 'Stephen's Norman Itinerary', pp.93-4.

of Mézidon, near Caen, and from there to Rabel's other strongholds at Lillebonne and Villers. These charters, however, are the only two of fifteen extant acts issued by Stephen whilst in Normandy to have been witnessed by Robert.¹⁰⁵³ The earl probably then headed north to his castle at Caen, which lacked ducal protection,¹⁰⁵⁴ while Stephen remained at Évreux, in the company of his brother Theobald, to whom he had been forced to pay 2,000 marks in compensation for having taken the English crown.¹⁰⁵⁵

Crouch has suggested that Stephen's grant of Évreux to Waleran of Meulan had served to further alienate Robert, contributing to his absence from the Norman court.¹⁰⁵⁶ Yet it did not sufficiently rouse him to surrender Caen to Geoffrey.¹⁰⁵⁷ Robert was nevertheless threatened, for Orderic makes it clear that after ravaging the Hiémois, Geoffrey was able to gain the upper hand in localities such as Argences (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Troarn) and St-Pierre-sur-Dives (Caen, arr. Lisieux), the former a staging-post from St-Pierre to Caen itself, which lay only 20km to the northwest.¹⁰⁵⁸ Geoffrey extorted money from the monks of St-Pierre and of Fécamp, some of whose estates lay at Argences; the area was being wasted, and put beyond Stephen's use, despite his victory at Mézidon.¹⁰⁵⁹

Late spring 1137 was in many respects the natural time for Robert to defect to the Angevins, but this was not formalised until the following June.¹⁰⁶⁰ William of Malmesbury describes Robert in the months leading to his defiance 'parrying craft by craft' in Normandy while Stephen dealt with English matters, and, 'as though placed on a watch-tower', 'looking to see how things would end and considering carefully how he could avoid being branded a traitor'.¹⁰⁶¹ Robert's decision to remain ostensibly loyal to Stephen prior to June was perhaps influenced by the declaration of several Norman magnates for the king's cause, as well as the defection of Geoffrey's supporter Robert of

¹⁰⁵³ Cf. Patterson, 'Malmesbury's Robert of Gloucester', p.989, ignoring the dating of the two charters Robert witnessed to only the very beginning of Stephen's itinerary, citing 'charter evidence placing Robert at Stephen's Normandy court after the incident [the ambush] until the king's return to England at the end of 1137'.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.63 notes that Waleran had not 'made any attempt to extend his activities even as far west as Caen'.

¹⁰⁵⁵ RT I, pp.206-7; OV VI, p.454.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Crouch, 'Robert earl of Gloucester', p.232.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Leedom, 'Robert of Gloucester', p.259.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Cf. the discussion of 'waste' in England during Stephen's reign, in C. Warren Hollister, 'The Magnates of Stephen's Reign: Reluctant Anarchists', *HSJ* 5 (1993), pp.77-87, at 81-4; OV VI, pp.482-3; Helmerichs, 'Stephen's Norman Itinerary', pp.94-5.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Leedom, 'Robert of Gloucester', p.259; OV VI, pp.514-5.

¹⁰⁶¹ WM, *HN*, p.41.

Neubourg and the death of another Angevin supporter, Amaury of Montfort, in 1137.¹⁰⁶² Juhel of Mayenne toyed with withdrawing his support from Geoffrey, and it may have been during the summer of 1137 that William Talvas betrothed his daughter Ella to Waleran of Meulan's half-brother and royal partisan William of Warenne.¹⁰⁶³

Stephen thus had the support of the bulk of the Norman baronage, though Geoffrey evidently had the means to wreak havoc in the duchy and magnates did not face an easy choice. The Angevins and their supporters discussed above posed a serious enough threat to compel Stephen to agree a truce which stipulated that Geoffrey was to receive 2,000 marks per annum, the first payment of which was made immediately upon the truce being formalised in July 1137.¹⁰⁶⁴ For the second time in three months, Stephen had to resort to paying out a large amount of money to arrest a threat.

Gloucester's support enabled Geoffrey to break this stalemate in June 1138, when the fourth Angevin campaign was launched from Carrouges.¹⁰⁶⁵ Robert had perhaps been encouraged finally to defect by the continued unrest in the Evreçin, the capture of Ralph of Esson during Lent, and Waleran of Meulan and William of Ypres' inability to deal with Roger of Tosny, now 'a warlike knight, ready to resist them'.¹⁰⁶⁶ Others who had previously adhered to Stephen also seem to have defected during this period, such as Henry I's steward and Robert's Norman neighbour Robert of Courcy, who disappears from royal witness lists in November 1137.¹⁰⁶⁷ Robert of Gloucester had perhaps sided with Geoffrey as early as Easter (3rd April), a date which allows more time for arrangements for the campaign to be made than Malmesbury's indication that Robert sent representatives to Geoffrey immediately after Whitsuntide or Pentecost (22nd May).¹⁰⁶⁸ Robert does not appear to have joined Geoffrey and Matilda at the Maine border in the weeks leading to his defection, and his absence from their meeting at Carrouges suggests that he remained in or around Caen in charge of his own forces.¹⁰⁶⁹

Robert's defection brought Bayeux, Caen and 'numerous Norman strongholds'

¹⁰⁶² Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.65-6.

¹⁰⁶³ Kathleen Thompson, 'William Talvas', pp.169-84, at 177, tentatively dates the betrothal to 1137×40; for Juhel of Mayenne, see above.

¹⁰⁶⁴ RT I, p.207; OV VI, pp.486-7; Helmerichs, 'Stephen's Norman Itinerary', p.95.

¹⁰⁶⁵ And see App. I, no.93.

¹⁰⁶⁶ OV VI, pp.512-15.

¹⁰⁶⁷ As noted by Chibnall, OV VI, p.517, n.3; see below. Gloucester's defection may have also influenced that of others, such as his nephew through his half-sister Mabel, William Gouet IV, who can be found in Angevin company in 1138: App. I, no.93. Thompson, 'Affairs of State', p.148, discusses this branch of the family.

¹⁰⁶⁸ OV VI, p.516, n.2, citing RT I, p.213 (amended here to Delisle's edition); cf. WM, *HN*, p.41.

¹⁰⁶⁹ App. I, no.93.

to the Angevins, along with the final submission of the inhabitants of the Bessin and Hiémois, and was the only way Geoffrey could have hoped to advance in northern central Normandy.¹⁰⁷⁰ Like Stephen, Geoffrey again found it necessary to tempt his supporters, and Robert was only won over 'with pleas and promises' of an unspecified nature.¹⁰⁷¹ Robert of Torigny's statement that Henry II 'undertook to retake patiently and prudently back into his own possession his demesne, which his father through pressing necessity had granted to the nobles of Normandy' suggests that much valuable land was alienated.¹⁰⁷² It is likely that Geoffrey would have made promises similar to those made by Matilda in 1141 to her English supporters, essentially giving Robert a 'licence to conquer' certain lands which had been negotiated beforehand.¹⁰⁷³ Evidence that Reginald of Saint-Valéry, Geoffrey's Norman *dapifer* from 1144 onwards, was granted the port of Dieppe until such time that his English estates could be recovered suggests that grants could be significant.¹⁰⁷⁴

One source for what those lands granted to Robert of Gloucester may have consisted of is the body of evidence connected with the Bayeux inquests, discussed in greater length in Chapter 6, though the picture is complicated by the seizures of estates made by Robert prior to 1135, and an incomplete picture of the extent of his estates around Caen. In this context, Robert's apparent acquisitions between 1138 and 1144 were a continuation of a process that had begun decades earlier, the effect of which was to establish Robert as the pre-eminent landholder in west-central Normandy.

What has been established is that Robert controlled the honour of Évrecy through his marriage to Matilda, daughter of Robert fitz Hamo, and that this included the castles of Torigni-sur-Vire (Manche, arr. St-Lô), Creully (Calvados, arr. Caen) and Sainte-Scolasse-sur-Sarthe (Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Courtomer).¹⁰⁷⁵ Robert had clearly aggregated vast estates in the Bessin and Hiémois in addition to his demesne and marital lands, which he promised to restore to the bishop of Bayeux in 1146.¹⁰⁷⁶ These estates

¹⁰⁷⁰ OV VI, pp.516-17; RT I, p.213.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ibid, pp.514-15.

¹⁰⁷² RT I, pp.283-4: 'Henricus...coepit revocare paulatim et prudenter in jus proprium sua dominica, quae pater suus, urgente necessitate, primoribus Normanniae ad tempus concesserat.'

¹⁰⁷³ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.106-12.

¹⁰⁷⁴ App. VI, no.5, and notes therein.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Judith A. Green, 'Robert fitz Haimon (d.1107)', *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9596> [accessed 10 Aug 2010]; David Crouch, 'Robert, first earl of Gloucester (b. before 1100, d.1147)', *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23716> [accessed 10 Aug 2010].

¹⁰⁷⁶ *Earldom of Gloucester Charters: The Charters and Scribes of the Earls and Countesses of Gloucester to A.D. 1217*, ed. Robert B. Patterson (Oxford, 1973), no.6 (*RRAN* III, no.58) and see the discussion there for these lands. This restitution seems not to have been carried out, and is discussed in Chapter 6.

all lay in modern Calvados, and included the lands of the Lacy family at Lassy and Campeaux – both situated just north of Torigni, and which appear to have been mingled with Robert’s own demesne – as well as the Maulévrier fee at Asnières and Eudo Dapifer’s lands at Mathieu.¹⁰⁷⁷ It has been suggested that the Lacy quitclaim was a significant shift in Robert’s cross-Channel activities, for he had also promised Miles of Gloucester assistance in his pursuit of English Lacy lands.¹⁰⁷⁸ The agreement also touched on St-Clair-sur-l’Elle (Manche, arr. St-Lô), situated between Caen and St-Lô, which the Saint-Clair family held of Eudo Dapifer; after Eudo’s death in 1120, they had been created lords of Eaton Socon (Beds.) and Walkern (Herts.) by Henry I.¹⁰⁷⁹ Saint-Clair would have been a prime target for Robert and Geoffrey, for its estates abutted Robert’s Bessin territories, and lay on a potentially important line of communication between Caen and the Angevin outpost at Bohon. Moreover, the family’s sympathies were with Stephen: Hamo of St-Clair was at the king’s Easter court in 1136, and received a royal writ in 1140×1143, while his son Hubert also witnessed charters for Stephen in the later 1140s and 1150s.¹⁰⁸⁰

The agreement with Bishop Philip stipulated that Robert was to keep Évrecy and other lands near Bayeux, as well as his own demesne and a mill at Crèvecoeur (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Mézidon-Canon) which Ranulf, earl of Chester and vicomte of the Bessin, had held of the bishop. Further, Philip agreed that Robert was to hold Mathieu until Eudo’s heirs could recover it, and the earl of Chester’s land which pertained to the bishop ‘until such time as a rightful heir of Earl Ranulf came to and was recognised by the duke’, this final proviso suggesting that Robert’s appropriation of Ranulf’s estates extended beyond a single mill. The significance of the mill’s location must nevertheless be noticed: Crèvecoeur was a lordship of five knights’ fees, held of the bishops of Bayeux, situated directly adjacent to episcopal estates at Cambremer, the

¹⁰⁷⁷ Ibid., where the accompanying note outlines Robert’s possession of the Lacy estates. Mathieu is situated near Caen (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Douvres-la-Déliverande), while Asnières-en-Bessin lay adjacent to episcopal estates in the western coastal part of the Bessin (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Isigny-sur-Mer), some of which were held by the earl of Chester.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Robert B. Patterson, review of Wightman, *The Lacy Family*, in *Speculum* 43 (1968), pp.200-2, at 202. For Robert’s agreement with Miles, probably drawn up just prior to Robert’s crossing to Normandy in 1142, see Dalton, ‘Allegiance and Intelligence’, pp.91-2.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Leedom, ‘Robert of Gloucester’, p.261; Nicholas Vincent, ‘Warin and Henry fitz Gerald: the origins of the Fitzgeralds revisited’, *ANS* 21 (1999), pp.233-60, at 248, n.64; Green, *Government*, pp.272-3.

¹⁰⁸⁰ *RRAN* III, nos. 210 (writ to Hamo and Geoffrey of Mandeville), 271, 341, 944, 946-8 (all witnessed by Hamo in 1136); Hubert witnessed nos. 223 and 229, and Stephen confirmed Hubert’s grant to St. John’s, Colchester, in no.237, all dating to the period between 1148 and 1154.

boundaries of which had to be settled by an inquest under Geoffrey.¹⁰⁸¹

The suspicion that Robert received extensive Chester lands in Normandy is strengthened by evidence from the 1140s. In 1146, Ranulf of Chester appears to have renewed a much-debated agreement originally made with Stephen in 1140, in which the king granted Lincoln castle to the earl until his Norman estates could be recovered.¹⁰⁸² Robert's assistance in the capture of ten castles in the Avranchin and western Bessin brought the Chester castles of Vire and Briquessart to the Angevins in 1142, and it is conceivable that Robert was rewarded with them, not least because they lay adjacent to his own estates along the River Vire. It is hard to see how Stephen would have been able to restore any Norman estates after 1144, leaving open the possibility that the promise was made in the earlier 1140s. When read in conjunction with Robert's 1146 agreement with Bishop Philip and the chronicle accounts of Geoffrey's campaigns, it suggests that Robert was a key beneficiary of the estates lost by Ranulf in both the Avranchin in 1142-3 and in the Bessin in 1138.

Furthermore, both the earls of Chester and the counts of Mortain held estates to the north-west of Bayeux, in the strip of land between the Channel and the River Aure from a point at Vieux-Pont to where the river met the sea north of Isigny-sur-Mer. Successive papal confirmations of Bishop Philip's lands there in 1144-45 suggest that the bishops had experienced problems there too, and Robert of Gloucester had certainly seized lands at Asnières.¹⁰⁸³ It appears that Robert's seizure of episcopal lands may have spread to the estates of other lords in the Bessin, including the earl of Chester and perhaps even the count of Mortain. In sum, it is therefore possible that Geoffrey's promises of 1138 involved 'grants' of land in the Bessin, from both the former honour

¹⁰⁸¹ *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.67, 4th February (1153), is a letter of Pope Eugenius III to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux regarding William of Crèvecoeur and his father who had built a market to the detriment of Bishop Philip's market there, stating that they also took customs they were not entitled to, and authorising their excommunication. *Ibid.*, no.71, 9th February (1153) is a letter to Henry II on the same subject. Mathieu Arnoux and Christophe Maneuvrier, *Deux abbayes de Basse-Normandie: Notre-Dame du Val et Le Val Richer (XII^e-XIII^e siècles)*, Le Pays Bas-Normand no.237-8, Revue Trimestrielle no.1-2 (2000), pp.72-4, suggest that this market was a primary motivation behind the Cambremer inquests.

¹⁰⁸² *RRAN* III, no.178, dated to 1146. There has been much disagreement over the date of this document. In favour of 1140: Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.143-4; Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1955), p.141; Edmund King, 'The foundation of Pipewell Abbey', *HSJ* 2 (1990), pp.167-77, at 171; Green, *Aristocracy*, pp.308-9. Cf. the dating of 1146 in *RRAN* III, as well as Graeme White, 'King Stephen, Duke Henry and Ranulf de Gernons', *EHR* 91 (1976), pp.555-65, at 555-6, and Dalton, '*In neutro latere*', pp.46-7. King, *King Stephen*, p.147, n.12 and n.14, and p.223, modifies the argument of 'Pipewell Abbey', and makes the clearest case for the addition of the clause regarding Lincoln and Normandy in 1146.

¹⁰⁸³ *Livre noir*, I, nos. 154 and 155, redated in *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, nos. 23 and 30.

of Eudo Dapifer and perhaps from the estates of Robert's own son-in-law, Ranulf and from Mortain fees held of the bishop; these grants must initially have been pre-emptive, much like those made by Matilda in favour of the earls of Essex and Oxford in 1141, and complemented the gains Robert had already made in the area at the expense of the bishops of Bayeux.¹⁰⁸⁴ If this was the case, it is striking that in 1141 Matilda granted Eudo Dapifer's estates to Eudo's grandson Geoffrey of Mandeville in exchange for his English support; although Geoffrey of Mandeville's reversion to Stephen's cause meant that Robert kept the estates, hence their inclusion in the concord of 1146 with the bishop of Bayeux, Matilda's promise calls into question Robert's importance in the later stages of the conquest, an issue discussed further below.¹⁰⁸⁵ It is possible that Robert came by these lands at some point between 1141 and 1146, but all the circumstances of 1138 suggest that Robert's Calvados estates were consolidated during the first long phase of the conquest, whilst his own son was bishop of Bayeux.¹⁰⁸⁶

The *Infeudationes militum* reveal that Robert's support was highly significant for the Angevin cause in terms of manpower and estates, in spite of the problems of getting to the finer details of his resources and Earl William of Gloucester's failure to account for his fees in 1172.¹⁰⁸⁷ As Chapter 6 shows, Robert had seized swathes of territory belonging to the bishops of Bayeux, meaning that he directly controlled a substantial portion of the 120 fees accounted for by the bishop in 1172, after the restoration of episcopal estates. The documentation of the inquests indicates that he had 'taken for himself the greater part of the church of Bayeux's estates, keeping them both in fee and in demesne'.¹⁰⁸⁸ Comparison of the named lands held by Robert in 1146 with the 1133 inquest shows that together, the estates in the earl's hand – which had previously been held of the bishop of Bayeux by Robert Fitz Hamo as the honour of Evrecy, by Roger Suhard, by the vicomte of the Bessin, by the earl of Chester and by Eudo dapifer – totalled thirty-nine and a half fees.¹⁰⁸⁹ Those he did not control directly were under the authority of his son Richard, bishop of Bayeux (1135-42).¹⁰⁹⁰ It seems that twenty of the bishop's knights owed service to the duke for forty days a year; the appropriation of

¹⁰⁸⁴ *RRAN* III, nos.274-5, 634; Gleason, *Ecclesiastical Barony*, pp.41-2.

¹⁰⁸⁵ *RRAN* III, nos.274-5; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.109.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Crouch, 'Zelophehad', p.236.

¹⁰⁸⁷ And indeed the earl of Chester's failure to account further muddies the waters around Robert's resources.

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.32, a letter of 18th March 1145 from Pope Eugenius III to the bishops of Worcester and Bath, specifically concerning Robert.

¹⁰⁸⁹ *RRAN* III, no.58; *RB* II, pp.645-6.

¹⁰⁹⁰ See Spear, *Personnel*, p.33, for Richard's career.

control of these fees by Robert and his family would have been a serious blow for Stephen's ability to raise revenue and manpower.¹⁰⁹¹

Robert of Courcy – Gloucester's neighbour, who disappears from Stephen's charters from 1138 – also had considerable resources at his disposal, judging by the 1172 fees' roll, in which his descendant owed five knights from his patrimonial honour of Courcy-sur-Dives (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Morteaux-Couliboeuf), where he had thirty-three fees, and three knights from the seventeen and a quarter fees he had at Écajeul (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Mézidon-Canon), also in the Dives valley.¹⁰⁹² Robert of Courcy does not appear as a witness to the charters of his Gloucester namesake, but the two were neighbours in central Normandy, and in the northern Bessin and its border with the Cotentin at Isigny-sur-Mer.¹⁰⁹³ Although it has been argued that the relatively small knightly quotas owed by the lord of Courcy in 1172 meant that his resources were smaller than they appear, his submission to Geoffrey nonetheless brought Normandy's sixth-greatest landholder over to the Angevin cause.¹⁰⁹⁴

Though Geoffrey's forces may have been considerably augmented by these defections, they were met by armies equally as large and skilful, commanded by Stephen's deputies. The chronicles indicate that the 1138 campaign was short, and that by July Robert was barricaded within Caen castle; he maintained contact, however, with Matilda and Geoffrey, organising his crossing to Arundel in autumn 1139 with the Empress, Guy of Sablé and Reginald of Dunstanville, and apparently coordinating the landing with Baldwin of Redvers, whose arrival at Wareham drew Stephen into a short-lived siege, and William of Mohun, who rebelled simultaneously at Dunster.¹⁰⁹⁵ According to Malmesbury, Robert brought only 140 knights with him to England, 'a far smaller military force than that which anyone else would have ventured on so hazardous a war', and it is possible that although he turned his attention to England, he had

¹⁰⁹¹ *RB* II, pp.625, 644, 647 gives the impression that the bishop owed 40 knights in 1133, and 20 in 1172. An earlier French royal copy of the 1172 inquest (*Les registres de Philippe Auguste I (texte)*, ed. John W. Baldwin, *Recueil des historiens de la France, documents financiers et administratifs* VII (Paris, 1992), pp.267-76, at 267). Smith, 'Servicium debitum and scutage' I, p.50, draws attention to the later French royal copy of a lost exemplar of the 1133 inquest text, which gives the earlier quota as 20 (citing *RHGF* XXIII, p.699). See also Gleason, *Ecclesiastical Barony*, pp.41-2; Crouch, 'Zelophehad', p.236.

¹⁰⁹² *RB* II, p.627; Steve Flanders, *De Courcy: Anglo-Normans in Ireland, England and France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* (Dublin, 2008), p.38.

¹⁰⁹³ Flanders, *De Courcy*, pp.37-8.

¹⁰⁹⁴ *Ibid.* Cf. Crouch's assessment of the c.30 knights' fees owed to the count of Mortain as equivalent to c.100 English fees, above.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *GS*, p.81; Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.107-8.

provided Geoffrey with a force to assist with campaigning in Normandy.¹⁰⁹⁶

In the final analysis, Robert's defection was crucial in moving the Angevin cause along in both Normandy and England. Central Normandy was now largely under Geoffrey's control. Nevertheless, a turning-point had not yet been reached, and as Chapter 1 shows, the second campaign of 1138 failed to take Touques and Bonneville-sur-Touques. Rotrou of Perche's capture of Pont-Échanfray, a little to the north-east of Gacé, suggests that no headway was made to the east of the front which ran roughly between Caen in the north and Gacé in the south.¹⁰⁹⁷ While events in England moved swiftly with the arrest of the bishops in 1139 and the loss and rapid regaining of Cornwall by Stephen in 1140, Geoffrey had to content himself with chipping away at the remnants of Stephen's support in central Normandy, in 1140 finally destroying Robert Marmion's castle at Fontenay in the Hiémois, in retribution for the garrisoning of Falaise against him.¹⁰⁹⁸ On the evidence of the chronicles, the Norman struggle lost pace as a result of Matilda's decision to cross to England. It is unfortunate that evidence for Geoffrey's progress in 1139 and 1140 is scarce; what follows deals with events from 1141 onwards, which saw Robert of Gloucester's influence wane, and that of his rival, Waleran of Meulan, come into play.

1141-4: consolidation and *de facto* rule

Matilda's capture of Stephen at Lincoln on 2nd February 1141 changed the terms on which the cross-Channel war was fought, and had dramatic consequences in Normandy. Although Normandy did not fall immediately to Geoffrey, Chapter 1 shows that the gains he made after Stephen's capture were more substantial and achieved more rapidly than anything prior to 1141. It is also clear that an increasing number of magnates defected to the Angevins, although many continued to safeguard their interests with agreements and alliances which allowed them to shift their allegiance to another, winning, side if necessary.

These new defections, most prominently that of Waleran of Meulan, were transformative. Geoffrey began to gain real power as a ducal figure. Historians have long been preoccupied by the precise date at which Geoffrey began using the ducal title; it will be suggested here that Geoffrey acted as *de facto* duke well before his investiture,

¹⁰⁹⁶ WM, *HN*, p.61.

¹⁰⁹⁷ OV VI, pp.534-5.

¹⁰⁹⁸ RT I, p.219.

but that he had to carry this task out sensitively, and always with an awareness of the need to win and maintain support for the conquest. In the absence of other concrete evidence for the arrogation of ducal prerogatives, Geoffrey's involvement in episcopal elections prior to 1144 must suggest that as his control of the duchy increased, he began to assume powers associated with the duke. These elections provide the most fertile route into examination of how defection, territorial gains and *de facto* power went hand-in-hand, and what magnates and ecclesiastics could reasonably seek from Geoffrey in order to guarantee their continued support. It is this evidence, in the almost total absence of any other, which provides a commentary on Geoffrey's evolving Norman court and its internal dynamics from 1141 onwards.

Before his investiture, it appears that Geoffrey was involved in some way in the election of three Norman bishops: Arnulf, elected to Lisieux in 1141; Philip of Harcourt, elected to Bayeux in 1142; and Richard of Subligny, elected to Avranches in 1143. Each election will thus be examined in turn.

Arnulf of Lisieux

Geoffrey's role in Arnulf's election left a lasting mark on Arnulf's long career. Arnulf's letters indicate that after being chosen from among the ranks of the canons from Sées cathedral by the Lisieux chapter, he was barred from office by Geoffrey for two years and three months, and was unable to visit the newly-elected Pope Celestine II in 1143-4 because he had been so busy 'establishing for [himself] the recent favour of a new ruler, and patching up the ruins of my church and house'.¹⁰⁹⁹ Although Arnulf 'had been consecrated in a canonical election', it was without Geoffrey's approval, and he was eventually forced to buy his bishopric back at the cost of over £900.¹¹⁰⁰ Aside from an insistence upon the ducal licence to elect a bishop, Geoffrey's anger at the chapter's choice may also have been a reflection of Arnulf's leading role in arguing Stephen's case in the papal court in 1139.¹¹⁰¹

It is unclear whether Arnulf was politically opposed to Geoffrey in 1141, but the election bears similarities to the events in Le Mans in 1136, when Geoffrey exiled the bishop-elect for eight months for refusing to assist his cause in Normandy.¹¹⁰²

¹⁰⁹⁹ *Letter Collections of Arnulf*, ed. Schriber, nos. 1.38 and 4.37 (= *Letters of Arnulf* ed. Barlow, nos. 2 and 137); Spear, *Personnel*, pp.170-1.

¹¹⁰⁰ *Letter Collections of Arnulf*, ed. Schriber, no.4.37.

¹¹⁰¹ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.108.

¹¹⁰² And see Chapter 4.

According to Robert of Torigny, Arnulf's predecessor John had made peace with Geoffrey and brought with him the leading men of the Lieuvin; Orderic places this surrender, which represented a huge gain in the push towards Rouen, during Lent of 1141.¹¹⁰³ This meant that the region was under Angevin control before John's death on 21st May 1141, very soon after Stephen's capture at Lincoln.¹¹⁰⁴ It appears that Arnulf was elected immediately upon John's death, as his attestation of William Talvas' grant to Vignats in September 1143, dated by Geoffrey's 'ducal' reign, was only a little over two years and three months after John's death. Even then, Arnulf's own letters, as shown above, suggest that he was still experiencing problems with Geoffrey into the reign of Celestine II (26th Sept 1143 – 8th March 1144).

Bernard of Clairvaux's letters indicate that Geoffrey appealed to the pope for a revocation of Arnulf's election, an action which in Bernard's opinion was unwarranted and illegal: Geoffrey was 'a man who has not made God his helper, but an adversary of the Church and an enemy of the cross of Christ...He is not the oppressed, he is on the contrary the oppressor. He is not appealing for relief of injuries, but simply to hold up the consecration of the bishop by interposing an appeal.'¹¹⁰⁵ In the absence of explicit reasons other than the chapter's independent election of Arnulf, political reasons for Geoffrey's determined interference remain possibilities only, but feasible possibilities nevertheless, in the context of the very early establishment of *de facto* ducal authority in the Lieuvin at the behest of Bishop John in the immediate aftermath of Stephen's capture.

Geoffrey's possession of Lisieux appears to have come at the same time as Waleran of Meulan's defection, which as well as the Roumois brought the castle of Montfort-sur-Risle (Eure, arr. Bernay) – one of Lisieux's closest neighbours – into Geoffrey's hands.¹¹⁰⁶ Montfort pertained to Waleran's imprisoned brother-in-law, Hugh, and had been granted to Waleran by Stephen early in the reign.¹¹⁰⁷ Though the sources only refer to the electoral reasons for Geoffrey's obstruction of Arnulf's investiture, if there were political motivations for the assertion of his ducal prerogative it is perhaps to the Beaumont lands to the east that we must look.

¹¹⁰³ RT I, p.224; OV VI, pp.550-1.

¹¹⁰⁴ Ibid; OV VI, pp.144-5, 550-1; Spear, *Personnel*, p.170.

¹¹⁰⁵ *Letters of St. Bernard*, ed. James, no.252.

¹¹⁰⁶ RT I, pp.224-5.

¹¹⁰⁷ Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, pp.29-30.

Philip of Harcourt

The circumstances of Philip of Harcourt's election as bishop of Bayeux were different, but clearly involved the Beaumont kin-group. Philip's family were the pre-eminent Beaumont sub-tenants, with substantial estates south of Brionne (Eure, arr. Bernay) and kinship ties with the family.¹¹⁰⁸ Philip's earlier years were spent near Harcourt (cant. Brionne), first as archdeacon of Évreux, and then during the 1130s as dean of Waleran of Meulan's church at Beaumont-le-Roger.¹¹⁰⁹ He was elected dean of Lincoln Cathedral in 1133, which led to his nomination by Waleran in 1140 as bishop of Salisbury; despite by this time having acquired the office of royal chancellor, Stephen's brother, Bishop Henry of Winchester, objected to the Salisbury election.¹¹¹⁰ Soon afterwards, however, Philip was elected as bishop of Bayeux, and was in office by 18th June 1142.¹¹¹¹

There is no direct evidence that Geoffrey nominated Philip for election, but that he consented to and encouraged this choice can be confidently inferred. Stephen's loss of the Bessin, Robert of Gloucester's defection and his son's position as bishop of Bayeux, and the agreements made with Waleran and his brother Robert of Leicester in 1141 led not only to authoritative control of the area, but also to circumstances in which an influential family, whose support was still in its infancy but clearly crucial in making progress, could push for a favourable election.¹¹¹²

The appearance of a Beaumont candidate as bishop of Bayeux was also a reflection of the decline of Robert of Gloucester's fortunes after Stephen's capture. Robert spent September and October of 1141 in captivity in England, after being captured at Stockbridge, and was exchanged in November in return for Stephen's release by Matilda.¹¹¹³ Robert's absence since 1139 and his captivity in 1141 seemingly opened the door for the Norman rise of Waleran, and his kin-group, secure in the knowledge that the accumulation of land in the Risle valley, Roumois and Lieuvin, and his promotion to the rank of military commander under Stephen, made him a formidable enemy and then ally for Geoffrey. His changed loyalties prompted his own followers to defect, and the most likely explanation for the fall of Falaise to the Angevins is the

¹¹⁰⁸ Ibid., pp.120-7.

¹¹⁰⁹ Spear, *Personnel*, p.33; *RRAN* III, p.x.

¹¹¹⁰ OV VI, pp.536-7.

¹¹¹¹ Spear, *Personnel*, p.33.

¹¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹¹³ *GS*, pp.134-7; *WM, HN*, p.107; Crouch, *King Stephen*, pp.186-7; King, *King Stephen*, pp.172-3.

surrender of Robert Marmion, who held land of Waleran near Caen.¹¹¹⁴ Waleran's price for defection is unknown, but the expediency to Geoffrey of maintaining his support in any way he could in the months following Stephen's release is clear.

Waleran was particularly active in this period with respect to securing his own position. He made an agreement (*conventio*) with his cousin Robert of Neubourg, which directly related to the agreement Torigny states that he made with Geoffrey. Robert, whose allegiance to the Beaumonts during the twins' minority was questionable – as was his loyalty to either Stephen in light of his cession of Annebecq to Geoffrey in 1136, or to Geoffrey following his reversion to Stephen in 1137 – was brought back into the fold by the grant of Pont Audemer (Eure, arr. Bernay). The town commanded the crossing of the Risle, and Crouch has suggested that placing it at Geoffrey's disposal and under Robert's custody would have formed an important part of the agreement with Geoffrey himself, despite Waleran's *conventio* with his cousin allowing for the possibility of Geoffrey's defeat.¹¹¹⁵

Philip's election to Bayeux must be read in this context. The *conventiones* and chronicle narratives do not make the material benefits to Waleran of defection to the Angevins clear, but the events and negotiations of 1141-2 planted the seeds of an important Beaumont presence within the ducal administration throughout Geoffrey's reign. There may also be a hint of Geoffrey taking advantage of the rivalry between Waleran and Robert of Gloucester, which had existed in an English context since the beginning of Stephen's reign.¹¹¹⁶ Geoffrey appealed to Robert for assistance with the next major campaign of the conquest, in the Avranchin, at exactly the time that Robert's son had been succeeded at Bayeux by Philip, who, as the following chapter argues, immediately pursued the restitution of lands seized from the diocese by Robert. Politics at the new Norman court may have been the lever which persuaded Robert to cross to Normandy in June 1142, in sharp contrast to the English plans of Lent to tempt Geoffrey himself across the Channel to assist the cause in England.¹¹¹⁷ On the basis of William of Malmesbury's account, the events of 1142 have traditionally been seen as an attempt by Geoffrey to legitimise his conquest, regardless of the consequences for Matilda's

¹¹¹⁴ *Pl. Acta*, no.2425 shows that Waleran was Robert's lord for Barbery and Cinglais (both Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Bretteville-sur-Laize); *The Charters of the Anglo-Norman Earls of Chester, c.1071-1237*, ed. Geoffrey Barraclough, Publications of the Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire 126 (Chester, 1988), no.44 (1138×41) shows him with Ranulf of Chester and William of Roumare in England.

¹¹¹⁵ Crouch, 'A Norman *'conventio'*', p.304.

¹¹¹⁶ Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, pp.30-1; idem., *King Stephen*, p.198, with specific reference to the election.

¹¹¹⁷ WM, *HN*, pp.123-5; RT I, pp.225-6.

progress in England;¹¹¹⁸ analysis of the Norman evidence suggests that Geoffrey's summoning of Robert was part of an important process, which saw magnates jockeying for power and influence in the new political order which followed Stephen's capture.

Waleran was not the only influential figure in the agreements made during these months of dramatic change. The following chapter shows that Bishop Philip himself may well have forced Geoffrey to commit to set the inquests into the bishopric's possessions into motion as soon as he was eventually invested as duke, and here we may detect another wedge which was driven between Geoffrey and Robert of Gloucester. The wheelings and dealings at Bayeux during this period may in turn have led Geoffrey to regard the cathedral as fertile ground for patronage. The dean, Richard of Bohon, is known to have been associated with the cathedral perhaps as early as 1135×1142, but his earliest securely dated appearance in the office is 1144.¹¹¹⁹ Upon Geoffrey's investiture, Richard became chancellor, reflecting the importance his uncles Alexander and Engelger had acquired at the courts of both Geoffrey and Matilda.¹¹²⁰ The chancellorship was not simply granted, however, but purchased, and Richard was still in debt for a loan secured from his deanery in 1152.¹¹²¹

The sources therefore suggest that Geoffrey was involved with the episcopal election at Bayeux in 1142 for ostensibly political reasons, and that it was the support of the Beaumonts combined with the fact that Bayeux had been in Angevin hands since 1138 that facilitated a smooth election, by contrast with that at Lisieux the previous year. Smoothing the path for Philip's election was a signal of the Beaumont rise at court, while the promise of an inquest provided Geoffrey with the opportunity to demonstrate that his pursuit of ducal prerogatives came hand-in-hand with the fulfilment of other responsibilities such as justice and protection of the church.

Richard of Subligny

A different set of circumstances, though equally symptomatic of Stephen's loss of power and Geoffrey's appropriation of the machinery of ducal government, can also be detected in the episcopal election at Avranches in 1143. The death of Richard of Beaufou attracted the attention of Robert of Torigny as the bishop was buried at

¹¹¹⁸ Davis, *King Stephen*, p.71.

¹¹¹⁹ Spear, *Personnel*, p.35. This dating supersedes that of Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.136-7. Cf. *RRAN* III, p.xxxiii.

¹¹²⁰ Bourrienne, *Livre noir* I, no.185.

¹¹²¹ *Ibid.*; *RRAN* III, p.xxxiii.

Robert's abbey of Bec.¹¹²² Although there has been some uncertainty over the date of the election of his successor, Richard of Subligny, David Spear has shown that Richard of Beaufou was dead by 25th April 1143, and that therefore the date of 1143 provided by Robert of Torigny for Richard of Subligny's election must be preferred to that of 1142 supplied by the annalist of Mont-St-Michel.¹¹²³

By this time, Geoffrey had obtained all of Stephen's Mortanais castles, and other strongholds in the Avranchin and its borders with the southern Bessin and the Passais.¹¹²⁴ Robert of Torigny's account of the events of 1142 then indicates that all of the men of the Avranchin and Cotentin surrendered to Geoffrey.¹¹²⁵ As Chapter 1 notes, although Angevin annalists date the fall of both Avranches and Coutances to 1143,¹¹²⁶ Robert's more local account indicates that the Avranchin was secured in 1142, and the Cotentin was the target of the following year, although Geoffrey probably already 'received the voluntary surrender of those in the Cotentin who saw the writing on the wall'.¹¹²⁷ It was Richard of Beaufou himself who surrendered Avranches to Geoffrey in 1142, after Stephen's town of Cérences fell without a fight.¹¹²⁸

The surrender of Avranches meant that Geoffrey could seek to exercise his prerogative in the episcopal election of 1143. The choice of Richard of Subligny was for the most part a result of his holding the recently-established office of dean at Avranches.¹¹²⁹ Yet local forces, whether the chapter or the family politics associated with its members, were subject in 1143 to Angevin influence.¹¹³⁰ The possibility that Geoffrey may have sought to gain the support of Richard's kinsmen, the Subligny dynasty, are particularly interesting given Keats-Rohan's suggestion that the family had lands not only at Subligny (Manche, arr. Avranches, cant. La Haye-Pesnel) to the north of Avranches, but also at Soligné (arr. Avranches, cant. Pontorson, comm. Tanis), between Pontorson and St-James de Beuvron on the Normandy-Brittany border.¹¹³¹

¹¹²² RT I, p.329.

¹¹²³ Spear, *Personnel*, p.4; cf. Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.152, which ignores the dating evidence presented by Spear.

¹¹²⁴ See Chapter 1.

¹¹²⁵ RT I, p.228.

¹¹²⁶ *St-Serge*, p.146; *St-Aubin*, p.35.

¹¹²⁷ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194 and n.11.

¹¹²⁸ JM, *Historia*, p.228.

¹¹²⁹ Allen, 'Five charters', p.18, corrects some of the uncertainties of Spear, *Personnel*, pp.6-7.

¹¹³⁰ Cf. Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.152 and especially notes 370 and 372, which underplays the Angevin element in the election as a consequence of uncertainty over the date of Richard I's death.

¹¹³¹ Keats-Rohan, *Domesday Descendants*, pp.725-6; Allen, 'Five charters', p.18.

Pontorson had fallen to Geoffrey in the weeks leading to the fall of Cérences and Avranches in 1142, and the events of the 1130s must have confirmed the region's reputation for internal unrest and vulnerability to attack from Brittany.¹¹³²

Richard Allen has recently pointed out that even after Geoffrey's reception in Avranches in 1142, the bishop still sought the security of a confirmation for the cathedral's possessions from Archbishop Hugh, apparently later in the same year.¹¹³³ The witness list to this confirmation indicates that Bishop Richard I was at Rouen at this time, in the company of both Archbishop Hugh, who still supported Stephen, and Arnulf of Lisieux, titled bishop but not yet reconciled to Geoffrey. The meeting of these three prelates provides an elegant commentary on the complex and ambiguous political situation in the duchy: by 1142, Geoffrey exercised substantial *de facto* power, to the extent that Bishop Richard had to accept him and that in 1143 Geoffrey could control the Avranches election by means of approval; Normandy's archbishop had to meet with and keep close bishops whose dealings with the Angevins had been very different, and although the anathema clause of his confirmation for Avranches appears to have been directed against the Angevins, he nevertheless had to implicitly recognise Angevin authority in the area.

The practical value of a prelate's support in any given region of Normandy prior to 1144 is hard to quantify, and indeed Judith Green has also highlighted the difficulty in gauging the extent of ecclesiastical support at different stages in Henry I's recovery of the duchy from Robert Curthose, precisely because the impact of that support is rarely explicitly manifest in the source material.¹¹³⁴ The case of Richard of Beaufou demonstrates that a bishop possessed important regional power, and could perform an instrumental role in cession of land and the defection of lords to the Angevins. John of Marmoutier's account of the bishop of Coutances' armed resistance in 1143 indicates that unreconciled bishops could pose a serious challenge, holding towns and castles in Stephen's name and commanding soldiers and other military resources. According to John, Bishop Algar had nearly 200 knights at his disposal, and the castles they garrisoned at St-Lô and Coutances were among the last places to surrender in the campaigns of 1142-3.¹¹³⁵ The appropriation of these resources into Angevin control was essential not just to the security of areas recently taken, but also in swelling the size and

¹¹³² JM, *Historia*, p.227.

¹¹³³ Allen, 'Five charters', pp.9-10 (the document is edited by Allen as Appendix I, no.3).

¹¹³⁴ Green, *Henry I*, p.97.

¹¹³⁵ JM, p.228.

increasing the effectiveness of Geoffrey's army as it moved ever closer to Rouen.

These cases also demonstrate the potential for bishoprics to become important assets in securing the allegiance of key families like the Beaumonts, Bohons and Subligny, even if only for a few years. While John of Subligny, Bishop Richard's nephew, remained a presence at Henry II's court into the 1180s,¹¹³⁶ the Beaumont and Bohon prominence at Geoffrey's court did not continue under Henry. It has been suggested that Richard of Bohon's election in 1151 as bishop of Coutances was a convenient way for Henry to sideline Geoffrey's chancellor for whom he no longer had any use, apparently replacing him with Matilda's chancellor, William.¹¹³⁷ Waleran of Meulan was also sidelined after Geoffrey's cession of the duchy, apparently as a result of the mistrust in which he was held by Matilda and Henry, due to his contact with the French court.¹¹³⁸ As Crouch concludes, the 'temporary expedient' of the central place at Geoffrey's court of figures like Richard of Bohon and Waleran ceased after the cession of Normandy to Henry.

Control of episcopal elections prior to 1144, therefore, is one highly visible aspect of the way in which Geoffrey facilitated his rise to power in the second phase of the conquest, and the source material is such that these elections and disputes are the prism through which the events of 1141-3 must be seen. The appropriation of authority in episcopal towns, which were natural regional centres, was an important factor in the conquest of the entire duchy to the west of the Seine, sealed by the fall of Coutances in 1143. Success in the pays de Caux soon followed, and by the autumn of 1143 Rouen, and with it legitimate rule of Normandy, was in Geoffrey's sights. By this time Geoffrey could act and was regarded by many as *de facto* duke. The evidence for the final weeks and months of the conquest is unusually detailed, and confirms the inference that Geoffrey planned his campaigns carefully, and was conscientious in attracting and maintain support from all quarters, whether lay or ecclesiastical, without overstepping the shaky legitimacy acquired by the process of conquest.

¹¹³⁶ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, pp.211-2; Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.152, n.372. John is indexed in *Pl. Acta*, as witnessing two dozen charters for Henry II in England, Normandy and Anjou.

¹¹³⁷ *RRAN* III, pp.xxxiii-xxxiv; Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.146-7.

¹¹³⁸ Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, pp.69-76, though it must be noted that at 69 Crouch incorrectly dates the witness list of Geoffrey's Rouen charter, confirmed by Henry in 1150-1, to 1151, when it in fact indicates that Waleran was with Geoffrey at Rouen in 1144.

1144: the fall of Rouen and Geoffrey, duke of the Normans

Control of the metropolitan town of Rouen, arguably by 1144 already a capital despite the importance of Caen, was crucial for control of the duchy, not least because this was where the dukes received their investiture at the hands of the archbishop.¹¹³⁹ On the strength of the Norman chronicles, it is generally agreed that Geoffrey was invested as duke not upon his entry into Rouen on 20th January 1144, but after the surrender of the tower on 23rd April.¹¹⁴⁰ The Saint-Florent annals are the only Angevin source to date precisely Geoffrey's definitive acquisition of Normandy, stating that it occurred on Saturday 22nd April.¹¹⁴¹ The annalist may have been incorrect by a day in his dating – and was certainly incorrect in the year – but this dating raises the possibility that the Norman chroniclers preferred to place the final fall of the tower on the 23rd, a Sunday, for symbolic or liturgical reasons.¹¹⁴²

Both of these dates, however, are contradicted by two charters, the first issued by Bishop Ulger of Angers, which considers the feast of St Peter and St Paul (29th June) in 1145 to be during the first year of Geoffrey's ducal reign, and the second by Pope Lucius II, who wrote to Geoffrey on 16th May 1144, styling him count only.¹¹⁴³ The papal reference to Geoffrey as count cannot be considered reliable evidence of the date at which the ducal title was assumed – it may have been too early for Lucius to have learnt of the fall of Rouen, and in any case a papal letter of 1147 to Geoffrey also styles him count – though it may be an important sign of the temporary nature of the reign.¹¹⁴⁴ These examples are not alone in the ecclesiastical letter tradition in this respect, with

¹¹³⁹ David Bates, 'Rouen from 900 to 1204: From Scandinavian Settlement to Angevin 'Capital'', *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology at Rouen*, ed. Jenny Stratford (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 12, 1993 for 1986), pp.1-11, especially 5. Caen, whether as a location for Geoffrey's court or as the beneficiary of charters, is strikingly absent from Geoffrey's *acta*; see Chapter 6. There is no written reference to Geoffrey's investiture, but *ordines* pertaining to the ducal accession survive: from the late tenth century, the 'Ad ducem constituendum', in *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, ed. H. A. Wilson (London, 1903), pp.157-59, with dating of the whole manuscript, p.xi; from the eleventh, texts produced at Fécamp also survive, discussed by Francis Wormald, 'An Eleventh-Century Copy of the Norman Laudes Regiae', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 37 (1964), pp.73-76.

¹¹⁴⁰ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.195; Chartrou, pp.65-6; RT I, p.234: 'Videlicet Gaufrido antea Andegavensis comiti, jam exinde Normannorum duce'; *RHGF* XII, p.773: 'reddita est turris Rotomagensis Gaufrido comiti Andegavensi et exinde factus est comes Normanniae'.

¹¹⁴¹ *St-Florent*, p.191, giving the date as 10 kalends May, in the third week after Easter. In common with the rest of the annals for these years, the year date supplied is incorrect (1142).

¹¹⁴² Cf. Chibnall's note, OV VI, p.448, n.2: some chroniclers of Henry I's death on 1st December give the date as 2nd December, 'because of the liturgical usage of starting the day at sunset'.

¹¹⁴³ *CSPL*, no.62 (Ulger); App. II, no.1, both cited by Delisle, *Introduction*, p.135, as proof that the ducal investiture only occurred after 29th June 1144.

¹¹⁴⁴ App. II, no.3. Whether Geoffrey's ducal reign was a regency for Henry, see Chapter 6.

Arnulf of Lisieux referring to Geoffrey simply as count in his letter of 1146 to Pope Eugenius and Bernard of Clairvaux doing the same in 1146/7.¹¹⁴⁵

A more complex political reality than the creation of Geoffrey as duke simply by the rite of investiture is suggested by Robert of Torigny's account of the siege: 'Count Geoffrey besieged [the tower], with Count Waleran of Meulan and other Norman princes who by now were on good terms with *the duke*'.¹¹⁴⁶ Robert's early application of the title hints at a reality manifest in the charter evidence. As many commentators have noted, Geoffrey's supporter William Talvas dated a charter issued for his abbey of Vignats on 19th September 1143 with a reference to 'duke Geoffrey reigning in Normandy' (*principante in Normannia duce Gaufrido*), a sentiment the charter's other important witnesses – the bishops of Sées, Lisieux and Bayeux, and the abbots of Vignats, St-Pierre-sur-Dives and Savigny – approved of.¹¹⁴⁷ Crouch has also drawn attention to two charters issued by Matilda for Godstow Abbey in 1143, which also style Geoffrey duke.¹¹⁴⁸

These early references to Geoffrey as duke raise questions of the nature of his authority in Normandy prior to the fall of Rouen and his official investiture. One unpublished study has even suggested that the *terminus post quem* for Geoffrey's ducal charters, for the Savigniacs at least, ought to be amended to 1143 on the strength of Talvas's act.¹¹⁴⁹ The *acta*, however, indicate that Geoffrey himself never used the title prior to his investiture. This approach to *de facto* rule is particularly interesting in the context of the aggregation of power since 1141, and in the light of several charters issued during the siege of Rouen itself, which accord with King's recent assertion that 'a series of agreements, which involved a good deal of patient diplomacy, lay behind the smooth takeover of power'.¹¹⁵⁰

Historians have never addressed the question of whether Geoffrey was present for the entire eleven weeks and five days of the siege.¹¹⁵¹ Geoffrey in fact issued at least three, and possibly four, charters during this period – although one is suspect – all some

¹¹⁴⁵ *Letter Collections of Arnulf*, ed. Schriber, no.1.39 (= *Letters of Arnulf*, ed. Barlow, no.3); *Letters of St. Bernard*, ed. James, no.401.

¹¹⁴⁶ RT I, p.233: 'Obsedit ergo eam comes Gaufridus, et Galeranus comes Mellenti, et ceteri principes Normanniae, qui jam cum duce concordati erant'.

¹¹⁴⁷ *Pontieu actes*, ed. Brunel, no.27; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.130, n.24; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.65.

¹¹⁴⁸ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.195, n.15, citing RRAN III, nos. 370-1.

¹¹⁴⁹ Patrick Conyers, 'Changing Habits: the Early Years of Savigny's Congregation and its Dealings with the Cistercians, 1105-80', PhD thesis, University of Iowa, 2001, p.143.

¹¹⁵⁰ King, *King Stephen*, p.200, citing JM, p.230, RT I, p.148 and Geoffrey's charter for the citizens of Rouen (App. IV, no.14).

¹¹⁵¹ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.129; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.64; King, *King Stephen*, p.200.

distance away from the capital in both Anjou and Normandy. They show that, after setting the siege up on 25th January, Geoffrey must have returned immediately to Angers, apparently to meet with his son, Henry, and to organise additional resources for the siege. He then returned north, apparently pausing at the Norman abbey of Saint-Évroul and perhaps also at La Trinité in Vendôme, before returning to conclude the siege of the tower.¹¹⁵²

One act shows that Geoffrey must have returned to Anjou almost immediately after 25th January, for it was there that he was either delayed or residing (*morabatur*) on the first Sunday of Lent, 12th February, 1144, and was petitioned by the monks of the priory of Les Alleuds to deal with Engressus, the comital seneschal at Brissac.¹¹⁵³ It was probably during this time that Geoffrey learnt of the death of his father as the result of a riding accident at Acre on 10th November 1143.¹¹⁵⁴ Fulk's death was acknowledged in Geoffrey's charter for the priories of Cunault and Loudun, which describes him as 'recently dead' (*nuper defuncti*).¹¹⁵⁵ Despite the attention paid to this charter by A. L. Poole in 1932, who dated it to the spring of 1144, this evidence has not been factored into recent accounts of the siege.¹¹⁵⁶

These charters suggest that Geoffrey continued to attend personally to the government of Anjou, even in apparently minor matters at a crucial juncture of the conquest, and that he was perhaps forced to return to Anjou for material support, which may be one immediate factor in the prior of Cunault and Loudun's concern with assistance in Geoffrey's Norman war.¹¹⁵⁷ They also provide an important commentary upon the position attained by Waleran of Meulan, who had been left to manage the siege, perhaps in the absence other Angevins who were in Rouen when the tower eventually fell, such as Geoffrey's brother Helias, who apparently did not take part in

¹¹⁵² App. I, no.110 is a record of Geoffrey's intervention in a dispute between John, son of Count Geoffrey of Vendôme, and the abbey. It appears to have been issued in 1144 but its dating cannot be definitively resolved, and is discussed in the appended notes.

¹¹⁵³ App. I, no.9 (Engressus).

¹¹⁵⁴ Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (3 vols., London, 1990-91) II, p.233, notes that Fulk's riding accident occurred on 7th November; William of Tyre's description of his death three days later is corroborated by the necrology of Angers cathedral, which records Fulk's death on IV ides November.

¹¹⁵⁵ App. I, no.42.

¹¹⁵⁶ Poole, 'Early Visits', pp.450-1, also cited by Marjorie Chibnall, 'L'avènement au pouvoir d'Henri II', *CCM* 37 (1994), pp.41-8, at 43.

¹¹⁵⁷ App. I, no.42: 'quod cum cogente necessitate guerrarum, quas in Normannia habemus, ab ecclesiis et religionibus Andegaviae nos quaerere subsidia oporteret, venerabilis Petrus abbas Trenorchiensis, et Petrus de Aula tunc temporis prior de Cunaldo et de Lausduno, facere nobis hujusmodi auxilia recusarunt'.

the early stages of the siege.¹¹⁵⁸

It seems that Geoffrey then returned to Rouen, perhaps in the company of additional Angevins. A short charter issued for Saint-Évroul – which has caused considerable confusion – must be assigned to this period, if it is genuine. Haskins observed that this charter ‘displays some curious features. Geoffrey speaks as the successor of Henry I, yet he has not taken the ducal title’; he goes on to puzzle over the description of Fulk as *bone memorie*, suggesting that ‘the news of his death could hardly have reached his son before the capitulation of Rouen, where Geoffrey remained until his assumption of the ducal title: yet a charter issued at Rouen in such an alien style is surprising’.¹¹⁵⁹ Davis suggests a date of issue after Fulk’s death, admitting the possibility of 1143-4, but noting that the reference to Henry as Geoffrey’s own predecessor ‘suggests that he was, or had been, Duke himself’, suggesting 1150-1 to be just as likely.¹¹⁶⁰ Yet as the Cunault charter shows, Geoffrey had learned of Fulk’s death prior to his departure from Angers. Haskins’ supposition that the Saint-Évroul charter was issued in Rouen, moreover, is not backed up by any evidence; far more feasible is that it was actually drawn up at the abbey itself, on the way back to Rouen from Angers.

In the charter, Geoffrey placed the abbey under his protection, confirmed its goods (*res*) just as they had stood under Henry I, and prohibited third parties from bringing the monks to court over matters connected with these goods.¹¹⁶¹ The grant, and its custody element, may have been explicit recognition of the monks’ suffering during the conquest; as Orderic Vitalis tells us, in some of the most vehement passages of the *Historia*, Saint-Évroul had borne the brunt of violence in the early years of campaigning.¹¹⁶² There appear to be no special devotional reasons for this charter, and what is most striking about it is the opportunity it gave Geoffrey to identify himself as the legitimate heir to Henry I, his ‘ancestor’ (*antecessoris mei*). This evidence is problematic, however, given the spurious nature of the acts of Henry I, Henry II and Richard I in the two Saint-Évroul cartularies. If it is genuine, it provides a compelling insight into Geoffrey’s movements prior to the investiture, and bears out the other evidence that he sought to promote himself as duke sensitively.

¹¹⁵⁸ Helias is recorded as present in Mayet on 28th January 1144, consenting App. I, no.34, granted by Geoffrey’s son Geoffrey junior in his father’s name.

¹¹⁵⁹ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.141, n.61.

¹¹⁶⁰ *RRAN* III, no.774; Round, no.637, suggests 1136×44.

¹¹⁶¹ ‘Insuper illis de cum aliquo inde placitentur prohibeo’.

¹¹⁶² OV VI, pp.459-63 (including an account of how the town of Saint-Évroul was burnt), 471-5.

The evidence suggests, therefore, that Geoffrey left the siege of Rouen to attend to matters in Anjou – including a last-minute push for assistance in Normandy – and to promote actively his ducal legitimacy. Finally, after months of carefully-controlled *de facto* rule, Geoffrey was in a position to posit himself as Henry's heir while William of Warenne's garrison slowly starved in their Rouen stronghold. The vast majority of the duchy was already in hand, and the charter issued for the citizens of Rouen after the investiture indicates that Geoffrey enjoyed considerable aristocratic support, including many lords from the strategic Vexin border.¹¹⁶³ Charters and chronicles give the impression that the remaining outpost loyal to Stephen, at Arques, was a nuisance rather than a threat and its custodian William the Monk's resistance into 1145 did not undermine Geoffrey's larger success.¹¹⁶⁴ Victory at Rouen, the key to Normandy, was assured; the title was not yet in use, but ducal powers were.

This chapter has shown that the conquest's success was rooted in Geoffrey's ability to win over gradually the key lay and ecclesiastical elements of Anglo-Norman political society to his cause, and to put their resources to effective use. Perhaps the clearest case of this is western Normandy, the centre of Stephen's comital power; although Mortain only fell in 1142, Stephen was effectively denied authority in the region from the beginning of the conquest. The appropriation of local support and resources was at least as important as the military expertise which Geoffrey was famed for. Although the conquest was an extremely long process, the shrewd assimilation of resources, and their distribution amongst local followers and perhaps some Angevins, had created an effective foothold – larger than previously assumed – which could be capitalised upon after by Stephen's capture in 1141. At this point, *de facto* authority could be dispensed, but very carefully, continuing the tactic of appeasement which had earlier found expression in the agreements and enticements made with and offered to the Norman aristocracy, and which from 1141 can be detected in Geoffrey's dealings with civic organisations, monastic institutions and the episcopate.¹¹⁶⁵

¹¹⁶³ App. IV, no.14; Green, 'Norman Vexin', *passim*.

¹¹⁶⁴ RT I, p.237; App. I, no.27, dated 1145, 'anno...ipso comite ducatum Normannie in pace habente, eo anno quo idem dux Normannie Archas castrum adquisivit, quod solum ei de toto ducatu resistebat'.

¹¹⁶⁵ See also King, *King Stephen*, p.202: 'Geoffrey of Anjou, in taking over Normandy with the support of the Church, the magnates, and the mercantile community, provided a model of how the takeover of England might be achieved'.

Chapter 6

The ducal reign

Peace appears to have returned to Normandy fairly quickly after Geoffrey's investiture. There is evidence, for example, that pilgrims could now travel through Normandy to reach Chartres, and that church-building was renewed with vigour.¹¹⁶⁶ Even Normandy's border with Maine, beset by conflict in the eleventh and earlier twelfth century, had emerged from the conquest calmer and more peaceful.¹¹⁶⁷ It was in the interests of both Geoffrey and his new Norman subjects to avoid the problems which had erupted under Stephen. This chapter examines Geoffrey's approach to ducal rule, and the forces which shaped the character of his reign. A different approach has been taken to that employed in chapters 2 and 3 to analyse comital rule in Anjou. The Norman nobility are not here subject to detailed prosopographical study from the *acta*; rather, they are only addressed briefly in the context of broader attitudes taken by Geoffrey to re-establish ducal authority and order in the duchy.

Geoffrey's ducal reign was described by Haskins as one which 'restores rather than creates, and administers rather than ordains'; it was 'a regency rather than a permanent government'.¹¹⁶⁸ This picture persists.¹¹⁶⁹ Continuity is evident in patronage and land tenure, both being confirmed by a flurry of charters which restored the status quo of 1135. Likewise, suggestions that Geoffrey's ducal government sought to expurgate Stephen from the administrative history of the duchy are borne out by diplomatic analysis of Geoffrey's Norman *acta*, and provide a clear precedent for the attempted erasure of Stephen's entire Anglo-Norman reign by Henry II.¹¹⁷⁰ There is also strong evidence that Henry was associated in his father's administration throughout this period. What Geoffrey did not do is also significant: no new castles, for example, are attested to in the evidence, with the symbolic exception of the restoration of Rouen castle. Nevertheless, Geoffrey did not spend five years seeking merely to restore Henrician Normandy, rendered irretrievable by 'a breach in continuity created by time

¹¹⁶⁶ Léopold Delisle, 'Lettre de l'abbé Haimon sur la construction de l'église de Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive, en 1145', *BEC* 21 (1860), pp.113-39; RT I, p.238.

¹¹⁶⁷ Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.470, contrasting the post-1144 peace with Orderic's account of the region around Saint-Céneri under Henry I (OV IV, pp.155-6).

¹¹⁶⁸ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.135.

¹¹⁶⁹ King, *King Stephen*, p.265.

¹¹⁷⁰ King, 'Anglo-Norman Aristocracy', p.181.

and civil war'.¹¹⁷¹ He had to deal with the imprint left on the duchy by the violence wrought by partisans of both sides, and by Stephen's activities and influence – however diminished – as king-duke. It was impossible to erase Stephen's rule entirely, and it would be incorrect to suggest that this was the sole or even primary aim of the ducal reign.

The events of 1135-44 had ushered in a new political climate. Perhaps the most visible sign of this was the inquiry into the bishop of Bayeux's estates, which not only altered the Gloucester-Beaumont balance of power in Geoffrey's Norman court, but also brought the actions of many other partisans into question. The sworn inquest, used by Henry I during his assessment of Bayeux's knights' fees when the bishopric was vacant in 1133, was seized upon by Bishop Philip of Bayeux soon after his investiture in 1142 as the most effective way to approach the recovery of his lost possessions. Papal and episcopal pressure led to Geoffrey commissioning the inquests very early in the reign, as part of a larger process of restitution and recovery of possessions lost both before and during Angevin campaigning, and this process could not avoid being political. In legal terms, Geoffrey's reign has been regarded as innovative, for the sworn inquest or recognition entered into more widespread and regularised use.¹¹⁷² Numismatic evidence indicates that Geoffrey undertook the wholesale replacement of the *denier roumois*, Normandy's currency, with the *denier angevin*.¹¹⁷³ Although Normandy's new pennies did not bear Geoffrey's image, their legend (FVLCO COMES / VRBS ANDEGAVIS) reflected the new Angevin order, and was a clear political statement.¹¹⁷⁴

Other elements of the reign further reflect a past that was not purely Henrician. Although Geoffrey favoured some institutions important to Henry, his own devotional interests can at times be detected, and he also had to confirm privileges granted by Stephen, particularly in his Mortain heartland to institutions such as Savigny and its daughter houses. In this case, the language of the charters indicates the approach to excising Stephen from the ducal record was subtle, and that it had ramifications beyond

¹¹⁷¹ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.146.

¹¹⁷² Helmerichs, 'Norman Institutions or Norman Legal Practices?', *passim*. Chapter 2, however, shows that there is strong evidence that the recognition or sworn inquest was already in use in Anjou prior to Geoffrey's reign; in England, Stephen ordered a recognition to be made into land belonging to St. Martin le Grand, London, in 1147×52 (*RRAN* III, no.546); prior to his investiture as King of Scots, probably in the early 1120s, David I carried out an inquest into the estates of the bishop of Glasgow over a large cross-border area of southern Scotland and northern England (*The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I King of Scots, 1124-53, and of his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, 1999), no.60).

¹¹⁷³ Cook, 'The monetary system of the Angevin Empire', pp.631-41.

¹¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.634-5.

the borders of Normandy. Like their Angevin counterparts, Geoffrey's Norman charters suggest a reluctance or inability to patronise the church generously, though there are some hints of his influence and family background upon ducal religious patronage, at least in the case of the Cistercian abbey of Mortemer and Bec's priory of Notre-Dame-du-Pré, alias La Bonne Nouvelle. Mortemer was the recipient of the most generous set of grants made by Geoffrey to a Norman beneficiary, and his charter for the monks attests primarily to the recently-founded abbey's need for landed endowment, but also to the influence exerted upon the reign by his marriage to Matilda, the importance of Geoffrey styling himself successor to Henry and of expunging Stephen's reign from the record, as well as how the character of Geoffrey's personal piety was affected by his own dynastic background. Matilda's influence in Geoffrey's grant to Bec is well-documented, and – along with Mortemer – provides evidence for the role of Matilda and Henry in Norman affairs.¹¹⁷⁵

How Geoffrey's ducal reign functioned in a cross-Channel world previously united by a single ruler and still held together by magnates, trade, religious filiations and monastic estates, has barely been considered before, except with reference to the presence of Angevins in Matilda's charters in 1141.¹¹⁷⁶ Geoffrey, Stephen and Matilda's *acta*, however, present compelling evidence for the continuation of ducal activities in the former *regnum*. Acts for Savigny, Cluny and the citizens of Rouen indicate that both Geoffrey and Stephen played a part in cross-Channel monastic affairs involving trade and estates after 1144, suggesting that how important aspects of the cross-Channel world functioned were more complex than previously thought, but that while Geoffrey's position as Henry I's Norman heir led Continental institutions with English interests to seek security from the new duke on both sides of the Channel, Stephen's ability to protect the cross-Channel interests of both lay and ecclesiastical beneficiaries was severely circumscribed.

Other aspects of Geoffrey's ducal reign will not be considered, due to the limited nature of the relevant evidence and the attention they have already attracted. The personnel of the court is the largest omission, though some key figures are addressed in passing. There is no evidence that Geoffrey revived the Norman exchequer system implemented in the 1130s by Henry I, which seems to have fallen into abeyance under

¹¹⁷⁵ Chibnall, 'Matilda and Bec', *passim*.

¹¹⁷⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.106.

Stephen, and no new evidence has been found to alter previous conclusions.¹¹⁷⁷ Little beyond what has already been set out in recent historiography can be said of other innovations in administrative personnel, such as the bailli, or those – with the exception of Thomas of Loches, as Chapter 4 shows – who operated the ducal chancery which Geoffrey so clearly inherited.¹¹⁷⁸ The charters can only reveal so much – and in some cases, nothing at all – about the political and curial roles of key magnates during the reign, such as Count John of Eu, who witnessed none of Geoffrey's extant charters, but whose own subjects sought ducal confirmation for their new commune created by the count; Henry's confirmation of Geoffrey's surety for John's commune is all that remains of their relationship.¹¹⁷⁹

Other features of the reign attest to the normal business of any administration. Legal cases, such as those concerning the abbey of Fécamp's rights over ports and the settlement of a dispute over customs between Enguerrand of Vascoeuil and Préaux Abbey, had no explicit connection with the events of the 1130s and early 1140s, but represent a concern for ducal justice which is entirely to be expected.¹¹⁸⁰ Likewise, evidence that Geoffrey sought to defend and maintain ducal prerogatives, in episcopal and abbatial elections – sometimes to the long-term detriment of those he opposed or sought to control – but also in areas such as the forest, need not necessarily be considered in the context of the war or a concern to revert to Henrician precedent.

Finally, this chapter will briefly address the transfer of the duchy to Henry. As Chapter 3 has shown, Henry was prepared from a young age for an Anglo-Norman, rather than Angevin, future. No new evidence for the exact nature of the involvement of either the young Henry or Matilda in Geoffrey's Norman government can be cited, and Chibnall's work on the subject remains authoritative.¹¹⁸¹ This issue lies at the heart of the existing debate over Geoffrey's Norman reign – namely, whether and how he held it purely for his son and heir – but, as what follows shows, if we are to understand the pressures, priorities and events of Geoffrey's time as duke, it must not be granted undue prominence.

¹¹⁷⁷ Green, 'Unity and Disunity', pp.118-22, reviews the evidence.

¹¹⁷⁸ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.151-2.

¹¹⁷⁹ App. IV, no.5; cf. *Le livre rouge d'Eu 1151-1454*, ed. A. Legris (Paris, 1911), pp.1-2; Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.56.

¹¹⁸⁰ App. I, no.78.

¹¹⁸¹ Chibnall, 'L'avènement'.

Heir to Henry I: confirmations and restitutions

The charter for Saint-Évroul which refers to Henry I as Geoffrey's ancestor and restores the *status quo* of December 1135 suggests that attempts were made to wipe the slate clean of any trace of Stephen's ducal reign even prior to the investiture.¹¹⁸² Duke Henry's confirmation in 1150-1 of Geoffrey's privileges for Rouen reinforces this: on the day Geoffrey received the citizens of the town, 'all complaints concerning farms, debts, pleas, disputes were quit'; properties were to be held in peace, and individuals disseised after 1135 were to be restored to their estates under ducal protection.¹¹⁸³ The restorative and confirmatory purpose of these two acts, for different types of beneficiaries, was the blueprint for many of Geoffrey's ducal *acta*. It was necessary to lavish the same attention upon important groups and institutions as upon the fabric of the duchy, such as Rouen's castle and bridge: all required re-building in one form or another.¹¹⁸⁴

Of the thirty-three acts for Norman beneficiaries in Appendix I, fifteen refer to 'the time of King Henry', 'the year in which King Henry was alive and dead', Henry as Geoffrey's ancestor (*antecessor*) and/or to Henry's own charters.¹¹⁸⁵ The same trend has been detected amongst Henry II's charters, not only those issued prior to his English coronation, but also in his coronation charter itself, which 'indicated that Henry I was to be the model for Henry II's government'.¹¹⁸⁶ Neither Geoffrey nor Henry (with a handful of exceptions) refers to Stephen in the charters.¹¹⁸⁷ Geoffrey's fifteen confirmatory acts constitute a significant proportion (45%) of the total number of acts issued for Norman beneficiaries in Appendix I, and are a striking indication of the need to restore order and security to tenure and title after the conquest.

Many beneficiaries individually secured the rights and privileges they had in December 1135. The abbess of Almenêches, for example, was to have all the customs and liberties 'that she had in the time of King Henry'.¹¹⁸⁸ The monks of Héauville

¹¹⁸² App. I, no.85.

¹¹⁸³ App. IV, no.14. Geoffrey's Rouen charter is discussed in detail below.

¹¹⁸⁴ RT I, pp.239, 242; Bates, 'Rouen', p.5.

¹¹⁸⁵ App. I, nos. 1, 32, 43 (though not in the form of a confirmation, discussed in detail below), 53, 72, 73, 79 (also discussed below), 80-5, 87, 88, 95.

¹¹⁸⁶ J. C. Holt, '1153: The Treaty of Winchester', *Anarchy*, ed. King, pp.291-316, at 303.

¹¹⁸⁷ The exceptions amongst Henry's 3000+ *acta* are discussed by Vincent, 'Sixteen New charters', p.5, and pertain to Cluny (*RRAN* III, no.206; DB I, no.444; DB II, no.502), Stephen's Cluniac priory at Faversham (Canterbury Cathedral Library MS Chartae Antiquae F83, recto, a mid-14th century cartulary roll), Stephen's daughter Mary (TNA E13/64, Exchequer Plea Roll 10/11 Edward III, m.15), Darley Abbey (DB I, no.42), and Hugh of Gournay (DB I, no.325).

¹¹⁸⁸ App. I, no.1.

presented Geoffrey with a verbatim copy of the confirmation Henry himself had issued sometime between 1130 and 1135; Geoffrey duly consented to its terms, which protected the priory's lands as ducal alms, which the monks were to hold 'well and in peace and honourably and justly and quietly, just as well and quietly as they held they in the time of King Henry'.¹¹⁸⁹ Geoffrey's confirmation charters rarely refer in detail to the estates beneficiaries held in 1135, and only occasionally enumerate specific privileges and exemptions; there is a clear reliance upon the more detailed documents issued by Henry I. There is also evidence that it was not only mention of the king which strengthened these confirmations, but also a process of collaboration: thus Geoffrey's confirmation for Bec was made with the advice of not only his son but also his Norman barons (*consilio Henrici filii mei et baronum meorum*), just as judicial decisions involved counsel.¹¹⁹⁰

The importance of such confirmations is illustrated by Geoffrey's renewal of Henry I's privileges for the guild of cordwainers and cobblers of Rouen.¹¹⁹¹ Henry's grant enabled the craftsmen to practice their trade under the auspices of a guild, just as they had under William the Conqueror and Robert Curthose.¹¹⁹² In 1137 Stephen renewed Henry's grant whilst in Normandy.¹¹⁹³ The right to operate the guild had not been made in perpetuity and required renewal through notification to the individuals responsible for the dispensation of justice and the collection of revenues – the justiciars and vicomtes – by each successive duke.¹¹⁹⁴ Both Geoffrey and Stephen considered Henry to be their immediate predecessor as duke: even though Stephen had confirmed Henry's concession, therefore, Geoffrey's confirmation refers only to Henry's document.

Rouen occupies an important place in the extant *acta*, with seven charters surviving for beneficiaries in the town itself and records of the comital court convening

¹¹⁸⁹ App. I, no.53, confirming *RRAN* II, no.1948. The clause reads: 'teneat...ita bene et in pace et honorifice et juste et quiete sicut melius et quietius tenuerant tempore regis H(enrici)'.

¹¹⁹⁰ App. I, no.32. Cf. *ibid.*, no.78, a record of a meeting of the ducal court 'coram iudicibus et baillivis et dapifero, assensu procerum et consilio utriusque partes'.

¹¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, no.82. Mark Hagger, 'The earliest Norman writs revisited', *Historical Research* 82 (2009), pp.181-205, at 191, n.54, notes that Henry's confirmation of Geoffrey's writ-charter for the guild is one of the two writ-charters issued by Henry II whilst duke only, and is counted alongside three such documents issued by Matilda and fourteen by Henry I. The manuscript tradition of this document is garbled, and its initial issue under Geoffrey must be added to Hagger's list.

¹¹⁹² *RRAN* II, no.1695.

¹¹⁹³ *RRAN* III, no.727.

¹¹⁹⁴ Hagger, 'Norman writs', p.196.

there.¹¹⁹⁵ Other charters were awarded to institutions immediately adjacent to Rouen, such as the priory of Le Pré (discussed below) across the Seine in Quevilly, and the abbey of Saint-Wandrille in the nearby pays de Caux.¹¹⁹⁶ Individuals were granted offices in the vicinity of the town, while others in Rouen were notified of grants made in the wider Haute-Normandie region; together, these acts provide evidence of a well-evolved apparatus of ducal power and, along with the charter for the town's citizens, demonstrate the economic importance of the town and surrounding region.¹¹⁹⁷ Rouen was the venue for the issue of 35% of all Geoffrey's Norman *acta*, a proportion double that of the second most frequent place of issue, Argentan; the *acta* issued at Rouen account for 42% of all of Geoffrey's Norman *acta* which have place-dates.¹¹⁹⁸ This is to be expected in light of Rouen's importance under Henry I, but also underscores the surprising absence of Caen as both a venue for charter issue and as the location for beneficiaries in receipt of extant ducal *acta* between 1144 and 1150.¹¹⁹⁹ The prominence of Rouen in Geoffrey's charter place-dates echoes the preponderance of Rouen charters in Stephen's 1137 itinerary, but also stands in contrast to the apparent issue of charters by Stephen at other important ducal strongholds such as Falaise and Évreux, as well as locations favoured by Henry I, such as Lyons-la-Forêt.¹²⁰⁰

Geoffrey's confirmatory charters attest to the concern of individuals and institutions to seek security for their privileges.¹²⁰¹ Indeed, the individuals who sought the privileges for the cordwainers of Rouen appear in successive charters between 1131 and 1150.¹²⁰² The case of the cordwainers owes as much to Henry I's original omission of a perpetuity clause in the grant of their guild as it does to Geoffrey's investiture, but

¹¹⁹⁵ App. I, nos. 78 (court), 79-84; App. IV, no.14.

¹¹⁹⁶ App. I, nos. 31, 87 and 88, in which St-Wandrille's right to revenues from the duke's toll in Rouen is confirmed.

¹¹⁹⁷ Ibid., no.54; App. IV, no.19.

¹¹⁹⁸ These proportions have been calculated from Appendix I and the acts issued by Geoffrey in Appendix II. Out of the 40 *acta* in question, 14 were issued in Rouen, 7 in Argentan, 2 in Lisieux, and 1 each in Saint-Évroul (for which refer to the above discussion on the siege of Rouen), Bayeux, Bec and St-Lô; several Norman *acta* were also issued in Anjou, with 2 each issued at Le Mans and Saumur, and 1 each at Mirebeau and Montreuil-Bellay. 7 of Geoffrey's Norman *acta* do not have place-dates.

¹¹⁹⁹ Caen's importance during this period requires further investigation.

¹²⁰⁰ Stephen issued 7 charters at Rouen (*RRAN* III, nos. 67, 73, 117, 327, 463-4 and 727); 4 at Évreux (nos. 69, 280-2), perhaps 1 at Falaise (no.298) and perhaps 1 at Lyons (no.598). Another charter not in *RRAN* III, in favour of L'Abbaye Blanche, also appears to have been issued at Falaise (Vincent, 'New Charters of King Stephen', pp.906 and 924-5, no.8).

¹²⁰¹ Hagger, 'Norman writs', p.187, discusses the lengths to which Norman beneficiaries went to obtain writs from Henry I, citing OV VI, pp.324-6.

¹²⁰² Alongside others, Osbert fitz Hubard was a petitioner to Henry I in 1131 and to Stephen in 1137; William Canute was a petitioner in 1137, and to Geoffrey in 1144 and Henry in 1150, though it is unclear whether the reproduction of Geoffrey's list of petitioners in Henry's charter reflects the circumstances of 1150.

some documents are hard to classify as straightforward confirmations, as their content suggests that any confirmation contained therein arose from the need to restore possession to a beneficiary. Two such cases are the charters issued for the bishops of Coutances and Évreux.¹²⁰³

The former refers to the Cotentin churches of Cherbourg and Turlaville (both Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville), and was issued in the form of a confirmation of a verdict decided upon by six jurors, who swore at the ducal assize that one Robert fitz Nigel and his predecessors had held rights in the two churches from Bishop Algar of Coutances and earlier bishops, and that these rights were to be held in perpetuity. In the latter case, Geoffrey addressed his officials at Verneuil and Nonancourt commanding them to render immediately (*absque dilatione reddatis*) to the bishop of Évreux all of the tithes he was accustomed to have there under Henry I, as set out in Henry's charter. In addition, the charter stipulates that if anyone should 'break the peace' (*de pace vero fracta*), the duke's officials were to levy a fine of £9, just as under Henry I; finally, Geoffrey's man William Lovel, one of the addressees, was to dispense justice to a certain Gilbert.¹²⁰⁴

Geoffrey's instructions to his officials with regard to the bishop of Évreux are an interesting departure from the earlier documents connected to the tithes in question. Henry I originally granted the tithes of all churches in Verneuil and Nonancourt to Bishop Ouen in 1128, along with tithes from the nearby demesne river port of Verneuil, in perpetuity.¹²⁰⁵ Stephen renewed Henry's grant in 1137, in an act which faithfully reproduced the terms of the original grant, with the addition of a *pro anima* clause relevant to 1137 and a sealing clause which emphasised the perpetual nature of the confirmation.¹²⁰⁶ In 1144, however, Geoffrey does not appear to have confirmed the grant in the same way, for no such charter survives. Instead, we see Geoffrey forcefully attempting to restore the tithes to the bishop as the result of local problems, using what appears to be the language of warranty, but perhaps consisted of a promise to maintain possession.¹²⁰⁷ Although Henry and Stephen did not have to guarantee (*garantare*) the bishop's possession of the tithes, Geoffrey's act suggests that he did; the tithes were to

¹²⁰³ App. I, nos. 40 and 43.

¹²⁰⁴ And see the note to App. I, no.43.

¹²⁰⁵ *RRAN* II, no.1554, printed there as Appendix no. CCVII.

¹²⁰⁶ *RRAN* III, no.281.

¹²⁰⁷ Though precisely what this would have meant in practice is difficult to discern, particularly as royal warranty under the Angevins in England has not been detected until the mid-1190s: Paul R. Hyams, 'Warranty and good lordship in twelfth-century England', *Law and History Review* 5 (1987), pp.437-503.

be restored and the bishop be in possession of them just as Henry had apparently ‘warranted’ (*sicut carta eius garantizat*).

It is significant that in this charter, Geoffrey also took this opportunity to reaffirm elements of Henry’s act concerning the Peace and Truce of God,¹²⁰⁸ specifically the bishop’s right to demand a fine of £9 from anyone who infringes the local peace; again, despite a very different characterisation of this right in Henry’s original charter, Geoffrey stated that this privilege was given in accordance with Henry’s warranty (*sicut carta Henrici regis garantizat*). Henry I had strengthened the terms of the Peace and Truce in 1135, apparently during the period when Geoffrey and Matilda had broken with him.¹²⁰⁹ No other evidence that Geoffrey confirmed the Peace and Truce survives, but this confirmation suggests that he, like his predecessors, did so: this was not just important for the bishop of Évreux, but for the entire archdiocese and Geoffrey’s ducal authority.

Though not as explicitly suggestive of local violence or seizure, the confirmation of privileges in the form of mandates to ducal officers in the case of Saint-Amand of Rouen and the town’s leper hospital, indicates that a simple, generally-addressed confirmation was not enough to secure these institutions’ seisin of their rightful privileges after the events of 1135-44.¹²¹⁰ In the case of the lepers, a writ may simply have been required in order to notify a new vicomte of an item of expenditure; in the case of Saint-Amand, however, the restatement of privileges came with a command that the forest tithes in question at Eawy and Alihermont were in no way to be diminished (*quia nolo ut elemosina mea minuatur*).

These documents indicate the necessity of delineating privileges and tenures, and for redress of seisin of certain privileges connected with property and revenue as the result of losses, as opposed simply to confirmation upon the investiture of a new duke. The Coutances charter appears to confirm Robert fitz Nigel in his perpetual possession of the rights in question (*secundum illorum juramentum ratum sit et perpetuo teneatur*), but the use of *teneatur* and a later royal confirmation for Bishop Hugh of Coutances show that the jurors had actually decided that the rights in question were firmly in the gift (*ad donationem*) of Algar and his successors.¹²¹¹ Geoffrey’s charter therefore

¹²⁰⁸ *RRAN* II, no.1910; *Coutumiers de Normandie, textes critiques*, ed. E.-J. Tardif (2 vols., Rouen and Paris, 1881-96) I (I), p.65, ch.71.

¹²⁰⁹ Green, *Henry I*, p.219.

¹²¹⁰ App. I, nos. 80 and 84.

¹²¹¹ *Le cartulaire du chapitre cathédral de Coutances: Étude et édition critique*, ed. Julie Fontanel (Saint-

appears to be the end-point of a dispute between the two parties, perhaps occasioned by a claim by Robert that he held the rights in demesne.¹²¹²

All of these examples demonstrate the necessity of ducal mandates which served both to confirm and to restore after Geoffrey's investiture; confirmations operated within a spectrum which ranged from the straightforward, such as the renewal of privileges for the Rouen cordwainers to the forceful use of ducal authority to restore assets lost or seized during the conquest, as at Verneuil and Nonancourt. Confirmation and restoration are also the two most salient aspects of the inquests into lost episcopal possessions in Bayeux, which deserve special attention because the extant material preserved in the cartulary of Bayeux cathedral provides an unparalleled insight into how Geoffrey attempted to restore order to post-conquest Normandy.

The Bayeux Inquests

Losses and the need for restoration in the diocese of Bayeux and its enclaves were not simply a product of the disruption caused in the duchy by the Angevin conquest. It is well-established that the bishops of Bayeux had suffered substantial losses to their estates in the late-eleventh and early-twelfth centuries.¹²¹³ This period provided an opportunity for Robert of Gloucester and other barons, including the earl of Chester, to acquire lands in the diocese, and appears to have been the trigger for Henry I's inquest into episcopal lands and obligations in 1133.¹²¹⁴ It was Robert who was entrusted by Henry with the conduct of the inquest,¹²¹⁵ and it appears that the aim then was not to deprive him of the gains he had made. These acquisitions appear to have increased after 1133, with the assistance of Robert's son Richard, nominated as bishop in 1134 and consecrated in 1135, giving the family even greater control of current and

Lô, 2003), no.294 (issued by Philip Augustus, 1208).

¹²¹² Robert fitz Nigel witnesses no other edited Norman charters of the period, and has not been investigated further in this connection, but his patronymic suggests that he may have been a member of the local vicecomital dynasty; he was perhaps the Robert fitz Nigel who was active in Oxfordshire at the end of Henry I's reign and into that of Henry II, who was a member of the branch of the vicecomital family which had crossed to England and held lands of the earl of Chester (Keats-Rohan, *Domesday Descendants*, pp.928-9). Whatever his possible English connections, the appearance of a Fitz Nigel in the Cotentin, apparently making trouble and ruled against by the duke, is very interesting in the context of Geoffrey's supporters' murder in 1137 of Roger the vicomte, grandson of Nigel the vicomte, whose own father's identity is not known (Léopold Delisle, *Histoire du château et des sires de Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, suivie de pièces justificatives* (Paris and Caen, 1867), p.j. no.48).

¹²¹³ Gleason, *Ecclesiastical Barony*, pp.41-2, though he wrongly identifies Richard fitz Samson (1107-33) as Richard II and Richard of Gloucester (1134/5-1142) as Richard III; cf. Spear, *Personnel*, pp.32-3.

¹²¹⁴ *RB* II, pp.645-7; *RHGF* XXIII, pp.698-9.

¹²¹⁵ Henri Navel, 'L'Enquête de 1133 sur les Fiefs de l'Évêché de Bayeux', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie* 42 (1934), pp.5-80, at 5.

former episcopal resources than before.¹²¹⁶ Robert of Gloucester had demonstrably gained much land at the expense of the bishops but he was not the only offender.¹²¹⁷ Investigations were also made into different parcels of land pertaining to the bishops at Cambremer, an episcopal enclave within the diocese of Lisieux, as well as at nearby Cheffreville, which jointly pertained to the bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux, and scattered holdings around Bayeux and Caen.

It has already been suggested in the previous chapter that a large inquiry into the estates and rights of the bishop of Bayeux was in the pipeline as early as 1141, and was used by Waleran and his episcopal candidate Philip of Harcourt as a bargaining tool in Beaumont support for the Angevins and Philip's election to Bayeux. It has also been shown that this was a crucial moment in Geoffrey's management of the conquest, forcing a change in the dynamics of the Angevin powerbase in Normandy: just as the Beaumont twins' agreements of this period forced Geoffrey to elevate Waleran over Robert of Gloucester, by now imprisoned in England, Philip's election and Waleran's machinations set into train a series of events which were eventually to deprive Robert of the enormous territorial acquisitions he had made in Normandy over the previous decades. The extent to which the inquests were a direct result of Robert's efforts to gain land around Caen and Bayeux is demonstrably large, though the need for such an inquiry cannot be solely ascribed to him; nevertheless Robert and others like him lay at the root of the problem, and the inquests, therefore, were as much a political as a religious issue.

Geoffrey's inquests are attested to in a relatively large number of complex documents, yet despite the attention paid to the recovery of Bayeux's possessions by Gleason in his study of the diocese, and by the editors of Geoffrey's Norman *acta*, the course, scope, nature and consequences of the inquests have not been examined in detail, with the exception of Haskins' and Helmerichs' work on the legal dimension of the evidence and its contribution to the history of the use of juries.¹²¹⁸ A re-examination of the evidence associated with the inquests yields information of significance for understanding the dynamics and priorities of Geoffrey's ducal reign. It is possible to date the different phases of the process more precisely than previously, with reference to Ramackers' re-dated papal documents and evidence surrounding the translation of the

¹²¹⁶ Spear, *Personnel*, p.33.

¹²¹⁷ Gleason, *Ecclesiastical Barony*, p.42; *RRAN* III, no.58 (*Gloucester Charters*, no.6); *Livre noir* I, no.179.

¹²¹⁸ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.196-238; Helmerichs, 'Norman Legal Practices?', *passim*.

Cistercian abbey of Val-Richer by Bishop Philip and his men to a site within the Bayeusain enclave (*leugata*) of Cambremer (Calvados, arr. Lisieux) in the diocese of Lisieux, which was the subject of an inquest and donated to the monks after Philip's possession had been confirmed by local sworn men. This new evidence shows that, although the inquests had to be resuscitated by Henry II, they were substantially complete under Geoffrey by 1147; what remained to be resolved, however, was the return of episcopal lands seized by Robert of Gloucester which were not subject to ducal inquiry, but which had been dealt with in a separate agreement between Robert and Philip. In this respect, the inquests were only a small part of the wider process of post-conquest restitution, which was achieved with only mixed success.

The first inkling of the revival of the inquests after the death of Henry I is a letter of 18th June 1142 or 1143, in which Pope Innocent II responded to petitions by Bishop Philip and Archbishop Hugh for assistance against violators of Bayeux's estates.¹²¹⁹ The pope there confirmed the excommunication of Philip of Colombières, Henry II's future constable Richard of Le Hommet, and unnamed others for their part in the cathedral's oppression. The letter's date of either 1142 or 1143 indicates that Bishop Philip set out to tackle his cathedral's problems from the very beginning of his episcopate. Nevertheless, this is the only surviving document related to the inquests from the period prior to 1144, though as the corpus of relevant *acta* shows, there have been substantial losses of material. The next sign of Philip's efforts is another papal letter, this time issued by Celestine II on 9th January 1144, in which the pope exhorted the bishop to pursue those who had seized his lands, and to pronounce sentences of excommunication if necessary.¹²²⁰ The arrival of the pope's letter authorising Philip to pursue his claims in the first weeks of 1144 is perhaps no coincidence, but rather the result of a petition by Philip in the weeks before Angevin victory at Rouen.

Neither of these letters mentions the use of recognitions as a tool for the recovery of episcopal estates, but the first mention of the inquests after Geoffrey's investiture came very early, in a letter sent to him by Pope Lucius II, dated 16th May 1144.¹²²¹ In the letter an immediate comparison is made with the reign of Henry I who, as he 'loved and honoured churches and churchmen, and was eager to protect their rights', carried out a recognition (*fecit recognosci*) of the rights and estates of Bayeux

¹²¹⁹ *Livre noir* I, no.195 (*Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.14, erroneously dated to 1138×42).

¹²²⁰ *Livre noir* I, no.179 (*Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.19).

¹²²¹ App. II, no.1.

cathedral as they had stood under Bishop Odo (1049-97). The inquests to which Lucius II referred must have been those into military service owed to the bishop in 1133.¹²²² Geoffrey, Lucius ordered, was to recognise his own duty as duke – though he is addressed only as count – and to undertake to make a recognition and then to restore to the bishop any estates either alienated or seized.

There is no papal correspondence pertaining to the inquest of 1133, which arose from Henry I's wish to determine the *servitium debitum* owed to the bishop, at a time when the see was vacant and under ducal custody; it thus seems likely that Philip himself had alerted the papacy to the use in the diocese of inquests by the process of recognition at the end of Henry's reign.¹²²³ Geoffrey was acting under papal and episcopal pressure, by contrast with his predecessor, although he was moved to do so by political necessity and as part of an ongoing programme to define himself as Henry I's successor. While Henry's inquiry was focused upon knight service, however, Geoffrey's was made up of several individual inquests which set out to establish what exactly pertained to the bishop in terms of lands and rights, and whether they were held as demesne or as a fief, and to set in motion the process of recovery of the estates in question. The inquiries of 1133 and the 1140s share certain features, such as the nomination of local men to swear on oath over questions of seisin, right and (under Geoffrey) boundaries, and indeed some of the same individuals feature in both sets of documentation. The inquests of the 1140s are especially important when considered alongside the investigations made by Henry II, including that which led to the *Infeudationes militum* of 1172, with the express aim of the recovery of lost ducal estates and services.¹²²⁴ Haskins suggested that although Geoffrey committed himself to restitution on behalf of Bayeux, he did not embark upon the process of rebuilding ducal estates, by contrast with his long-reigning son.¹²²⁵ Rather, the restitution of episcopal estates and the confirmation of episcopal rights was the first step in the long process of the reassertion of strong ducal authority.

After receiving Lucius's letter, Geoffrey set the process of inquiry in motion by notifying all of his Norman prelates and barons of Philip's right to hold all of the diocese's episcopal demesne and fiefs as they stood under Bishop Odo (1049-97); the bishop's claim to any estates or rights which were in dispute was to be settled by the

¹²²² *RB* II, pp.645-7; *RHGF* XXIII, pp.699-702. See Chapter 5 for discussion of the levels of service.

¹²²³ Gleason, *Ecclesiastical Barony*, p.68.

¹²²⁴ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.159-60.

¹²²⁵ *Ibid*, citing *Livre noir*, I, nos. 13, 35, 138 and RT I, p.344.

testimony of local men, under oath.¹²²⁶ This act was perhaps issued immediately after the fall of Rouen, for it was witnessed by Waleran of Meulan, who left the duchy soon after the investiture in order to make a pilgrimage to Compostela.¹²²⁷

The threat of recognitions was clearly necessary. In the wake of the above charter, inquests were commissioned into a variety of possessions which Philip claimed had been alienated, seized or abused: these included fiefs which were the bishop's to grant as benefices to his tenants, but which had fallen into the hands of others such as Geoffrey's follower Engelger of Bohon or Robert of Gloucester's vassal Robert fitz Erneis;¹²²⁸ lands at Cambremer which had been intruded upon and whose boundary needed confirmation;¹²²⁹ lands at Cheffreville (-Tonnencourt, Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Livarot), where the bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux shared revenues and had special arrangements for authority over clergy;¹²³⁰ customs, such as those at apparently at Lison (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Isigny-sur-Mer) which had been usurped by another of Geoffrey's followers, Richard of Le Hommet;¹²³¹ and forest, which was the subject of a now-lost inquest during Geoffrey's ducal reign.¹²³² Alongside other evidence such as Robert of Gloucester's agreement with Bishop Philip and a series of papal letters, these documentary traces left by Geoffrey's administration show that the inquests were conducted over a large area of the duchy, not solely within the diocese of Bayeux, and involved large numbers of laymen and indeed ecclesiastics who had profited from the laxity of episcopal rule prior to 1141 and the chaos caused by the years of Angevin conquest.

The inquest at Cambremer is the most prominent case, being the subject of a writ to all of Geoffrey's ducal justices setting the inquiry into motion, as well as figuring in two separate returns to Geoffrey from his officers Robert of Courcy and Robert of Neubourg, and a report by Geoffrey to Archbishop Hugh and the other leading men of Normandy.¹²³³ The inquest returns describe the jurors assembled by the two Roberts – eighteen in total – and the bounds of the *leugata*, the latter in a detailed manner designed to establish authoritatively the extent of the enclave.¹²³⁴ The descriptions of

¹²²⁶ App. II, no.2 (with dating notes).

¹²²⁷ Ibid. shows that it may also have been issued in 1145-6.

¹²²⁸ App. II, nos. 3, 4.

¹²²⁹ Ibid., nos. 8-11

¹²³⁰ Ibid., nos. 5, 6.

¹²³¹ Ibid., no.12.

¹²³² Ibid., no.16.

¹²³³ Ibid., nos. 8-11.

¹²³⁴ The two returns provide slightly different descriptions of the enclave's boundaries, which however

Cambremer's boundaries show that the enclave stretched c.17 kilometres from Manerbe in the east to Corbon in the west, and 6 kilometres from St-Gilles-du-Livet in the north to Crèvecoeur in the south; its southern border followed the course of the River Vie, while its northern edge was marked by the Dorette from the Vie to Livet, though from there its exact course eastwards to Manerbe and Gratte-Panche is unknown, marked only by the house of one Richard Garet.¹²³⁵

The precision with which the boundaries are described also shows that the enclave was the site of the abbey of Val-Richer, situated just within its north-eastern edge near Manerbe. This is significant as Mathieu Arnoux and Christophe Maneuvrier have recently suggested that Val-Richer was translated to its Cambremer site after the failure of its monks to succeed at their original location at Souleuvre, and that this move took place under the aegis of Bishop Philip and was complete by 24th June 1147.¹²³⁶ The boundaries provided in *Neustria Pia*'s account of the re-sited abbey largely correspond to those provided in the inquest returns, and also indicate that it was Bishop Philip and his vassals – including Simon of Bosville, whose name appears in the returns – who were the main donors. Similarly, the appearance of Robert fitz Miles in both the re-foundation account and as a juror in the inquest indicates that the two processes were tenurially related. The inquest at Cambremer must have been completed before Philip's grant of the land to the monks of Souleuvre; this also indicates that many of the other inquiries which formed the inquests had also been undertaken prior to 1147, as they are included in Geoffrey's report of the Cambremer inquest to the archbishop.

The extent of the lands appropriated by Robert of Gloucester has already been discussed with reference to his agreement of 1146 with Bishop Philip, and although Geoffrey's inquests do not name Robert directly, successive popes single Robert out as the most prominent usurper of episcopal rights. In this case, it was not only Geoffrey who was entrusted with dealing with his vassal, but also Robert's local English bishops

appear to follow the same course but use different markers; the description provided in App. II, no.9, is the one used in the report to Archbishop Hugh.

¹²³⁵ Some of the places used to delineate the enclave's boundaries are now lost but can be found on the Cassini map.

¹²³⁶ Arnoux and Maneuvrier, *Deux abbayes*, p.69, citing Angel Manrique, *Cisterciensium seu verum ecclesiasticorum annalium a condito Cistercio* (4 vols., Lyon, 1649) II, p.90. A translation date of 1146-7 is also provided in *Neustria Pia*, p.825. Val-Richer's importance was also noted by Helmerichs, 'Norman Institutions or Norman Legal Practices?', p.94. Cf. *Pl. Acta*, no.2734, which catalogues Henry II's lost charter for Val-Richer, summarised in *GC XI*, p.446 and *Neustria Pia*, p.828, and dates the translation to c.1167; cf. also Leonie V. Hicks, *Religious Life in Normandy, 1050-1300: Space, Gender and Social Pressure* (Woodbridge, 2007), p.191, which states that Souleuvre was founded in 1147 and moved to Val-Richer prior to 1150, erroneously citing Arnoux and Maneuvrier.

at Bath and Worcester, and ultimately the archbishop of Canterbury, a reflection of the seriousness of his actions and his decision to remain in England during his final years. In spring 1146, these three prelates were commanded by Pope Eugenius III to compel Robert to restore the bishop of Bayeux's lands, on pain of excommunication and interdict.¹²³⁷ The 1146 agreement shows that Robert agreed to restore substantial estates to Philip, but the letters make it clear that he did not honour his promise.¹²³⁸ Which lands and rights is unknown, as is Geoffrey's role in seeking their recovery, though his forceful command to another key supporter, Engelger of Bohon, to restore fees which ought to be held of the bishop by one Robert Marin at Vierville (Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville, cant. Sainte-Mère-Église) and by the Angevin supporter William of Mohun at Montmartin¹²³⁹ on pain of inquest suggests that he would not have minced his words:

I command and order you return to the bishop...[these fees] which you have unjustly occupied. If you do not do so, I order my justice Richard of La Haye to make a recognition according to my assise...And I entreat you, Engelger, not to harass the bishop unjustly, for I will not permit any of his rights to be illegitimately lost.¹²⁴⁰

During this process, Geoffrey had to act impartially, compelling his supporters to relinquish their illegitimate gains, which could conceivably have been made between 1135 and 1144.

Geoffrey also had to target Robert's vassals. One ducal writ commands Guy of Sablé and Robert of Courcy to begin an inquest into tenurial arrangements at St-Aignan de Cramenil and nearby Rocquancourt (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Bourguébus), which were being claimed by Walkelin of Courseulles against Robert fitz Erneis, who appears to have been arbitrarily exacting forfeits from local residents.¹²⁴¹ There is evidence that Robert was a vassal of Robert of Gloucester, from whom he held land at, it seems, Banneville-sur-Ajon; he also had estates at Foupendant, between Cramenil and Rocquancourt, which like Banneville lay just east of the Lacy estates at Lassy which had

¹²³⁷ *Livre noir* I, no.198 (*Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.41, redated to Trastevere, 10th March 1146).

¹²³⁸ *Livre noir* I, no.191 (*Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.41), Eugenius to the bishops of Worcester and Bath commanding them to ensure that Robert adheres to the terms of the agreement on pain of interdict.

¹²³⁹ Either Montmartin-sur-Mer (Manche, arr. Coutances) or Montmartin-en-Graignes (Manche, arr. Saint-Lô, cant. Saint-Jean-de-Daye). William of Mohun had held Dunster (Somerset) for the Angevins in 1139.

¹²⁴⁰ App. II, no.3: 'Mando tibi et precipio quod dimittas episcopo Baiocensi in pace feudum...Quod nisi feceris, precipio quod justicia mea Ricardus de Haia secundum assisiam meam recognosci faciat...Et te, Engeng(er)e, precor ne de aliquo injuste fatiges episcopum, quia ego non paterer quod de jure suo aliquid injuste p(er)deret.'

¹²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, no.4.

been appropriated by Gloucester, who agreed to return them in 1146 but may not have done so.¹²⁴² It may be that Robert fitz Erneis had benefited from his lord's assimilation of episcopal estates to the south of Caen during the 1130s or 1140s, perhaps as a result of his father Robert III's service to the Angevins.¹²⁴³

This evidence suggests that the effect of the inquests, which directed Geoffrey against his own supporters, upon the relationship between the duke and his vassals was complex. A lord who had to restore lands or rights to Bishop Philip did not automatically incur ducal disfavour, just as those who fought against Geoffrey almost until the end of the conquest, such as Richard of La Haye, went on to become officers in the ducal administration, indeed playing a part in the inquests themselves. Engelger of Bohon, Robert of Neubourg and Richard of Le Hommet all had to restore lands or rights to Philip, whilst simultaneously playing a role in the conduct of the inquests themselves. The extent to which the inquests placed a strain upon relations with magnates who had to hand lands back is unclear, but it appears that it was not powerful enough to cause a break with Geoffrey, whose ducal authority was unquestioned. Pragmatism dictated relations between Geoffrey and his new Norman vassals.

Robert of Gloucester may have been the exception. He was still an indispensable ally to the Angevins in the early 1140s, and was instrumental in the success of Geoffrey's 1142 campaign; he also acted as the young Henry's guardian during the same period.¹²⁴⁴ Yet it has been shown above that Robert's fortunes in Normandy may have begun to wane at this time when the Beaumont candidate Philip was elected bishop of Bayeux, where previously Robert's own son's episcopacy had allowed the earl to assimilate estates in the region; at around the same time, Matilda's promise of Eudo Dapifer's estates to the earl of Essex suggests that gains made by Robert could be taken back. Crouch has pointed out that his influence in England after

¹²⁴² *Pl. Acta*, no.2425, a confirmation of Henry II for Savigny, including a grant 'ex dono Roberti filii Erneshii et concessione Roberti comitis de Glocestria terram de Basenvilla cum pertinentiis suis': according to *Pl. Acta*, the estate in question is perhaps Bazenville (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Ryes), but there is evidence that Robert VI fitz Erneis held land at Banneville-sur-Ajon (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Villers-Bocage), mapped and discussed by Daniel Power *et al*, *Lands of the Normans*, <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/normans/casestudies.shtml> [accessed 08/11/10]. Arnoux and Maneuvrier, *Deux abbayes*, no.35 is a grant by Robert to Val-Richer prior to the translation of 1147 of land at Foupendant. Both Banneville and Foupendant lie adjacent to Robert's patrimonial estates in the Cinglais forest.

¹²⁴³ *LOTN* (<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/normans/casestudies.shtml> [accessed 08/11/10]) suggests that Robert III died during the conquest, perhaps as a result of fighting.

¹²⁴⁴ Poole, 'Early Visits', *passim*; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194.

1144 appears to have been very limited,¹²⁴⁵ whilst his activities in Normandy ceased. Henry returned to the Continent in the same year, most likely at Geoffrey's behest for the final stages of the conquest.¹²⁴⁶ In 1147, when Henry mounted his sudden and unsuccessful English campaign – without Geoffrey's permission – Robert refused to assist him.¹²⁴⁷ In the meantime, Robert had been plagued by the attacks of his Herefordshire neighbours, and his son Philip had joined Stephen's cause.

These English misfortunes have been viewed as the prime causes of Robert's downfall in the two years prior to his death on 31st October 1147.¹²⁴⁸ The *Gesta Stephani* suggests that Robert died in disgrace, and Crouch attributes this to the author's royalist bias: 'The way in which the author of the *Gesta* insinuated that the earl had died unconfessed and without making reparation for his sins tells us quite how much the royalists feared him: they did not like to think of a man making a good end who had done so much damage to the king'.¹²⁴⁹ This analysis, however, ignores the Bayeux evidence. By 24th May 1147, Pope Eugenius III had written at least three letters concerning Robert's seizures to the bishops of Bath and Worcester, with the second letter also being addressed to Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury.¹²⁵⁰ The two bishops had been commanded to bring Robert to heel, but had been unsuccessful; by March 1146, the pope authorised Robert's excommunication and the placing of an interdict upon his English lands should he not be brought into line within three months. By May 1147, Robert had still not returned the lands in question, and the pope ordered that the interdict be laid. In July 1147, the pope had no compunction in ordering Geoffrey to use all necessary military force to bring his barons within the diocese into line.¹²⁵¹ Despite his burial at his own foundation of St James, Bristol, Robert arguably died disgraced in the eyes of the church; Geoffrey had pushed the inquests through at the behest of his new Norman prelates, and Robert appears to have been a casualty of this process. It is remarkable that other magnates did not suffer the same fate. Some, like Waleran of Meulan, slip out of view, first on crusade then at a distance from the ducal court,¹²⁵²

¹²⁴⁵ Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.215.

¹²⁴⁶ Ibid, pp.219-20.

¹²⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁴⁹ Ibid, p.221.

¹²⁵⁰ *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, nos. 32 (18th March 1145), 41 (10th March 1146) and 46 (24th May 1147); the latter two are discussed above.

¹²⁵¹ App. II, no.14.

¹²⁵² Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, p.69. Contrary to Crouch's argument, Waleran appears to have only witnessed Geoffrey's grant to the citizens of Rouen, not Henry's confirmation of it, which would date his loss of influence to the 1140s not 1150.

others, like Engelger of Bohon, continued to exercise important roles within the ducal administration.¹²⁵³

Patronage and prerogatives

As in Anjou, Geoffrey was bound in Normandy by certain traditions and customs; patronage of institutions and individuals was key to the functioning of ducal rule. His confirmation acts have already shown that his ducal authority was conceived with reference to Henry I as a legitimate successor; his choice of personnel partly reflected this too, such as the choice of Henry's dapifer Robert of Courcy as dapifer and justice after 1144.¹²⁵⁴ But in common with other aspects of the restoration of ducal authority – such as the promotion of new men such as Reginald of Saint-Valéry to the dapiferate¹²⁵⁵ and old partisans such as Robert of Neubourg to justice roles¹²⁵⁶ – dealings with religious institutions were not guided by one principle alone. Here, examination of Geoffrey's dealings with the Norman Church and his exercise of ducal prerogatives indicates that this construction of authority was comprehensive, but by no means the only dimension to Geoffrey's attitude to ducal rule.

Monastic patronage and prerogatives

A comprehensive account of Geoffrey's dealings with Norman abbots and abbeys in the Benedictine order has recently been provided by Véronique Gazeau, who surveys fourteen acts issued for nine houses.¹²⁵⁷ Gazeau stresses the continuity between Henry I and Geoffrey's patronage of certain institutions, such as Montebourg, which is described in Geoffrey's two acts as Henry I's own chapel, which came under Geoffrey's special protection.¹²⁵⁸ The Empress Matilda's influence is also detected in Geoffrey's four acts for Bec, not only by Gazeau but also by Chibnall. Geoffrey's grant of three prebends at Bures-en-Bray to Bec's priory of Le Pré, alias La Bonne Nouvelle, was one

¹²⁵³ App. I, nos. 40, 69; App. II, no.3; App. IV, no.14.

¹²⁵⁴ Steve Flanders, *De Courcy*, p.66; App. I, nos. 40, 73, 81, 82, 88; App. II, nos. 4, 9, 10, 11; App. IV, no.14.

¹²⁵⁵ App. I, nos. 44, 45, 54, 78, 79; App. II, nos. 6-8; App. IV, no.14; App. VI, no.5. See also Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.146, and Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.85, 221, 248-9 and 425 for the family's history, and the correct identification of them as from Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme (Somme, arr. Abbeville).

¹²⁵⁶ App. I, nos. 2, 31, 40, 45, 74, 80, 82, 83, 87, 88, 113; App. II, nos. 7-11, 13, 16.

¹²⁵⁷ Véronique Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* (2 vols., Caen, 2007) I, pp.315-8. The relevant acts are calendared here as fifteen acts: App. I, nos. 30-33 (for Bec), 44-5 (for Fécamp), 69 (for Lessay), 72-3 (for Montebourg), 78 (for Préaux), 80 (for Saint-Ouen), 85 (for Saint-Évroul), 87-8 (for Saint-Wandrille) and 97 (for Saint-Martin of Sées).

¹²⁵⁸ App. I, nos. 72-3; Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* I, p.315.

of only two major benefactions made by Geoffrey as duke.¹²⁵⁹ The grant was made during the period in which Matilda had established herself resident at Le Pré, near Rouen, where she was to remain until her death.¹²⁶⁰ Geoffrey's grant transferred the three prebends of the church of St-Etienne to the priory, and made provision for the secular clerks who held them – Ivo, Hugh and Alexander – to surrender them, in order that they be replaced by regular monks. The small charter belies the gift's importance, for in the mid-thirteenth century the prebends constituted over half of Le Pré's annual Continental revenue of £1000.¹²⁶¹

Ducal and marital antecedents were not the only forces which guided Geoffrey's religious patronage. Evidence that Geoffrey regarded the expurgation of Stephen's brief ducal reign as a priority can also be found in the other Norman act in which he made an outright grant. His charter for the Cistercian abbey of Mortemer granted the monks significant lands in the Norman Vexin: thirty acres were given in the Mortemer valley itself, as well as 157 acres at Beauficel-en-Lyons and 143 at nearby Bosquentin.¹²⁶² The abbey had been founded in 1134 by Henry, but it was apparently under Stephen's auspices in 1137 that it joined the Cistercian order.¹²⁶³ Like Geoffrey's other charters, this act makes no mention of any Stephanian precedent, despite Stephen's important role in the abbey's recent history, his confirmation of Henry's grants, and his own grants of a hermitage and 140 acres of land at Bosquentin to allow the monks to build a grange, as well as use of a mill near Lyons-la-Forêt for grinding wheat.¹²⁶⁴ The same can be observed in Henry II's confirmation of Geoffrey's lost act for the Mortanais nunnery of L'Abbaye-Blanche, in which grants made by Stephen from the comital demesne pertaining to Mortain were confirmed, couched in terms which did not refer to Stephen's original grant.¹²⁶⁵

Geoffrey's charter for Mortemer coincided with Matilda's return to the duchy in 1148, and Chibnall has suggested that the couple could pursue Matilda's Cistercian interests by patronising Mortemer, whilst at the same time replacing Stephen's invalid grant with a new charter and gift of their own.¹²⁶⁶ Geoffrey's charter certainly provides

¹²⁵⁹ App. I, no.31; Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* I, pp.316-7; Chibnall, 'Matilda and Bec', passim.

¹²⁶⁰ Chibnall, 'Matilda and Bec', pp.43-4.

¹²⁶¹ Ibid, p.44, n.58.

¹²⁶² App. I, no.74.

¹²⁶³ Green, *Henry I*, p.211; *Neustria Pia*, pp.770-1.

¹²⁶⁴ *RRAN* III, no.598.

¹²⁶⁵ App. IV, no.12.

¹²⁶⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.183.

grounds for this argument, but it also suggests that this gift provided Geoffrey himself with an outlet for personal religious devotion in a Norman context. His parents – keen patrons of the Cistercians, as Chapter 4 has shown – are both remembered in the charter’s *pro anima* clause, the only example of its kind amongst Geoffrey’s Norman *acta*.

As duke, Geoffrey was also obliged to patronise other recently-established, reformist houses, notably Savigny and its dependencies. Three acts issued by Geoffrey for the abbey survive,¹²⁶⁷ as well as a fourth for its daughter-house of Saint-André-en-Gouffern at Vignats, founded by Geoffrey’s follower William Talvas.¹²⁶⁸ With the exception of Geoffrey’s notification to the archbishop of Rouen of Bishop Philip of Bayeux’s quitclaim of the abbey’s estate at Escures,¹²⁶⁹ these acts are all confirmations of Savigny and Vignats’ existing estates and privileges. As argued below, Savigny was particularly significant, being situated in Stephen’s former county of Mortain and receiving generous patronage from Stephen as well as Henry I. Its importance extended across the Channel, and it appears that Geoffrey was petitioned by the abbey to confirm certain privileges pertaining to the entire order.

Abbatial and episcopal elections

The previous chapter has shown that Geoffrey utilised episcopal elections during the conquest as one means by which to win and maintain baronial support. Once he had been invested, there is evidence that he vigorously sought to retain control of both abbatial and episcopal appointments as his predecessors had. It is only possible here to review the existing scholarship on the subject, but the evidence suggests that, quite apart from potential patronage opportunities, episcopal and abbatial elections were a key ducal prerogative that Geoffrey was determined to control and preserve.

In 1149, Geoffrey forced the monks of Mont-Saint-Michel to pay a large sum of money to secure his approval for the election of Geoffrey, a monk of the abbey, as abbot.¹²⁷⁰ The exact amount is not known, but Katharine Keats-Rohan has suggested that ‘the fine was so punitive that much of [Abbot Geoffrey’s predecessor’s] work in restoring abbey finances was undone overnight’, and that the monks perhaps even had to

¹²⁶⁷ App. I, nos. 94-6.

¹²⁶⁸ Ibid., no. 113.

¹²⁶⁹ Ibid., no. 96.

¹²⁷⁰ ‘De abbatibus Montis Sanctae Michaelis in periculo maris’, *PL* CCII, col. 1327; Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* I, p. 315 and II, pp. 218-9.

borrow money.¹²⁷¹ Mont-Saint-Michel had a history of abbatial appointments controlled by the duke, and Abbot Geoffrey's predecessor Bernard (1131-49) was nominated by Henry I from his favoured house of Bec after a three-year vacancy sparked by Henry's deposition of Abbot Richard in 1128, who had also been nominated by Henry.¹²⁷² Mont-Saint-Michel appears to have been particularly troublesome for Henry I, but rather than being an exception, it is a forceful example of the ducal prerogative of abbatial nomination, recorded elsewhere, such as Saint-Évroul in 1122.¹²⁷³ Attention is often drawn to Geoffrey's extortion of protection money during the conquest from abbeys such as Fécamp and Saint-Pierre-sur-Dives,¹²⁷⁴ but it is perhaps a mistake to draw parallels between these wartime incidents and a post-investiture policy of pursuing long-established ducal prerogatives, particularly in marginal houses such as Mont-Saint-Michel, which was one of the greater landholding powers of the Avranchin.¹²⁷⁵

Geoffrey's involvement in episcopal elections after his investiture is also well-known. Electoral practice in the duchy has recently been examined in detail by Peltzer, who emphasised the weakening of ducal influence over episcopal elections after the death of Henry I, whose control of appointments was 'undisputed'.¹²⁷⁶ This opened the way for greater aristocratic influence, such as that of Waleran of Meulan, not only in the case of Bayeux as outlined in the previous chapter, but also at Évreux in 1139.¹²⁷⁷ There was only one episcopal vacancy in the duchy between 1144 and 1150, at Sées in 1144, and if it is any indication of Geoffrey's broader approach to ducal prerogatives, it shows that he pursued them doggedly. After the death of Bishop John, a faction of canons within the cathedral chapter elected Gerard (II) as bishop, but this choice was opposed by both other elements within the chapter and Geoffrey.¹²⁷⁸ The letters of Arnulf of Lisieux suggest that Geoffrey or his followers physically assaulted Gerard; Gerald of Wales and William fitz Stephen, both writing in the aftermath of Thomas Becket's murder, state that Gerard was castrated.¹²⁷⁹ Both Spear and Peltzer have stressed the

¹²⁷¹ K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, 'Bibliothèque municipale d'Avranches, 210: Cartulary of Mont Saint Michel', *ANS* 21 (1997), pp.97-112, at 102, and Appendix I.

¹²⁷² Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* II, pp.214-6

¹²⁷³ Green, *Henry I*, pp.265-6, citing OV VI, pp.320-4.

¹²⁷⁴ OV VI, pp.482-3; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.53; Gazeau, *Normannia monastica* I, p.315.

¹²⁷⁵ On the prerogative under William the Conqueror, see Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.36; on Mont-Saint-Michel's resources, see Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.150-1.

¹²⁷⁶ Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.73-169.

¹²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p.100.

¹²⁷⁸ Spear, *Personnel*, pp.273-4; Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.115-20.

¹²⁷⁹ *Letter Collections of Arnulf*, ed. Scriber, no.1.39 (= *Letters of Arnulf*, ed. Barlow, no.3); William fitz Stephen, 'Vita sancti Thomae Cantuariensis archiepiscopi et martyris', *Materials for the History of*

unusual circumstances of Gerard's election, which occurred while the chapter was still divided between secular and regular canons in the wake of reform begun by Bishop John, and indeed comparison with other episcopal elections made under similar circumstances suggests that the consequences of such a split could be devastating for bishops.¹²⁸⁰ Nevertheless, Sées was an important frontier bishopric, and it would have been desirable for Geoffrey to have a loyal follower installed there, particularly in the context of Louis VII's brother Robert's installation as count of Perche.¹²⁸¹

Cross-Channel activities

Geoffrey's involvement in English affairs has only been treated – briefly – in relation to his agreement to Matilda's *conventiones* of 1141, and William of Malmesbury's observation that he refused to join Matilda and Robert of Gloucester in England in 1142.¹²⁸² Garnett's recent reassessment underplays his role in England prior to 1142, when Geoffrey appears more frequently in Matilda's charters, arguably as a consequence of his increased power and authority in Normandy.¹²⁸³ The evidence of the conquest indicates that Stephen lost control of Norman affairs early on, and the temporary disintegration of the Anglo-Norman realm requires examination from a Norman perspective. A re-reading of the evidence of Geoffrey's reign suggests that during the ducal period he played an active role in maintaining important cross-Channel interests, particularly in monastic affairs and the shipping trade. This evidence underscores the argument that Geoffrey's ducal confirmations cannot all simply be deemed a restoration of the Henrician past, nor that Stephen could be easily 'written out' of recent ducal history or current events. Instead, he had to work within the framework of a cross-Channel society, in spite of the fragmentation of the Anglo-Norman realm and its cross-Channel lay estates.¹²⁸⁴ In this evidence can also be traced some of the

Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, ed. J. C. Robertson and J. B. Sheppard, Rolls Series LXVII (7 vols., London, 1875-85) IV, p.65; Gerald of Wales, 'De principis instructione', *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer, Rolls Series XXI (8 vols., London, 1861-91), VIII, pp.160, 301, 309.

¹²⁸⁰ Spear, *Personnel*, pp.273-4; Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, pp.115-6. Cf. Geoffrey of Louroux's attempts to replace the secular canons of the cathedral chapter of Saint-André of Bordeaux with monks in the 1130s and 1140s, which resulted in his exile in the mid-1140s, discussed briefly in Dutton, 'Angevin comital children', p.37 and n.81.

¹²⁸¹ For which see above, and Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest*, p.119.

¹²⁸² *RRAN* III, nos. 275, 634; Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.109. WM, *HN*, pp.123-5; Davis, *King Stephen*, p.72.

¹²⁸³ Garnett, *Conquered England*, pp.225-6.

¹²⁸⁴ The only direct evidence of this within Geoffrey's *acta* is App. VI, no.5, in which Geoffrey confirmed Reginald of Saint-Valéry's grant of revenues from Dieppe, which he had given to Reginald until his English estates could be recovered. For these English estates, given by Stephen of John of St. John, see

ramifications for Stephen's power and authority, particularly in the sphere of religious patronage and customary cross-Channel rights and revenues.

Geoffrey's charter for the citizens of Rouen makes the economic concerns of the duke and the key city of the duchy clear.¹²⁸⁵ Rouen was to be the sole port of entry for Irish imports, and all Norman ships travelling to Ireland were to depart from Rouen, with the exception of a single ship each year from Cherbourg. Rouen's merchants were to be quit of dues in London, except for taxes on wine and porpoises; Geoffrey's charter confirmed that their entry-point to the city was the wharf and gate at Dowgate, in the heart of the city, where the Walbrook met the Thames, just as it had been under Edward the Confessor.¹²⁸⁶ This landing was for the exclusive use of the Rouen merchants, who, Geoffrey's charter sets out, could cut adrift any ship not belonging to them found moored there, without fear of penalty. The charter also stipulates that the merchants were 'free to go through all the markets in England, saving the king's lawful dues'.¹²⁸⁷

Despite the problems of disentangling Henry's confirmation of 1150-1, with its wholesale reproduction of the list of sureties of 1144, from Geoffrey's charter, it appears that these terms were written into the original agreement, as the confirmation states that 'Geoffrey duke of Normandy, my father, swore to maintain all of these concessions'.¹²⁸⁸ The Rouen charter is the most explicit evidence of the cross-Channel aspect of ducal rule after 1144, and suggests that although 'the best part of the next decade saw Stephen confined to England', the same could not be said of Geoffrey.¹²⁸⁹ Its implications are supported by two other sets of documents which demonstrate Geoffrey's involvement after his investiture in issues of cross-Channel trade, ecclesiastical organisation, and estate management, by contrast with Stephen's inability to maintain similar influence from his new English position.

Some time between 1144 and 1147, Geoffrey issued a confirmation charter for

RRAN III, p. xxxvi, and *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. John Caley, Henry Ellis and Bulkley Bandinel (new ed., 6 vols. in 8, London, 1817-30) V, p. 425.

¹²⁸⁵ App. IV, no. 14; Round, no. 109, translates the terms of the agreement.

¹²⁸⁶ 'Item cives Rothomagi habeant apud Londoniam portum de Dauegate sicut habuerant a tempore Edwardi regis'; Henry A. Harben, *A Dictionary of London* (London, 1918), <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=63108> [accessed 28/09/2010], notes the location of Dowgate, and its earliest mention in a suspicious charter of William I in 1067. Its wharf is mentioned in a later charter of Henry II which reproduces many of the terms of his earlier confirmation of Geoffrey's charter, also stating that the merchants had this privilege under Henry I (*Pl. Acta*, no. 2278).

¹²⁸⁷ 'Item liceat eis ire cum mercibus suis per omnes nundinas Anglie salvis legalibus consuetudinibus regis.' The translation is Round's.

¹²⁸⁸ 'Omnes autem predictas concessionones affiduciavit Galfridus dux Normannorum pater meus se tenere'. The translation is mine.

¹²⁸⁹ Crouch, 'King Stephen and Northern France', p. 53.

the Burgundian abbey of Cluny.¹²⁹⁰ It refers to the 100 marks of silver granted to the abbey each year by Henry I as alms, and that this sum had been replaced with land – how much and where is unspecified in Geoffrey’s charter – upon Henry’s death. Geoffrey granted the abbey the ‘perpetual right to possess’ (*jure perpetuo possidendam concedimus*) the land in question, adding that he likewise approved and confirmed ‘the grant made by the empress concerning this land’ (*donationem quoque de terra predicta ab imperatrice factam*). Henry I’s charter, issued in two different forms in 1131, indicates that the 100 marks were to be drawn from the revenues of the towns of London (sixty marks) and Lincoln (forty marks).¹²⁹¹ The substance of the grant – from revenues to estates – changed under Stephen, whose charter of 1136 shows that the land in question was the manor of Letcombe Regis (Oxon., formerly Berks.), part of the royal demesne, and that its value was equal to Henry’s original grant.¹²⁹²

What does not survive is Matilda’s charter, obliquely referred to in Geoffrey’s confirmation, and it is this lost document which is crucial to understanding the importance of the confirmation itself. By contrast with Chibnall’s conclusion, it appears that the land to which Matilda’s lost charter referred was Letcombe Regis itself; if not, the reference to ‘the aforementioned land’ (*terra predicta*) in Geoffrey’s confirmation does not make sense.¹²⁹³ What Geoffrey’s charter represents, therefore, is the confirmation of Cluny’s possession of the English manor of Letcombe Regis, but not with reference to Stephen’s grant directly, but rather to Matilda’s ‘grant’ of the same manor, evidently made some time after her arrival in England in 1139.

There are several reasons why Geoffrey would have either sought or been petitioned to confirm Cluny’s English estates. Matilda’s lost charter shows, along with others, that she dispensed royal demesne (whether as a promise or in fact) and that those holding it as tenants sought her approval of their title. Such a grant, concerning a location less than twenty miles from Oxford, may well have been made while Matilda had a strong presence in the area, perhaps even during July 1141, when Matilda made a series of grants – many not actionable in practice, but rather a ‘licence to conquer’ – to

¹²⁹⁰ App. I, no.36.

¹²⁹¹ *RRAN* II, nos.1691 and 1713, printed in *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Cluny*, ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexander Bruel (6 vols., Paris, 1876-1903) V, nos. 4016 and 4015 respectively.

¹²⁹² *RRAN* III, no.204. Letcombe Regis was still in Cluny’s possession in 1204, when it rendered the same amount, then temporarily lost until 1209: ‘Parishes: Letcombe Regis’, *A History of the County of Berkshire*, Victoria County History, ed. P. H. Ditchfield and William Page (4 vols., London, 1924) IV, pp.222-8 (<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=62704> [accessed 21/07/2010]).

¹²⁹³ Matilda’s charter, as it is lost, does not appear in *RRAN* III but is in the list of addenda and corrigenda supplied by Chibnall, ‘Charters of the Empress’, at p.295 and Appendix 2, no.1, at p.297.

her supporters at a meeting in Oxford.¹²⁹⁴ Around this time, Matilda was also ‘granting’ other lands and privileges already granted by Stephen, all of whose grants were regarded as invalid, and therefore renewed without mention of the king to maintain title.¹²⁹⁵ Although the tide was to turn later in the year, Matilda felt secure enough in the region to grant Aubrey de Vere an earldom in either Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire or Dorset, should her promise of Cambridgeshire not come to pass.¹²⁹⁶ She also made several grants of lands and privileges in the area of Oxfordshire immediately north of Letcombe to Oseney Abbey and St. Frideswide’s, Oxford.¹²⁹⁷

Though this is a likely period for the issue of Matilda’s charter, this dating is not conclusive, and her attempt to confirm the manor is not referred to in the bull issued in favour of Cluny by Innocent II in 1142.¹²⁹⁸ Her charter may have been issued in the months prior to the fall of Rouen, when she reissued grants originally made in 1141 to Oxfordshire beneficiaries such as Godstow Abbey, who received confirmation of their estates including those at Shillingford, west of Letcombe and north of Wallingford, in 1143 and perhaps 1144.¹²⁹⁹ We may, however, date Geoffrey’s confirmation more precisely. His use of the ducal title only after the fall of Rouen has already been outlined above, indicating that the act was issued after his investiture. Geoffrey’s new status may have enticed Cluny to solicit a confirmation, in which the duke effectively acted as warrantor for Matilda’s grant.

Like many of Geoffrey’s other confirmations, this text negates Stephen’s role. Henry is referred to as ‘our predecessor of happy memory’ (*felicitis memorie predecessor noster*), while Stephen is never referred to by name; Letcombe was simply ‘given’ to the monks. This diplomatic manipulation is even more striking when compared to three further confirmations made by Henry II after Geoffrey’s death, one of which – as noted above – ranks amongst the handful of examples of Henry’s *acta* which refer to Stephen as king.¹³⁰⁰ Nevertheless, the rights the monks had to the resources of the manor are

¹²⁹⁴ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.106-12.

¹²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.129.

¹²⁹⁶ *RRAN* III, no.634; Edmund King, ‘A Week in Politics: Oxford, late July 1141’, *King Stephen’s Reign*, ed. Dalton and White, pp.58-79, at 70.

¹²⁹⁷ *RRAN* III, nos. 629-31 and 645-8.

¹²⁹⁸ Round, no.1393, citing *Monasticon Cluniacense Anglicanum, or Charters and Records of the Ancient Abbey of Cluni, 1077-1534*, ed. G. F. Duckett (2 vols., Lewes, 1888) I, p.75.

¹²⁹⁹ *RRAN* III, nos.370-2; cf. no.368, Matilda’s original ‘grant’ of Shillingford and other estates, from 2nd February-25th July 1141, in fact confirming Stephen’s earlier grant, no.367.

¹³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, no.206; *Pl. Acta* nos. 642 (1506H, dated to before the introduction of the *Dei gratia* clause and probably to the period before Letcombe’s appearance in the first surviving Pipe Roll of the reign, of Michaelmas 1155-6) and 643 (381H). The second text refers to Stephen. Holt, ‘1153’, p.308 draws

delineated by Henry II not with reference to Stephen's grant, but to the time in which Henry I held the manor as part of the royal demesne (*tenuit illud rex Henricus in manu sua*).

Charters pertaining to Savigny and its daughter houses provide further information on the cross-Channel aspect of Geoffrey's ducal rule, and how the loss of Normandy impacted upon Stephen's rule. During the ducal period, Geoffrey confirmed the entire Savigniac order's right to move goods for their own consumption freely, and that a £10 fine was to be levied against any official who attempted to extort toll or other payments associated with land or sea travel against the monks.¹³⁰¹ This charter is the most comprehensive exemption from toll and similar levies issued for Savigny since its foundation, and the only document to remit all of the abbey's daughter-houses from these customs. He also placed the monks, along with their men and estates, under his protection. Although the charter's apparent reference to a Savigniac 'order' (*abbatum qui sunt de obedientia Savigneii*) is debatable in terms of the congregation's institutional and administrative history, it does appear that all houses affiliated to the mother abbey at Savigny were the beneficiaries of the exemption.¹³⁰² Savigny's offshoots formed a vibrant and fashionable cross-Channel monastic network which, moreover, was patronised by Stephen.

Both Henry I and Stephen had been keen patrons of Savigny. Henry had exempted the personal property and food of Abbot Vitalis from toll in 1112, granted the monks vineyards in Avranches in 1113 and made further grants in the Passais forest, but his charters indicate that the rest of his contact with Savigny took the form of consenting to grants made by others to the monks, or arbitrating disputes.¹³⁰³ Stephen was a far more active patron of Savigny, which was situated close to Mortain, playing an instrumental role in the foundation of at least four daughter-houses, at Virey (Manche, arr. Avranches, cant. Saint-Hilaire-du-Harcouët), Buckfastleigh (Devon), Furness (Cumbria) and Tulketh (Lancs., which was later translated to Furness).¹³⁰⁴

attention to Henry's confirmation as duke, noting that its reference to Stephen may be explained by the demesne status of the land in question: only two other charters granted by Henry during this period, which confirmed Stephen's grants, refer to the king (*RRAN* III, nos. 140, 458).

¹³⁰¹ App. I, no.95.

¹³⁰² Patrick Conyers, 'Changing Habits: the Early Years of Savigny's Congregation and its Dealings with the Cistercians, 1105-80', PhD dissertation (University of Iowa, 2001), p.143.

¹³⁰³ *RRAN* II, nos. 1003 (Abbot Vitalis), 1016 (vineyards), 1212 (Passais lands at Dompierre, and cf. *RRAN* III, no.809, a Henry II charter which shows that his grandfather had also granted neighbouring Fresnay, discussed below). Cf. consent to third-party gifts and agreements brokered by Henry in *RRAN* II, nos. 1015, 1183, 1433 (also discussed below), 1588 and 1973.

¹³⁰⁴ King, *King Stephen*, pp.22-4; *RRAN* III, nos. 800, 803.

Stephen also exempted Savigny from tolls on the abbey's own goods,¹³⁰⁵ but comparison with Geoffrey's exemption charter brings significant differences between the two sets of privileges to light. Stephen's charter is addressed solely to English officials, and relates only to the monks and abbot of Savigny itself. It frees them from customary payments on goods they can prove to be their own, and anyone who transgresses the charter's terms – as later granted by Geoffrey also – is to be fined £10. Nevertheless, its scope and focus are different. While Stephen's charter looks north of the Channel, Geoffrey's looks south, addressing 'the barons, the barons' men and the officials of all Normandy and Maine and the seaports'. Most crucially, the exemption issued by Stephen appears to pertain only to the monks and abbot of Savigny itself (*monacorum et abbatis de Savinneio*). The date of this exemption is uncertain, and T. A. M. Bishop's identification of the scribe as active in the English chancery during the mid- to late-1140s could suggest that Savigny sought an exemption from Stephen for its activities in England at the same time as securing confirmation more widely from Geoffrey.¹³⁰⁶ If this is the case, it bears witness to the overlapping spheres of influence and authority after Geoffrey's investiture, and the tendency – manifest in other ways above – of beneficiaries to make their assets as secure as possible.

Geoffrey does not seem to have used Stephen's exemption as a template for his own exemption act; instead, significant diplomatic similarities can be traced in the toll exemption he issued for Savigny's daughter house of Vignats, itself an almost-verbatim copy of an exemption granted by Henry I in the first half of the 1130s.¹³⁰⁷ Both of Geoffrey's acts were issued at Argentan, and share one witness in Alexander of Bohon. It is possible that they were issued on the same occasion, which may have been an opportunity for Geoffrey to confirm the tolls and other privileges of the entire order, both in general terms and in specific documents issued for each house. Geoffrey's two acts, however, have significantly different address clauses. The Vignats exemption is addressed to the 'barons, all *vicecomites* and *ministri* of all England, Normandy and the seaports'. It has been suggested that this was a careless scribe copying Henry's act too slavishly, but the evidence for Geoffrey's cross-Channel authority and interests in the

¹³⁰⁵ *RRAN* III, no.801.

¹³⁰⁶ In *ibid.*, Davis dates Stephen's exemption to 1139×43, as 'the Abbot of Savigny could hardly have sought [Stephen's] charter after 1143, since he and his abbey (and most of Normandy) were by then in the power of the Angevins'; cf. R. H. C. Davis, review of T. A. M. Bishop, *Scriptores Regis: Facsimiles to identify and illustrate the hands of royal scribes in original charters of Henry I, Stephen, and Henry II* (Oxford, 1961), in *EHR* 77 (1962), pp.321-3.

¹³⁰⁷ App. I, no.113, confirming *RRAN* II, no.1941.

acts for Rouen, Cluny and Vignats' own mother house and order, suggests that this requires reconsideration.¹³⁰⁸ It is possible that Geoffrey intentionally addressed his confirmation to English officials, perhaps at the request of the monks themselves, in order to safeguard their cross-Channel trade.

Geoffrey's Savigny *acta* must also be read in the context of developments within the network of Savigniac houses between 1138 and 1147. Janet Burton has recently shown that English houses within the nascent order which were founded or patronised by families of arguably Angevin sympathies maintained contact with their mother-house at Savigny throughout the 1140s, with the abbots of Neath (patronised by Richard of Granville, one of Robert of Gloucester's followers), Quarr (patronised by Baldwin of Redvers) and Byland (patronised by Roger of Mowbray) the only Insular abbots to attend the general chapter of 1147.¹³⁰⁹ Byland had been founded as recently as 1142, from a colony of monks settled at Calder in Cumbria; after fleeing to their mother-house, Stephen's Savigniac foundation of Furness, following Scottish raiding on their house, the monks were refused entry and eventually settled at Hood, with the help of Roger, before being permanently settled at nearby Byland. Ties were cut with Furness, and the monks placed themselves directly under Savigny's authority.¹³¹⁰

Stephen's disengagement from the Continental elements of the order and the maintenance of Savigniac ties only with those English houses patronised by Angevin partisans may have been a product of not only Stephen's loss of the duchy, but also his loss of the county of Mortain. Nearby Savigny was now in the hands of a new duke who had been the beneficiary of local unrest during the conquest, and his protection of the mother-house extended to its daughters. Other shreds of evidence, such as the appearance of William Avenel – whose heirs went on to serve as seneschals of Mortain under John in the 1190s – in Geoffrey's charter for the abbey of Montebourg, and Geoffrey's appropriation of patronage at L'Abbaye-Blanche, near Mortain, indicate that Stephen's loss of the county was comprehensive.¹³¹¹ The political consequences of Geoffrey's presence, and Stephen's loss of control, in the south-west of Normandy early on in the conquest may also explain Stephen's approval of the Savigniac abbey of

¹³⁰⁸ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.142, n.12, remarks that 'Geoffrey has even let *Anglie* stand'.

¹³⁰⁹ Janet Burton, 'English Monasteries and the Continent in the Reign of King Stephen', *King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Dalton and White, pp.98-114, at 104.

¹³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.101-2.

¹³¹¹ App. I, no.72; App. IV, no.12. King, 'Stephen of Blois', p.288, n.3, dates William Avenel's appearance as seneschal to 1121; cf. Power, *Norman Frontier*, p.52, n.158 and p.60, n.212, correctly dates the appearance of a William Avenel as seneschal to 1191.

Mortemer's entry into the Cistercian order in 1137.¹³¹² Toll exemptions, which have already been noted elsewhere as an important privilege granted by the English king-dukes to the abbey and its daughters from the time of Savigny's foundation, are one way of tracking this change.¹³¹³

This evidence bears out Stephen's position in such matters more generally. Of his twenty-eight other acts of exemption from toll in the *Regesta*, only one – a notification of Bec's exemption – concerns a Norman beneficiary besides Savigny, and it is addressed only to the *vicecomites* and *ministri* of his Boulonnais towns of Wissant and Boulogne.¹³¹⁴ Only three of his other toll exemption acts which were issued in favour of English beneficiaries are addressed to Norman officials, and always in conjunction with those of England and (once) Boulogne; all were issued prior to 1140-1.¹³¹⁵ After 1144, and perhaps significantly earlier, Stephen was unable to protect the Norman interests of Continental and Insular institutions, some of which he had previously patronised. This evidence provides a valuable index of how the conquest had impacted upon both the king's and the duke's cross-Channel authority.

Succession and cession

This chapter has shown that Geoffrey's ducal reign was concerned primarily but not exclusively with the restoration of what we might term Henrician order in Normandy. Institutions and individuals were confirmed in their rights and estates, and religious patronage continued; the impact of Stephen's reign could not be completely swept away, however, and his activities left a tangible imprint on Normandy in the 1140s. This re-examination has thus far brought into question aspects of the argument, propounded by Haskins and more recently King, that the reign acted as a mere regency, during which the dynasty could bide its time until Henry came of age.¹³¹⁶

Geoffrey's ducal reign officially ended with Henry's investiture, although his notification to Archbishop Hugh of Bishop Philip of Bayeux's quitclaim of some of

¹³¹² Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.183; *RRAN* III, no.598; *RHGF* XIV, pp.510-1; *Neustria Pia*, pp.770-1.

¹³¹³ Béatrice Poulle, 'Savigny and England', *England and Normandy*, ed. Bates and Curry, pp.159-68, at 162, who also makes many of the same observations as Burton, 'English Monasteries', *passim*.

¹³¹⁴ *RRAN* III, no.73. The other twenty seven acts for non-Norman beneficiaries are *ibid.*, nos.8, 9, 48, 107, 108, 141, 170, 186, 214, 250, 322, 344, 346, 383, 572, 604, 676, 737, 741, 754, 755, 834, 868, 891, 908, 953, 968. No. 426, for Kirkham Priory, has not been included as it is a highly truncated cartulary notice.

¹³¹⁵ *RRAN* III, nos. 186 (for Cirencester Abbey, 1136-9), 322 (for Crowland Abbey, 1135-40) and 754 (for Abbot Anselm of St. Edmunds, 1135-41, probably 1135-7).

¹³¹⁶ Haskins, *Norman Institutions* pp.131, 135; King, *King Stephen*, p.265.

Savigny's estates, issued in 1150, probably at the siege of Montreuil-Bellay, indicates that he continued to play a role in ducal affairs.¹³¹⁷ The evidence outlined in Chapter 3 strongly indicates that Geoffrey and Matilda prepared Henry for the assumption of ducal rule, and the complex evidence relating to the conflict and negotiations with Louis VII in 1150-1 suggests that the English throne was a feasible target too. Less certain, however, is the Angevin succession.

It has been hotly debated whether Geoffrey intended Henry to succeed to Greater Anjou, and if so, whether his rule there was meant to be temporary or permanent. The cession of Normandy to Henry, and the provision Geoffrey made for his younger sons, has been vigorously debated in modern historiography, and has hitherto been the starting-point for appraisals of Geoffrey's ducal reign.¹³¹⁸ Most historians cite William of Newburgh's account of the reasons for Geoffrey junior's revolt against Henry in 1156 as proof that Geoffrey V intended Greater Anjou and Normandy not to be united under a single heir, and it is worth quoting Newburgh at length:

The reason for his brother's revolt was this. The illustrious count of Anjou had by Matilda the former empress raised three sons, Henry, Geoffrey, and William. Since the rights of father and of mother passed wholly to Henry as first-born, the count refused to allow provision for the others to depend wholly on the favour of their brother, for he was uncertain what attitude Henry would adopt towards them. So just before he died, he left the county of Anjou to his middle son in his will.

But because at that time the future of England was uncertain, the count said: "When Henry obtains his mother's rights in full, comprising Normandy and England, he must relinquish his paternal rights wholly to his brother Geoffrey. But in the meantime Geoffrey must be satisfied with the three considerable castles of Chinon, Loudun, and Mirebeau." As Henry happened to be away at the time, but was soon to return, the count made the bishops and nobles present swear not to allow his body to be buried unless his son first took an oath not to revoke his father's will in the smallest respect.¹³¹⁹

When Henry learnt of the substance of the oath he had sworn, according to Newburgh, he appealed to the pope, who released him from its terms, and Henry was thus able to claim legitimate rulership of Greater Anjou.¹³²⁰

Thomas Keefe has put forward the clearest case for acceptance of Newburgh's

¹³¹⁷ App. I, no.96.

¹³¹⁸ Hollister and Keefe, 'The Making of the Angevin Empire'; Keefe, 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will', pp.266-74; John Le Patourel, 'Angevin Successions and the Angevin Empire', in idem., *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet*, ed. Michael Jones (London, 1984), ch.IX (pp.1-17), which provides a good overview of the debate in the 1960s and 70s; Gillingham, *Angevin Empire*, pp.10-11.

¹³¹⁹ William of Newburgh, *History of English Affairs* II, ed. Walsh and Kennedy, pp.30-1.

¹³²⁰ Ibid., pp.30-33.

account, arguing that it was natural for Geoffrey to bequeath Normandy (and a promise of England) to his eldest son in lieu of the Greater Angevin patrimony, as it outstripped Anjou in terms of size, wealth, title and prestige.¹³²¹ Chartrou and many others also accept Newburgh's account.¹³²² W. L. Warren has argued against this account, as it is not corroborated elsewhere, would have been unpalatable to Louis VII, and went against traditional inheritance patterns.¹³²³ As Keefe points out, two other chronicles – the Tours Chronicle and a fragment of another, anonymous Angevin text – which comment on Geoffrey junior's rebellion do not, as Warren and Chartrou suggested, provide evidence that Geoffrey intended him to inherit the comital title.¹³²⁴ The Tours Chronicle – which, as shown in Chapter 3, contains some serious deficiencies – in fact only states that Geoffrey junior held the three castles named by William of Newburgh and that he invaded Anjou. The fragmentary Angevin source – whose origin is unknown – provides a garbled account of the rebellion, stating that after Geoffrey V's death and Henry's marriage, Henry received the counties of Anjou, Maine and Touraine, which proved problematic for him; it states that Geoffrey junior 'was made Count of Anjou, [as] he was unwilling to take that which was offered to him by Henry'.¹³²⁵ Geoffrey junior is then described as ceding the title, which was taken by Henry. These problematic chronicle accounts neither affirm nor argue against Newburgh's account of events.

Chibnall's examination of evidence from both England and Normandy led her to conclude two things. First, that Geoffrey 'clearly anticipated that [Henry] would inherit the kingdom of England. He was already beginning to introduce him to the practical work of government in Normandy and Anjou',¹³²⁶ and second, that he was not tightly bound by rules governing succession, so he could secede the duchy within his own lifetime.¹³²⁷ This first conclusion must be modified, for the evidence outlined in Chapter 3 in fact indicates that Henry was prepared for rule in the Anglo-Norman realm but not necessarily in Anjou. The charters cited by Chibnall show him in an 'official capacity' with his father only in Normandy, and that his executive actions in the period prior to

¹³²¹ Keefe, 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will', pp.268-71

¹³²² Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pp.85-6, and see Keefe, 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will', p.267, n.4, for a survey of the historiography.

¹³²³ Warren, *Henry II*, pp.46-7, 64.

¹³²⁴ Keefe, 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will', p.273, n.25; 'Chronicon Turonense magnum', *Chroniques de Touraine*, ed. Salmon, p.136; 'Fragment de chronique angevine', *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, 251-4, at 251; Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, p.85; Warren, *Henry II*, p.46.

¹³²⁵ 'Fragment de chroniques angevine', *Chroniques*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, p.251: 'Gaufridus, frater Henrici predicti, comes Andegavensis creatus, ea que ab Henrico rege offerebantur noluit recipere

¹³²⁶ Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.145.

¹³²⁷ Chibnall, 'Normandy', p.107.

Geoffrey's death and his own investiture as duke pertain only to the duchy.¹³²⁸ Prior to 1150, he also issued several charters for English beneficiaries both in his own right – the earliest during the frantic period of consolidation of support at Oxford in 1141, in which he is named as 'lawful heir to England and Normandy' (*rectus heres Anglie et Normann(ie)*) – as well as at least one charter with his mother.¹³²⁹ The only evidence of Henry's involvement in Angevin affairs prior to Geoffrey's death is the charter issued by Geoffrey for the priories of Cunault and Loudun in the weeks before the fall of Rouen, and his corroboration of Geoffrey's grant in 1138 to the men of Saumur, also consented to by his brothers.¹³³⁰

However much the *acta* reveal about Henry's preparation for the assumption of rule in Normandy and, later, in England, they provide no conclusive answers regarding well-defined plans for the Angevin succession, only probabilities. Geoffrey junior appeared in his father's *acta*, and indeed on one occasion in 1144 stood as his representative to a grant drawn up in favour of Château-l'Hermitage, while Count Geoffrey was in Normandy.¹³³¹ Along with his brother William, he attested a small number of his father's charters. Whether this should be interpreted as a sign of training directed towards his likely succession as count, as an insurance policy should Henry die, or simply as part of well-established Angevin comital practices of upbringing, remains open to question. Ultimately, although Henry's place in the Anglo-Norman succession was planned and prepared for methodically, the same cannot be said of the Angevin succession. At the time of his death Geoffrey was not yet forty, and his Norman abdication allowed him to return to Anjou and attend to comital affairs.

Geoffrey had both preserved the duchy for his son and exercised ducal authority in his own right. Ducal rule was a task that Geoffrey seized whole-heartedly, not just

¹³²⁸ Chibnall cites what here are App. I, nos. 32, 33, 45 and 88, which show Henry either jointly issuing charters with Geoffrey or advising or assenting to his father's grants; to these texts can also be added App. I, no.74, consented to by all three of the couple's sons as well as Matilda. Chibnall also cites *RRAN* III, nos. 18, 729 (= App. IV, no.14) and 735, which were issued by Henry alone, the first and the last both prior to the investiture.

¹³²⁹ *RRAN* III, nos. 320 (for Fulk Fitz Warin, 1149), 420 (for Kingswood Abbey, prior to his return to Normandy, thus 1149), 635 (for the earl of Oxford, 23rd July × 14th September 1141), 666 (for Quarr Abbey, 13th April 1149), 704 (for Reading Abbey, 1147 or 1149) and 795 (for Salisbury Cathedral on the same occasion as no.666) were all issued in his own right; with Matilda, he issued nos. 111 (for Humphrey of Bohon, dated in *RRAN* III to 1144, and more precisely after the death of Miles of Gloucester on 24th December 1143 and before Henry's return to Anjou in the weeks before the fall of Rouen).

¹³³⁰ App. I, no.42; cf. no.7 and the discussion therein of its date. For the men of Saumur, App. I, no.93. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.145, suggests that Geoffrey's letter of 1145 to Henry regarding La Trinité of Vendôme (App. V, no.1) is indicative of his involvement in Angevin administration, but this could have been of dynastic rather than administrative significance.

¹³³¹ App. I, no.34.

confirming and restoring the *status quo ante* December 1135, but also engaging with and moving on aspects of ducal authority such as justice and coinage. Stephen's ducal activities were scrubbed from the record, and it appears that Geoffrey even exercised some authority in a cross-Channel context. Analysis of the personnel and networks used to dispense Geoffrey's ducal rule remains to be conducted in the same depth as that provided in Chapter 3 for their counterparts in Greater Anjou. This chapter has focused on certain aspects of Geoffrey's ducal reign, and has attempted to show the range and nature of Geoffrey's activities as duke. While not providing a complete picture of the reign, it shows nonetheless that Geoffrey had no single purpose, managing simultaneously to secure his son's succession and to dispense convincingly his own authority as duke.

Conclusion

This study began by considering the question of representation. Historians have previously approached Geoffrey V of Anjou through the works of chroniclers and biographers, who each worked to their own agenda and sought to represent him in particular ways. This thesis proposed that a better and more balanced understanding of Geoffrey's career, in terms of events, circumstances, pressures and priorities, can only be gained by analysing a much broader range of evidence than has hitherto been considered. This material – primarily the *acta* of Geoffrey and those close to him – facilitates a significant insight into how Geoffrey and the institutions and individuals around him understood and represented his authority as both count of Anjou and duke of Normandy.

The representation of Geoffrey as 'Martel' in some of the *acta* drawn up by his scribes and by beneficiaries neatly encapsulates the aspect of his career which looms so large in all of the chronicle accounts of his activities and the modern narratives they have informed.¹³³² Geoffrey's martial prowess was noteworthy, and dictated – alongside Angevin comital precedent – that he use the cognomen. His victories, particularly in siege warfare, were the result of careful study of Vegetius, and the siege of Montreuil-Bellay and the Norman campaigns of 1138 and 1142 indeed confirm his aptitude as a tactician and military leader. The conquest of Normandy ensured that military activity retained its central place in Geoffrey's career, and gave rise to two opposing representations – John of Marmoutier's Geoffrey, the chivalric knight, and Orderic Vitalis's Geoffrey, the cruel oppressor and Matilda's 'stipendiary commander' – which resound through the historiography.

Analysis of the *acta* alongside the narrative material does not displace martial activity from the heart of Geoffrey's reign. Rather, it highlights its different significances and contexts in Greater Anjou and Normandy. The use of the Martel cognomen reflects more than mere prestige or contemporary *topoi*: it goes to the heart of the issues of Geoffrey's career. In Greater Anjou, the structure of elite landed society meant that military action was a fundamental facet of comital rule. Although Angevin lords such as Gerald of Montreuil-Bellay were at times found in Geoffrey's company, and even sought his consent to some of their acts, they could happily conceive of their

¹³³² App. I, nos. 6, 41, 48, 58, 86, 89, 93, 111; App. IV, no.2.

own positions with reference to the regnal years of their more distant overlord, the king of France.¹³³³ In practice, these barons had little compunction in ravaging the countryside as a means of gaining power, resources and authority. Siege warfare was, by default, a tool of government in the absence of any comprehensive ability to control baronial inheritance, disseise the aristocracy of their fortifications, or prevent them from using their resources against the count. In Normandy, military enterprises were the only way to recover the duchy from Stephen, but subjugation had to be tempered with accommodation, promise and reward. Geoffrey had to entice as well as compel men away from Stephen and into his following. In both regions, Geoffrey's authority had to be first established and then perpetually reinforced. Although he was regarded by some as count (and even occasionally duke) 'by the grace of God', in practice he was a ruler and conqueror whose acts defined his power. He could not conceive of that power with reference to royal authority nor take for granted the loyalty of those over whom, in theory, he ruled.

The framework and personnel of Angevin comital administration were used by Geoffrey to mitigate the problems posed by the structure of elite society and, particularly after 1135, by the need to fill the space left first by his wife's absences and then by his own. The primary way in which this was achieved was the utilisation of a body of officials who, unlike the higher aristocracy, owed their careers to his patronage. Many of these men were linked by kinship; some had begun their rise under Fulk V, and Geoffrey's reliance upon them ensured that different generations of a handful of identifiable families appear repeatedly in the materials left by Geoffrey's administration and those of his predecessors and successors. One notable feature of these families is that they originated and had interests in areas on the margins of Angevin comital authority, such as Maine, Tours and the Poitevin frontier. This geographical distribution perhaps allowed Geoffrey to ameliorate the patchy local effectiveness of comital authority; in the case of Maine, it was one facet of a determined attempt, begun by Fulk V, to exert tangible power over a recent acquisition. This attempt also found expression in monastic patronage, saintly devotion and, ultimately, the choice of a burial site which broke with comital precedent; it may even have influenced Geoffrey's choice of mistress.

Chartrou concluded that Geoffrey's reign was instrumental in taming the

¹³³³ App. VI, no.6.

Angevin aristocracy; he ‘affirmed [his] authority over his vassals’ by building methodically and dispassionately on the ground prepared by Fulk V.¹³³⁴ The evidence surveyed here brings this conclusion into question. It suggests that Geoffrey did not subdue the Angevin aristocracy, but rather succeeded in holding elements of it at bay by means of military force and an administrative strategy which relied upon groups whose fortunes were much more closely linked with those of the count. Geoffrey did command the consistent loyalty of a small number of barons, such as Galvan of Chemillé, but it appears that the ties that bound in these cases were personal and affective, having little connection to overlordship, land tenure or clear structures of power. Chartrou’s characterisation of the Greater Angevin aristocracy as Geoffrey’s vassals is problematic, for in practice they exercised virtual autonomy. They continued to rebel under Henry II, under the figureheads of first his brother Geoffrey in 1156 and then his son Henry, the Young King, in 1173.¹³³⁵

Examination of Geoffrey’s dealings with the Angevin episcopate confirms that comital power was patchy and exercised competitively. The conflict with Bishop Ulger over Châteauneuf brings the overlapping jurisdictions of count and bishop into sharp relief, indicating that some Angevin barons held their honours from the bishop rather than the count, and that the bishop was prepared to pursue his prerogatives and defend episcopal lands and privileges voraciously. Yet even the serious disagreement which ensued did not create a lasting rift with Geoffrey, nor did incidents like the enforced exile of Bishop Hugh of Le Mans following his refusal to assist the Angevin cause in Normandy. This example highlights the political influence that these bishops could wield, something which Geoffrey could not afford not to cultivate; it was Ulger who argued Matilda’s case before the pope, and analysis of the *acta* has shown that Geoffrey appears to have sought – apparently successfully – to influence archiepiscopal elections at Tours, where Angevin and French interests and estates met. It is striking that the *acta* contain examples from all three Greater Angevin dioceses of the relinquishment of comital prerogatives over (archi)episcopal possessions upon the death of the prelate.¹³³⁶ This evidence requires further examination with reference to canon law and a wider process of reform, but here indicates that Geoffrey had to be prepared, to an extent, to compromise with the episcopate.

¹³³⁴ Chartrou, *L’Anjou*, pp.223-4.

¹³³⁵ Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire*, pp.197-8.

¹³³⁶ App. IV, nos. 2, 11, 18.

Evidence of Geoffrey's religious patronage is conspicuously absent from the narrative sources, and the *acta* only go a little way towards moderating the impression that patronage was not an important part of his career. This is surprising, given the reputation of his parents as committed patrons of highly ascetic religious orders, Fulk's status after 1131 as ruler of a crusader kingdom, and the prominence accorded to the practice by both contemporaries and Geoffrey's own ancestors. The patronage in Greater Anjou in which Geoffrey did engage served largely to confirm the grants of his predecessors, with the exception of Maine, which appears to have had personal as well as geopolitical significance for a ruler in whom local devotional ties had been deliberately inculcated by his parents. Yet, with the exception of a single complaint of institutional poverty during the reign,¹³³⁷ Geoffrey's apparent unwillingness or inability to make large bequests or found new institutions was of little consequence for his image as a ruler. This suggests a need to reconsider more widely the importance of religious patronage to the construction of medieval rulership: it was certainly desirable, but perhaps not essential.

The college of Saint-Laud has emerged from this examination as a particularly important institution. It functioned as the comital chapel, though it was not the exclusive source of Geoffrey's chaplains; it commanded a ritual which appears to have constituted the count's investiture; it also appears to have been the primary provider of scribes for the occasions on which *acta* were not drawn up by beneficiaries. There is compelling evidence that a Saint-Laud canon named Thomas has in the past been conflated with Thomas of Loches, who appears as 'chancellor' in Anjou and Normandy. The disentanglement of the personnel who undertook scribal duties for Geoffrey provides a clearer picture of how the diplomatic aspect of his authority functioned, and arguably the reduction of Thomas of Loches' role alongside the evidence for the continuation of beneficiary production of acts attests to only a loosely-structured culture of comital document production. Closer analysis of the different diplomatic practices manifest in Geoffrey's *acta* is a task for the future, and such a survey must also take in the *acta* of Fulk V, only incompletely calendared by Chartrou.

It is hard not to conclude that Geoffrey's experience in dealing with the problems of Angevin rule provided effective training for the conquest of Normandy. From the moment of Henry I's death, one of the most visible elements of his activities

¹³³⁷ Bienvenu, *Les premiers temps de Fontevraud* I, pp. 354, 359.

in the duchy was the pursuit of local support as a means of gaining and extending his power and influence. Both the early and late stages of the conquest were facilitated by the negotiation of support as well as the exertion of military force, and the methodology employed here, of examining the *acta* and the *Infeudationes militum*, has shown that the scale of the Angevin foothold prior to 1141 was more substantial than the chronicles suggest and, where possible, has quantified that foothold in terms of resources available to Geoffrey. Geoffrey's conquest strategy paradoxically allowed him to cut to the heart of Stephen's authority as duke of Normandy and count of Mortain whilst simultaneously taking a sensitive approach to the appropriation of *de facto* ducal authority. Ducal prerogatives such as control of episcopal elections began to be exercised after 1141, but only as part of the process of negotiation with local magnates and ecclesiastics, and the ducal title was deliberately avoided until the day of Geoffrey's investiture in 1144, in spite of its earlier application by Angevin supporters.

This current of appeasement continued into the reign, as demonstrated by the Bayeux Inquests, which subjected some of Geoffrey's key supporters to enquiries over the status of their estates, but it seems that for all except for Robert of Gloucester, the consequences were not damaging. The Bayeux Inquests were part of a broader process of restitution and confirmation, and the reassertion of ducal prerogatives. This was not a one-way process, and Geoffrey was undoubtedly petitioned by many institutions and individuals seeking confirmation of their rights and privileges, something which was granted only with reference to a legitimate, pre-Stephanian ducal past. The analysis of Geoffrey's Norman *acta* undertaken here, however, challenges aspects of the argument put forward by Haskins that Geoffrey's reign was first and foremost a regency. Although Henry was clearly prepared for ducal rule from a very early age, Geoffrey's dispensation of ducal power only occasionally referenced and involved his son. Geoffrey's ducal authority was conceived with reference to Henry I, and conducted in a pragmatic manner.

Post-1144 ducal rule also had to deal with the consequences of the temporary (but potentially indefinite) partition of the Anglo-Norman realm, and while Geoffrey's role in cross-Channel affairs has been highlighted here, further work remains to be done on this phenomenon, with reference to a larger body of evidence. Many other aspects of Geoffrey's ducal reign also require further exploration, particularly the personnel of his administration. There is a clear need for a close study of the county of Mortain in the

twelfth century in order to further illuminate the impact of Geoffrey's conquest upon Stephen's authority. Other areas of the duchy, most notably Caen, are conspicuously absent from the evidence pertaining to Geoffrey's ducal reign, and while much direct evidence is lost, it is anticipated that continued archival research will yield material which will aid further work in these areas.

Geoffrey's Norman activities will always be examined in relation to his marriage and children. It is hoped that what has been achieved here is an account of the ways in which he managed the conquest and rule of the duchy occasioned by the Anglo-Norman succession crisis, shifting the investigation from the dynastic consequences of his marriage to their manifestation in practice. Nevertheless, family has emerged as a key element of Geoffrey's reign, in relation to both Anjou and Normandy. Geoffrey was undoubtedly associated in Fulk V's rule in a highly pragmatic way, and he continued this practice with his own sons, only in the new circumstances engendered by the succession crisis. This crisis also meant that Matilda could not fulfil the same role as her predecessor, Countess Aremburga. Comital power was dispensed without spousal collaboration, and ultimately the structures of Angevin power, though still firmly rooted in the count's presence, had become a little less personal by 1151.

In the final analysis, Geoffrey's comital power and authority, like that of his Breton ducal counterparts, was heterogeneous and had significant weaknesses.¹³³⁸ Thus, while Bisson's recent argument that '[T]here can be no doubt that lordship was imposed and exercised coercively in Anjou' withstands scrutiny, it has to be modified to reflect the variety of means by which Geoffrey sought to impose his comital authority.¹³³⁹ The same attitude to the acquisition and maintenance of power can be detected in the conquest of Normandy, achieved by a mixture of force, negotiation, promise and reward, a process which continued after 1144. Although many aspects of his career are difficult to reconstruct and remain the subject of future research, it is clear that he met the challenges presented to him in both Anjou and Normandy adeptly. His success was never spectacular and his authority frequently hung in the balance. His achievement was the management of the serious problems inherent in the structure of Angevin comital authority, a remarkable feat given his conquest and rule of Normandy. His own *acta* and the ways he is represented within them show that he did this in the only way possible, as a non-royal ruler who could not take his power for granted.

¹³³⁸ Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, pp.177-8.

¹³³⁹ Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, p.136.

Bibliography

1. Primary sources

Manuscripts consulted

Angers ADML MSS 1MI28, 17G1, 101H168, G826, G1003, H1775, H1840, H3714, H3715

Angers BM MSS 686B, 687, 863, 865

Oxford Bodley MS Gough Drawings Gaignières 14

Paris AN MSS JJ97, JJ102, K23, K186A, L969, M15, MM894

Paris BnF MSS Baluze 76, 77, 139

Paris BnF MS De Camps 103

Paris BnF MS Dupuy 828

Paris BnF MSS Latin 5430A, 5458, 5459, 9067, 10037, 10072, 10107, 13820, 14194, 17049, 17126, 17149

Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou vols. I (1) - VI (5), XII (1 and 2), 13, 18, 31

Paris BnF MSS Nouvelles acquisitions françaises 7433

Paris BnF MSS Nouvelles acquisitions latines 766, 1183, 1227

Rouen ADSM MSS 7H12, 20HP5

Rouen BM MSS 1235, 2192

Tours ADIL MSS 1271, G1, G10, H210, H466, H1056

Published sources

Acta of the Plantagenets, ed. J. C. Holt, Nicholas Vincent and Judith Everard (Cambridge, forthcoming)

Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru, Archives historiques du Maine II (Le Mans, 1902)

Agnellus, Thomas, 'De morte et sepultura Henrici Regis Junioris', in *Radulphi de Coggeshall chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson, Rolls Series, 66 (1875),

pp.268-69

Antiquus cartularius ecclesiae Baiocensis (Livre noir), ed. Valentin Bourrienne (2 vols., Rouen, 1902-3)

Archives d'Anjou, ed. Paul Marchegay (3 vols., Angers, 1843-54)

Archives du Cogner (J. Chappée, Le Mans) Série H, art. 97: Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sauveur de Villeloin, ed. L.-J. Denis (Paris and Le Mans, 1911)

Arnoux, Mathieu and Maneuvrier, Christophe, *Deux abbayes de Basse-Normandie: Notre-Dame du Val et Le Val Richer (XII^e-XIII^e siècles)* Le Pays Bas-Normand no.237-8, *Revue Trimestrielle* no.1-2 (2000)

The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, ed. H. A. Wilson (London, 1903)

Calendar of documents preserved in France, illustrative of the history of Great Britain and Ireland: A.D. 918-1206, ed. John Horace Round (London, 1899)

Cartulaire de Château-du-Loir, ed. Eugène Vallée, *Archives historiques du Maine* VI (Le Mans, 1905)

Cartulaire de Cormery, précédé de l'histoire de l'abbaye et de la ville de Cormery, ed. J.-J. Bourassé, *Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine* XII (Tours and Paris, 1861)

Le cartulaire de l'abbaye Bénédictine de Saint-Pierre-de-Préaux, ed. Dominique Rouet (Paris, 2005)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme, ed. Charles Métais (5 vols., Paris and Vannes, 1893-1904)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Noyers, ed. Casimir Chevalier, *Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine* 22 (1872)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin d'Angers, ed. Bertrand de Broussillon, with tables by Eugène Lelong (3 vols., Angers, 1896-1903)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Cyprien de Poitiers, 931-1155, ed. Louis Rédet, *Archives historiques du Poitou* (Poitiers, 1874)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Laon de Thouars, ed. Hugues Imbert (Niort, 1876)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité de Tiron, ed. Lucien Merlet (2 vols., Chartres, 1883)

Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans (ordre de Saint Benoît), premier cartulaire: 572-1188, ed. R. Charles and Menjot d'Elbenne (Mamers and Le Mans, 1886-1913)

Cartulaire de l'évêché du Mans: 936-1790, ed. Bertrand de Broussillon (Le Mans, 1900)

Cartulaire de Marmoutier pour le Vendomois, ed. M. de Trémault (Paris and Vendôme, 1893)

Cartulaire de Saint Jouin-les-Marnes (Chartularium sancti Jovini), ed. A. Grandmaison, Mémoires de la Société de Statistique du département des Deux-Sèvres XVII, 2^e partie (Niort, 1854)

Cartulaire de Saint-Victeur au Mans, prieuré de l'abbaye du Mont-Saint-Michel (994-1400), ed. P. Farcy and Bertrand de Broussillon (Paris, 1895)

Cartulaire de Saint-Ymer en Auge et Briquebec, ed. Charles Bréard (Rouen, 1908)

Le cartulaire du chapitre cathédral de Coutances: Étude et édition critique, ed. Julie Fontanel (Saint-Lô, 2003)

Cartulaire du chapitre Saint-Laud d'Angers (Actes du XI^e et du XII^e siècle), ed. Adrien Planchenault (Angers, 1903)

Cartulaire du chapitre royal de Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour, du Mans, ed. Menjot d'Elbenne and L.-J. Denis, Archives historiques du Maine IV (Le Mans, 1907)

Cartulaire general de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1310), ed. J. Delaville le Roulx (4 vols., Paris, 1894-1906)

Cartulaire general de l'ordre du Temple: 1119?-1150: recueil des chartes et des bulles relatives à l'ordre du Temple, ed. Marquis d'Albon (2 vols., Paris, 1913-22)

Le Cartulaire noir de la cathédrale d'Angers, ed. Charles Urseau (Paris and Angers, 1908)

Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, saint Louis et Philippe le Hardi, ed. Léopold Delisle (Paris, 1882)

Cartulaires des abbayes de Saint-Pierre de la Couture et de Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, publié par les Bénédictins de Solesmes (Le Mans, 1881)

Cartulaire Tourangeau et sceaux des abbés [de Marmoutier], ed. C. Chantelou (Tours, 1879)

The Cartulary of the Abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Donington, 2006)

The Cartulary of Countess Blanche of Champagne, ed. Theodore Evergates (Toronto, 2009)

Catalogue des actes des évêques du Mans jusqu'à la fin du XIII^e siècle, ed. Léonce Celier (Paris, 1910)

Catalogue analytique des diplômes, chartes et actes relatifs à l'histoire de Touraine, contenus dans la collection de Dom. Housseau, ed. Émile Mabille, Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine XIV (Tours, 1863)

The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I King of Scots, 1124-53, and of his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52, ed. G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, 1999)

The Charters of the Anglo-Norman Earls of Chester, c.1071-1237, ed. Geoffrey Barraclough, Publications of the Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire 126 (Chester, 1988)

Charters of the Redvers Family and the Earldom of Devon, 1090-1217, ed. Robert Bearman (Devon and Cornwall Record Society N.S. 37, 1994)

Chartes de Saint-Julien de Tours: 1002-1227, ed. L.-J. Denis (2 vols., Archives historiques du Maine 12, Le Mans, 1912)

Chartularium insignis ecclesie Cenomanensis quod dicitur Liber albus capituli, ed. R.-J.-F. Lottin (Le Mans, 1869)

Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I, ed. Richard Howlett (Rolls Series 82, London, 1885)

Chronique de Parcé, ed. H. de Berranger (Le Mans, 1953)

Chronique de Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont Saint Michel, ed. Léopold Delisle (2 vols., Rouen, 1872-3)

Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise, ed. Louis Halphen and René Poupardin (Paris, 1913)

Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou, ed. Paul Marchegay and André Salmon, intro. Émile Mabille (Paris, 1856)

Chroniques des églises d'Anjou, ed. Paul Marchegay and Émile Mabille (Paris, 1869)

Comte, François and Bienvenu, Jean-Marc, *L'abbaye Toussaint d'Angers des origines à 1330: étude historique et cartulaire* (Société des études angevines, 1985)

Cosnier, Michaelis, *Fontis-Ebraldi exordium complectens opuscula duo, cum notationibus de vita B. Roberti de Arbresello Fontebraldensis ordinis institutoris et quaestionibus aliquot de potestate abbatissae* (La Flèche, 1641)

Coutumes et institutions de l'Anjou et du Maine antérieures au XVI^e siècle: textes et documents, ed. C.-J. Beaumonts-Beaupré (8 vols., Paris, 1877-97)

Coutumiers de Normandie, textes critiques, ed. Ernest-Joseph Tardif (2 vols., Rouen and Paris, 1881-97)

Delisle, Léopold, *Histoire du château et des sires de Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, suivie de pièces justificatives* (Paris and Caen, 1867)

Documents historiques touchant les Templiers et les Hospitaliers en Normandie, tirés des archives du Calvados et des autres dépôts publics, ed. Léchaudé d'Anisy, *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, 2nd series, 4 (1844)

Documents pour l'histoire de l'église de Saint-Hilaire de Poitiers, ed. Louis Rédet, *Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest* 14 and 19 (2 vols., Poitiers, 1847-52)

Earldom of Gloucester Charters: The Charters and Scribes of the Earls and Countesses of Gloucester to A.D. 1217, ed. Robert B. Patterson (Oxford, 1973)

Les établissements de Rouen: études sur l'histoire des institutions municipales de Rouen, Falaise, Pont-Audemer, Verneuil, La Rochelle, Saintes, Oléron, Bayonnes, Tours, Niort, Cognac, Saint-Jean-d'Angély, Angoulême, Poitiers, ed. Arthur Giry (2 vols., Paris, 1883-5)

Les établissements de Saint Louis, ed. Paul Viollet (4 vols., Paris, 1881-6)

The Etablissements de Saint Louis: Thirteenth-Century Law Texts from Tours, Orléans and Paris, ed. F. R. P. Akehurst (Philadelphia PA, 1996)

Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa: qua series et historia archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, et abbatum Franciae vicinarumque ditionum, ab origine Ecclesiarum ad nostra tempora deducitur, et probatur ex authenticis instrumentis ad calcem appositis, ed. Denys de Sainte-Marthe et al (16 vols., Paris, 1715-1865)

Gerald of Wales, *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer (8 vols., Rolls Series 21, London, 1861-91)

The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni, ed. and trans. Elisabeth M. C. van Houts (2 vols., Oxford, 1992-5)

Gesta Stephani, ed. and trans. K. R. Potter (2nd ed., Oxford, 1976)

Grand cartulaire de Fontevraud: pancarta et cartularium abbatissae et ordinis Fontis Ebraudi, ed. Jean-Marc Bienvenu, with Robert Favreau and Georges Pons (2 vols., Archives historiques du Poitou 63 and 64, Poitiers, 2000-5)

Grands rôles des Echiquiers de Normandie, ed. Léchaudé d'Anisy (Paris, 1845)

Inventaire des titres de l'abbaye de Beaulieu du Mans (1124-1413), ed. L. Froger, Archives historiques du Maine VIII (Le Mans, 1907)

Juenin, Pierre, *Nouvelle histoire de l'abbaye royale et collégiale de Saint-Filibert et de la ville de Tournus* (Dijon, 1733)

Ledain, Bélisaire, 'Chartes de la Trinité de Mauléon', *Archives historiques du Poitou* 20 (1889), pp.1-94

The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. and trans. Carolyn Poling Schriber (Lewiston, 1997)

The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. Frank Barlow, Camden Society 3rd series, 61 (London, 1939)

The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, ed. and trans. Bruno Scott James, intro. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Stroud, 1998)

'Lettre de l'abbé Haimon sur la construction de l'église de Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive, en 1145', ed. Léopold Delisle, *BEC* 21 (1860), pp.113-139

Le livre rouge d'Eu 1151-1454, ed. A. Legris (Paris, 1911)

Ferdinand Lot, *Études critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandrille* (Paris, 1913)

Magni rotuli scaccarii Normanniae sub regibus Angliae, ed. Thomas Stapleton (2 vols., London, 1840-44)

La Mainferme, Jean de, *Clypeus nascentis Fontebraldensis ordinis, nova editio* (3 vols., Saumur and Paris, 1684-92)

Manrique, Angel, *Cisterciensium seu verium ecclesiasticorum annalium a condito Cistercio* (4 vols., Lyon, 1649)

Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, ed. J. C. Robertson and J. B. Sheppard, Rolls Series LXVII (7 vols., London, 1875-85)

Mémoires et notes pour servir à l'histoire du département de l'Eure, Auguste Le Prévost, ed. L. Delisle and L. Passy (3 vols., Évreux, 1862-9)

Marchegay, Paul, 'Chartes Angevines des onzième et douzième siècles', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 36 (1875), pp.381-441

Monasticon Anglicanum, ed. John Caley, Henry Ellis and Bulkley Bandinel (new ed., 6 vols. in 8, London, 1817-30)

Monasticon Chuniacense Anglicanum, or Charters and Records of the Ancient Abbey of Chuni, 1077-1534, ed. G. F. Duckett (2 vols., Lewes, 1888)

Nécrologe-obituaire de la cathédrale Saint-Julien du Mans, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru, *Archives historiques du Maine* 7 (Le Mans, 1906)

Neustria Pia, seu de omnibus et singulis abbatiis et prioratibus totius Normaniae, Arthur du Monstier (Rouen, 1663)

The Normans in Europe, ed. and trans. Elisabeth van Houts (Manchester, 2000)

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall (6 vols., Oxford, 1969-80)

Ordonnances des roys de France de la troisième race, recueillies par ordre chronologique, ed. Eusèbe Jacob de Laurière, Denis-François Secousse et al (21 vols, Paris, 1723-1849)

La pancarte noire de Saint-Martin de Tours, brûlée en 1793, restituée d'après les textes imprimés et manuscrits, ed. Émile Mabille (Paris and Tours, 1866)

Papsturkunden in Frankreich: Neue Folge, ed. Johannes Ramackers, Dietrich Lohrmann and Rolf Grosse (9 vols., Göttingen, 1937-99)

Patrologia cursus completus: omnium ss. Patrum, doctorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum: series latina, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (221 vols., Paris, 1844-64)

Le Peletier, Laurent, *Breviculum foundationis S. Nicolai* (Angers, 1616)

---, *De rerum scitu dignissimarum a prima fundatione monasterii S. Nicolai Andegavensis ad hunc usque diem epitome necnon et ejusdem monasterii abbatum series* (Angers, 1635)

Placita Anglo-Normannica, ed. Melville Madison Bigelow (Boston, MA, 1879)

Premier et second livres des Cartulaires de l'abbaye Saint-Serge et Saint-Bach d'Angers (XIe et XIIe siècles), ed. Yves Chauvin (2 vols., Angers, 1997)

Ralph of Diceto, *Radulphi de Diceto Decani Londoniensis, opera historica: The historical works of Master Ralph of Diceto, Dean of London*, ed. William Stubbs (2 vols., Rolls Series 68, 1876)

Recueil d'Annales angevines et vendômoises, ed. Louis Halphen (Paris, 1903)

Recueil des actes de Henri II, Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France, ed. Léopold Delisle and Élie Berger (3 vols., Paris, 1909-47)

Recueil des actes de Louis VI, Roi de France, 1108-1137, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier and Jean Dufour, Chartes et diplômes relatifs à l'histoire de France 13-16 (4 vols., Paris, 1992-4)

Recueil des actes des comtes de Pontieu, 1026-1279, ed. Clovis Brunel (Paris, 1930)

'Recueil de chartes concernant l'abbaye de Saint-Victor-en-Caux', ed. E. de Robillard de Beaurepaire, *Mélanges de la Société de l'histoire de Normandie*, 5th series (1898), pp.333-453

Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Chuny, ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexander Bruel (6 vols., Paris, 1876-1903)

Recueil de chroniques de Touraine, ed. André Salmon (Tours, 1854)

Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, et Martin Bouquet *et al* (24 vols., Paris, 1738-1904)

Recueil des historiens de la France, obituaires de la province de Sens, ed. Auguste Molinier and Auguste Longnon (4 vols. In 5, Paris, 1902-23)

Recueil des historiens des croisades (Historiens occidentaux) (6 vols., Paris, 1844-95)

Red Book of the Exchequer, ed. Hubert Hall (3 vols., Rolls Series 99, London, 1896)

Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII, ed. Philip Jaffé (2 vols., 2nd rev. ed., Leipzig, 1885-8, repr. 1956)

Regesta regni Hierosolymitani (MXCVII-MCCXCI), ed. Reinhold Röhricht (Innsbruck, 1893)

Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum, 1066-1154, ed. H. W. C. Davis, R. H. C. Davis, H. A. Cronne *et al* (4 vols., Oxford, 1913-69)

Les registres de Philippe Auguste I (texte), ed. John W. Baldwin, *Recueil des historiens de la France, documents financiers et administratifs VII* (Paris, 1992)

La Roque, Gilles-André de, *Histoire généalogique de la maison de Harcourt* (4 vols., Paris, 1662)

Schroeder, H. J., *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis, 1937)

Suger, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, ed. and trans. Richard C. Cusimano and John Moorhead (Washington DC, 1991)

---, *Vie de Louis le Gros, suivie de l'Histoire du Roi Louis VII*, ed. Auguste Molinier (Paris, 1887)

Teulet, Alexandre, *Layettes du Trésor des chartes* (5 vols., Paris, 1863-1909)

Vincent, Nicholas, 'Sixteen New Charters of Henry Plantagenet Before his Accession as King (1149-54)', unpublished

William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, ed. and trans. K. R. Potter (Edinburgh, 1955)
---, *Historia Novella: the contemporary history*, ed. Edmund King and trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford, 1998)

---, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (2 vols., Oxford and New York, 1998-2002)

William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy (2 vols., Oxford, 1988-2001)

William of Tyre, *Chronique*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (2 vols., Turnhout, 1986)

2. Secondary works

Adhémar, J., and Dordor, G., 'Les Tombeaux de la Collection Gaignières', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 6th series, 84 (1974)

Aird, William, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy c.1050-1134* (Woodbridge, 2008)

Allen, Richard, 'Five charters concerning the early history of the chapter at Avranches', *Tabularia (Documents)* 8 (2008), pp.1-33

Althoff, Gerd *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004)

Amt, Emily, *The Accession of Henry II in England. Royal Government Restored, 1149-59* (Woodbridge, 1993)

Angot, Alphonse, 'Les vicomtes du Maine', *Bulletin de la Commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne* 30 (1914), pp. 180-232, 320-42, 404-24

---, 'Baronnie de Château-Gontier', *Bulletin de la Commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne* 31 (1915), pp.15-46

---, 'Sablé', *Bulletin de la Commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne* 35 (1919), pp.166-204, 266-308, 369-91

Aurell, Martin, *The Plantagenet Empire, 1154-1224*, trans. David Crouch (Harlow, 2007)

---, (ed.) *La cour Plantagenêt* (Poitiers, 2002), *Culture politique des Plantagenêts (1154-1224)* (Poitiers, 2003)

Avril, Joseph, 'L'Église d'Angers au temps des grands conciles (1148-1317)', *Histoire de Diocèse d'Angers*, ed. François Lebrun, *Histoire des diocèses de France* 13 (Paris, 1981), pp.43-67

---, *Le gouvernement des évêques et la vie religieuse dans le diocèse d'Angers (1148-1240)* (2 vols., Paris, 1984)

Bachrach, Bernard S., 'A study in feudal politics: relations between Fulk Nerra and William the Great, 995-1030', *Viator* 7 (1976), pp.111-22

---, 'The Idea of the Angevin Empire', *Albion* 10 (1978), pp.293-9

---, 'Henry II and the Angevin Tradition of Family Hostility', *Albion* 16 (1984), pp.111-30, pp.533-60

---, 'The Angevin strategy of castle-building in the reign of Fulk Nerra, 987-1040', *AHR* 88 (1983)

---, 'Enforcement of the Forma Fidelitatis: the Techniques Used by Fulk Nerra, Count of

the Angevins (987-1040)', *Speculum* 59 (1984), pp.796-819
 ---, 'The practical use of Vegetius' 'De re militari' during the early Middle Ages', *Historian* 47 (1985), pp.239-55
 ---, 'The Angevin economy, 960-1060: ancient or feudal?', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 10, ed. J. A. S. Evans and S. Unger (New York, 1988), pp.1-55
 ---, 'The Combat Sculptures at Fulk Nerra's 'Battle Abbey' (c.1005-1012)', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.63-80
 ---, *Fulk Nerra, the Neo-Roman Consul, 987-1040: A Political Biography of the Angevin Count* (Berkeley CA, 1993)
 ---, *State-Building in Medieval France: Studies in Early Angevin History* (Aldershot, 1995)
 ---, 'The Social Origins of the Angevin Castellanate to 1040', *Medieval Prosopography* 21 (2000), pp.1-22

Barthélemy, Dominique, *La société dans le comté de Vendôme de l'an mil au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1993)
 ---, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution I', *Past and Present* 152 (1996)

Barton, Richard E., 'Lordship in Maine: transformation, service and anger', *ANS* 23 (2001), pp.7-38
 ---, *Lordship in the County of Maine, c.890-1160* (Woodbridge, 2004)
 ---, 'Writing Warfare, Lordship and History: the *Gesta consulum Andegavorum*'s Account of the Battle of Alençon', *ANS* 27 (2005), pp.32-51

Le Bas, Philippe, *L'Univers. France: dictionnaire encyclopédique* (15 vols., Paris, 1840-5)

Bates, David, 'The Earliest Norman Writs', *EHR* 100 (1985), pp.266-84
 ---, 'Rouen from 900 to 1204: From Scandinavian Settlement to Angevin 'Capital'', *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology at Rouen*, ed. Jenny Stratford (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 12, 1993 for 1986), pp.1-11
 ---, 'The rise and fall of Normandy, c.911-1204', *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Bates and Anne Curry (London, 1994), pp.19-35
 ---, 'The Prosopographical Study of Anglo-Norman Royal Charters', *Family Trees and the Roots of Politics*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Woodbridge, 1997), pp.89-102
 ---, 'West Francia: the Northern Principalities', *New Cambridge Medieval History III c.900-c.1024*, ed. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge, 1999)
 ---, *William the Conqueror* (new ed., Stroud, 2004)

Bauduin, Pierre, 'Une famille châtelaine sur les confins normanno-manceaux: les Géré (X^e-XIII^e siècle)', *Archéologie médiévale* 20 (1992), pp.309-56

Bautier, Robert-Henri, 'Conclusions. 'Empire Plantagenêt' ou 'espace Plantagenêt'. Y eut-il une civilisation du monde Plantagenêt?', *CCM* 29 (1986), pp.139-47
 ---, 'Chancellerie et culture au moyen âge', *Cancellaria e cultura nel Medio Evo: Comunicazioni presentate nelle giornate di studio della Commissione [Internazionale di Diplomatica]*, ed. G. Gualdo (Vatican, 1990), pp.1-75, repr. in idem, *Chartes, sceaux et chancelleries: études de diplomatique et de sigillographie médiévales* (2 vols., Paris, 1990), I, pp.47-121

Bearman, Robert, 'Baldwin de Redvers: Some Aspects of a Baronial Career in the Reign of King Stephen', *ANS* 18, pp.20-46

Beck, Egerton, 'The Crozier in Heraldry and Ornament', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* (1914), pp.335-40

Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte Miriam, 'Diplomatic Sources and Medieval Documentary Practices: An Essay in Interpretive Methodology', *The Past and Future of Medieval Studies*, ed. John Van Engen (Notre Dame IN and London, 1994), pp.313-43

---, 'Medieval Identity: A Sign and A Concept', *AHR* 105 (2000), pp.1489-1533

Beem, Charles, "'Greater by Marriage': The Matrimonial Career of the Empress Matilda", *Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz (Lincoln NE, 2009), pp.1-15

Bellanger, Stanislas, *La Touraine ancienne et moderne* (Paris, 1845)

Bémont, Charles, 'Hugues de Clers et le *De senescalcia Franciae*', *Etudes d'histoire du moyen âge dédiées à Gabriel Monod* (Paris, 1896), pp.253-60

Benjamin, Richard, 'The Angevin Empire', *History Today* 36 (1986), pp.17-22

Benton, John F., 'The Revenue of Louis VII' *Speculum* 42 (1967), pp.84-91

Bienvenu, Jean-Marc, 'Le conflit entre Ulger, évêque d'Angers, et Pétronille de Chemillé, abbesse de Fontevraud', *Revue Mabillon* 58 (1972), pp.113-32

---, 'Renouveau de l'Église Angevine (an mil-1148)', *Histoire de Diocèse d'Angers*, ed. François Lebrun, *Histoire des diocèses de France* 13 (Paris, 1981), pp.19-42

Bigelow, Melville Madison, *History of Procedure in England from the Norman Conquest: The Norman Period (1066-1204)* (London, 1880)

Bisson, Thomas N., 'The Feudal Revolution', *Past and Present* 142 (Oxford, 1994), pp.6-42

---, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution. Reply', *Past and Present* 155 (1997), pp.208-34

---, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton NJ and Oxford, 2009)

Boase, Thomas S. R., 'Fontevrault and the Plantagenets', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 34 (1971), pp.1-10

Bouchard, Constance B., 'The origins of the French nobility: a reassessment', *AHR* 86 (1981), pp.501-32

---, 'Monastic Cartularies: Organizing Eternity', *Charters, Cartularies, and Archives: The Preservation and Transmission of Documents in the Medieval West*, ed. A. J. Kosto and A. Winroth (Toronto, 2002), pp.22-32

Boulton, D'Arcy J. D., 'Classic Knighthood as Nobiliary Dignity: The Knighting of

Counts' and Kings' Sons in England, 1066-1272', *Medieval Knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Strawberry Hill Conference, 1994*, ed. Stephen Church and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, 1995), pp.41-100

Bournazel, Éric, *Louis VI le Gros* (Paris, 2007)

Boussard, Jacques, *Le comté d'Anjou sous Henri Plantagenêt et ses fils (1151-1204)* (Paris, 1938)

---, 'La vie en Anjou aux XI^e et XII^e siècles', *Le Moyen Âge* 4th series, 5 (1950), pp.29-68

---, 'Le comté de Mortain au XI^e siècle', *Moyen Age* 58 (1952), p. 253-279

---, *Le gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt* (Paris, 1956)

---, 'Aspects particuliers de la féodalité dans l'Empire Plantagenêt', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de l'Ouest* 4th series, 7 (1963), pp.29-47

---, 'Le droit de *vicaria*, à la lumière de quelques documents angevins et tourangeaux', *Etudes de civilisation médiévale (IX^e-XII^e siècles): Mélanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande à l'occasion de son départ à la retraite et du XX^e anniversaire du C. E. S. C. M. par ses amis, ses collègues, ses élèves* (Poitiers, 1974), pp.39-54

Bouton, André, *Le Maine: histoire économique et sociale, des origines au XIV^e siècle* (2 vols., Le Mans, 1962)

Bradbury, Jim, 'Greek Fire in the West', *History Today* 29 (1979), pp.326-31

---, 'Fulk le Rechin and the origin of the Plantagenets', *Studies in Medieval History presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, Christopher Holdsworth and Janet Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp.27-41

---, 'Geoffrey V of Anjou, count and knight', *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood III: papers from the fourth Strawberry Hill conference, 1988*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge, 1990), pp.21-41

Brooke, Z. N. and C. N. L., 'Henry II, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine', *EHR* 61 (1946), pp.81-9

Brunner, Heinrich, *Die Entstehung der Schwurgerichte* (Berlin, 1872)

Bullock-Davies, Constance, 'Marie, Abbess of Shaftesbury, and her Brothers', *EHR* 80 (1965), pp.314-22

Burkholder, J. Peter, 'The "feudal revolution" and the lords of Durtal', *HSJ* 11 (2003), 85-96

Burton, Janet, 'English Monasteries and the Continent in the Reign of King Stephen', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.98-114

Callahan, Daniel F., 'Eleanor of Aquitaine, the Coronation Rite of the Duke of Aquitaine and the Cult of Saint Martial of Limoges', *The World of Eleanor of Aquitaine: Literature and Society in Southern France between the Eleventh and Thirteenth Centuries* (Woodbridge, 2005), ed. Marcus Bull and Catherine Léglu, pp.29-

Carré de Busserolle, Jacques-Xavier, *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et biographique d'Indre-et-Loire et de l'ancienne province de la Touraine* (6 vols., Tours, 1878-84)

Chartrou, Josèphe, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jerusalem et Geoffroi Plantagenêt* (Paris, 1928)

Chedeville, André and Tonnerre, Noël-Yves, *La Bretagne féodale, XI-XIII^e siècles* (Rennes, 1987)

Chibnall, Marjorie, 'The Empress Matilda and Bec-Hellouin', *ANS* 10 (1987), pp.35-48
---, *The Empress Matilda: queen consort, queen mother and lady of the English* (Oxford, 1991)

---, 'Military Service in Normandy before 1066', *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. Matthew Strickland (Woodbridge, 1992), pp.28-40

---, 'The charters of the Empress Matilda', *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp.276-98

---, 'Normandy', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Edmund King (Oxford, 1994), pp.93-115

---, 'L'avènement au pouvoir d'Henri II', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 37 (1994), pp.41-8

---, 'The Changing Expectations of a Royal Benefactor: The Religious Patronage of Henry II', *Religious and Laity in Western Europe, 1000-1300: Interaction, Negotiation and Power* (Turnhout, 2006), ed. Emilia Jamrozak and Janet Burton, pp.9-21

Christophe, Delphine, 'La plaque de Geoffroy Plantagenêt dans la cathédrale du Mans', *Hortus atrium medievalium* 10 (2004), pp.75-80

Clanchy, Michael, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066-1307* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1993)

Comte, François, 'Le quartier de la collégiale de Saint-Lézin d'Angers', in *Les chanoines dans la ville: recherches sur la topographie des quartiers canoniaux en France*, ed. Jean-Charles Picard (Paris, 1994), pp.109-14

Cook, Barrie J., 'En monnaie aiant cours: the monetary system of the Angevin Empire', *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500-1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, ed. Barrie J. Cook and Gareth Williams (Leiden and Boston, 2006), pp.617-86

Costen, M. D. and Oakes, C., *Romanesque Churches of the Loire and Western France* (Stroud, 2000)

Croenen, Godfried, 'Governing Brabant in the Twelfth Century: The Duke, his Household and the Nobility', *Secretum Scriptorum. Liber alumnorum Walter Prevenier*, ed. Wim Blockmans, Marc Boone and Thérèse de Hemptinne (Leuven-

Apeldoorn, 1999), pp.39-76

Crouch, David, 'Robert earl of Gloucester, and the Daughter of Zelophehad', *JMH* 11 (1985), pp.227-43

---, *The Beaumont Twins: The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1986)

---, *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300* (London, 1992)

---, 'A Norman *'conventio'* and bonds of lordship in the middle ages', *Law and government in medieval England and Normandy*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), pp.299-324

---, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (Harlow, 2000)

---, 'The origin of chantries: some further Anglo-Norman evidence', *JMH* 27 (2001), pp.159-80

---, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France, 900-1300* (Harlow, 2005)

---, 'King Stephen and Northern France', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.44-57

---, 'Between Three Realms: The Acts of Waleran II, Count of Meulan and Worcester', *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm: Papers Commemorating the 800th Anniversary of King John's Loss of Normandy*, ed. Nicholas Vincent (Woodbridge, 2009), pp.75-90

Cussonneau, Christian, 'Une famille de chevalerie saumuroise: les Roinard de Boumois', *Archives d'Anjou* 7 (2003), pp.5-23

Dalton, Paul, 'In neutro latere: the armed neutrality of Ranulf II earl of Chester in King Stephen's reign', *ANS* 16 (1992), pp.39-59

---, 'Allegiance and Intelligence in King Stephen's Reign', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.80-97

Davis, R. H. C, 'The authorship of the *Gesta Stephani*', *EHR* 77 (1962), pp.209-32

---, *King Stephen, 1135-1154* (London, 1967)

Delisle, Léopold, 'Notice sur un manuscrit de Saint-Laud d'Angers appartenant à M. le marquis de Villoutreys', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* (1898), pp.533-49

---, *Recueil des actes de Henri II, Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France* (Introduction, Paris, 1909)

Deyres, Marcel, *Maine roman* (La Pierre-qui-Vire, 1985)

Dieudonné, Alphonse, *Hildebert de Lavardin, Évêque du Mans, Archevêque de Tours (1056-1133): Sa vie, ses lettres* (Paris and Mamers, 1898)

Duby, Georges, *The Knight, the Lady and the Priest: The Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France*, trans. Barbara Bray (London, 1985)

Dunbabin, Jean, *France in the Making 843-1180* (2nd ed., New York, 2000)

---, 'Henry II and Louis VII', *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.47-84

Dutton, Kathryn, 'Ad erudiendum tradidit: the upbringing of Angevin comital children', *ANS* 32 (2010), pp.25-39

Van Engen, John, 'The "Crisis of Cenobitism" Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050-1150', *Speculum* 61 (1986), pp.269-304

Elias, Norbert, *The Court Society* (Oxford, 1983)

Everard, Judith, 'The "Justiciarship" in Brittany and Ireland', *ANS* 20 (1998), pp.87-105
---, *Brittany and the Angevins: Province and Empire, 1158-1202* (Cambridge, 2000)
---, 'Lay Charters and the *Acta* of Henry II', *ANS* 30 (2008), pp.100-16

Evergates, Theodore, *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne, 1100-1300* (Philadelphia PA, 2007)

Fanning, Steven, 'Acts of Henry I of France Concerning Anjou', *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp.110-14

Farmer, Sharon, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours* (Ithaca NY, 1991)

Favier, Jean, *Les Plantagenêts: origines et destin d'un empire, XI^e-XIV^e siècles* (Paris, 2004)

Flanders, Steve, *De Courcy: Anglo-Normans in Ireland, England and France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* (Dublin, 2008)

Flori, Jean, *L'Essor de la chevalerie XI^e-XII^e siècles* (Geneva, 1986)

Forsyth, George H., Jr., 'The Church of St. Martin at Angers: Roman, Merovingian and Carolingian Constructions', *Antiquity, a Quarterly Review of Archaeology* 11 (1937), pp.400-8

Garnett, George, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession, and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford, 2007)

Gazeau, Véronique *Normannia monastica* (2 vols., Caen, 2007)

Gillingham, John, *The Angevin Empire* (2nd ed., London, 2001)

Gleason, Sarell E., *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: The Bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204* (Cambridge MA, 1936)

Golding, Brian, 'The religious patronage of Robert and William of Mortain', *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. Richard Gameson and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford, 2001), pp.211-30

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England, c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974)

Grant, Lindy, *Abbot Suger of St-Denis: Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France* (Harlow, 1998)

---, 'Aspects of the Architectural Patronage of the Family of the Counts of Anjou in the Twelfth Century', *Anjou: Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. J. McNeill and D. Prigent (Journal of the British Archaeological Association, Leeds, 2003), pp.96-110

---, 'Geoffrey of Lèves, Bishop of Chartres: "famous wheeler and dealer in secular business"', *Suger en question: Regards croisés sur Saint-Denis*, ed. R. Grosse (Munich, 2004), pp.45-56

Green, Judith, 'Lords of the Norman Vexin', *War and Government in the Middle Ages*, ed. John Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp.47-61

---, *The Government of Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986)

---, 'Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State', *Historical Research* 63 (1989), pp.115-34

---, 'Financing Stephen's War', *ANS* 14 (1992)

---, 'The Piety and Patronage of Henry I', *HSJ* 10 (2001), pp.1-16

---, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 2006)

---, 'Networks and Solidarities at the Court of Henry I Beauclerc', *Liens personnels, réseaux, solidarités en France et dans les îles Britanniques (Xe-XXe siècles)*, ed. David Bates, Frédérique Lachaud and Véronique Gazeau (Paris, 2006), pp.113-26

Griffiths, Quentin, 'The Capetian Kings and St. Martin of Tours', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* new series 19 (1987), pp.85-133

Guillot, Olivier, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XI^e siècle* (2 vols., Paris, 1978)

---, 'A Reform of Investiture before the Investiture Struggle in Anjou, Normandy, and England', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.81-99

Hagger, Mark, 'The Norman *vicomte*, c.1035-1135: what did he do?', *ANS* 29 (2007), pp.65-83

---, 'The earliest Norman writs revisited', *Historical Research* 82 (2009), pp.181-205

Hallam, Elizabeth, 'Henry II as a Founder of Monasteries', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 28 (1977), pp.113-32

---, 'Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship in France and England', *JMH* 8 (1982), pp.359-80

Halphen, Louis, *Le comté d'Anjou au XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1906)

---, 'Prévôts et voyers du XI^e siècle dans la région angevine', *Moyen âge* 15 (1902), pp.319-30

Harben, Henry A., *A Dictionary of London* (London, 1918)

Haskins, Charles Homer, 'The Early Norman Jury', *AHR* 8 (1903), pp.613-40

---, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', *EHR* 27 (1912), pp.417-44

---, *Norman Institutions* (Cambridge MA, 1918)

Helmerichs, Robert, 'King Stephen's Norman Itinerary, 1137', *HSJ* 5 (1993), pp.89-97

---, 'Ad tutandos patriae fines: The Defense of Normandy, 1135', *The Normans et War: Essays in Honour of C. Warren Hollister*, ed. Richard Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach (Woodbridge, 2001), pp.129-48

---, 'Norman Institutions or Norman Legal Practices? Geoffrey le Bel and the Development of the Jury of Recognition', *HSJ* 10 (2003), pp.81-94

Hicks, Leonie V., *Religious Life in Normandy, 1050-1300: Space, Gender and Social Pressure* (Woodbridge, 2007)

Hicks, Sandy Burton, 'The Anglo-Papal Bargain of 1125: The Legatine Mission of John of Crema', *Albion* 8 (1976), pp.301-10

A History of the County of Berkshire, Victoria County History, ed. P. H. Ditchfield and William Page (4 vols., London, 1924)

Hollister, C. Warren, and Keefe, Thomas K., 'The Making of the Angevin Empire', *Journal of British Studies* 12 (1973), pp.1-25

Hollister, C. Warren and Baldwin, John, 'The Rise of Administrative Kingship: Henry I and Philip Augustus', *AHR* 83 (1978), pp.867-905

Hollister, 'Magnates and "Curiales" in Early Norman England', *Viator* 8 (1977), pp.63-81

---, *Henry I*, ed. Amanda Clark Frost (New Haven CT and London, 2001)

---, 'The Magnates of Stephen's Reign: Reluctant Anarchists', *HSJ* 5 (1993), pp.77-87

Holt, James Clarke, '1153: The Treaty of Winchester', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. Edmund King (Oxford, 1994), pp.291-316

Hyams, Paul R., 'Warranty and good lordship in twelfth-century England', *Law and History Review* 5 (1987), pp.437-503

Jaeger, C. Stephen, *The Origins of Courtliness – Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia, 1985)

Jessee, W. Scott, 'The Angevin Civil War and the Norman Conquest of 1066', *HSJ* 3 (1991), pp.101-9

---, 'Urban violence and the *coup d'état* of Fulk le Réchin in Angers, 1067', *HSJ* 7 (1997), pp.75-82

Johnson, Penelope, *Prayer, Power and Patronage: The Abbey of La Trinité, Vendôme, 1032-1187* (New York, 1981)

Jolliffe, John Edward Austin, *Angevin Kingship* (2nd ed., London, 1970)

Keats-Rohan, Katharine S. B., 'Two studies in northern French prosopography', *JMH* 20 (1994), pp.3-37

---, 'Bibliothèque municipale d'Avranches, 210: Cartulary of Mont Saint Michel', *ANS* 21 (1997), pp.97-112

---, *Domesday Descendants: a prosopography of persons occurring in English documents, 1066-1166. II, Pipe Rolls to Cartae Baronum* (Woodbridge, 2002)

Keefe, Thomas K., 'Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession', *Albion* 6 (1974), pp.266-74

---, *Feudal Assessments and the Political Community under Henry II and his Sons* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1983)

---, 'Place-Date Distribution of Royal Charters and the Historical Geography of Patronage at the Court of King Henry II Plantagenet', *HSJ* 2 (1990), pp.179-88

---, 'The courting game: rank order and witness clusters in the early charters of King Richard I, 1189-90', *HSJ* 1 (1989), pp.135-46

King, Edmund, 'King Stephen and the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy', *History Journal* 59 (1974), pp.180-94

---, 'The foundation of Pipewell Abbey', *HSJ* 2 (1990), pp.167-77

---, 'Stephen of Blois, Count of Mortain and Boulogne', *EHR* 115 (2000), pp.271-96

---, 'A Week in Politics: Oxford, late July 1141', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.58-79

---, *King Stephen* (New Haven, CT and London, 2010)

Koziol, Geoffrey, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca NY and London, 1992)

Langlois, Pierre, *Histoire du prieuré du Mont-aux-Malades lès Rouen* (Rouen, 1851)

Latham, R. E., *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources, with Supplement* (Oxford, 2004)

Latouche, Robert, *Histoire du comté du Maine pendant le X^e et le XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1910)

Leedom, Joe W., 'William of Malmesbury and Robert of Gloucester Revisited', *Albion* 6 (1974), pp.251-65

Lemarignier, Jean-François, 'Political and Monastic Structures in France at the end of the Tenth and the Beginning of the Eleventh Century', in Fredric L. Cheyette, *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe: Selected Readings* (New York, 1968), pp.100-127

Lemesle, Bruno, *La société aristocratique dans le Haut-Maine (XI^e-XII^e siècles)* (Rennes, 1999)

---, 'Le comte d'Anjou face aux rebellions (1129-1151)', *La vengeance, 400-1200*, ed. D. Barthélemy, F. Bougard and R. Le Jan (Rome, 2006), pp.199-236

---, 'Les enquêtes contre les épreuves: les enquêtes dans la région angevine (XII^e-début XIII^e siècle)', *L'Enquête au Moyen Âge*, ed. Claude Gavard (Rome, 2008), pp.41-74

Lewis, Suzanne *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora* (Aldershot, 1987)

Leyser, Henrietta, *Hermits and the New Monasticism: A Study of Religious Communities in Western Europe, 1000-1150* (London, 1984)

Livingstone, Elizabeth A., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2nd edn., Oxford, 2000)

Louise, Gérard, *La seigneurie de Bellême, X^e-XII^e siècles* (2 vols., Flers, 1992)

Luchaire, Achille, 'Hugues de Clers et le « De senescalcia Franciæ », *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge* III, ed. Luchaire (Paris, 1897), pp.1-38

Lyon, Jonathan R., 'Fathers and sons: preparing noble youths to be lords in twelfth-century Germany', *JMH* 34 (2008), pp.291-310

Maître, Léon, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Mayenne, comprenant les noms de lieu anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1878)

Marritt, Stephen, 'Royal souls, titles and superlatives in Anglo-Norman charters', *ANS* 32 (2010), pp.183-202

Martin, Henri, 'Autour de Thomas Pactius, prieur de la Collégiale de Loches', *Bulletin Trimestriel de la Société Archéologique de Touraine* 41 (1986), pp.389-95

Mason, Emma, 'Pro statu et incolumnitate regni mei: royal monastic patronage 1066-1154', *Studies in Church History* 18 (Oxford, 1982), pp.99-118

Martin, Henri, 'Autour de Thomas Pactius, prieur de la Collégiale de Loches', *Bulletin Trimestriel de la Société Archéologique de Touraine* 41 (1986), pp.389-95

Mayer, Hans Eberhard, 'The Succession to Baldwin II of Jerusalem: English Impact on the East', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 39 (1985), pp.139-47

---, 'Angevins versus Normans: The New Men of King Fulk of Jerusalem', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133 (1989), pp.1-25

Navel, Henri, 'L'Enquête de 1133 sur les Fiefs de l'Évêché de Bayeux', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie* 42 (1934), pp.5-80

Nelson, Janet L., 'Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?', *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: essays in honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), pp.15-28

Nicholas, Karen S., 'Countesses as Rulers in Flanders', *Aristocratic Women in Medieval France*, ed. Theodore Evergates (Philadelphia PA, 1999), pp.11-37

Norgate, Kate, *England under the Angevin Kings* (2 vols, New York, 1887, repr. 1969)

Pacaut, Marcel, *Louis VII et les élections épiscopales dans le royaume de France, 1137-1180* (Paris, 1957)

Le Paige, André René, *Dictionnaire topographique, historique, généalogique et bibliographique de la province du diocèse du Maine* (2 vols., Le Mans, 1777)

Painter, Sidney, 'Castellans of the Plain of Poitou in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Speculum* 31 (1951), pp.243-57

Panofsky, Erwin, *Tomb Sculpture: Four Lectures on Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*, ed. H. W. Janson (New York, 1992)

Le Patourel, John, *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet* (London, 1984)

Patterson, Robert B., 'William of Malmesbury's Robert of Gloucester: a re-evaluation of the *Historia novella*', *AHR* 70 (1965), pp.983-97

Peltzer, Jörg, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c.1140-c.1230* (Cambridge, 2008)

Pichot, Daniel, *Le Bas-Maine du X^e au XIII^e siècle: Étude d'une société* (Laval, 1995)

Pietri, Luce and Biharne, Jacques, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule: dès origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle V: Province ecclésiastique de Tours (Lugdunensis Tertia)* (Paris, 1987)

Poole, Austin Lane, 'Henry Plantagenet's Early Visits to England', *EHR* 47 (1932), pp.447-52

---, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1955)

Port, Célestin, *Dictionnaire historique, géographique et biographique du Maine-et-Loire* (3 vols., Paris, 1874-8)

Pouëssel, Jean, 'Les structures militaires du comté de Mortain (XI^e-XII^e siècles)', *Revue de l'Avranchin et du Pays de Granville* 58 (1981), pp.11-74, 81-156

Pouille, Béatrice, 'Savigny and England', *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Bates and Anne Curry (London, 1994), pp.159-68

Power, Daniel, 'What did the Frontier of Angevin Normandy comprise?', *ANS* 17 (1995), pp.181-201

---, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, 2004)

---, 'Angevin Normandy', *A Companion to the Anglo-Norman World*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Elisabeth Van Houts (Woodbridge, 2002)

Powicke, F. M., 'The Angevin Administration of Normandy' parts 1 and 2, *EHR* 21 (1906), pp.625-49 and 22 (1907), pp.15-42

---, 'The Honour of Mortain in the Norman *Infeudationes Militum* of 1172', *EHR* 26 (1911), pp.89-93

---, *The Loss of Normandy 1189-1204: Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire* (2nd ed., Manchester, 1960)

Rédet, Louis, *Dictionnaire topographique de la France* 27. *Dictionnaire topographique*

du département de la Vienne: comprenant les noms de lieu anciens et modernes (Paris, 1881)

Renoux, Annie, 'Châteaux, maisons fossoyées et baronnie dans le comté du Maine au XII^e et XIII^e siècles', *Les seigneuries dans l'espace Plantagenêt (c.1150-c.1250)*, ed. Martin Aurell and Frédéric Boutoulle (Bordeaux, 2009), pp.225-53

Reuter, Timothy, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution III', *Past and Present* 155 (1997), pp.177-95

Richard, Alfred, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou, 778-1204* (2 vols., Paris, 1903)

Riley-Smith, Jonathan, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge, 1997)

Runciman, Steven, *A History of the Crusades* (3 vols., London, 1990-91)

Sassier, Yves, *Louis VII* (Paris, 1991)

Senséby, Chantal, 'Une notice fausse du cartulaire de l'abbaye tourangelles de Noyers?', *BEC* 155 (1997), pp.61-94

Shopkow, Leah, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington DC, 1997)

Smith, Julia M. H., *Province and Empire: Carolingian Brittany* (Cambridge, 1992)

Southern, Richard W., *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, CT, 1953)

Spear, David S., *The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals during the Ducal Period, 911-1204* (London, 2006)

Stein, Henri, *Bibliographie générale des cartulaires françaises ou relatifs à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1907)

Stirnemann, Patricia, 'Two twelfth-century bibliophiles and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*', *Viator* 24 (1993), pp.121-42.

Tanner, Heather J., 'Reassessing King Stephen's Continental Strategies', *Medievalia et humanistica* n.s. 26 (1999), pp.101-17

Teunis, Henk B., *The Appeal to the Original Status: Social Justice in Anjou in the Eleventh Century* (Hilversum, 2006)

Thompson, Kathleen, 'Family and influence to the south of Normandy in the eleventh century: the lordship of Bellême', *JMH* 11 (1985), pp.215-26

---, 'William Talvas, Count of Ponthieu, and the Politics of the Anglo-Norman Realm', *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. David Bates and Anne Curry (London, 1994), pp.169-84

---, *Power and Border Lordship in Medieval France: The County of the Perche, 1000-*

1226 (Woodbridge, 2002)

---, 'Affairs of State: the illegitimate children of Henry I', *JMH* 29 (2003), pp.129-51

Tonnerre, Noël-Yves, 'Henri II et l'Anjou', *Plantagenêts et Capétiens: confrontations et heritages*, ed. Martin Aurell and Noël-Yves Tonnerre (Poitiers, 2006), pp.211-25

Turner, Ralph V., 'The problem of survival for the Angevin 'Empire': Henry II's and his sons' vision versus late twelfth-century realities', *AHR* 100 (1995), pp.78-96

Vale, Malcolm, *The Princely Court: Medieval Courts and Culture in North-West Europe 1270-1380* (Oxford, 2001)

Vincent, Nicholas, 'Warin and Henry fitz Gerald: the origins of the Fitzgeralds revisited', *ANS* 21 (1999), pp.233-60

---, 'Regional variations in the charters of King Henry II (1154-89)', *Charters and Charter Scholarship in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Marie-Thérèse Flanagan and Judith Green (Basingstoke, 2005), pp.70-106

---, 'The Court of Henry II', *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Nicholas Vincent and Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.278-334

---, 'King Henry II and the Poitevins', *La cour Plantagenêt (1154-1204): actes du colloque tenu à Thouars du 30 avril à 2 mai 1999*, ed. Martin Aurell (Poitiers, 2002), pp.103-35

---, 'Hugh de Gundeville (fl. 1147-1181)', *Records, Administration and Aristocratic Society in the Anglo-Norman Realm: Papers Commemorating the 800th Anniversary of King John's Loss of Normandy*, ed. idem (Woodbridge, 2009), pp.125-52

Walker, Rose, 'Leonor of England, Plantagenet queen of King Alfonso VIII of Castile, and her foundation of the Cistercian abbey of Las Huelgas. In imitation of Fontevraud?', *JMH* 31 (2005), pp.346-68

Warren, W. L., *Henry II* (new ed., New Haven CT and London, 2000)

White, Graeme, 'King Stephen, Duke Henry and Ranulf de Gernons', *EHR* 91 (1976) pp.555-65

White, Stephen D., *Custom, kinship and gifts to saints: the laudatio parentum in Western France, 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill NC and London, 1988)

---, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution II', *Past and Present* 152 (1996), pp.205-23

Wickham, Chris, 'Debate: the Feudal Revolution IV', *Past and Present* 155 (1997), pp.197-208

Wightman, Wilfrid E., *The Lacy Family in England and Normandy, 1066-1194* (Oxford, 1966)

Wormald, Francis, 'An Eleventh-Century Copy of the Norman Laudes Regiae', *BIHR* 37 (1964)

Ziezulewicz, William, 'The Fate of Carolingian Military Exactions in a Monastic Fisc:

The Case of Saint-Florent-De-Saumur (ca.950-1118)', *Military Affairs* 51 (1987), pp.124-7

3. Websites

Anglo-Norman Anonymous, The Haskins Society for Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, Angevin and Viking History, <http://www.haskins.cornell.edu/archive.html>

Carte de France or 'Carte de Cassini', www.cassini.ehess.fr (L'École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris)

CartulR – Répertoire des cartulaires médiévaux et modernes, ed. Paul Bertrand, Ædilis, Publications scientifiques, 3 (Orléans, Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, 2006), <http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/index/>

Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis, Charles du Fresne, sieur du Cange *et al* (10 vols., Niort, 1883-7), <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/>

Lands of the Normans, <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/normans/casestudies.shtml>

Medieval Lands, Foundation for Medieval Genealogy, <http://fmg.ac/Projects/MedLands/>

Richard Sharpe, *Anglo-Norman Royal Acta*, <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/sharpe/index.htm#anglonorman>

4. Reviews

Davis, R. H. C., review of T. A. M. Bishop, *Scriptores Regis: Facsimiles to identify and illustrate the hands of royal scribes in original charters of Henry I, Stephen, and Henry II* (Oxford, 1961), in *EHR* 77 (1962), pp.321-3

Holt, J. C., review of Wightman, *The Lacy Family*, *Economic History Review* 20 (1967), pp.385-6

Keats-Rohan, Katharine S. B., review of Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra*, *EHR* 111 (1996), pp.668-9

Koziol, Geoffrey, review of Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra*, *Speculum* 70 (1995), pp.332-4

Noble, Thomas F. X., review of Bachrach, *Fulk Nerra*, *Journal of Military History* 58 (1994), pp.319-20

5. Unpublished dissertations and theses

Bienvenu, Jean-Marc, 'Les premiers temps de Fontevraud, 1101-1189: Naissance et evolution d'une ordre religieux', Thèse de doctorat (3 vols., Sorbonne, 1980)

Conyers, Patrick, 'Changing Habits: the Early Years of Savigny's Congregation and its Dealings with the Cistercians, 1105-80', PhD dissertation (University of Iowa, 2001)

Hudson, John, 'Legal aspects of seignorial control of land in the century after the Norman Conquest', D. Phil thesis (Oxford, 1988)

Sourice, Gaëtan, 'L'abbaye cistercienne du Loroux (1121-1370): Essai de reconstitution du patrimoine (formation et gestion)', Mémoire de maîtrise (2 vols., Université d'Angers, 1996)

Pavard, Étienne, 'Le personnel d'origine angevine dans le gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt. Essai d'étude prosopographique', Mémoire de maîtrise (Université d'Angers, 1994)

Waldman, Thomas G., 'Hugh 'of Amiens', archbishop of Rouen, 1130-1164', D. Phil thesis (University of Oxford, 1971)

GEOFFREY, COUNT OF ANJOU AND DUKE OF NORMANDY, 1129-51

KATHRYN DUTTON

APPENDICES

CONTENTS AND NOTE ON TEXT

APPENDIX I	Comital and ducal <i>acta</i> , 1129-51
APPENDIX II	The Bayeux Inquests
APPENDIX III	The conflict with Bishop Ulger of Angers
APPENDIX IV	Post-9 th September 1151 references to lost <i>acta</i>
APPENDIX V	Letters, 1129-51
APPENDIX VI	<i>Acta</i> , 1129-51, petitioned for or witnessed by Geoffrey

NOTE ON TEXT

This calendar of texts is arranged alphabetically, by beneficiary, and details of their geographical and diocesan locations supplied. References to Chartrou's catalogue of *acta* are provided in smaller numbers adjacent to the main number where necessary.

Manuscripts have been lettered and ordered according to their date. 'A' has been used only where the existence of an original manuscript is attested, either by its survival or by reliable references to lost texts.

Details of dating and witnesses have been provided in full, with the exception of the acts catalogued in Appendix IV (later confirmations of lost acts) as all of these texts are printed in full and discussed elsewhere, and the witnesses and dates of issue are all posterior to Geoffrey's reign. The only exception is Appendix IV, no.14, which reproduces the witnesses and sureties to Geoffrey's original charter in favour of the men of Rouen in 1144.

Transcriptions have been provided where possible and where no published edition exists. Abbreviations have been silently expanded; where doubt exists over transcription, triangular brackets have been used. Square brackets denote more precise identification of individuals suggested by the author.

Occupational names and titles have been left in the original Latin, with the exception of common titles such as bishop, abbot, count and duke. Toponymics have, where possible, been translated into their modern French equivalents. Where doubt exists, the original Latin has been included.

Geoffrey's titles (count, duke) have been provided for each text in the order in which they appear.

Every effort has been made to supply complete lists of the manuscripts in which these texts appear, but there are without doubt some omissions and errors which will need to be rectified through future archival work. Where possible these have been noted.

APPENDIX V

LETTERS

To Henry, Geoffrey's son

- 1 153 Letter summarising an agreement arbitrated by the count between the abbeys of Saint-Julien, Tours, and La Trinité, Vendôme, over three chapels in Anjou. Confirms that Robert, abbot of La Trinité, has the right to the chapels. Exhorts Henry to fulfil his duties as protector of the abbey, which was founded by Geoffrey's ancestors. Angers, January × 15th February 1145, or very soon after.

B = s.xviii copy from lost sealed original, Paris BnF Latin 5419 (copies of La Trinité charters by Gaignières), p.101.

Printed CTV II, no.501; CSJ I, no.87; DB I, no.4* (Delisle no. 2*).

Date: the dating of this letter depends upon the versions of the same agreement drawn up by the abbot of Saint-Julien (CSJ I, no.85; CTV II, no.500) and the archbishop of Tours (CSJ I, no.86; CTV II, no.502). Both are dated 1144, and, like this letter, name Robert as abbot of La Trinité. Robert's predecessor Hubert died on 19th March 1144 (Johnson, *Prayer, Power and Patronage*, p.188; cf. GC VIII, col.1170, which gives 1145 in error), so the agreements, and Geoffrey's letter, must postdate this.

This letter is also posterior to the investiture of William of Passavant as bishop of Le Mans, sometime in January 1145, after a vacancy of six months following the death of Bishop Hugh (APC, pp.442, 454-5, states that Hugh succeeded Guy of Ploërmel on 7th February 1136, the day of Guy's death, and held his post for seven years, four months and seventeen days).

Geoffrey does not use the ducal title here, but he is referred to as duke by Aimery, abbot of La Trinité, in his version of the agreement (*Facta est autem hec concordia Andegavis, in presentia domni Goffridi, illustris Normannorum ducis et Andegavorum comitis*).

From Hildebert of Lavardin, archbishop of Tours

- 2 112 Letter to Count Geoffrey advising against his planned pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella due to local difficulties, particularly the hostility of Duke William of Aquitaine. c.1131.

Printed, PL CLXXI, col. 181D, epistola XV; RHGF XV, p.327. Extract (in translation), Richard W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven CT, 1953), p.95.

Date: undated. This frequently-discussed letter fills in several gaps in John of Marmoutier's account of events in southern Anjou in the early 1130s, and is especially important in the absence of extant charters for the 1129-33 period. As Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp.57-8, noted, it should be read in conjunction with another, slightly later letter written by Hildebert, this time to Henry I, in which he expresses his happiness at Henry and Geoffrey's reconciliation (PL 171, col. 272, ep. XLVI).

From the Knights Templar, Jerusalem

- 3 134 Letter to Count Geoffrey commending one of the Knights Templar to

him. c.1140?

B = s.xii³⁻⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 848B (formerly MS 760), Ronceray cartulary roll 6, no.59.

Printed *Ronceray*, no.388.

Date: undated; during the period as count but not duke. This letter, asking Geoffrey to take in one of the canons of the Temple, is printed in the Ronceray cartulary and dated there to c.1140 by Marchegay, accepted by Chartrou.

To and from Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis

- 4 189 Letter from Duke and Count Geoffrey to Suger, informing him that he is unable to attend a council at Beaugency due to illness. Probably late 1148.

Printed *PL* CLXXXVI, col. 1351C, epistola VIII; *RHGF* XV, pp.493-4, no.XXIX.

Note: Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.169, n.77: 'This letter is the key to understanding the chronology for these events.'

- 5 190 Letter from Duke and Count Geoffrey to Suger, informing him that he has recovered and is ready to listen to King Louis' command. Probably late 1148.

Printed *PL* CLXXXVI, col. 1364D, epistola XXXVII; *RHGF* XV, p.494, no.XXXII.

- 6 225 Letter from Suger to Duke and Count Geoffrey and the Empress Matilda, promising his diplomatic help with King Louis VII and asking for protection for Saint-Denis. Apparently 1150.

Printed *PL* CLXXXVI, col. 1419D, epistola CLIII; *RHGF* XV, pp.520-1, no.CII.

Dating: though Geoffrey is addressed as duke, Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p.285, n.46, dates this letter to the period after Henry's investiture and Geoffrey's recovery of La Nue.

- 7 226 Letter from Count Geoffrey to Suger, discussing a meeting with King Louis VII to bring an end to hostilities. After January 1150.

Printed *PL* CLXXXVI, col. 1427C, epistola CLXVII; *RHGF* XV, p.521, no.CIII.

Dating: after the cession of the ducal title to Henry.

- 8 230 Letter from Suger to Count Geoffrey, in response to the previous letter, informing him that Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, Count Thierry of Flanders and Suger had persuaded King Louis VII not to assemble his army, and that negotiations continued. After January 1150.

Printed *PL* CLXXXVI, col. 1429A, epistola CLXVIII; *RHGF* XV, p.522, no.CV.

Dating: incorrectly dated post-28th October 1150 by Chartrou (her dating of the cession of the ducal title).

APPENDIX I

ACTA, 1129-51

Almenèches, female Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Mortrée (dioc. Sées).

- 1 166 Notification by Count and Duke Geoffrey to Fulk of Alnou and Robert of Neuville of his confirmation of the abbess's customs in the ducal forest of Gouffern (Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Exmes). 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xiii copy, Rouen BM MS 1235 (formerly Y201, 'Cartulaire normand', Stein 2754), f.26r. C = *ibid.*, ff.37v-38r.

Printed Léchaudé d'Anisy, *Grands rôles des Echiquiers de Normandie* (Paris, 1845), p.167; Léopold Delisle, *Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, saint Louis et Philippe le Hardi* (Paris, 1882), p.2, no.4, and p.273; *RRAN* III, no.17.

Witnesses: Reginald of Saint-Valéry; unnamed others.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period. Delisle and Chartrou date it to c.1145.

Note: this document was confirmed by Henry; the copy of his confirmation on f.26r of B has the intitulation *H' dux Norm' et comes Andeg' filius* (and indeed *comes* is ungrammatical here); another copy on f.37v reads *H' dux Norman' et com' andeg' filius*. It is printed in *RRAN* III, no.18, where the titles are altered to *Henricus ducis Normannorum et comitis Andegavorum filius* and dated to 1146×50. It is possible that *dux* was intended, which would date the confirmation to January 1150 × September 1151.

Angers, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Aubin Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

- 2 109 Notice of rights circumscribed by Count Geoffrey in the monks' forest following an inspection of previously granted comital charters. Beaufort (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers), 29th May 1129.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy by Roger de Gaignières, BnF Latin 17126, p.325.

Printed CSA II, no.932; Paul Marchegay, *BEC* 36, p.426.

Witnesses: *Huic visioni, huic auditioni, huic limitationi cum Gosfredo comite affuerunt proceres*: Rainier of Fougeré (*de Fulgeriaco*); Geoffrey fitz Fulcrade; Roland of Montrevault; Carbonel of Saint-Michel; Pagan Borrell and his brother Peloquin of Luigné. Abbot Robert of Saint-Aubin, with monks Geoffrey *de Trochia*; Geoffrey *de Cellula*; Reginald *Recordellus*; and *famuli* Reginald *vitulus*; Artuis *cementarius*; Gosbert *cocus*; Peloquin of Saint-Jean; Stephen *Diabellus*; Froger fitz Fulcrade.

De ministris siquidem comitis et forestariis et sagittariis: Robin, *prepositus* of Beaufort; Bernard *venator*; Geoffrey *Malmuchon*; David *de Lorria*; Pagan *de Focario*; Adelin *Corda*; William *Bobels*; Andrew *Gibosus*; Reginald *Marescot*; Theobald *de Ruella*; Lohald; John *forestarius*; Adelard *de Chimentis*; Aimery fitz Godfrey.

Dating: *Hoc actum est anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXXIX indictione VII, IV kalendas junii.*

Note: although this notice was inserted in the section dealing with Trèves by the cartulary's

editor, it was not in the original cartulary, and in fact deals with Saint-Aubin's rights in general, rather than specific privileges pertaining to the priory of Saint-Mathieu of Trèves.

- 3 128 Notice detailing the history of the dispute between the monks and a knight, Gosbert Alelini, over villa Prisciniacus, and the sentence passed and proclaimed by Count Geoffrey at a session of the comital court in the church of Saint-Laud. Angers, in the cloister of Saint-Laud, 25th August 1139.

B = later insertion to s.xii cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 829 (formerly MS 745, Stein 121).
Printed, CSA I, no.9 (A9), with a note that the text was added the cartulary after its initial compilation (and see introduction to CSA I, pp.viii-ix).

Adjudicators: Count Geoffrey (*domnus Gaufridus comes filius Fulchonis regis*); Bishop Ulger of Angers; Abbot Matthew of Saint-Florent; Thomas, the count's chaplain; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Pippin [of Tours], *prepositus*; Witerd *de Buignone*; Galvan *de Troata*; Geoffrey of La Poissonière.

Witnesses: Abbot Robert of Saint-Aubin with his monks, Brian the almoner; Geoffrey the treasurer (*thesaurarius*); Christian of Saint-Maurille.

De clericis: Master Guy, the bishop's chaplain.

De laicis: Galvan of Chemillé and unnamed others.

Dating: *Hoc autem iudicium in capitulo Sancti Laudi factum recitavit ipse Gaufridus comes in claustrum ejusdem Sancti coram superius nominatis personis, anno Domini M C XXX VIII indictione secunda, IX kalendas septembris.*

- 4 Notice concerning the agreement between the abbey and Pagan of Clairvaux and Hugh of Pocé, arbitrated by Count Geoffrey in the comital court, over customs at the abbey's holding of Bor' in the villa of Champigny (now Souzay-Champigny, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Saumur-Sud), the site of the abbey's priory of Champigny-le-Sec. Pagan and Hugh are to retain rights to three forfeits of *furto*, *homicidio* and *incendio*; the monks are quit of all other customs in return for an annual payment of 15s. Angers, 1142.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126 (with seal drawing), p.65.
Printed, CSA II, no.674.

Witnesses: Abbot Robert of Saint-Aubin; Abbot Hervey of Saint-Serge; Abbot Fulk of Pontron.

De clericis (cathedral of Saint-Maurice) Richard, dean of Saint-Maurice; Grafionus *cantor*; Norman and Ralph, archdeacons; Master Vaslet; Master Arnulf - canons. Engelbald fitz Marcoard; Gerald; Garsilius - monks.

De militibus: Theobald of Blazon; Andrew of Doué; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Absalon Roonaud; Ralph of Gré; Loel *Ferlus* (*Ferli*); Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh and Fulk, his brothers; Peter fitz Letard; Burchard of Mareuil; Burreius *laicus*.

Dating: *Actum Andecavis, anno Domini M C XLII, indictione V.*

Note: terminates with a further clause, *Ego Gaufridus Andecavorum comes hoc concessi et sigilli mei impressione confirmavi. Terminus quindecim solidorum est ad festum Beate Marie, medio Augusti.*

- 5 143 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey, at the request of Bishop Ulger and Abbot Robert, of the monks' rights over the forest of Chédon and the curtis of Varennes (now Varennes-sur-Loire, Maine-et Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Allonnes). Baugé, 1143, after 7th July.

A = original, lost. B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126, p.327.
Printed CSA II, no.933.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs, *consiliarius meus*; his brother Hugh of Clefs; Absalon Roonard; Brian of Martigné; Oliver of Neuville; Borell of Plessis; Walter *Femaute*; Simon of Châtillon, the count's chamberlain (*camerarius meus*); Fulk the chamberlain; Gorron the chamberlain; Geoffrey fitz Durand the chamberlain.

Dating: *Actum est hoc apud Balgiacum anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXLIII.* Bishop Ulger was in Rome from at least November 1142 until at least 7th July 1143, but had returned to Angers by the end of the year (Bienvenu, 'Conflit', pp.126-7).

- 6 144 Grant by Count Geoffrey of exemption from customs at Pruniers (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Angers-6, comm. Bouchemaine). Angers, 1143.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126, p.128.
Printed CSA II, no.898.

Witnesses: as for no.5.

Dating: *Actum est hoc apud Andegavim anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXLIII.*

Note: given for the safety of the count's son Henry (*Hoc autem totum perdono pro Dei amore et anime mee et antecessorum meorum remedio, necnon et incolumitate Henrici filii mei*). The witnesses are the same as no.5, but the forms are the names have shifted towards the vernacular.

- 7 233 Diploma of Count Geoffrey restoring the privileges granted to Saint-Aubin by Geoffrey I and usurped by Gerald Berlay. Angers, in the abbey, 10th June 1151.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126, p.175.
Printed, CSA II, no.864; DB I, no.18*; RRAN III, no.19.

Witnesses: (1) *Actum...in presentia:* Bishop Norman of Angers; Abbot Robert of Toussaint, *tempore Rotberti Sancti Albini abbatis.*

Videntibus et audientibus istis: Geoffrey and William, the count's sons; Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh, his brother; Fulk of Clefs; Brian of Martigné; Warin of Bellême; Joscelin of Tours; Bareius *de Saceio*; Pippin of Tours *et aliis multis.*

De clericis: Master Vaslet, archdeacon; Geoffrey *Bibevinum*; Thomas the chaplain; Geoffrey, dean of Saint-Laud; Peter fitz Fulbert.

De monachis: Abbot Robert of Saint-Aubin; Warin the prior; William *sacrista*; John *elemosinarius*; Mainier *cellarius*; Theoderic *pannetarius*; William of Dol *bajulus totoque conventu.*

De familia monachorum: Arraud; Pagan *de Alodis*; Gaignard *de Sartrino*; Benedict *famulus*; Brian.

(2) Subscribed and sealed by Geoffrey's son Henry, *coram his testibus:* Guy of Sablé; Geoffrey his nephew; Joscelin of Tours; Pippin of Tours; Bonellus; Walter Fraser; Odo *Summeterrensi.*

Dating: *Actum in capitulo Sancti Albini, in presentia Normanni Andecavensis pontificis et Roberti abbatis Omnium Sanctorum, tempore Rotberti Sancti Albini abbatis, anno ab incarnatione Domini MCLI, indictione XIV, IV idus junii.* After the destruction of Gerald's castle of Montreuil-Bellay in 1151 (*St-Aubin*, p.36).

Though the text does not expressly state that this diploma was granted as soon as Montreuil fell, Broussillon (*CSA II*, p.221, n.2) suggests that Geoffrey returned to Angers with Gerald and his other prisoners as soon as the siege ended, which he dates to 9th June on the strength of this charter. The siege in fact appears to have ended at least several days before 10th June; the so-called 'Méron Chronicle', a sermon of sorts which appears to have been composed soon after the events it describes, states that Geoffrey first took Gerald and the prisoners to Saumur, where at least one night was spent. Then, after a short time (*post modicum vero temporis*), Geoffrey, along with Bishop Norman of Angers who witnessed this charter, came to meet Abbot Robert at Saint-Aubin as described in this diploma (*Chron. des églises*, pp.87-90).

Note: witnessed by Geoffrey and William, the count's sons. Witnessed, sealed and confirmed by Henry (*Hoc signum feci ego Hainricus et hanc cartam sigilli mei impressione confirmavi*); *signa* of Henry (*signum Hainrici ducis Normannorum et comitis Andecavorum*), Geoffrey and William, *filiis comitis*. Terminates with Geoffrey's comital seal (*Ego Gaufridus comes Andecavorum, hoc concessi in capitulo Sancti Albini et sigilli mei impressione confirmavi*).

The description *Hainrici ducis Normannorum et comitis Andecavorum* should read *Hainrici ducis Normannorum et comitis Andecavorum filii*, if the diploma in its entirety was issued before Geoffrey's death. It seems, in fact, that Henry confirmed the diploma after his father's death; the order of subscriptions appears to have been garbled by copyists. In *RRAN III* the editors have put Geoffrey jr. and William's *signa* before Henry's. This possibility is corroborated by the 'Méron Chronicle', which states that only Geoffrey jr. and William were present at the ceremony at Saint-Aubin with their father (*Méron*, p.89).

**- Dependent priory of Notre-Dame and Saints-Gervais-et-Protais, Gouis
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Durtal (dioc. Angers).**

8 228 Notice of a decision made against a knight, Gofferius, who had constructed a mill in the parish of Seiches-sur-le-Loir to the detriment of the abbey's priory at Gouis. January 1150 × 25th March or 16th April 1151.

B = fragmentary s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126, p.122.
Printed, *CSA II*, no.803.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Engelard *prefectus* of Angers.

Dating: *anno MCL*, during Geoffrey's time as count but not duke, and apparently after the destruction of Montreuil-Bellay c.9th June 1151 (*De quo cum orta esset calumnia hanc fregit Gaufridus comes, qui Mosteriolum destruxit, anno MCL*); cf. no.7, above.

Even allowing for a New Year style beginning on 25th March or Easter, the year 1150 by this calculation would have ended before the fall of Montreuil, as Easter Sunday 1151 fell on 16th April. The text only exists in a much later copy, and it appears that the reference to the destruction of the castle was probably inserted between the twelfth and the seventeenth centuries.

**- Dependent priory of Saint-Aubin, Les Alleuds
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Thouarcé (dioc. Angers).**

9 146 Notice drawn up by the monks detailing the order given by Count Geoffrey to Engressus, seneschal of Brissac, to cease his incursions

against the monks at the abbey's priory of Les Alleuds, and the eventual outcome in Geoffrey's court in the monks' favour. Angers, 12th February 1144; Angers, in the count's chamber, 13th February × April 1144; soon after 23rd April 1144.

A = original, ADML H197 (documents pertaining to the priory of Les Alleuds), f.465. B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Latin 17126, f.148.
Printed CSA II, no.627.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh of Pocé; Reginald *de Rupe*, *et multis aliis*.
De monachis: Peter, prior; Oliver.

Dating: (1) *prima dominica Quadragesime ... comitem, qui tunc Andecavis morabatur*; (2) *Actum Andecavis in thalamo comitis anno Dei MCXLIII, indictione VI*; (3) *Post adeptum Normannie ducatum dux et comes, sigilli mei impressione idem confirmavi*.

Note: although dated 1143, 6th Indiction, this notice records a series of events which began formally on the first Sunday of Lent 1144, that is 12th February, when the *prepositus* of Les Alleuds, Oliver, brought the case before Geoffrey, 'who was at that time delayed in Angers'. 6th Indiction 1143 began in autumn 1143 and included the period of both the Annunciation (25th March 1144) and Easter (26th March 1144). Geoffrey declared in favour of the monks, but the seneschal, Engressus, refused to accept this verdict. The second stage of this document, therefore, discusses the assembling of a panel of impartial (*media equitate*) judges to examine whether Geoffrey's verdict was unjust. This possibility was enough to bring Engressus to terms and to accept the original verdict. This was ratified by the drawing up of the document and its recital in the count's chamber or treasury (*thalamum*) in Angers. Although this stage is only dated to 1143 (i.e. 1144), it seems to have been fairly soon after the initial complaint from Oliver. The final clause of the document indicates that this was indeed the case, by stating that it went through a third stage, the application of Geoffrey's seal *after* the conquest of Normandy. It is clear that he did not confirm and seal the document at the same time, as he is styled only *comes* in the concession clause ('Ego ... hoc concessi'); the clause mentioning the seal states that he had not only conquered Normandy but also assumed the ducal title ('Post adeptum vero Normannie ducatum dux et comes...'). Nevertheless, this must have been very soon after the concession itself; 'post adeptum ... ducatum' suggests that the securing of Normandy had been a recent event (cf. Chartrou, p.293, dating the sealing post-1144). Although certain charters issued by Angevin supporters describe Geoffrey as duke before April 1144, this document makes clear that Normandy had been fully conquered by the time of the addition of the final clause. This breaking-down of this charter indicates that Geoffrey was not present for the entirety of the siege of the Tower of Rouen, corroborating the evidence of other charters.

**- Dependent priory of Saints-Gervais-et-Protais, Brion
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Beaufort-en-Vallée (dioc. Angers).**

10 133 Notice of Count Geoffrey's order to Goscius, *prepositus* of Beaufort, to cease his continued violations of the monks' possessions at L'Ailleraie (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Beaufort-en-Vallée, comm. Brion).¹ The boundary of the monks' land is to be determined. 1140.

B = s.xvii cartulary copy, ADML H224 (Brion cartulary, Stein 640), no.8.
Printed, CSA II, no.644.

Witnesses: *Huic autem jussioni sive fossati divisioni interfuerunt isti:* Goscius of Beaufort; Joscelin *de Brellio*, *prepositi* [sic] of Baugé; Pagan *de Faerio*; Warin *mercerius*; Warin; Gislerius;

¹ Given in the text as *Alliolata*; cf. CSA III, p.9, the entry for *Allolia*, consisting of land and a mill near Brion. For L'Ailleraie, a watermill c.2km from Brion, see Port, *Dictionnaire* I, p.5.

Geoffrey de Chuce.²

Dating: *Factum est igitur juxta imperium comitis, anno Domini MCXL indictione tertia.*

**- Dependent priory of Saint-Macé, Trèves
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Gennes (dioc. Angers).**

- 11 Confirmation by Count and Duke Geoffrey of grants made by Geoffrey Fulcradi, lord of Trèves and Hamelin, abbot of Saint-Aubin, at the foundation and dedication of Saint-Aubin's priory of Saint-Macé at Trèves. Probably 1135 or before.

B = s.xv-xviii French summary, Angers BM MS 863 (formerly 775, compilation of items relating to Benedictine abbeys and priories in Anjou, improperly paginated), section containing inventory of titles relating to Saint-Macé, f.1v.

Confirmation of revenues from tolls and other customs granted by Geoffrey Fulcradi at the priory's foundation and subsequent dedication (on 12 kalends May 1123) by the bishop of Angers, Rainald of Martigné; confirmation of a measure of wine and a measure of wheat granted to Prior Warin by Abbot Hamelin of Saint-Aubin.

An initial confirmation is first attributed to 'Foulques le jeune comte et roi de Jerusalem', but erroneously dated to 1136. A second confirmation 'avec son sceau' is attributed to 'Geoffroi comte d'Anjou et duc de Normandie fils dud[it] Foulque', and oddly dated to 1291.

Witnesses: none given.

Dating: Aimery of Loudun was lord of Trèves by 1135 (see below, nos. 39, 42, 46, 107). The use of the ducal title is not a reliable indicator of date given the summarised form of the text and its late provenance.

- 12 Confirmation by Count and Duke Geoffrey of Hugh of Pocé's consent of his brother Geoffrey of Pocé's consent to Geoffrey Fulcradi's grant of a measure of grain from a mill at Sarcé to Saint-Aubin's monks at Saint-Macé.

B = s.xv-xviii French summary, Angers BM MS 863, section containing inventory of titles relating to Saint-Macé, f.2.

'Accord entre Hugues de Pocé et les moines de St-Aubin touchant led(it) muid de bled, confirma par Geoffroi, comte d'Anjou et duc de Normandie, fils de Foulques roi de Jerusalem.'

Witnesses: none given.

Dating: perhaps during the ducal period, but uncertain, as the use of the ducal title is not a reliable indicator of date given the summarised form of the text and its late provenance.

² Probably Cucé (*Cutiaco*), Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Baugé, comm. Cuon.

Note: the inventory (ff.1v-2) notes that Geoffrey fitz Fulcrade granted the monks a measure of grain from a mill at Sarcé and rights to *vinage* revenues in the land of Saint-Florent. The alienation of the measure of grain was consented to by Geoffrey of Pocé, and subsequently confirmed by his brother Hugh in a separate agreement with the monks of Saint-Aubin. This agreement was then confirmed (f.2) by Count Geoffrey.

The location of Sarcé is unclear: it is possibly the modern commune of Sarcé in the Anjou/Maine border region (Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, arr. Mayet), but one would perhaps expect a small revenue in kind to be drawn from a mill close to the priory, situated just 1km from the castle of Trèves.

Geoffrey of Pocé went on to grant a second measure of grain from the mill in his own right, in order that the monks would say prayers for his brother Hugh, who had died from a sword wound ('Hugue de Pocé qui avait été tué d'un coup d'épée', f.2).

- Dependent priory of Saint-Martin, Luché
Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Le Lude, comm. Luché-Pringé (dioc. Angers)

- 13 Notice of settlement reached in Count Geoffrey's court at Baugé concerning a dispute between the monks of the priory and John Chamailard over the priory's rights and customs. Baugé, 9th June × 7th September 1151.

A = original, in poor state, in the *cabinet de M. Chappée*; formerly sealed with the comital seal.³
Printed, CSA III, no.949.

Witnesses: (to the eventual outcome, *ante comitem Baugeio*) William, bishop of Le Mans; Reginald Rufus; Geoffrey of Clefs; Joscelin of Tours; Hugh [of Clefs], *siniscallus*; Lunell; William *Burcardi*; Hardouin of Mayet.

De parte vero monachorum: Abbot Robert; Warin, prior; John, *elemosinarius*; Ernulf *de Intramis*; Mainer, *cellarius*; Hilary, prior of La Flèche; Turpin, prior of Luché; William of Dol, *bajulus*; Fulk, prior of Saint-Colombe; Benedict *famulus*; Pagan of Les Alleuds (*Alodis*).

Dating: *anno domini [MC]LI, indictione XIII, capto Mosteriolo*; the agreement was formalised after the fall of Montreuil-Bellay and before Geoffrey's death. The judgment was in fact reached during the siege of Montreuil-Bellay (*judicium quod factum fuerat in obsidione Mosterioli*). Geoffrey has the comital but not ducal title.

Angers, female Benedictine abbey of Sainte-Marie (Le Ronceray)
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

- 14 110 Cartulary notice of the permission given by Count Geoffrey to the abbess of Ronceray to build upon two arpents of land in the parish of Saint-Gilles, at Avrillé (cant. Angers Nord-Ouest), which had been given to the nunnery by Fulk V before his departure for Jerusalem. In return, she must accept one of Geoffrey le Rasle's daughters into the nunnery. Exemption granted from all customs except *hostis*. Angers, 1129.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 846 (formerly MS 760), third roll of Ronceray cartulary, no.8.
Printed, *Ronceray*, no.89.

³ Most though not all of the Chappée manuscripts are now in the BnF, and await classification.

Witnesses: Galvan of Chemillé; Geoffrey of Doué; Aimery his brother; Robert *Papans Bovem*; Adam of Rochefort; Pagan *Chamaillart*; Hugh of Pocé; Silvester of Bollé; Warin his brother.
Ex parte nostra [nuns]: Ralph *sacrista*; Babin *capellanus*; Pagan of Saint-Gilles [Avrillé]; Abbess Hildeburga; Verzelina; Isilia; Amelina *de Cholet*; Warin of Loudun; Barbot *villicus*; Boselin *dapifer*; Ascelin *Rufus*; Geoffrey *Amaurici* and Herluin *Bersegun*; Ernald.

Dating: *Postquam vero Jerusalem [Fulco] adiit...anno ab incarnatione domini MCXXIX annis.*

15 130 Chirograph whereby Count Geoffrey gives rights to Saint-Laud and Ronceray in return for land he had taken at Brissac. Angers, 14th February 1140.

B = s.xii³⁻⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 848B (formerly MS 760), Ronceray cartulary roll 6, no.56. C = s.xiii¹ cartulary copy, ADML 1MI28, fragmentary Saint-Laud cartulary, f.92v. D = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1635. E = *ibid.*, no.1637.
Printed, CSL, no.52 (from C); *Ronceray*, no.92 (from B).

Witnesses: *istis videntibus et audientibus:* Adelard of Château-Gontier; Oliver fitz Samuel; Pippin [of Tours], *prepositus*; Loel Ferlus, *cum multis aliis*.

De canonicis (Saint-Laud): Norman the dean; Fulcoius; Galvan; Warin *de Chalein*; Geoffrey *Manerii*; Thomas *capellanus*.

Ex parte monialium: Mainard, canon; Turpin *vicarius*; Manerius *dapifer*; Odo *cellarius*; Vendel *pistor*; Valai *cocus*; Petronilla *decana*; Advenia *elemosinaria*; Ossanna *cellaria*; Agnes *sacrista*; Vigolend; Oiscia.

Dating: *Facta sunt autem hec Andegavi, in presencia mee, xvi kalendas marcii anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXL.* It seems here that the year was reckoned from Christmas of the previous year. On 14th February 1141, Geoffrey was most likely engaged in Normandy, where he had gone after being informed of Stephen's capture at Lincoln (2nd February 1141) to tempt Norman magnates over to the Angevin cause. He met with Rotrou of Perche during Lent, which in 1141 began on 12th February (OV VI pp.546-7)

16 139 Confirmation of the recent judgment that tithes from the mills at Coémont (Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Château-du-Loir, comm. Vouvray-sur-Loir) should be rendered to the nuns of Ronceray, following their complaint that the mills adversely affected their nuns in the area. 1142.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 847, Ronceray cartulary roll 4 (Stein 119), no.76.
Printed, *Ronceray*, no.399.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs, seneschal of La Flèche; Joscelin of Tours; Thomas *cancellarius*; Gerald *notarius*, *cujus manu hec carta bullata est*.

Ex parte vero capituli...: Abbess Ameline (*tunc dicta abbatissa*); Petronilla *decana*; Agnes *sacrista*; Osanna *cellerari*.

Ex canonicis; Ralph *sacrista*; Adam; Durand; Pagan.

Ex servientibus: Turpin *vicarius*; Mainier *dapifer*; Vendel *pistor*; Robert; Rainier.

Dating: *anno ab incarnatione domini MCXLII, Ludovico regnante in Gallia.*

Note: *Curia Hamonis*, now Coémont, lies just to the south of Château-du-Loir and was granted to the nuns of Ronceray in 1028 by a tenant of Bishop Hubert of Angers on the occasion of her entry into the nunnery: *Ronceray*, no.391; Steven Fanning, *A Bishop and His World Before the Gregorian Reform: Hubert of Angers, 1006-1047*, Transactions of the American Historical Society (1988), pp.116-7, no.20.

Witnessed, amongst others, by Thomas the chancellor (*cancellarius*) and Gerald the notary, the

charter's scribe (*cujus manu hec carta bullata est*). The wording *hec carta bullata est* is curious and does not occur elsewhere within Geoffrey's charters. Certain changes appear to have been made to the text by the cartulary copyist, for example the identification of Abbess Ameline as *tunc dicta abbatissa*. Gerald the notary was most likely Gerald of Beaufort, a canon of Saint-Laud; cf. below, nos. 26-8.

17 236 Cartulary notice of quitclaim of woodland at Lattay by Nivard of Rochefort following arbitration by Geoffrey. Brissac, likely 1147.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 844, Ronceray cartulary roll 1, no.64.
Printed, *Ronceray*, no.185; DB I, no.81*; *RRAN* III, no.725 (revival under Henry).

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Joscelin of Tours; Pippin of Tours; Warin of Bellême; Choan of Brissac; Friso of Brissac; Maurice *de Lorre*; Hugh the dean; Master Rivallon; Pagan *Singe*; Peter *Eudelin*; Turpin; Warin of Tours; Berthelot *Biet Solem*; John *Bachelotus*, *et plures alii*.

Dating: undated. The narrative continues in Marchegay's edition with the nuns' account of the revival of Nivard's claim after Geoffrey's death, when he kidnapped and imprisoned some of the convent's men (*homines S. Marie cepit et captos in turre posuit*). Henry was at that time being crowned in England, and the notice describes how he mandated Joscelin of Tours, his *dapifer*, with restoring the woodland to the nuns. This was then confirmed by the same witnesses as here.

Cf. *Ronceray*, no.13, a copy of a letter to the bishops of Angers, Le Mans and Nantes, issued by Pope Eugenius III on 22nd August 1147. The letter is not dated by year, but Eugenius was in the place of its issue, Auxerre, between 14th July and 6th September 1147 (*RPR* II, pp.45-7). It certainly predates Bishop Ulger's death in 1148. It urges the bishops to address the crimes committed by laymen against Ronceray, and specifically refers to Nivard's actions at Lattay (*de multiplicibus et gravibus injuriis...Nivardus de Rupe Forti silvam de Lateio, sicut asserunt, sibi sine iudicio et per violentiam auferunt*).

Unlike the following charter, Geoffrey is not here named as duke. This text, however, bears the characteristics of a beneficiary-composed account of proceedings, rather than a copy (whether reworked or not) of a comital/ducal charter or confirmation, as no.18 below.

18 218 General confirmation of customs and all previous comital grants to the abbey, with particular reference to the woodland at Lattay and Cour-Pierre, granted by Countess Hildegarde (d.1046). Angers, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150, perhaps 1147.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS 847, roll 4, no.25. C = *ibid.*, MS 848A, roll 5, no.21.
Printed, *Ronceray*, no.183.

Witnesses: Master Geoffrey, dean of Saint-Laud; Hugh *Rufus*, archpresbyter; Adam, canon; Hugh *Parvus*; Joscelin of Tours; Berthelot *de Campigneio*; Salomon *de Doit Salvage*; Guiscard of Neuville; Gorron and Fulk, chamberlains; Berthelot *Bibit Solem*; Laurence *de Leonio*; Turpin; Warin of Tours; Granus *et plures alii*.

Ad hanc recordationem convenerunt: Abbess Theophanie; Milesende *decana*; Oicia *sacristana*; Petronilla of Neuville.

Dating: undated; *apud Andegavim*. Perhaps around the same time as no.17.

19 235 Notice of Abbess Theophanie's request to Count Geoffrey to enquire into customs forced upon the abbey's men at La Barre and the 'countess's vineyard' (*in clauso comitis*) by the count's officials who

collected wine revenues (*benagiores*). 1151, on or after 10th June.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, Angers BM MS H848B, Ronceray roll 6, no.34.
Printed, *Ronceray*, no.87.

Sworn men: Pippin of Tours; Geoffrey of Clefs, *vicarius*; Turpin *de Super Pontem*; Warin of Tours; Nicholas Luscus, *qui per X et VII annos benagii famulus fuerat*.

Witnesses: (Count?) Geoffrey; Absalon Roonard; Pippin of Tours; Turpin *de Super Ponte*; Warin of Tours; Abbess Theophanie; Theophanie, the abbess's sister; Petronilla *Moretum*; Mathea; Ralph the canon; Rainier *sacrista, et plures alii*.

Dating: undated but after the capture of Montreuil Bellay in spring 1151: *Hoc factum est anno quo Goffredus strenuissimus comes Andegavensis, vi et machina, Monsteriolum cepit et Giraudum Bellai at coadjutores suos apud Andegavim duxit in captionem. In illo die quo hec facta sunt, venit comes Gaufridus in ecclesiam S. Trinitatis agere gratias burgensibus suis de collato beneficio et honore.*

The wording here is ambiguous, and it remains unclear whether this text was drawn up on the day Geoffrey returned to Angers.

Note: the text states that Gerald and his supporters were led to Angers as prisoners, which is corroborated by no.7, above, and by *Méron*, p.89. According to this notice, Geoffrey then met with the town's burgesses 'to give thanks [to them] for their help and honour', which took place in the church of the Holy Trinity, which adjoins Ronceray. Marchegay suggests that this equated to Geoffrey's being accepted into some kind of confraternity (*ibid.*, p.311).

Angers, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Nicolas Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

20 121 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey of the abbey's possession of a section of the River Loire and its islands, along with the rights of *éclusage*, fishing and milling; Abbot John also invested with another section of the river at Roches-Berhuart, previously granted by Fulk V. 1135.

B = cartulary copy, s.xii-xiii 'premier cartulaire' of Saint-Nicolas (Stein 124), lost. C = copy from partial reconstruction of lost cartulary, Laurent Le Peletier, *De rerum scitu dignissimarum a prima fundatione monasterii S. Nicolai Andegavensis ad hunc usque diem epitome necnon et ejusdem monasterii abbatum series* (Angers, 1635), pp.56-7 (where it follows an identical act of Fulk V, Chartrou cat. no.21), from which this copy.

Gaufridus comes Andegavorum, praesulibus et abbatibus totique clero et baronibus, omnibusque suis fidelibus totius Andegave, Cenomane, et Turone, salutem. Vobis omnibus presentibus et futuris fidelibus innoteat: me prece et monitu domni Ioanni abbatis Sancti Nicholai Andegavensis: rato concessisse et perpetuo donasse in elemosina pro animae meae remedio et uxoris meae Matildis quondam Romanorum Imperatricis, filiorumque nostrorum cum caetera consanguinitate mea Deo, abbatae ipsius Sancti Nicholai Andegavensis: aquam apud Rupem quae est sub veteri exclusa monachorum, in Ligeri, cum insulis ad eandem aquam pertinentibus, ad faciendam in exclusam, molendina,

et piscaria: quidquidne ipsis monachis ibidem fieri placuerit, sicut in proprio. Et hoc ita solide et quiete et libere ab omni consuetudine sicut unquam de antecessoribus meis quietus et liberius in elemosina contulit. Hoc quidem me ita dedisse et confirmasse liquet. Anno 1135 ab Incarnatione Domini. Ludovico Philippi regnante in Gallia. Ulgerius quidem Andegavorum Episcopali fungente officio. Sed et his mecum testificantibus Abbate Ioanne, Mauricio monacho. Laicis, Galgano de Chimiliaco, Pipino de Tourone tunc temporis Andegavum praeposito, Radero de Greio multisque aliis. Pretera vestram non latere prudentiam censeo: ex meo iussu Pipinum ipsum cum ipso Abbate ad locum usque qui vocatur Rocha perrexisse. Ipsumque Abbatem Ioannem de praefata aqua cum insulis et omnibus ad eam pertinentibus investivisse. Quod Pipinum fecisse novimus qui primum palum quae tunc infixit ipsius aquas, huic investiturae interfuerunt monachi, Abbas ipse Ioannes, Berengarius de Salmuro, Raginaldus de Sartrino; laici, Pipinus ipse, Guido de Ponte, Gauffredus de poceonaria, Andreas prepositus ipsius Rochae, et multi alii.

Witnesses: (1) *Sed et his mecum testificantibus* Abbot John; Maurice, monk. *Laicis:* Galvan of Chemillé; Pippin of Tours, *tunc temporis Andegavum praeposito*; Ralph of Gré; *multisque aliis*. (2) Investiture by Pippin of Tours: Abbot John; Berengar of Saumur; Reginald *de Sartrino*; *laici*, Pippin [of Tours]; Guy *de Ponte*; Geoffrey of La Poissonière; Andrew *prepositus ipsius Rochae*, *et multi alii*.

Dating: 1135.

21 126 Confirmation of donations made by Count Geoffrey and his predecessors to the abbey, accompanied by a careful delineation of the abbey's lands and privileges. Additional grant of a tributary of the River Loire, near Roche-Berhuart and the old lock belonging to the abbey, along with the islets on this stretch of water, and the right to establish mills and fishing, immune to intrusion from the count's officers. 1136.

B = s.xii-xiii cartulary copy (Stein 124), lost. C = *vidimus* of 21st March 1312, AN J179, no.78. D = Laurent Le Peletier, *Breviculum foundationis S. Nicolai* (Angers, 1616), p.45. E = Le Peletier, *De rerum scitu dignissimarum*, p.70. F = GC IV, instrumenta, col. 690. Printed, Alexandre Teulet, *Layettes du Trésor des chartes* (5 vols., Paris, 1863-1909), I, no.65. Summarised, Marchegay, *Archives d'Anjou* II, pp.197-8 (analysis of AN J178 and 179, misdating C to 1313).

Witnesses: *Sed et his mecum testificantibus:* Abbot John; Maurice, monk; Orric, monk; Robert *Anglicus*, monk. *De laicis:* Galvan of Chemillé; Reginald Rufus; Pippin of Tours, *tunc Andegavensi praeposito*, Ralph of Gré; Guy *de Ponte*; Andrew *prepositus monachorum*; others unnamed.

Dating: *anno M C XXXVI ab incarnatione Domini, Ludovico Philippi [filio] regnante in Galia, Ulgerio Andegavensi episcopo.*

Note: both this and no.20 appear to have been beneficiary-authored, containing extremely similar dating clauses and the unusual clause *sed et his testificantibus* at the head of the witness list. They both allude to Matilda; the confirmation in no.20 is made *in elemosina pro animae meae remedio et uxoris meae Matildis quondam Romanorum imperatricis*, and the terms of this confirmation were made at her behest (*uxoris mee Mathildis imperatricis interventu*). Cf RRAN III, no.20, 1133×1139, in which Matilda confirmed Saint-Nicolas' churches in England, and App. VI, no.3, a grant of 1129×1136 to Saint-Nicolas by Duke Conan of Brittany, consented to and witnessed by Geoffrey and Matilda.

Angers, Benedictine abbey of Saints-Serge-et-Bach Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

22 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey of privileges and exemptions from customs originally granted by Geoffrey II. 1131 × 23rd April 1144, probably after 13th November 1143.

B = s.xii cartulary copy, 'premier cartulaire' of St-Serge, f.29, no.50. C = ibid., f.65, no.135 and f.171. D = s.xvii copy, BnF Duchesne 22, f.119. E = s.xvii copy, Angers BM MS 1027 (formerly 895), ff.30, 32. F = copy, ADML H1245 *bis*, pp.118-9. G = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou, II (2:1), nos.446, 447. H = ADML H778 *bis*, ff.268-9.
Printed, GC IV, p.823 (without Geoffrey V's confirmation); *Saint-Serge* I, no.50.

Dating: before the assumption of the ducal title, and apparently after the coronation of Fulk as King of Jerusalem; probably after Fulk's death on 13th November 1143 (*Goffridus Dei gratia Andegavorum comes, filius videlicet bonae memoriae Hierosolymitani Regis*).

- Dependent priory of Saint-Melaine Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Les Ponts-de-Cé (dioc. Angers).

23 234 Notice of enquiry commissioned by Count Geoffrey into a dispute over *fodrium* which a vassal, Bechet, alleged that the priory owed for land at La Brétellière (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Angers-Trelazé, comm. Andard); jurors decided that it was not due. 31st March 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xii cartulary copy, Nantes Musée Dobrée MS 3 (second book of Saint-Serge cartulary, Stein 128), f.175, no.403. C = ADML H778 *bis* I, f.271 (modern copy of B in its entirety by Paul Marchegay). D = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1753 (from B).
Printed, Jacques Boussard, *Le comté d'Anjou sous Henri Plantagenêt et ses fils (1151-1204)* (Paris, 1938), pp.173-4, no.3; *Saint-Serge* I, no.403.

Witnesses: *ipse Hamo manu sua iuravit coram testibus istis: Hasleius praesbitero; Ralph of Saint-Saturnin; Odo de Monte Seiberti; Warin of Bellême (de Bolesma); Ernald de Rupe; Hubert Naal; and William Jaret, tunc vicariis de Brachesac; Geoffrey Barbotin homine monachorum.*

Dating: copy D suggests a date of 1150, whereas Chartrou suggests 31st March-7th September 1151. Chauvin correctly redates the text by the death of Abbot Hervey (31st March 1150) and Geoffrey's own death, and notes that it was drawn up after Geoffrey's death: not only does it refer to *tempore Goffredi Andegavorum comitis*, Abbot William, mentioned in the text, was not invested until 1st January 1152.

Note: Chauvin does not identify the location of La Brétellière; cf. Port, *Dictionnaire* I, p.488. The

identification here refers to a now-lost location on the north side of the Loire, directly across from Brissac and Saint-Melaine.

The jurors agreed that if the oldest amongst them, Hamo, was to swear on the priory's relics that the land in question did not exceed one *sextaria*, the priory did not owe *fodrium*; he swore that this indeed was not the case. Du Cange, *Glossarium* VII, p.463 (*sextarata* and *sextaria*) notes that the amount of land denoted by this measurement is not clear and could vary.

Angers, Augustinian priory of Toussaint Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

24 137 Cartulary notice of Geoffrey's judgment over the prévôt (*pretor*) of Beaufort-en-Vallée's seizure of cattle from Toussaint abbey. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = cartulary copy (Stein 129), f.10, lost. C = s.xviii copy and analysis, BnF Touraine-Anjou XIII¹, no.10634 (from B).

Printed, Chartrou, pièce justificative no.51; François Comte and Jean-Marc Bienvenu, *L'abbaye Toussaint d'Angers des origines à 1330: étude historique et cartulaire* (Société des études angevines, 1985), no.25.

Witnesses: Fulk, lord of Candé; Robert, abbot of Saint-Aubin; Robert, abbot of Toussaint; Pippin of Tours; others unnamed.

Dating: undated; during the abbacy of Robert (c.1118-51); cf. Chartrou's incorrect dating of Robert's death to 1141.

Angers, canonical college of Saint-Laud Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers (dioc. Angers).

25 141 Chirograph issued by Count Geoffrey for the canons and a local man, Guerrin, terminating their dispute over holdings in the forest of Verrières. It is decided that Guerrin and his heirs must pay an annual rent of 20 *solidi* to the canons on the feast of Saint Nicholas (6th December). After 1131.

B = s.xiii¹⁻² cartulary copy (Stein 130), in poor condition, ADML 1 MI 28, f.86v.
Printed CSL, no.38.

Witnesses: *Huic rei affui ego qui eam composui et Pipinus prepositus et, de militibus meis mecum*: Garsilius of Bignon (*de Bugnonio*);⁴ Geoffrey of Clefs; Guy fitz Hugh; Boterus and Engelbald, his father.

ex parte vero canonicorum: Norman, dean of Saint-Laud; Fulcoius, *capellanus*; Geoffrey *Manerii*; Master Theobald; Master Isenbard; Gerald of Montfort; Thomas, *capellanus*; Vaslotus, *magister scholarum* of Saint-Maurice (Angers); Peter *Fulberti*, canon of Saint-Martin.

de Cenomannensibus: Bulgeric, *magister scholarum* of Saint-Julien; Gervase, precentor of Saint-Pierre.

ex altera parte: *ipse* Guerrin; Loellus Fellus; Oliver fitz Samuel; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Ralph of Gré; Oliver of Neuville.

Dating: ostensibly during the deanship of Norman, who did not succeed Guy of Athée until at least 1131 (cf. CSL no.3), but ongoing work by Nicholas Paul on Guy is expected to alter this.⁵

⁴ Le Bignon-du-Maine, Mayenne, arr. Laval, cant. Meslay-du-Maine.

⁵ Nicholas Paul, personal communication.

The cartulary's editor, Planchenault, dated the text 1129×1142 with no explanation.

26 164 Cartulary notice written up by the canons of Saint-Laud, detailing Count (and Duke) Geoffrey's order of the destruction of a weir constructed by his men living at Fosses, and which was having a detrimental effect upon the three churches. He also grants to Ronceray and Saint-Laud a portion of alluvial land next to the weir which they held in common. Angers, in the crypt of Saint-Laud, Summer 1145 × 25th-31st March 1146.

B = s.xiii¹⁻² cartulary copy, fragmentary, ADML 1 MI 28, f.91v. C = BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1711. D = *ibid.*, Baluze 276, f.130v.

Printed CSL, no.48, from B, missing sections supplemented by C and D.

Witnesses: *Hec vero facta sunt in ecclesia Sancti Laudi, ante altare Beate Marie in cripta, videntibus istis et audientibus:* Brian of Martigné; Hugh of Pocé; Pippin *preposito*; Joscelin of Tours; Turpin; Nicholas Luscus; Simon of Châtillon; Fulk *camerario*, Gorran [the chamberlain]. *insuper presente:* Abbot Herbert *cum duobus monachis, scilicet* Geoffrey *Engraalo*; Reginald *psalterario*; *presente* *eciam* Abbess Hamelina (of Ronceray); Aremburga *monetaria* (?); *presentibus* *eciam* *istis Sancti Laudi canonicis:* Galvan, *capellano*; Fulcoius; Geoffrey *Manerii*; Master Isembert; Gerald of Douces (*de Daulciis*); Hugh Rufus; Andrew; Gerald of Beaufort; G. *Micawt*.

Dating: in 1145-6, after the fall of Arques (*anno ab incarnatione Domini M C XL V ipso comite ducatum Normannie in pace habente, eo anno quo idem dux Normanniae Archas castrum adquisivit, quod solum ei de toto ducatu resistebat*), recorded as occurring during the summer (RT I, p.237). Before either the Annunciation or Easter 1146, or perhaps Christmas 1145.

Note: Geoffrey is initially referred to as count, then duke only in the dating clause. The Gorran who witnesses after Fulk the chamberlain is likely Gorron the chamberlain, see below, nos. 27, 28, 51.

27 195 Confirmation by Count and Duke Geoffrey of the college's lands and privileges, and reassertion of the count's position of 'lord and abbot' over the canons. Angers, in the count's chamber, 23rd April 1144 × 8th September 1149, perhaps in the latter part of this period.

A = original (mutilated and mostly illegible), Angers BM MS 757 (s.xviii miscellany of documents pertaining to the college, formerly MS 680), p.9. B = cartulary copy, ADML 1 MI 28, f.72. C = *ibid.*, local *vidimus* of 1279. D = local *vidimus* of 1405. E = s.xviii copy of royal *vidimus* of 1351, within the Chambre des comptes register for the *généralité* of Tours, AN K186 A, no.68. F = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1507. G = copy, ADML 17 G 1, no.1 (copies of Saint-Laud charters by Toussaint Grille).

Printed CSL, no.2 (from A, B, C, D, F); RRAN III, no.1002 (from CSL).

Witnesses: Fulk of Candé; Reginald of Château-Gontier; Reginald Rufus; Geoffrey, Hugh and Fulk of Clefs (*de Durico*, in error); Gorron and Fulk, chamberlains; Pippin of Tours; Joscelin of Tours.

De canonicis: Norman, dean; Hugh of Chartres; Geoffrey *Manerii*; Gerald of Beaufort; Gerald of Douces (*de Daulcis*); Andrew *Cadaver*; Ganguenon; Peter *Brito*; others unnamed.

Dating: after the assumption of the ducal title and during the deanship of Norman (cf. no.28, below, which mentions Dean Geoffrey).

Note: E and G, the copies unknown to Planchenault, both list Fulk of Candé as a witness.

28 197 Resignation of Hubert of Chambiers from the position of *prepositus* of Chambiers (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. and comm. Durtal), which was ceded to the canons of Saint-Laud in exchange for four *setiers* of land. The canons then granted the position to Hubert's son Geoffrey during his lifetime. This settlement confirmed by Count and Duke Geoffrey in the comital court. Angers, in the house of Hugh of Chartres, canon of Saint-Laud, 9th September 1149 or 1150.

B = s.xiii¹⁻² cartulary copy, ADML 1 MI 28, f.91, fragmentary. C = summary, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1734.

Printed CSL, no.49.

Witnesses: fragmentary list in B as follows:

Hii affuerunt: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; *Mala Musca*, *cellerarius* of Saint-Martin of Tours; Geoffrey, dean of Saint-Laud; *canonici* Galvan, Geoffrey *Manerius*, Master Isembert,⁶ Gerard of Douces (*de Daulcis*), Hugh *Rufus*, Hugh of Chartres, Master Andrew, Gerard of Beaufort, *qui hanc cartam (recte quartam) scripsit*, Master Peter, Arraud of Chemillé; Hugh *de Soouria*, canon of Saint-Martin of Tours; Ulger, *prepositus* of Restigné; *capellanus*.

Laici: Pippin of Tours; Bargius⁷ *prepositus tunc temporis Andegavis*, Gorron and Fulk, *camerarii*; Malet, *prepositus* of Tours; Isoredus of Montbazou; Chalo *de Castellone*; Geoffrey *foresterus*; Turpin *de Super Pontem*; Pagan *Simia*,⁸ Warin, *sacerdos* of Chambiers, *senescallus* of Bouchemaine;⁹ William of Outillé, *garderoba*.

Ex parte Huberti: Gastinellus Arch . . . edus, Perrellus.

Dating: *apud Andegavim, in domo Hugonis de Carnoto, canonici Beati Laudi, anno ab incarnatione Domini M C XL IX, V idus septembris, luna tercia, epacta vicesima, Eugenio sedem apostolicam obtinente, Ludovico regnante in Gallias, Normanno Andegavense episcopo.* Planchenault and Chartrou date this to 9th September 1150 rather than 1149, on the strength of the epact and Planchenault's error in dating Bishop Norman's investiture to 6th March 1150. This dating is not certain however, due to the application of the ducal title to Geoffrey in the body of the text.

Note: drawn up by Gerald of Beaufort, a canon of Saint-Laud. The lost original appears to have been sealed by both Geoffrey and the chapter.

Angers, men of

29 119 Grant of *vinagium* privileges by Count Geoffrey. *In spacio curie sue prato*, 30th June 1135.

B = royal *vidimus* of 1366, AN JJ97, no.610 (enrolled in Registres de trésor des chartes, f.168). Printed, *Ordonnances des roys de France de la troisième race, recueillies par ordre chronologique* (21 vols, Paris, 1723-1849), IV, ed. Denis-François Secousse, pp.632-4. Extract, Charles du Fresne, seigneur du Cange et al, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infirmae latinitatis* (rev. ed., 10 vols., Niort, 1882-7), VIII, col.337a.

Witnesses: *barones familiares comitis:* Galvan of Chemillé; *Hugoninus de Monte-feron, Baion*;¹⁰

⁶ Queried in CSL.

⁷ Queried in CSL.

⁸ Cf. Pagan *Singe*, no.14, above.

⁹ It is unclear whether this is an unnamed seneschal of Bouchemaine or Warin the priest. The seneschal was not a comital official, but a religious officer.

¹⁰ B has *vaion*; Secousse has *Baionensis*, which would suggest that this individual was from

Adam of Rochefort; Roland of Montrevault; Ridel Lupperell; Pippin *tunc prepositus*; Thomas, *capellanus*.

De parte vero burgensium, interfuerunt: Garin of Loudun (*Losdinii*); Guy *de Supra pontem*; Ulland of Tours; Tressand his brother; Gungan *Bibens solem*; Fulk fitz Aubert; Nicholas Luscus; Hubert *Fulberti*; Bartholomew *Fulberti*; Laurence *de Leone*; Reginald *Perduel*; Richard *Passeiai*; Torpin; unnamed others.

Dating: *concessionem Andegavie factam fuisse in spacio curie sue prato, anno videlicet ab Incarnacione Domini millesimo centesimo tricesimo quinto pridie kal. Julii, Innocencio secundo Sancte Romane sedis pontifice summo, Ulgerio Andegavensi presule, regnantibus Fulcone supradicti comitis patre apud Jherosolimam, Ludovico in Francia.* The dating clause terminates with *Henrico ejusdem Gaufridi filio in Anglia*, where *filio* appears to be an error for *socero*. The location of the grant, the count's *spacium curie pratum*, is intriguing and was perhaps an outdoor assembly.

Bec-Hellouin, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame Eure, arr. Bernay, cant. Brionne (dioc. Rouen).

- 30 183 Charter of Duke and Count Geoffrey addressed to the archbishop of Rouen, bishops and barons of Normandy, confirming the grant made to the monks of Bec by Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux before his departure on crusade, of the church of Saint-Hymer (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Pont-l'Évêque). Saumur, probably 1147, perhaps early summer.

B = cartulary copy (1752 copy of priory of Saint-Ymer cartulary), Paris BnF NA Latin 2097, p.9. Printed, *Cartulaire de Saint-Ymer en Auge et Briquebec*, ed. Charles Bréard (Rouen, 1908), no.4 (incorrectly cited by Chartrou as no.5); *RRAN* III, no.781.

Witnesses: Robert of Neubourg.

Dating: Arnulf of Lisieux and the Norman contingent of the crusading army met Louis VII at Worms on 29th July 1147 (Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, p.67, citing Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948), p.22). Louis himself left Paris on 15th June, and it seems likely that Arnulf and his fellow Normans would have left Normandy around the same time or slightly earlier. Robert of Neubourg, the sole witness to this confirmation, witnessed Arnulf's original grant (*Cartulaire de Saint-Ymer*, no.3), and it is possible that he rejoined Geoffrey at Saumur at the same time Arnulf departed, which would place this confirmation during the summer of 1147. This is also suggested by the issue of the charter for the Hospitallers, below, no.55, at Mirebeau at some point after 20th April.

- 31 192 Notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Hugh, archbishop of Rouen, of his grant of three prebends at Bures-en-Bray (Seine-Maritime, arr. Dieppe, cant. Londinières) to Bec's priory of Notre-Dame-du-Pré at Rouen. Bec, in the chapterhouse, 27th March 1149.

A = original, with double-sided seal attached to parchment tongue, ADSM 20HP5 (no longer 8H108 as cited in all published copies).

Printed Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.138, no.2; *RRAN* III, no.77.

Witnesses: Richard *cancellarius*; Geoffrey, dean of Rouen; Thomas *capellanus*; Robert of

Bayonne (Pyrénées-Atlantiques), rather than being a garbled record of Hugh of Matheflon's presence. On the other hand, this Hugonin is nowhere else attested.

Neubourg; unnamed others.

Dating: *Hoc autem concessum est anno ab incarnatione domini MCXLIX in Pascha instanti, die dominica de Ramis Palmar(um), in Beccensi capitulo.*

Note: written in the same hand as no.69, below, and apparently the same hand as no.66. This is the only extant charter to still have Geoffrey's double-sided ducal and comital seal still attached, although the legend has worn away.

32 221 Confirmation of the abbey's rights, privileges and exemptions throughout the duchy as they stood under Henry I. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = cartulary copy, lost. C = s.xvii copy, BnF Latin 13905 (*Chronicon Beccense* and cartulary extracts, Stein 1951), f.85v.

Printed, Haskins, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', p.423, n.29; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.131, n.29; *RRAN* III, no.79.

Witnesses: none provided.

Dating: the manuscript, a seventeenth-century copy of the Bec annals and various abbey titles (not s.xviii as noted in *RRAN* III), has the marginal note '1145, Geofroy'. It is likely that this confirmation was issued soon after the fall of Rouen, when many religious houses would have sought to secure their rights and privileges under the new duke. The text states that Geoffrey was counselled by his son Henry in this matter (*me consilio Henrici filii mei et baronum meorum*), which perhaps suggests a later date.

Note: in her summary from Haskins, Chartrou (p.312, no.221) wrongly cites Latin 13908 and confuses this text with another confirmation for Bec (below, no.34).

33 Confirmation of the abbey's exemption from all customs at Arques and Dieppe. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = cartulary copy, lost. C = s.xvii copy, BnF Latin 13905, f.85v.

Printed, Haskins, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', p.424, n.31; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.131, n.31; *RRAN* III, no.78.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period. Like no.32, the surviving copy only reproduces a portion of the original text. Dom. Jouvelin, the copyist, introduces the extract as a joint confirmation of Geoffrey and Henry (*Geofroy duc de Normandie et d'Anjou, Henri 2^d son fils, confirment et declarent que...*), which may suggest a date in the latter phase of Geoffrey's Norman career.

**Château-l'Hermitage, Augustinian priory
Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Pontvallain (dioc. Le Mans).**

34 148 Grant *in absentia* of privileges in the forests of Maine and Anjou, confirmed by the count's second son, Geoffrey. Grant of £10 by Count Geoffrey towards the building of a new church during the hermitage's period of conversion into an Augustinian priory. Mayet, 28th January

1144.

B = lost Chambre des comptes register XII, Normandy and Château-du-Loir. C = BnF Latin 9067 (s.xvii copy of B), f.252.

Printed (from B), *Cartulaire de Château-du-Loir*, ed. Eugène Vallée (Archives historiques du Maine 4, Le Mans, 1905), no.81.

Witnesses: (to Geoffrey junior's concession) Helias, the count's brother; Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; *Procolino, de Evriaco sacerdote*;¹¹ Alan, abbot of Gastines; Gerald of Beaufort, *tunc temporis illius comitis notario*.¹²

Dating: *Haec charta facta est apud Maetum, quinto calendas februarii, anno ab Incarnatione Domini millesimo centesimo quadragesimo quarto, sub papa Innocentio*. Innocent II died on September 24th 1143, and unless a mistake, this is hard to reconcile with the charter's date. If a mistake, a date of 1144 – which would mean the charter was dated using the Christmas or Circumcision style – is more likely than 1145. The presence of Geoffrey's brother Helias, who rebelled in 1145, also suggests an earlier date, as does Geoffrey's absence (see below).

Note: the precise conditions in which this important charter was issued and drawn up are unclear. The mention of Geoffrey's notary Gerald of Beaufort, a canon of Saint-Laud who drew up nos. 16 and 28, and witnessed nos. 26 and 27, above, implies that he had drawn the charter up. Vallée's notes to the charter point out that possibility that the scribe was in fact called Everard, but Gerald seems almost certain.

Count Geoffrey and his knight, Robert of Pocé, came together to the hermitage at some point in the past (*expetiit*), and granted Gilbert the hermit rights to collect wood for heating and building, and of pannage and pasturage in the woods of Maine and Anjou. This was confirmed by placing the missal on the altar. The charter was drawn up and sealed, and later witnessed by the young Geoffrey, the count's brother Helias and others. There is then an addendum to the charter, whereby it is noted that because the count's successors 'held this church in such great reverence', Geoffrey 'wished in the present charter to commit himself to the building of a church at Château-l'Hermitage by giving ten pounds and laying the first stone'. It is also after this that the charter was dated, and the place-date is given as the nearby castle of Mayet, not Château-l'Hermitage. It is unclear when the ceremony of placing the missal on the altar and the charter was sealed by Geoffrey occurred; it is evident, however, that Geoffrey was not present at the time the grant was corroborated by his son.

His absence can be attributed to the siege of the Tower of Rouen, which began on 25th January and, although some of the following charters demonstrate that he returned to Angers very soon after the siege began, he would not have been able to travel to Mayet for the 28th.

The presence of Alan, abbot of Gastines (Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours, cant. Château-Renault, comm. Villedômer), is significant as his house was also an Augustinian foundation which had its origins in a hermitage which had been confirmed as an abbey as recently as 1137 by Archbishop Hugh of Tours (Jacques-Xavier Carré de Busserolle, *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et biographique d'Indre-et-Loire et de l'ancienne province de la Touraine* (6 vols., Tours, 1878-84) III, p.164).

Château-du-Loir, Benedictine priory

Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Château-du-Loir (dioc. Le Mans).

35 222 Generally addressed confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of the outcome of a case heard in the court of Bishop William of Le Mans between the priory and Marsilius of Faye, over the church at Mansigné (Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Pontvallain). January 1145 × January 1150, almost certainly before July-August 1147, possibly 1145.

¹¹ Vallée suggests this individual was perhaps *Poolino de Curiaco sacerdote*.

¹² Vallée suggests that this may have been a notary named Everard, but see discussion below.

A = original, with seal pendant on yellow and white leather straps seen by Gaignières, lost. B = fragmentary s.xviii copy, BnF Gaignières 5441, II, p.244 (titles and charters of Marmoutier, Château-du-Loir section).

Printed, Chartrou *pièce justificative* no.64; *RRAN* III, no.1003.

Witnesses: Adam of Rochefort; Ridel of Rillé; Robert of Sablé; Hugh of Clefs; Geoffrey, his brother; Durand Burrell; unnamed others.

Dating: between the investiture of Bishop William of Le Mans (January 1145) and the cession of the ducal title, this document must be compared with no.52, below. Both were issued after the assumption of the ducal title, yet were witnessed by Robert of Sablé, one of the most notorious rebels of Geoffrey's lifetime. It is therefore tempting to assign them to the very early part of this period, before Robert's support of Helias' rebellion in 1145.

The first witness, Adam of Rochefort, appears had been succeeded by his likely son Nivard by July or August 1147: a bull sent by Eugenius III to the bishops of Angers, Le Mans and Nantes on either 22nd July or 22nd August referred specifically to Nivard's abuses towards the nuns' woodland at Lattay (*Ronceray*, no.13). The genealogy of the lords of Rochefort, however, is extremely unclear; neither Adam nor Nivard was a direct descendant of Abbo, lord of Rochefort, who is attested to in several Angevin charters with his sons, including the record of a case in which Geoffrey was involved (App. III, no.10; cf. App. III, no.7, witnessed by Adam of Rochefort).

Cluny, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Pierre Saône-et-Loire, arr. Mâcon, cant. Cluny (dioc. Mâcon).

36 188 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Abbot Peter of King Stephen's substitution of Letcombe Regis (Oxon.) for Henry I's grant of 100 silver marks per annum to the abbey in 1131. 23rd April 1144 × 1147.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, BnF NA Latin 766 (Cluny cartulary 'D', Stein 988), f.62. C = s.xiii⁴ cartulary copy, *ibid.* Latin 5458 (Cluny cartulary 'E', Stein 989), no.238. D = copy of 1701 by Étienne Baluze, *ibid.* Latin 5459, p.116, no.225, with marginal note "Nota ad Bibliothecam Cluniac' pag.143. Vidae menagium in historia Sablolii pag. 152, 352". Printed *RRAN* III, no.205; summarised Round, no.1394.

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop of Tours; Pagan of Clairvaux; Guy of Sablé.

Dating: undated; after the assumption of the ducal title and before the abdication in 1147 of Archbishop Hugh of Tours.

Note: this confirms *RRAN* III, no.204, which in turn changed the terms of *RRAN* II, nos.1691 and 1713.

Cormery, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Paul Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours, cant. Chambray-lès-Tours (dioc. Tours).

37 129 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey of the abbey's privileges at Loches, and delineation of the count's rights over the goods of deceased foreign serfs (*albani*) on the abbey's lands in Loches. 1139 × 23rd April 1144.

Printed, *Cartulaire de Cormery*, ed. J.-J. Bourassé, *Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine* 12 (1861), no.61.¹³

Witnesses: *Data per manum* Thomas, *notarii mei*; *testes...ex parte comitis*: Archembald fitz Ulger; Absalon Roonard; Peter, his brother; William of Taunay (*de Tannaiaico*); Peter *Letardi*; Isore *prepositus*. *Ex parte Sancti Pauli*: Abbot William; Peter *Ferrans gablum*; Geoffrey, mayor of Azay; Achard of Roches; Reginald *acularius*; Hubert *telonearius*; Ramald *molendinarius*; Peter *fremeerius*; and unnamed others; Renier *de curia*; Andrew *Bernardi*; Charterius *pelliparius*; Andrew *Amberti*; Geoffrey Berne; Pagan *Richardi*.

Dating: undated, whilst count but not duke, and during the abbacy of William, which commenced after the death of Abbot Theobald II in 1139 (*Cartulaire de Cormery*, ed. Bourassé, p.cxii). Dated 1139 in Bourassé's copy, which Chartrou follows; by contrast, as Beautemps-Beaupré (*Coutumes et institutions* II, p.27, n.1) notes, Housseau's copy from the cartulary (Touraine-Anjou no.1523) ascribes a date of 1142-4.

The presence of Archembald fitz Ulger as a witness indicates that this confirmation was issued before his death in 1146 or earlier, evidenced by no.39, below.

38 152 Settlement by Count Geoffrey of a dispute over possession of an oven, involving two local knights and the abbey. 1139 × 23rd April 1144.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, in poor condition, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1514.

Noscant omnes posterii mei quod ego Gauffredus Andegavorum comes filius fulconis bone memoriae regis Jherusalem in presentia mea consilio Baronum meorum hoc modo terminavi controversiam quae erat inter monachos de Cormeriaco et hugonem Galorum et Boscandum Sililloc duo milites predicti dicebant quod furnum apud Aziacum in terra sua propria¹⁴ est facere licebat monachi autem e controversio asserebant quod parrochia furni sicut ecclesiae totu propria illorum erat huic altercationi affuit miles unus scilicet Petrus Letardi de Losduno qui tunc temporis Turonensis prepositus qui obs' ... lit¹⁵ se proflare quod causa ista in presentia fulconis Regis Jherusalem terminata est ad finem juxta erat et furnum predictum curiae iudicio et ex predicti Fulconis decreto destructum et prostaretum¹⁶ audierat jussu itaque meo homines mei in

¹³ This document appears as a copy (s.xvii-xviii) in Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1523. It is unclear, however, where Bourassé made his copy from, as Cormery charters can be found in a number of cartularies, listed at <http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/producteur623/> [accessed 27/05/2011] which require further investigation. These consist of the following MSS: (1) Tours BM 1348 (Stein 1066, a paper copy of selected documents made by André Salmon, s.xix); (2) Paris BnF Baluze 47 (Stein 1067, s.xvii paper copy of selected documents, which appears to have been used as a source by Bourassé); (3) Tours BM 1349 (Stein 1064, a paper copy of the abbey's original cartulary, made by J. Péron, s.xvi, used by Bourassé); (4) Paris BnF Latin 12665 (extracts from (3) by Péron); (5) ADIL H82 (a collection of documents compiled between 1600 and 1706); and (6) Paris BnF MS non coté (a paper compilation of documents by Dom. Fonteneau, s.xvii).

¹⁴ This word uncertain; B gives *suellent*.

¹⁵ Perhaps *abstulit*.

¹⁶ This word uncertain.

partem obierunt et justo iudicio adjudicaverunt quod si predictus miles scilicet Petrus Letardi jurare posset quod causam istam hoc modo terminatum vidisset quod in aliud furnum in villa illa *jurcote*¹⁷ furnum monachorum fieri nos deberet. Hoc vero jus jurandum in presentia mea et curia mea a predicto milite factum fuit et ita militum calumnia quievit. Hujus rei conventionem testes fuerunt ex parte Sancti Pauli, Abbas Guilelmus. Petrus ferrans gablum. Goffredus ... aibed. Guillelmus de Taunaiaco. ... Absalon roonart. Petrus frater ejus. Archembaldus filius Ulgerii. Petrus Letardi. Isore prepositus. Michael. Goffredus major de Aziaco [*recte* Albiaco]. Achardus de Rochis. Rainaldus Acu(larius). Renarius de cu(ria). Galoius. Paganus Auberti. Bar' de Monte Basoni. ...

Witnesses: *ex parte Sancti Pauli*: Abbot William; Peter *ferrans gablum*; Geoffrey [...] *aibed*; William of Taunay[...]; Absalon Roonard; Peter, his brother; Archembald fitz Ulger; Peter *Letardi*; Isore *prepositus*; Michael; Geoffrey, *mayor* of Azay; Achard of Roches; Rainaldus *acu(arius)*; Renier *de cu(ria)*; Galoius; Pagan *Auberti*; Bar(ber) of Montbazou [...].

Dating: undated, whilst count but not duke, and during the abbacy of William. Housseau's marginal note in his copy attributes a date of 1130 to this text; Chartrou, on the other hand, opts for 1144 (between Fulk V's death and the assumption of the ducal title). The presence of Abbot William and Archembald fitz Ulger suggest limits of 1139×1146, narrowed down further by the absence of the ducal title, as in no.37, above. The texts share several witnesses in the same order, which suggests that they may have been issued on the same occasion or that one text reproduced the witness list of the other.

39 172 Termination by Duke and Count Geoffrey of a dispute between the abbey and Ulger de Brayes, over the vicary claimed by Ulger at the chapel of Saint-Bauld (Indre-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Loches). Perhaps Curçay-sur-Dive (Vienne, arr. Châtellerauld, cant. Les Trois-Moutiers) or Courçay (Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours, cant. Bléré), in exercitu, 1146, after 24th March.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1718.
Printed Chartrou, *pièce justificative* 61a; *RRAN* III, no.1001.

Witnesses: Absalon Roonard; Aimery of Loudun;¹⁸ Gilbert; Peter *Letardi*; Joscelin *Umberti*, *prepositus* of Loudun; Walter *faciente-malum*; Barin, *villicus* of Loches; Burchard of Rillé; Barbe of Montbazou; Burgeric, *notario comitis qui cartam illam fecit et scripsit*.

Dating: *anno domini MCXLVI regnante Ludovico rege Francorum qui tunc crucem domini assumpserat. Hoc autem factum est apud Curciacum.* Louis took the cross on 24th March.

The parties to the resolution of the dispute – rather than the witnesses to its recitation – are said to have assembled at *Curciacum super Divam in exercitu meo*. On this basis the consensus is that the confirmation was granted in Normandy, whilst Geoffrey was with his army at Courcysur-Dives (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Morteaux-Couliboeuf): Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.143, n.69; Chartrou, pp.110, 300 (no.172), 392-3; *RRAN* III, p.xlv and no.1001.

¹⁷ This word uncertain.

¹⁸ 'Hamarico de [Losduno] Alone'.

This makes little sense, however, in the light of the witnesses, who are all local to the area around Cormery. One possibility is Curçay-sur-Dive, next to Loudun and just less than 100km to the west of Cormery; Aimery, lord of Trèves and Loudun, and Joscelin, *prepositus* of Loudun, were both witnesses. Another possibility is that the transcription *super Divam* is incorrect in the only surviving copy of the text, and that the location is Courçay on the River Indre, which lies halfway between Cormery and Reignac-sur-Indre: Brayes is now the commune of Reignac-sur-Indre (Indre-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Loches; see Boussard, *Le comté d'Anjou*, p.44), and was the seat of Ulger of Brayes. Many of the witnesses were local to the Indre valley, including Barinus, the *villicus* of Loches, Barbe of Montbazou and Burchard of Rillé. JM, p.216, indicates that Geoffrey built two castles between Loudun and Montreuil, one of which, La Motte-Bourbon, lies directly adjacent to Curçay-sur-Dive.

Note: cf. the charter for Le Loroux (no.57, below), which appears to have been drawn up by the same scribe, Burgeric *notarius meus*, who was probably a dignitary of Le Mans cathedral. Both are dated 1146, after Louis' assumption of the cross, and contain the distinctive address clause *omnibus tam futuris quam presentibus et qui litteras ista viderint audierint vel legerint*. The two texts have very different witness lists; the Le Loroux charter was drawn up in Le Mans.

BnF Touraine-Anjou II (2,1) no.389, is an undated agreement between Archembald fitz Ulger and Abbot Richard and the monks of Cormery, in which Archembald granted possession of the chapel to a clerk, Letard, for the duration of Letard and Archembald's own lives (and see summary, Mabille, *Catalogue analytique*, p.53). Ulger of Braye's claim to the chapel therefore indicates that he was Archembald's son, and that Archembald had died in or before 1146.

Coutances, bishop of Manche, arr. Coutances (dioc. Coutances).

40 219 Generally addressed confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of the verdict of an enquiry by the ducal assize, that Richard fitz Nigel holds rights in the churches of Cherbourg and Tournelville (Manche) from Bishop Algar of Coutances. St-Lô, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = cartulary copy (Coutances cathedral cartulary 'B', f.173r-v, no.286), lost.

Printed, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.220, no.95; RRAN III, no.245; Julie Fontanel, *Le cartulaire du chapitre cathédral de Coutances: Étude et édition critique* (Saint-Lô, 2003), no.292. Summarised, Delisle, *Cartulaire normand*, no.162.

Jurors: Richard of *Wauvilla*; William the monk; William of Saint-Germain; William of Bricqueville; Richard of Martinvast; Robert of Valognes.

Witnesses: Richard *cancellarius*; William of Vernon; Engelger of Bohon; Alexander of Bohon; Jordan Taisson; Robert of Neubourg; Robert of Courcy; Joscelin of Tours; Geoffrey of Clefs; Pippin of Tours.

Dating: undated, *apud Sanctum Laudum*. Fontanel dates this notification of Robert fitz Nigel's confirmation to the ducal assize that he held possessions in the Cotentin to the period 1135×1150, i.e. from the death of Henry I to the cession of the ducal title to Henry. Although the Cotentin fell to the Angevins relatively early in the conquest, it is unlikely that Geoffrey would have ordered such a confirmation before 1144; the ducal title is also used which, despite existing only in later copies, suggests a date after the siege of Rouen.

This is confirmed by the use of the ducal assize to hold an inquest, and although it dealt with the diocese of Coutances, the concerns of the confirmation suggest that it should be read in the context of the Bayeux inquests (which also involved the bishop of Lisieux) and should perhaps therefore be dated to 1145×1147.

**Cunault, Benedictine priory of Notre-Dame (dep. Saint-Philibert of Tournus)
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Gennes (dioc. Angers).**

- 41 Unspecified grant, given in thanks for the victory in Normandy.
Probably in the abbey, 1145.

B = French summary from unknown source, Angers BM MS 686B (Joseph Grandet, *Notre-Dame angevine*, first version), f.57.

‘On est venu de tout tems dans l’eglise de Cunault invoquer le secours de la tres Ste Vierge. Il s’y est fait quantité de miracles, sur tout les meres et les nourices seches y viennent pout obtenir du lait, et il y en a par qui ne recoivent leffet de leurs prieres. Geofroy Martel (cancelled: *marginal note fils de Foulques roy de Jlem*) dans un don quil fait a leglise de Cunault en 1145 dit que la Ste Vierge fait beaucoup de miracles en ce lieu. *Beatiss^{ee} virgo multis virtutibus insignis*, et il attribue après Dieu la victoire glor’ (illegible) remportée sur les Normands a la protection speciale de la tres Ste Vierge on a veu quelques fois venir dans cette eglise vint et 30 processions des paroisses d’alentour. Et l’experience q’l’on aq’ la divine Marie ecoute favourablement les prieres de leur qui la prie avec foy et devotion fait que cette eglise a eté de tout tems frequentée.’

Witnesses: none recorded.

Note: the terms of this grant are not known, but it appears that Geoffrey granted or conceded something to the priory in the wake of his victory in Normandy. The only section of the grant which was reproduced by Grandet was a reference to the miracles performed by the virgin at Cunault (*Beatissime virgo multis virtutibus insignis*). This, and the date cited, distinguish it from the charter below. Grandet did not include this anecdote/reference in the more complete version of the *Notre-Dame angevine* (MS 687). This is clearly posterior to no.42, below.

- Cunault and the priory of Loudun (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Loudun; dioc. Poitiers)

- 42 149 Settlement by Count Geoffrey of a dispute provoked by the claim by the prior of Cunault and its priory at Loudun that the men of the priories were being unjustly taxed by the bailiffs of Angevin barons. Confirmation of the gifts made by the founder of the priories, Geoffrey II, and subsequent donors. Confirmation of the priories’ obligation to provide men for the comital army in time of war. Near Angers, February-March 1144.

B = s.xvi copy, ADML G 826 (documents relating to Cunault’s demesne preserved by the seminary of Saint-Charles, Angers), ff.37, 39, 59. C = pre-1724 copy, Angers BM MS 687 (Joseph Grandet, *Notre-Dame Angevine*), f.170r-170v.
Printed, Pierre Juenin, *Nouvelle histoire de l’abbaye royale et collégiale de Saint-Filibert et de la ville de Tournus* (Dijon, 1733), preuves, p.424.

Witnesses: Ulger, bishop of Angers; Henry, *primogenito nostro*; Andrew of Doué; Peter of

Chemillé; unnamed others.

Signa: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Ulger, bishop of Angers; Henry, the count's son; Aimery of Loudun; Joscelin Roonard.

Dating: *Actum ex hoc Andegavis civitate, in anno quo annuente Deo et sancta Matre ejus, partem Normannie quae est citra Sequanam, adquisivimus ... Anno ab Incarnatione Domini M.C.XLIII. regnante in Francia glorioso rege Ludovico.* A date of 1144, and thus the use of an Easter or Annunciation dating style, is suggested by the obvious delay in hearing the news of Fulk V's death in Jerusalem during November 1143 – he is here described as 'recently dead' (*nuper defuncti*). Furthermore, Geoffrey did not finish conquering the part of Normandy west of the Seine until 1144, and the dating clause which lauds Geoffrey's Norman achievements does not refer to the fall of Rouen or its tower. Geoffrey is also titled *Andegavorum comes*.

A. L. Poole placed this document as 'perhaps after the capture of Rouen in January 1144' ('Henry Plantagenet's Early Visits to England', *EHR* 47 (1932), pp.447-52: 451), but it in fact appears that Geoffrey returned to Angers during the course of the siege of Rouen; this is also suggested by the context of the agreement, which laments the priories' reluctance to assist with the Normandy campaign: *quod cum cogente necessitate guerrarum, quas in Normannia habemus, ab ecclesiis et religionibus Andegaviae nos quaerere subsidia oporteret, venerabilis Petrus abbas Trenorchiensis, et Petrus de Aula tunc temporis prior de Cunaldo et de Lausduno, facere nobis hujusmodi auxilia recusarunt.* For further discussion, see Chapter 1.

Note: in exchange for this agreement, Geoffrey received £100 angevin and Henry the gift of a horse, from Abbot Peter of Tournus.

Évreux, bishop of

43 214 Writ from Duke and Count Geoffrey instructing Guy of Sablé, William Lovel and the ducal *prepositi* and *baillivi* at Verneuil and Nonancourt (Eure, arr. Évreux) to give the tithes there to the bishop, as he held them under Henry I. Order to William Lovel to do justice to a certain Gilbert. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xiii-xiv cartulary copy (Stein 1289), ADEu G122, f.42, no.195.

Printed, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.140, no.6; *RRAN* III, no.283. Summarised, Auguste Le Prévost, *Mémoires et notes pour servir à l'histoire du département de l'Eure*, ed. L. Delisle & L. Passy (3 vols., Évreux, 1862-9), II, p.488.

Witnesses: Thomas *cancellarius*.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period.

Note: this confirms *RRAN* II, no.1554. In the transcription supplied by *RRAN* III, no.283, it is noted that the Évreux cathedral cartulary identifies this figure as *Gilberto mu[n]nario*, which was emended by Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.140, no.6, to *nummario*, which brings us no further to identifying Gilbert. In *RRAN* III Davis suggests that it ought to read *de Mineriis*, which would make Gilbert the same person as Robert of Leicester's steward; Round, *Calendar*, no.653, however, shows that this Gilbert was steward to a later Earl of Leicester, at the end of the twelfth century.

**Fécamp, Benedictine abbey of La Trinité
Seine-Maritime, arr. Le Havre, cant. Fécamp (dioc. Rouen).**

44 213 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey to the men of Fécamp of the abbey's control of all seaports between Étigue (now Vattetot-sur-Mer, arr. Le Havre, cant. Fécamp) and Liergan (now St-Aubin-sur-Mer, arr. Dieppe, cant. Fontaine-le-Dun), both Seine-Maritime. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = original, apparently formerly in ADSM, noted as 'misaid' by Haskins. B = copy, BnF NA Latin 1245, f.122. C = Rouen BM MS 1210, f.17. D = BnF Latin 14194 ('Anecdota vetera', compilation from various s.xi-xvi manuscripts, with marginal note wrongly dating the confirmation to 1140), f.267v.

Printed Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.133, n.37; *RRAN* III, no.303, both from B and C.

Witnesses: Reginald of Saint-Valéry.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Rothomagum*.

Note: this confirmation is the result of a plea brought before Duke Geoffrey by the abbot of Fécamp concerning rights over ports on this long stretch (c.30km) of the Pays de Caux coastline which encompassed Fécamp itself. This plea itself is only known of because the abbot had to appeal to Henry II between 1156 and 1159 for a similar confirmation, as the men of the district were claiming customs at the port of Fécamp (DB I, no.120; Vincent, *Pl. Acta*, no.914, with discussion and dating). Henry's confirmation states that Abbot Henry appeared before Geoffrey (*disrationavit in curia patris mei et postea in curia mea*), and this may well be this hearing, which dealt with a much wider area and bigger collection of ports than just Fécamp.

45 211 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey, and his son Henry, of Abbot Henry de Sully in the rights of the abbey. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150, perhaps 11th October 1148 × Spring 1149, or December 1149 × January 1150.

A = original (formerly sealed on a parchment tag, seal lost), ADSM 7H12. B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Rouen BM MS 1207 (Stein 1309), f.13. C = s.xv copy (from B), BnF NA Latin 2412 (Stein 1311), p.29.

Printed, DB I, no.8*; *RRAN* III, no.304. Summarised, Round, *Calendar*, no.126 (from B). Facsimile, *RRAN* IV, no.39.

Witnesses: Philip, bishop of Bayeux; Richard, bishop of Avranches; Richard *cancellarius*; Reginald of Saint-Valéry *dapifer*; Robert of Neubourg; Osbert of Cailly; Gofferus of Bruyères (*de Brueria*); Absalon Roonard; Gosbert *sine terra*; Ridel of Rillé; Enguerrand of Vascoeuil; Henry of Ferrières-St-Hilaire (*de Ferreris*).

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Rothomagum*. Unlike the charters issued in Rouen and Argentan around October 1148, in which Henry was involved (nos. 74 and 88, below) this differs as it was jointly issued by Duke Geoffrey and Henry. The Angevin witnesses Ridel of Rillé and Absalon Roonard were both in Vendôme with Geoffrey on 23rd February 1147 (no.112, below), as was Gofferus *de Brueria*, who also appears as a witness in Geoffrey's grant of 11th October 1148 to Mortemer (no.74). His presence in that grant alongside Osbert of Cailly and Enguerrand of Vascoeuil, who also appear here, brings together many of the witnesses in this charter.

The presence of witnesses is not conclusive, however. What is most significant is Henry's status in this rare jointly-issued charter, and it must belong either to the period just before his departure for England in the spring of 1149 or just after his return, either in December 1149 or January 1150, immediately prior to his investiture as duke.

Note: it is possible that this general confirmation was issued in the wake of a major plea over

port rights (no.44, above). Both charters deal with these rights, and were issued in Rouen, with Reginald of Saint-Valéry as a witness (the sole witness to no.44). Both texts may have followed Pope Eugenius III taking the abbey into his protection while at Paris on 26th May 1147 (*RPR* II, no.9058). Reginald, however, as seneschal of Normandy was a frequent witness, so a charter cannot be dated with much precision by his presence.

**Fontevraud, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Saumur-Sud (dioc. Poitiers).**

46 118 Grant of customs by Count Geoffrey over Fontevraud's mills on the Loire, to supplement those already held by the abbey. Angers, 14th April 1135.

B = cartulary copy, relevant section (f.135) lost ('Grand cartulaire'; surviving folios now BnF NA Latin 2414 and ADML). C = copy from B, ADML 101 H 225 *bis*, p.96, no.571. D = s.xviii copy (from B?), BnF Touraine-Anjou XII¹, f.167, no.5703.

Printed, Michaelis Cosnier, *Fontis-Ebraldi exordium complectens opuscula duo, cum notationibus de vita B. Roberti de Arbresello Fontebraldensis ordinis institutoris et quaestionibus aliquot de potestate abbatissae* (La Flèche, 1641), p.183 (from cartulary *avec coupures*); Jean de la Mainferme, *Clypeus nascentis Fontebraldensis ordinis, nova editio* (3 vols., Saumur and Paris, 1684-92) I, p.60 and II, pp.226-7 (full text after B); Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.47; Bienvenu II, no.868.

Witnesses: Fulk, abbot of Pontron; Thomas the chaplain [in *Clypeus*]; Theobald of Blazon; Galvan of Chemillé; John of Beaumont (*de Bello-Monte*); Pagan of Clairvaux and Belotus, his brother; William of Taunay; Absalon [in D]; Aimery of Trèves; Pippin *prepositus*; Pagan Gallus [in D].

Dating: *Petronillam, primam predicti monasterii abbatissam, a predicto comite hoc dono fuisse investitam, juxta principalem Andegavis aulam, in camera quae vulgo appellatur Estima*,¹⁹ *octava videlicet*²⁰ *die Resurrectionis Dominicae, anno ab Incarnatione ejusdem Domini nostri Jesu-Christi MCXXXV, Innocentio secundo, sanctae Romanae sedis universali pontifice, Ulgerio, Andegavorum presule, regnantibus*,²¹ *Ludovico in Francia, Henrico in Anglia.*

47 Chirograph notice drawn up by Fontevraud relating the history of a claim over Verrarium, eventually settled by Count Geoffrey in the comital court. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, perhaps before 1131; probably before 1140.

A = original, uncut chirograph, ADML 101 H 168, folder 9.
Printed, Bienvenu I, no.564.

Witnesses: *sub istorum testimonio, assensum petitioni eorum prebuit*: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Conan, duke [comes] of Brittany; Galvan of Chemillé; Adam of Rochefort; Pippin *prepositus*; Joscelin of Tours *qui multum ut hoc fieret laboravit*; Norman the archdeacon; Ralph of Gré; Peter of Montsabert; William *de Roisci*;²² John of Cossé-d'Anjou (*de Coceo*). *Ex fratribus aecclesiae*: Reginald of Cossé; Bertrand the sacristan; John *de Pozaugio*; Gerald Parvus.

¹⁹ D, 'Estuva'.

²⁰ In *Clypeus* only.

²¹ Omitted from D.

²² Perhaps Roissé (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Noyant, comm. Breil); cf. Port, *Dictionnaire* III, p.299.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke. Bienvenu dated this document to 1129-48, presumably by the presence of Conan of Brittany (d.1148). However, it originates from the period prior to 1144 and the assumption of the ducal title by Geoffrey. It may in fact have been issued 1129×1131, as Fulk is referred to simply as count rather than king; this is only very slight evidence, however.

The presence of Galvan of Chemillé suggests a date prior to 1140: he was a frequent witness to Geoffrey's charters, and his last appearance is dated 25th August 1139 (no.3, above). Galvan died sometime after this date and before 1148 (CN, no.214), and the absence of any attestations after 1139 suggests that he may have died in the early part of this period.

48 124 Chirograph drawn up by Abbess Petronilla, recording the outcome of a case brought before Count Geoffrey's court, whereby gifts granted to the abbey by Audeburge of Montreuil-Bellay were reclaimed by her heirs. It is decided that Petronilla will keep the lands, and pay Odo, Audeburge's grandson, an annual sum of 28s. ?Fontevraud, 1136.

A = originals, ADML 101 H 168, 5 *bis* (two halves of the chirograph with missing seal pendant of white wax, whether hung by tongue or cord of leather or silk is unknown). B = s.xviii copy BnF Latin 5480, I, p.379, with drawing on p.380 of partially destroyed comital seal.

Utile est scribi quod non convenit obliisci: notum esse volumus tam presentibus quam futuris quatinus Audeburgis de Mosterello donavit Deo et Sancte Marie et Sanctimonialibus apud fontem ebraudi Deo servientibus per manum magistri Roberti de Arbrisello Venerabilis et Religiosi viri, terram suam quam habebat ipsa ad Vallem Sichart et ad molendinum Sanctum et boscum de droua. Hoc donum concessit Mansella filia Audeburgis et Odo filius Manselle et Arenburgis, Burchardus Espechel et Gauduinus Espechel, et nepos eiusdem Audeburgis Hubertus de Booleto. Huius autem doni testes fuerunt isti supradicti. Quam terram videlicet et boscum diu de Fonte Ebraudi statenuit ecclesia. Tempore postea longo interposito, caritate frigiscente. Mansella et Odo filius suus diabolica decepti subgestionem quod prius concesserunt de concessisse negantes, calumpniati sunt propter quam calumpniam. Ego P(etr)onilla) I^a. de Fonte Ebraudi abbatissa cum fratribus nostris et sororibus in curia Ildeberti Cenomannensis Episcopi veni adversaria parte ibi adsistente. Auditis itaque utriusque partis rationibus episcopus cum clericis suis fecessit in partem qui reversi nostram iusticia dictante terram esse illam dixerunt. Ego vero Petronilla terram cepi edificare et in ea domos construere quod videntes Mansella et Odo terram vastaverunt atque domos combusserunt. Quamobrem curiam comitis Gaufridi Martelli Junioris adire me oportuit. Comes me de terra illa saisivit illis tamen reclamantibus ego vero controversiam illam finire cupiens, iterum curiam comitis iterum adivi, pacem et concordiam cum Odone feci quo licet Odo

subterfugeret atque ad curiam venire non auderet tamen venit tandem, concordia fuit talis quod Ecclesie Sancte Marie 28 census annuatim Odo persolveret ad festum Sancti Brixii quod ut firmatus fieret comes litteras fieri precepit et suo muniri eas sigillo fecit. Huius rei sunt testes Galvanus Chimilliaco. Pipinus de Turono, Fulco filius oberti et quamplures alii. Hoc autem factum est anno ab Incarnatione Domini 1136. Lodovico in Francia regnantes. Wlgerio Episcopatum Andegavense tenente.

Witnesses: Galvan of Chemillé; Pippin of Tours; Fulk fitz Obert; unnamed others.

Dating: *Hoc autem factum est anno ab Incarnatione Domini 1136.*

Note: Fulk fitz Obert appears to be the same individual as Fulk Auberti/fitz Obert in App. I, no.29 and App. III, no.1.

49 161 Notice drawn up by Abbess Petronilla recording the annual grant of 28 *solidi* in rent to Odo fitz Mansella and his heirs, assented to by Count Geoffrey. 1131×1144 (1136?).

B = cartulary copy ('Grand cartulaire', f.114), lost. C = copy from B, ADML 101 H 225 *bis*, p.87, no.461. D = 1498 transcription from B for the Dame de Montsoreau, *ibid.* 101 H 70 / 12 (provisional classification as cited by Bienvenu). E = copy from B, BnF Gaignières II, p.34, no.461.

Printed, Bienvenu, II, no.760, from C and E, and no.947 (5), from D.

Witnesses: Galvan of Chemillé; Pagan of Clairvaux; Pippin *Andegavensis prefectus* [in E only]; Thomas, chaplain of the count of Anjou [in E only].

Dating: undated, during the comital but not ducal period. Bienvenu dates it to 1131×44. 1136 is likely as this notice essentially confirms the grant which was contested by Odo in no.48, above.

50 92 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey of Fulk V's grant of pannage in all comital forests to the abbey. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = copy in *vidimus* of 1342, AN P1334⁵, f.131.

Printed, Chartrou, pièce justificative no.41 (and catalogued amongst Fulk's rather than Geoffrey's *acta*); Bienvenu, II, no.857.

Witnesses: G[osbert] *sine terra*; Gofferius of Bruyères; Archenoldus.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke. This was an important privilege, and its confirmation was perhaps sought soon after Fulk's departure. Cf. no.45, above, issued in Normandy and witnessed by Gosbert and Gofferius.

Fulk the Chamberlain

51 229 Notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey of his permission to Fulk to marry Hoysim, daughter of Bigot the chamberlain, as well as a grant to Fulk of hereditary rights over the revenues from Précigné (Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Sablé-sur-Sarthe) and whatever else the count has there, as well as lands previously acquired. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150, perhaps early.

B = copy of 1610, ADML G1003, f.10v (register of 13 items relating to Saint-Laud's fief and chapel of La Noue, copied from originals; headed 'Coppia fundatione et donatione capellaniae de La Noe dy Ecclesia collegiate Sancti Laudi. Originale hoc habitur in capsulam in capso Sancti Laudi').

Printed CSL, no.83; RRAN III, no.1004, where Fulk's daughter's name is rendered 'Loysim'.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Isore(dus) of Montbazou; Loellus Ferlus; Pippin of Tours; Simon, *camerarius* (recte *canonicus*); Gorron *camerarius* (recte *canonicus*); Thomas *capellanus*; Robin, *predicte domine avunculus*.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; wrongly dated to the period after the cession of the ducal title by Chartrou (who moreover dated this event to 28th October 1150), this unusual confirmation of an earlier concession made by Geoffrey himself seems in fact to perhaps date to the early years of the ducal period. The confirmation contains an extremely unusual sealing clause, stating that 'in order that he is in possession more firmly and freely, I strengthened [the grant] with the seal of my duchy, previously having ordered and caused [it] to be sealed with the seal of my county' (*Et ut firmitus et liberius teneatur, sigillo ducatus mei muniri feci, et ante sigillo comitatus mei sigillari preceperam et feceram*).

This presents the possibility that reconfirmations were sought by beneficiaries under Geoffrey's new, ducal seal. The questions of authenticity raised by this are unusual, and the desire for a reconfirmation may reflect the prestige of the ducal title.

Note: Henry II apparently issued two charters in favour of Fulk the chamberlain of Anjou, copies of which are both preserved in the same volume as this text (printed CSL nos. 85 [*Pl. Acta* no.1096], also surviving in a suspect 'original' in a s.xii^{ex} bookhand [Angers BM MS 757, no.11a], and 86 [*Pl. Acta* no.1097]), the authenticity of which has been questioned by Nicholas Vincent et al. The claim, however (*Pl. Acta* no.1096, n.), that 'Fulk the chamberlain appears to be an imaginary figure' cannot be sustained. Although he never appears as a witness to Henry's charters, Geoffrey's chamberlain Fulk appears several times in his *acta*: cf. App. I nos. 5, 6, 18, 27, 28, 29, 94. The unusual and apparently spurious nature of the charters in his favour does not preclude the possibility that elements of them are authentic; indeed, the witnesses to this concession are all authentic, with the possible exception of Robin. The apparent grant of revenues at Précigné by Geoffrey, repeated by Henry, is perhaps suspect. Henry also apparently confirmed a chapel founded by Fulk at Saint-Laud in Angers which, if authentic, strengthens the connections between Geoffrey's household and his chapel, i.e. Saint-Laud.

Fulk de la Roussière

52 220 Grant by Duke and Count Geoffrey of pannage for fifty pigs in comital forests, burial rights in the chapel of Seiches (-sur-le-Loir, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, chef-lieu de cant.) and the *métayage* previously belonging to Geoffrey in the parish of Seiches. Given in return for Fulk's service in battle and his liege homage. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1697, with no indication of provenance.

Printed *RRAN* III, no.1007.

Witnesses: [unnamed] lord of Sablé; Nivard of Rochefort; Bertrand of Champigné; Frosion of Champigné (*de Campigniaco*); Ra(lph) Burell; Geoffrey of Clefs; Geoffrey de la Roussière; Hugh of Clefs; Geoffrey of Soucelles; Simon of Châtillon, *qui mantellum recepit*.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period. The presence of the lord of Sablé suggests that this grant was made before the serious revolt of Robert of Sablé alongside Helias in 1145, although the lack of a specific name (presumably a copying error) means that a firm conclusion cannot be drawn. The attestation of Nivard of Rochefort perhaps suggests that his probable father and the previous lord of Rochefort, Adam, was deceased. Adam witnessed one of Geoffrey's charters (no.36, above) alongside Robert of Sablé during the ducal period, but after the investiture of Bishop William of Le Mans (January 1145).

**Héauville, Benedictine priory (dep. Marmoutier)
Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville, cant. Les Pieux (dioc. Coutances).**

53 209 Writ-charter addressed to the bishop, justices, vicomtes and barons of the Cotentin, in which Duke and Count Geoffrey confirms the privileges the priory had in King Henry's time. Argentan, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = original, known to have been sealed *en simple queue*, lost. B = *vidimus* of 1524, BnF Touraine-Anjou 31, p.57, no.8.

Printed DB I, no.29; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.141, no.7a; *RRAN* III, no.578.

Witnesses: Thomas *cancellarius*.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Argentomum*.

Note: Haskins, 'The Government of Normandy Under Henry II', *AHR* 20 (1914), pp.24-42, at 29, discusses this confirmation in relation to the continuation of Geoffrey's practices under Henry II, who reissued the confirmation almost word-for-word. Elsewhere, he draws attention to the presence of Thomas of Loches as chancellor and his adoption of 'the brevity and precision of the Anglo-Norman writ' in this 'thoroughly Norman' document (*Norman Institutions*, p.140). This is in fact, as the text states, a continuation of the *status quo* under Henry I (*RRAN* II, no.1948, incidentally witnessed by Pagan of Clairvaux, c.1130×1135).

Henry the Marshal

54 179 Generally-addressed notification of the grant by Duke and Count Geoffrey of the hereditary sergeanties of Cailly and the banlieu of Rouen, and other privileges, to Henry the Marshal. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × 1146, or 1149 × January 1150.

B = copy in French *vidimus* of 1318, Paris AN JJ72, no.191 (identified by Haskins as 'corrupt'). Printed Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.152-3, no.13 (wrongly dated 1144-7); *RRAN* III, no.381.

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop of Rouen; Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux; Philip, bishop of Bayeux; Waleran, count of Meulan; Reginald of Saint-Valéry; Roger (?) of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Rothomagum*. May be tentatively dated by Waleran of Meulan's attestation.

Note: the witness Roger of Clairvaux (*Rogero de Claris vallis*) ought perhaps to be corrected to Pagan of Clairvaux (*Claris vallibus*).

Hospitallers

55 175 Generally-addressed notification of Duke and Count Geoffrey's grant of market rights at Villedieu-les-Poêles and Saut-Chevreuil (both Manche, arr. St-Lô, cant. Villedieu-les-Poêles), to be shared equally with the nuns of Notre Dame, Lisieux. Mirebeau, 1147, after 20th April.

A = original in AD Calvados (Caen), lost post-1918. B = French copy, AD Calvados, lost? C = s.xix copy, BnF Latin 10071 (compilation by Léchaud d'Anisy) f.155, no.1.

Printed, *Documents historiques touchant les Templiers et les Hospitaliers en Normandie, tirés des archives du Calvados et des autres dépôts publics*, ed. Léchaudé d'Anisy, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 2nd series, 4 (1844), p.382 (wrongly ascribed to William Rufus); *RRAN* III, no.408 (where Saut-Chevreuil is wrongly identified as Montchevreil, dép. Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Trun). Summarised in Round, *Calendar*, no.576 (after lost original, no specific reference, vol. 1, f.148; erroneously dated to Easter 1147 and followed by Chartrou) and Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.133-4 (noting the existence of 'modern copies' at Caen).

Witnesses: Gervais de Marcillie, Absalon Piques, Gaffray Decaille, Ivon de Calonné, Guillaume de Bosseville, Simon de Castillon, maistre Hugues de Sanctelles, Jehan chapelain des Dames de St. Sever, et Claire religieuse.

Dating: l'an de l'incarnation de Notre Seigneur MCXLVII, Pasques précédente, la dite charte donnée à Mirebel.

Note: the only witness here definitely found elsewhere in Geoffrey's *acta* is Simon of Châtillon. C, wrongly ascribed to 'Guillaume Duc de Normandie et comte d'Anjou', renders Gervais de Marcillie as Gervais de Marseille. It is unclear whether the others were local Poitevins or Normans. Guillaume de Bosseville is rendered as de Botteville by d'Anisy, but it should also be noted that a William de Boevill' appears alongside a Roger de Boevill' in a charter of Henry II for Valmont Abbey in Normandy, and can perhaps be identified with nearby Bosville (Seine-Maritime, arr. Dieppe, cant. Cany-Barville). He may be the same individual as the William de Botevilla in no.96, below. D'Anisy gives Gaffray Decaille as Gessain de Scaille; this may actually be one Geoffrey of Cailly (and cf. Osbert of Cailly and his son Walter of Vascoeul).

56 205 Generally addressed notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey of his confirmation of grants made by Reginald of Bailleul to the Hospitallers at Villedieu-lès-Bailleul (Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. Trun). 23rd April 1144 x January 1150.

B = copy at head of s.xii pancarte (drawn up in different hands and misidentified in later marginal note as a confirmation by William Rufus, c.1105), AN M15 (1). C = s.xvii copy, ibid. M15 (2), attributed to William Rufus. D = s.xvii copy, ibid. M15 (3), attributed to William Rufus. Printed, *Cartulaire general de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1310)*, ed. J. Delaville le Roulx (4 vols., Paris, 1894-1906) I, no.156; *RRAN* III, no.407.

Witnesses: William, count of Ponthieu; John, his son; Hugh of Merlay; William of Montpinçon.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period.

Note: the witnesses listed are those who attested Reginald's grant rather than Geoffrey's confirmation.

Le Loroux, Cistercian abbey
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Longué-Jumelles (dioc. Angers).

57 173 Charter of Duke and Count Geoffrey detailing an annual payment of £8 Le Mans, for lighting the abbey's church, in exchange for rents at *Curneiacum* and the borough of Saint-Nicolas in Le Mans, following a dispute between Geoffrey and Abbot Fulk of Le Loroux over the *métayages* granted to the abbey by its founders, Fulk V and Aremburga, in which the abbey's possession of the lands and farming arrangements in them was found to be against the Cistercian rule. The *métayages* were then given to Fulk of Clefs. Le Mans, 1146, after 24th March.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1723. C = s.xvii-xviii copy, Angers BM MS 687 (Joseph Grandet, *Notre-Dame angevine*, second version), f.264v.

Printed, Paul Marchegay, 'Chartes Angevines des onzième et douzième siècles', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 36 (1875), pp.381-441, no.33; printed, *RRAN* III, no.1006 (stating £7 as the sum given, in error).

Witnesses: (to the agreement with Le Loroux) William, bishop of Le Mans; Robert Burgeric, *cantore*; Philip, *archidiacono*; Burgeric, *notario meo* (Geoffrey); Burgundius, *senescallo Cenomannis*; Boterius, *pincerna meo Cenomannis fealiter*; Hugh of Clefs, *senescallo* of La Flèche; Philip of Ponthouin; Ralph *de Rivellone*; Joscelin of Tours, *tunc impense mee administratore*; Pagan Nardoc, *villicus* of Le Mans; Pagan *Malo-cane*, custodian of the tower of Le Mans; Geoffrey Durand, *camerario*; Gilbert *gardarobam*.

(To the grant to Fulk of Clefs) Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh [of Clefs] *senescallus* of La Flèche; Reginald *de Sot*; Suhard *de Colunge*, Reginald *de Polers*; Matthew of Clefs; Geoffrey *de Courlion*.

Dating: *Facta est autem hec cartula jussu G(aufridi) suprascripti principis anno verbi incarnati MCXLVI^o, domno Eugenio Cisterciensis religionis monacho papa; Ludovico rege Francorum, anno quo cum aliis viris illustribus crucem sumpsit...*

Note: contains the same address clause as no.52 as well as no.39, above, which was drawn up by Burgeric the notary, who also witnessed this text.

Le Mans, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Couture
Sarthe, arr. Le Mans (dioc. Le Mans).

58 114 Cartulary notice detailing Count Geoffrey's consent to the abbey of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Couture to construct houses in the borough of Danguy (*burgum Guidonis*), in exchange for customs collected from foreign merchants. Le Mans, in the house of the merchant Durbress, 1133.

B = s.xiii¹ cartulary copy, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon MS 198 (s.xiii¹ cartulary with later

additions, Stein 1979), f.9. C = copy of c.1770, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon MS 91 (*Compendium historiae regalis abbatiae S. Petri de Cultura*), p.52, no.46. Printed *Cartulaires des abbayes de Saint-Pierre de la Couture et de Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, publié par les Bénédictins de Solesmes* (Le Mans, 1881), no.66, from B and C.

Witnesses: Abbot Fulk; William of Taunay (*de Tania*), monk; Hugh Borrel, monk; Fulcoius (*Fulchonis*), the count's chaplain; Roland of Montrevault; unnamed others.

Dating: *anno ab incarnatione Domini M C XXX III placuit domino Fulconi abbati Sancti Petri de Cultura*. The original request by the monks to construct the houses was granted by the abbot in 1133; Geoffrey's assent is undated. Geoffrey's first son Henry was born and baptised in Le Mans in March 1133, and one would perhaps expect to see him mentioned if the charter was drawn up after his birth.

59 138 Clarification by Count Geoffrey in the comital court of the tithes which could be collected by the monks in the forest of Roézé (formerly Roizé, Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. La Suze-sur-Sarthe), and those to which Pagan of Clairvaux was entitled. Le Mans, in the house of Bishop Hugh, 9th August 1142.

B = s.xiii¹ cartulary copy, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon MS 198, f.19v. Printed CSP no.53, from B.

Witnesses: Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; Abbot Ursus; Helinand *prepositus*; unnamed others.

Dating: *Acta hec sunt in domo domni Ugonis episcopi, in vigilia sancti Laurencii que dominico die erat, ab incarnatione Domini m° c° xliii*. Although dated 1143, it is a scribal error for 1142, the year in which the eve of the feast of Saint Laurence (9th August) fell on a Sunday. This date is somewhat problematic, however: during 1142 Geoffrey was campaigning in western Normandy (*Historia Novella*, p.72) and this has been interpreted as occupying the summer (Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194). Cf. RT, I, p.226, which implies that Geoffrey, before embarking upon his Normandy campaign, was reluctant to leave Anjou because 'he feared the rebellion of Angevins and his other men'. If Geoffrey stopped in Le Mans on his way to Normandy on 9th August 1142, it would mean that the taking of ten castles in the Avranchin and Bessin with Robert of Gloucester was fast and effective, coming to an end six weeks later at the most.

60 198 Generally addressed notification of a grant of a third of the tithes held by Duke and Count Geoffrey at Bellesaule (Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Ballon, comm. Courceboeufs), and confirmation of the grant of a third of the tithes held in fee from the count in the same place by Pagan of Mondoubleau and his mother, Guiberta. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xiii¹ cartulary copy, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon MS 198, f.27v. Printed CSP, no.54 (misdated 1142).

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Burg[undius], *senescaulo*; Simon [of Châtillon] *cam(erario)*; others unnamed.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period.

Note: although for a non-Norman beneficiary, the form of this confirmation follows the Norman style. CSP incorrectly names the seneschal as Burgeric; cf. no.57, above. Comparison with Geoffrey's other *acta* also shows that Simon the chamberlain was Simon of Châtillon.

**Le Mans, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Vincent
Sarthe, arr. Le Mans (dioc. Le Mans).**

- 61 191 Generally addressed confirmation of a grant of land by Duke and Count Geoffrey to the monks for building a bakehouse, to be free from all customs, near Mont Barbé (alias Mont Barbet). Le Mans, 12th January 1148 or 1149.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy by Roger de Gaignières from a 1259 *vidimus* of an official of Le Mans, BnF Latin 5444, p.604. C = s.xvii-xviii copy of *vidimus*, *ibid.* Latin 5445, p.89.
Printed Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.61; *RRAN* III, no.1005.

Witnesses: William, bishop of Le Mans; Hardouin, dean; Alberic, archdeacon; Bulgeric, cantor; Hardouin, chaplain; Eustace; Robert, dean of Saint-Pierre;²³ Helias, the count's brother; Joscelin of Tours, *dapifer*; Philip of Ponthouin; Gerald of Baugé; Boterius; Guy fitz Hugh; Simon Gondoini; Pagan Cavallenus; Pagan Malus-canis; Pagan Hardreii vicarius; Gilbert gardaroba.

Dating: *anno verbi incarnati MCXLVIII° pridie Idus Januarii. Apud Cenomanum.* The dating style used by Saint-Vincent is not known. Both Chartrou and *RRAN* III date this to 1149, not 1148 as stated in the dating clause, presumably on the grounds that the New Year began at the Annunciation or Easter. Chartrou gives the date as 'MCXLVIII' in error.

Note: witnessed by Geoffrey's brother Helias, which shows that he was not imprisoned in Tours continuously between 1145/6 and the period just before his death in 1151, as asserted by several narrative sources (GCA, p.71 and JM, p.207; 'Chronicon Turonense magnum', in *Chroniques de Touraine*, ed. André Salmon (Tours, 1851), p.131).

- 62 Cartulary notice of a claim by the count's hunter, Odo, that the count's dogs were entitled to be fed in the monks' house. Brought before the comital court at Château-du-Loir, where Odo abandoned his claim.

A = original, lost. B = cartulary copy, lost. C = s.xvii-xviii copy, Paris BnF Latin 5444, p.102.
Printed, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans, ordre de Saint Benoît: Premier cartulaire, 542-1188*, ed. R. Charles and Vicomte Menjot d'Elbenne (Mamers and Le Mans, 1886-1913), no.230 (dated late s.xi / early s.xii; and see below).

Witnesses: Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; Adelin of Semblençay; Gosbert of Mayet; Urso de Fracte Vallo; William de Alee; Leonard of Outillé; William de Campaniaco; Geoffrey of Saint-Georges; Burgundius *dapifero*; Geoffrey Bernard; Reginald de Brolio;²⁴ Harduin fitz Ebrard; John, prior; Mainard, *preposito*.

Dating: undated; the dating to Geoffrey's reign is extremely tentative. Some of the known witnesses – Pagan of Clairvaux, Geoffrey of Clefs – fit with this date, but equally the count in question could be Helias or Fulk V. By contrast with the editors of the cartulary, Beaupré (*Coutumes et institutions* II, i, pp.125-6, n.2) dates it to Geoffrey's reign. Bruno Lemesle, *La société aristocratique*, p.170 thinks this is a record of events under Helias.

²³ Chartrou mistakenly transcribed *Robertus* as *Roberti*; cf. *RRAN* III.

²⁴ Perhaps Le Breil-sur-Mérize (Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Montfort-le-Gesnois) or Breil (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Noyant).

Le Mans, Benedictine priory of Saint-Victeur (dep. Mont-Saint Michel, Manche); Sarthe, arr. Le Mans (dioc. Le Mans).

- 63 122 Generally addressed charter of Count Geoffrey granting a ditch on the outskirts of Le Mans to the monks, in order that they can construct houses with cellars. In return, the count stipulates that he receive half of the rent payments and customs derived from other houses, but that the residents are answerable to the monks, and the monks in turn to the count. 1129 × 1135.

B = s.xviii copy with drawing of original seal, BnF Latin 5430a, p.138 (transcripts and drawings of Mont-Saint-Michel documents, by Gaignières), from A. C = s.xix copy, BnF Latin 10072, no.28 (transcripts of Mont-Saint-Michel archives at St-Lô, by Léchaudé d'Anisy), from A. Printed *Cartulaire de Saint-Victeur au Mans, prieuré de l'abbaye du Mont-Saint-Michel (994-1400)*, ed. P. Farcy & Bertrand de Broussillon (Paris, 1895), no.17 ('reconstructed' cartulary, mostly from lost St-Lô AD Manche manuscripts and B); *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Donington, 2006), no.48.

Witnesses: Guy, bishop of Le Mans; William Salomon, prior [of St-Victeur]; Michael, monk; Galvan of Chemillé; Pippin, *prepositus* of Anjou; Robert fitz Reginald; Guy fitz Hugh; Boterius, *pincerna*; William *cognomina* Valor; Durand *Griferius*; Bernard, *coquo*; Peter *cognomina* Calopino; Aufred *Ortolanus*.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke, and during the episcopacy of Bishop Guy of Le Mans (1126-35).

**Le Mans, cathedral chapter of Saint-Julien
Sarthe, arr. Le Mans (dioc. Le Mans).**

- 64 131 Notification by Geoffrey, count of the Manceaux and Angevins, of the termination of a dispute with the canons over ditches running from Mont Barbé to the church of Saint-Ouen. The canons are to have the ditches, but Geoffrey is to retain the two mottes at Mont Barbé. Le Mans, 15th August 1140.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon MS 259 (cathedral chapter cartulary, alias *Liber albus* or *Livre blanc*, compiled 1236-89, Stein 1987), f.44. C = s.xvii copy, BnF Latin 10037 (Dom. Denis Briant, *Coenomania*), pp.318-9, from B. Printed, *Liber albus*, no.25. Summarised, Round, no.1017.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: *Actum Coenom' anno domini 1140 in die assumptione Beat' Mariae.*

- Pagan Arnald, canon of Saint-Julien

- 65 116 General notification of quitclaim by Geoffrey, count of the Angevins and Manceaux, to Pagan, in return for an annual payment of 6d. of Le Mans, the right to freely and peacefully hold a house which Pagan had built on the town wall. Le Mans, in the count's *camera*, January 1133.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon 259, f.21.
Printed, *Liber albus*, no.3. Calendared (without summary), *Cartulaire de l'évêché du Mans : 936-1790*, ed. Bertrand de Broussillon (Le Mans, 1900), p.6, no.37.

Witnesses: Hugh, archdeacon of Le Mans; Fulk of Assé-Riboul (*Fulco Ribolius*); Robert fitz Reginald, *dapifer*; Guy fitz Hugh; Boterius fitz Engelbald; Reginald of Roche (*de Roca*), *villicus* of Le Mans; Ralph fitz Froger; Robert, *carpentarius*.

Dating: *Facta est autem hec concessio anno in Incarnatione Domini M C XXX III, nostri consulus IIII, regnante Lodovico, rege Francorum, Guidone pontifice Cenomannorum, mense januario, apud Cenomannum, in camera nostra.*

Note: this is the only item dated by Geoffrey's regnal year. It was drawn up by Thomas, *capellani atque notarii nostri*, and it is unclear why a comital scribe would have used this unusual formula, and raises questions about alterations at the time it was inserted into the cartulary.

- Eustace, clerk of the bishop of Le Mans

66 227 Generally addressed notification of the sale of a house in the 'valley of the Jews' by Geoffrey, count of the Angevins and Manceaux, to Eustace for £60 Le Mans. Montreuil-Bellay *in exercitu*, 28th October 1150.

A = original, formerly AD Manche MS 201, lost. B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Le Mans Le Mans Médiathèque Louis Aragon 259, f.21v.
Printed, *Liber albus*, no.6. Summarised, Delisle Intr., p.508; Round, *Calendar*, no.1018.

Witnesses: William, bishop of Le Mans; others unnamed.

Dating: *Actum vero est istud anno ab Incarnatione Domini M^oC^oL^o in festo Symonis et Jude in exercitu juxta Mosterolum.*

Note: Chartrou, p.113, n.2, notes that the original was at AD Manche, and therefore destroyed in 1944. It was apparently in the same hand as nos. 31 and 69, both overseen but not drawn up by the Norman chancellor Richard of Bohon.

The transaction was conceded to by Geoffrey jr. and William, and both received a mark of silver. 'The valley of the Jews' (*Vaslini Judei*) is mentioned in JM, p.217, under the name *Vallis jude*, and was a deep gorge next to the castle of Montreuil-Bellay.

Le Mans, canonical college of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour Sarthe, arr. Le Mans (dioc. Le Mans).

67 156 Geoffrey, count of the Angevins and Manceaux, creates a twentieth prebend for the chapter, and prohibits the creation of any further prebends. Also confirms the judgment made by Pagan of Clairvaux and Geoffrey and Hugh of Clefs, concerning the dispute between the count's local officers and the canons over the profits of fairs held at Pentecost and the Nativity of St. John the Baptist (24th June). 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy (Stein 1993, f.21), lost. C = *vidimus* of 1299, unlocated, containing witnesses designated in []. D = copy, 'MS. de G. Savare, pp.6, 7, 251, 252, 264, 265',

unlocated.

Printed (from Savare, pp.264-5 and C), *Cartulaire du chapitre royal de Saint-Pierre-de-La-Cour du Mans*, ed. S. Menjot d'Elbenne & L.-J. Denis (Le Mans, 1903-7), no.16.

Adjudicators: Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh, his brother; unnamed others.

Witnesses: *ex parte comitis*: Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; Hugh, his brother; [Reginald of Roche; Pagan *Nardre*; Pagan *Malus Canis*; Hervey of *Fonte*; unnamed others].

Ex parte vero canonicorum interfuerunt: Berner, priest; Guy; Jordan; Hubert; other unnamed.

Dating: undated; during the period as count but not duke. Chartrou dates this to 1144 or earlier, though 1150×1151 is equally possible.

Note: both Chartrou and the editors of the cartulary mistakenly state that the second part of the charter dealt with a dispute between the canons and Pagan of Clairvaux and the two Clefs brothers; on the contrary, they were mandated by Geoffrey to deal with the dispute, which actually arose between the count's *villici* and the canons.

La Roë, Augustinian priory of Sainte-Marie Mayenne, arr. Château-Gontier, cant. Saint-Aignan-sur-Roë (dioc. Angers).

68 158 Cartulary notice of Count Geoffrey's protection of the abbey. 1129 × 23rd April 1144 or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xii³⁻⁴ cartulary copy, AD Mayenne H154 (Stein 1903), f.15, no.20 headed 'sigillum Gaufridi comitis Andecavis'. C = incomplete s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou XII², no.7544. D = incomplete copy, Angers BM MS 865 (formerly 777, documents relating to Angevin Augustinian institutions), f.5, from B. E = copy of 1848 (transcription of cartulary by Paul Marchegay), ADML 61 H 1, no.12, from B. F = faded reproduction of E, BnF NA Latin 1227, no.12. Printed Chartrou pièce justificative no.57 (55).

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke. Chartrou dated this to 1129×1144, but 1150×1151 is equally possible.

Lessay, Benedictine abbey of Sainte-Trinité and Notre-Dame Manche, arr. Coutances (dioc. Coutances).

69 196 Generally addressed confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of the grant made by William of Orval (Manche, arr. Coutances, cant. Montmartin-sur-Mer) of a mill at Sainte-Opportune to Lessay Abbey. Saumur, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = original sealed *en double queue* but seal lost, AD Manche H7771, destroyed 1944. B = photograph by Léopold Delisle, now apparently lost.

Printed Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.138, no.3 (from A); *RRAN* III, no.443 (from Haskins).

Witnesses: Richard the chancellor; William of Vernon; [...] Engelger of Bohon; Alexander of Bohon; Robert of Montfort; [John] of Saint-Jean; Rualocus of Say; Joscelin of Tours; Pippin of Tours; William of [...],²⁵ Adam of Sottevast.

²⁵ Haskins supplies 'Sai?', but Davis points out that William of Say (Orne, arr. Argentan) was

Dating: undated; *apud Salmuram*. During the ducal period.

Note: according to Haskins, in the same hand as no.31, above, for Bec and apparently the same hand as no.66, above, for Eustace the clerk.

**Loches, collegiate church of Notre-Dame
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Loches (dioc. Tours).**

70 151 Grant of tithes at *Molherna*, and approval of a similar donation by one of Count Geoffrey's knights, Fulk fitz Gerald, who receives a countergift of 400s. in return. 1129/1131 × 23rd April 1144.

B = possible cartulary copy (Stein 2203), lost. C = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou II (2:1), no.463, annotated 'ex chartis Eccl. Coll. Beatae Mariae de Castro Locharum'.
Printed Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.53 (59).

Witnesses: none *per se*, but the text terminates thus: 'Et ut hoc donum inviolatum et inconcussum servetur, sigillo domini Ulgerii, Andegavensis episcopi, et nostro confirmari decrevimus. Data per manum magistri Guidonis et Thome notarii'.

Dating: before the death of Bishop Ulger in 1148 and Geoffrey's assumption of the ducal title. This grant was dated to the period after Fulk's death in 1143 by Chartrou due to the identification of him as *bone memorie*. However, this cannot be taken as a definite sign that the grant was made after Fulk's death: such a descriptor may have been warranted by his absence, or may have been inserted by the cartulary copyist. Instead this should be dated to the period after Fulk's investiture as king, or even before if this too was interpolated. Even this dating presents problems in the context of a tradition of forged documents being produced by the canons at Loches, as discussed below.

Note: Vincent *et al* have identified several forged charters of Henry II for the college (*Pl. Acta* nos. 1616, 1618 (printed here as App. IV, no.10) and 1619), which establish privileges during Thomas's period as prior (d.1168) and in the years after his death. The exchange of a large countergift, and the mention of countergifts to other family members who were potential claimants to the tithes in the future, raises suspicions about the priory's possession of the revenues. Although countergifts and the *laudatio parentum* were common devices to pre-empt challenges, they were also useful features of forged charters.

A further reason for viewing the text with suspicion is the description of the sealing process. There are only two other texts amongst Geoffrey's *acta* which were countersealed by other parties: the grant to Bishop Ulger of a prebend at Saint-Laud was corroborated by the college's seal (App. III, no.7); and the agreement with Archbishop Engelbald of Tours was sealed by both parties (App. I, no.105). Unlike these two documents, this grant for Loches was apparently countersealed by a third party, Bishop Ulger. Finally, and in common with the forgeries identified by Vincent, suspicions are further raised by internal inconsistencies in the use of first person singular and plural verbal and nominal forms.

If this document is genuine, or at the very least represents genuine actors, it is evidence that Thomas of Loches was not necessarily the Thomas who acted as comital notary. The expression *data per manum* used in conjunction with two apparent scribes is difficult to interpret precisely, as it is unclear with it refers to both, and what roles they each had in the drafting process.

71 Notification of confirmation of the grant of Corné (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. Beaufort-en-Vallée) made to the college by Brice, lord of
killed in 1144.

Corné. 12th April 1138 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th–September 1151.

B = possible cartulary copy (Stein 2203), lost. C = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou II (2:1), no.464.

Summary, Mabilley, *Catalogue analytique*, p.59 (mistakenly attributed to Fulk V).

S(an)ct(ae) congregationi B(eatae) Mariae Lochensis G(aufredus) Andegavensis Comes salutem. Sciat(is) prudem... vestre Bricium militem nostrum domum suam quam Conturniaci habebat cum vinetis et quibusdam aliis appendiciis ad eandem domum pertinentibus Ecclesiae vestrae per manum domini Thomae me presente in perpetuum vendidisse et ut hoc stabile et indissolubile permaneat in presentia siquidem mea predictum priorem vestrum inde investivit et quod Ecclesiam vestram per se sive per heredes suos nullo tempore inquietaret aut calumpniis infestaret multis audientibus constanter affiduciavit ejusdem que fidelitatis observandae me vobis in jalegium donavit, valete. Cum vero post modum quidam de genere Bricionus ejus vendicionem calumpniarentur tempore Henrici Regis idem ... eandem vendicionem <con>firmavit²⁶ in hac carta.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated; during the period as count but not duke. Thomas had previously received confirmation of Loches' possessions in a bull issued by Innocent II on 12th April 1138 preserved in the (lost) Loches cartulary (*RPR* I, p.879, no.7886; Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1613, also summarised by Mabilley, *Catalogue analytique*, p.164). This confirmation does not refer to *Conturniac*.

Note: Vincent *et al* found a confirmation of this grant by Henry II (*Acta* no.1617), dateable to the period 1162×1173, which he identifies as the only 'apparently genuine' royal charter for Loches. As he notes, it was confirmed by Eugenius III in a bull issued on 8th April 1152 (*RPR* II, p.78, no.9568; Salmon, *Chroniques de Touraine*, p.378).

The name of the location as it appears in the eighteenth-century copy in the BnF is not entirely legible, and it appears that the writer was unsure of how to transcribe it. The nearest approximation is *Conturniac*, which bears a striking resemblance to *Cohorniacum*, i.e. Corné (see Port, *Dictionnaire* I, p.747), the church of which was apparently granted to the chapter at Loches in 1010 (*ibid*, p.748).

Montebourg, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame Manche, arr. Cherbourg-Octeville (dioc. Coutances).

72 199 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of Henry I's grants to the abbey, and an additional grant with a detailed delineation of rights of way (*aisimento*). Argentan, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

²⁶ There is an inkspot here.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, BnF Latin 10087 (Stein 2523), p.17, no.35.²⁷
Printed, Haskins, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', *EHR* 27 (1912), no.4 and *Norman Institutions*, p.139, no.4; *RRAN* III, no.595.

Witnesses: Thomas *cancellario*; Alexander of Bohon; Richard of La Haye; Richard of Vauville; W[illiam] Avenel; Oliver of Aubigny; Gilbert, archdeacon; Robert of Valognes; Robert *Bordel*; Unfrey of Bosville (*de Bosevilla*);²⁸ unnamed others.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Argentomum*.

73 200 Charter with general address confirming Count and Duke Geoffrey's *custodia* of the abbey and its monks, as well as the abbey's properties and privileges granted by the king. Concession of land between the abbey's existing properties and their forest, and the river; this is to include the river, the source of which is the *veterus fons*, and any *warlocum* there. Lisieux, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, BnF Latin 10087, p.17, no.36.
Printed Haskins, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', p.431, no.5 and *Norman Institutions*, p.139, no.5; *RRAN* III, no.596.

Witnesses: William of Vernon; Alexander of Bohon; Pagan of Clairvaux; Thomas *cancellario*; Robert of Courcy.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Luxovium*.

Note: the meaning of *warlocum* is unknown; it does not feature in any of Henry II's grants to the abbey.

Mortemer (Lisors), Cistercian abbey of Notre-Dame Eure, arr. Les Andelys, cant. Lyons-la-Forêt (dioc. Rouen).

74 181 Generally addressed charter of Duke and Count Geoffrey detailing a grant of 30 acres of land in the valley of Mortemer, 157 acres at Beauficel, and 143 acres at Bos-Quentin (both cant. Lyons-la-Forêt), to the abbey. Rouen, 11th October 1148.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, BnF Latin 18369 (Stein 2612), p.26.²⁹
Printed *RRAN* III, no.599.

Witnesses: Richard *cancellarius*; William of Roumare, earl of Lincoln; William of Vernon; Robert

²⁷ Further copies of this cartulary have not yet been consulted, in MSS Paris BnF NA Latin 2433 (Montebourg copies by Delisle, 1847, particularly pp.18-19 and 511, 559, copied from Touraine-Anjou 28 part 2) and Flers BM 19 and 20.

²⁸ Identified as Bosville, Seine-Maritime, by Davis; the only sizeable extant Bosville in Normandy is Seine-Maritime, arr. Dieppe, cant. Cany-Barville, but cf. App.II, no.8, witnessed by Simon of Bosville, whose toponymic refers to a now-lost location Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Cambremer, comm. Montreuil-en-Auge. This may make more sense given the beneficiary and place of issue.

²⁹ Mortemer's s.xii pancarte, MS Evreux AD Eure H592, has not yet been consulted; MSS H591-662, H1747, and 1 J 131, also contain documents relating to Mortemer.

of Neubourg; Alexander of Bohon; Osbert of Cailly; Enguerrand of Vascoeul; Joscelin of Tours; Geoffrey of Bruyères (*de Brueria*).

Dating: *Hec vero concessio facta est et hec carta data apud Rotomagum anno ab incarnatione domini MCXLVII a Pascha precedenti, mense Octobris, v Idus ejusdem mensis, epacta xxviii.* Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.153 n.55, redates this to 1148 as the epact and year do not agree and a scribal error for the year is the more likely mistake. The Empress consented to the grant, and she was in England in October 1147.

Note: in a clause prior to the witness list, it is clear that Matilda and all three of the couple's children participated in this grant (*Et hoc quidem concedentibus Matilda videlicet uxore mea, filiisque meis Henrico, Gaufrido atque Willelmo*). Unlike most of Geoffrey's Norman charters, this is an outright grant rather than a confirmation of the *status quo* under Henry I, who founded Mortemer in 1134, just before his death.

**Noyers, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Chinon, cant. Ste-Maure, comm. Nouâtre (dioc. Tours).**

75 Cartulary notice of a verdict in the comital court, in the monks' favour, concerning the claim of John of Montbazon to woods at Menne and nearby land and assarts. The count's barons agreed that John and the abbot's man should settle the matter with a duel, to which John defaulted.

B = s.xii⁴-xiiiⁿ cartulary, f.72v (Stein 2773), destroyed 1789. C = s.xviii copy from B, Poitiers médiathèque MSS 527 and 528, p.603 (Stein 2774, formerly Coll. Fonteneau vols. 71 and 72), attributing date of c.1141.

Printed from C, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Noyers*, ed. Casimir Chevalier, Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine 22 (1872), no.529. Discussed in Chevalier, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Noyers au XI^e et au XII^e siècles d'après les chartes*, Mémoires de la société archéologique de Touraine 23 (1873), pp.cxxi-cxxii.

Witnesses: *ex sua parte* (John): Ribotel *de Aia*; Joduin, *qui habebat neptam suam*.

Ex parte abbatis: Robert *de Avaisse*; Malet, the count's *prepositus*; Walter *Faimaut*; Fulk, his brother.

Dating: undated, during the abbacy of Bernier.

Note: the count is not named, but the witnesses suggest that it was Geoffrey V. John of Montbazon himself appears regularly in the *acta* – mostly in disputes; Walter Faimaut witnessed nos. 5, 6 (issued at Baugé and Angers respectively, though the witness lists are shared in many respects, both 1143), 40 (Tours then *Curciacum*, 1146) and 101 (probably 1129 X 1144, the settlement of a dispute between Marmoutier and John of Montbazon). Cf. also no.29, witnessed by Malet, *prepositus* of Tours, issued 9th September 1149.

Carré de Busserolle, *Dictionnaire d'Indre-et-Loire* IV, p.242, suggests that *Menne* was the Bois de Menne near Montbazon castle, which is attested to elsewhere in the Noyers cartulary.

**Nyoiseau, female Benedictine abbey
Maine-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Segré (dioc. Angers).**

76 231 Cartulary notice by the nuns of a sitting of Count Geoffrey's court to settle the claim made by Oliver, son of Bernard the stonemason, to his

dead father's vines and wine press, granted to the abbey by Mainard, a canon of Ronceray and his brother John *Bugasarius* in exchange for a *masura* in La Fauchetière. In the meantime, Joscelin of Tours, Geoffrey's seneschal, had paid 500 s. so that La Fauchetière would be transferred to Nyoiseau. To settle the case, it is decided in the comital court that Joscelin should give 100 s. to Oliver. 1150.

B = cartulary copy, lost. C = s.xviii copy, Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1749 (from the Nyoiseau cartulary, ff.32-3).³⁰

Mainardus, S(anctae) Mariae de Caritate canonicus et Iohannes Bugasarius frater eius quandam masuram que vulgo Fulcheteria le fauchelieue in parrochia Grugeii dicitur sub dominio domni Rainaldi de Iriaco [*recte* jureio], concambierunt pro vineis et pressorio Bernardi cementarii defuncti. Goslenus de Turone dedit quingentos solidos ut illa Falcheteria ecclesiae Nidi Avis concederetur quod ita factum est postea Oliverius filius Bernardi hanc donationem calumniavit sive calumpnia sedata fuit coram comite Andeg(avorum) et baronibus et ut pacifice sancti moniales possiderent Goslenus dedit Oliverio centum solidos. Testibus Guillelmo de Guirchia, Mauricio de Credonio, Rainaldo de Castrogunterii, Fulcone de Candeio, Rainaldo de Iriaco [*recte* jureio] et pluribus aliis. Hoc actum est Eugenio Romanne sedis praesule, Turonensium archiepiscopo Engelbaudo, Andegavensium venerabili Normanno episcopo, Francorum rege Ludovico jerosolimitano, Andecavensium strenuis comite Gaufrido. Anno ab incarnatione Domini M.C.L.

Witnesses: William of La Guerche; Maurice of Craon; Reginald of Château-Gontier; Fulk of Candé; Reginald of Iré (*de jureio*, sic); others unnamed.

Dating: *Hoc actum est Eugenio Romanne sedis praesule, Turonensium archiepiscopo Engelbaudo, Andegavensium venerabili Normanno episcopo, Francorum rege Ludovico jerosolimitano, Andecavensium strenuis comite Gaufrido. Anno ab incarnatione Domini M.C.L.* After the secession of the ducal title.

Note: Reginald, lord of Iré, appears in the La Roë cartulary (AD Mayenne H154), nos.117 and 118. The villages of Le Bourg-d'Iré and La Roche-d'Iré lie just south of Nyoiseau and south-west of Grugé (Maine-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Segré). La Fauchetière – now lost – just north of Grugé, on the southern bank of the Rivière L'Araize (Cassini).

William *de Guirchia* appears with Maurice of Craon's half-brother Warin (d. by 1150) in the La Roë cartulary, no.49. La Roë had a chapel held in common with Saint-Melaine of Rennes at *Guirchia* (ibid., no.23). The most obvious candidate for its location is the modern La Guerche-de-Bretagne, just inside Brittany (Ile-et-Vilaine, arr. Rennes, chef-lieu de cant.).

³⁰ It is possible that a copy of this text exists in the s.xviii cartulary copy of the Archives municipales de Nyoiseau, MS non coté, which has not been examined.

**Poitiers, chapter of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand
Vienne, arr. Poitiers (dioc. Poitiers).**

- 77 Renunciation by Count Geoffrey of the claim to judicial rights over the chapter's lands at Pouant (Vienne, arr. Châtelleraut, cant. Monts-sur-Guesnes), originally established by Fulk III. Saumur, in the house of Simon of Châtillon, 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = cartulary copy of unknown date ('Livre de la chaîne' Stein 3039), f.48, lost. C = s.xvii-xviii copy from B by Gaignières, BnF Latin 17149, pp.401-2. D = s.xvii copy from B by André Duchesne, BnF NA Française 7433, f.57 (p.139). E = s.xviii copy from A, Poitiers médiathèque MS 464 (Fonteneau 10), p.533.³¹

Printed (from E), *Documents pour l'histoire de l'église de Saint-Hilaire de Poitiers*, I, ed. Louis Rédet (Mémoires de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest 14, Poitiers, 1847, vol. 1 of 2), no.133.

Witnesses: Count Geoffrey (*ego Goffridus comes*); Brian of Martigné; Hugh of Pocé; Absalon Roonard; Joscelin of Blou (*de Blodo*); Simon of Châtillon; Pippin of Tours; Burchard of Mareuil.
Ex parte canonicorum: Gervase, *thesaurarius*; Master Bibnardus; Master P[eter] of Saintes; Geoffrey *Bibens-vinum*; Aimery Boot'.

Dating: undated, during the comital but not ducal period; *apud Salmurum in domo Simonis de Castellione*. This agreement is dated c.1150 by Redet, on the grounds that he 'frequently visited Saumur during 1150, due to the siege of Montreuil-Bellay' (*Documents* I, p.153, n.1). But as other charters show, he was frequently in Saumur throughout his career.

**Préaux, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Pierre
Eure, arr. Bernay, cant. Pont-Audemer (dioc. Lisieux).**

- 78 194 Cartulary notice of an agreement made in the ducal court at Rouen which terminated a long-running dispute between the abbey and Enguerrand of Vascoeuil. Rouen, 1149.

B = cartulary copy of 1227 (Stein 3085), ADEu H711, f.140v, no.453, under the rubric: *Compositio et Concordia que facta est inter Reginaldum, abbatem de Pratellis, ex una parte, et Engerrannum de Wascuil, ex altera, qui diu discordes ad invicem propter rectitudines et consuetudines de manerio nostro de Wascuil fuerant, quas Engerrannus usurpando violenter ecclesie Pratellensi auferabat*. C = copy by Delisle, BnF Nouvelle acquisition Française, f.275v (summarised f.199, no.453).

Printed L. Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie et sa cour* (Paris, 1910), p.265; RRAN III, no.665; Dominique Rouet, *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye Benedictine de Saint-Pierre-de-Préaux* (Paris, 2005), no. A177. Summarised, Auguste Le Prévost, *Mémoires et notes de M. Auguste Le Prévost pour servir à l'histoire du département de l'Eure* (3 vols., Évreux, 1862-9), III, p.324.

Witnesses: Reginald of Saint-Valéry, *qui dapifer Normannie erat*; Geoffrey Bertrand; Robert fitz Hamelin; Baldric fitz Gilbert; Godard de Valle; John de Lunda; Ralph de Tregewilla; Ralph of Aunay (*de Alneto*); Ralph de Hispania.
Ex parte autem Engeranni: Osbert of Cailly; Walter of Vascoeuil, his son.

³¹ Several MSS remain which may contain copies of this text are yet to be consulted: Paris BnF Latin 12755; Poitiers médiathèque MS 491 (Fonteneau vol.35, analysis of cartulary, s.xviii) and MS 465 (Fonteneau 11).

Dating: *Acta Rothomago anno M°C°XLIX° ab Incarnatione Domini.*

**Rouen, female Benedictine abbey of Saint-Amand
Seine-Maritime, arr. Rouen (dioc. Rouen).**

79 203 Order of Duke and Count Geoffrey to Reginald of Saint-Valéry and the ducal *ministri* at Arques to ensure that the abbey receives its tithes from the forests of Eawy and Alihermont (Seine-Maritime, arr. Dieppe, communes de Bosc d'Eawy and cant. Envermeu), near Dieppe and Arques. Lisieux, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xviii copy, BnF Latin 17031, p.137.

Printed (from B), Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.140, no.7; *RRAN* III, no.732.

Witnesses: Thomas *cancellario*.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Luxovium*.

Note: the forest of Eawy was mistakenly identified as Eu by Davis in *RRAN* III, where *Aw* is erroneously corrected to *Auci*. The nuns had a long association with Eawy, south of Aliermont (see, for example, AD Seine-Maritime 55H 8 and 530-47, and summaries in the catalogue of the collection: Isabelle Theiller, *55H: Abbaye Saint-Amand de Rouen répertoire numérique détaillé* (2005)).

**Rouen, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Ouen
Seine-Maritime, arr. Rouen (dioc. Rouen).**

80 212 Cartulary notice of Duke and Count Geoffrey's confirmation of the gift of one hawk a year to the abbey by Walter Giffard, earl of Buckingham and lord of Longueville. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xvii cartulary copy, BnF Latin 5423 (Stein 3242), f.232v.

Printed (from B), Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.134; *RRAN* III, no.734.

Witnesses: Robert of Neubourg; Guy of Sablé.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period.

Note: as *RRAN* III notes, Walter's grant survives in the original (ADSM 14H917, *liasse* 3), and was granted during the abbacy of Fraternus (1142-57).

Walter had come over to the Angevins relatively early, and helped Geoffrey to subdue the castle of Verneuil in either 1141 or 1143; Stephen confiscated his English earldom after 1142. See Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.194.

Rouen, cathedral of Notre-Dame

81 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of the rights of the dean and chapter to wood and customary revenues in their prebend of Angerville

in the forest of Alihermont (Seine-Maritime, arr. Dieppe, cant. Envermeu), proved by a sworn inquest in the ducal court. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, ADSM G7 (cartulary of Philippe d'Alençon, archbishop of Rouen 1369-75), f.349.

Printed Valin, *Le Duc*, p.266; DB I, no.39* (attributed to Henry II); *RRAN* III, no.726. Summary, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.134.

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clefs; Robert of Courcy.

Dating: undated, *apud Rothomagum*; during the ducal period.

Note: *RRAN* III follows Haskins in attributing this text to Geoffrey rather than Henry II, as the issuing duke (*dux Normann' comes Andegav'*), unnamed in the cartulary copy, does not refer to Henry I as *avi mei*.

Rouen, guild of cordwainers and cobblers

82 206 Generally addressed confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey of privileges accorded to the guild by Henry I. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = *vidimus* of 1371, AN JJ102 f.102v, no.317. C = BnF Latin 9067, f.155v (Register no.21 of the Chambre des Comptes). D = incorrectly transcribed copy of a *vidimus* of 1267, Rouen BM MS 2192, ff.189r-190v (and see below).

Printed (with errors) Gilles-André de La Roque, *Histoire généalogique de la maison de Harcourt* (4 vols., Paris, 1662) III, p.149; *RRAN* III, no.728.

Witnesses: Robert of Courcy; Robert of Neubourg.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Rothomagum*.

Note: despite existing in two clear copies, noted above, the origin of this confirmation (i.e. Geoffrey's years as duke) has been garbled. B contains not only Geoffrey's confirmation of Henry I's original grant, but also a confirmation issued by Geoffrey's son Henry during his time as duke before Geoffrey's death in September 1151. Duke Henry's confirmation also exists in a later copy of a *vidimus* of 1267 (D). This is the section of the *vidimus* in *RRAN* III (no.728). However, D contains two apparent confirmations by Duke Henry; the evidence of B and C shows that either the scribe, or more likely the copyist, wrote 'Henry' in error for what in fact should have been 'G' in the second of these confirmations (f.190). This error was replicated in an early printed version of the confirmations by La Roque, taken from D, the result being that Davis in *RRAN* III finds it odd that he had (1) a confirmation issued by Duke Henry in 1150/1 and (2) an erroneous confirmation issued by Henry as both duke and count – the confirmation in fact issued by Geoffrey between 1144 and 1150. He therefore assumes 'that La Roque's second version is wrong', whereas in fact the copy of the 1267 *vidimus* used by La Roque was wrong.

Rouen, leperhouse of Mont-aux-Malades Seine-Maritime, arr. Rouen (dioc. Rouen).

83 204 Writ of Duke and Count Geoffrey to the *vicecomes* of Rouen instructing

him to dispense 40s monthly to the leperhouse, as in the time of Henry I. Rouen, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = partially damaged original, AN K23, no.15²². B = AN K23, no.15²², *vidimus* of 1437. C = copy of 1610 of 'l'histoire en chronique de Normandie', AN S4889b, f.15. D = copy by Delisle, AN S4889, no.3.

Printed, Pierre Langlois, *Histoire du prieuré du Mont-aux-Malades lès Rouen* (Rouen, 1851), pièce justificative no.1; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.142, no.12 and plate 7a; *RRAN* III, no.730.

Witnesses: Robert of Neubourg.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Rothomagum*. Although there is nothing here to date the writ, apart from the possibility that institutions sought confirmations as soon as Geoffrey was invested as duke, Chartrou follows Langlois in ascribing a date of c.1145 to this confirmation.

- Mont-aux-Malades and the Confraternity of Palmers, Rouen

84 167 French translation of a charter with a general address, notifying all of Duke Geoffrey's 'ministers' and the faithful of the church that he was present at a ceremony whereby the confraternity of Rouen palmers were received into the priory. Rouen, in the lepers' chapterhouse, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = original, probably held at ADSM, lost.

Printed from A, in this French translation, Langlois, *Mont-aux-Malades*, p.4.

Witnesses: *en presence du prieur des chanoines et des lépreux*. None named.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *faite et accordé dans le chapitre des lépreux*.

Saint-Evroul, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame du Bois Orne, arr. Argentan, cant. La Ferté-Frênel (dioc. Lisieux).

85 150 Generally addressed confirmation of Count Geoffrey of the abbey's possessions and privileges as they stood under Henry I, grant of freedom from impleadings, and statement of friendship between Geoffrey and the monks. Probably in the abbey, late March – early April 1144. Spurious?

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, BnF Latin 11056 (Stein 3400), f.25v.

Printed, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.141, no.8; *RRAN* III, no.774. Summarised, Round, no.637.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, apparently during the period as count but not duke despite the Norman beneficiary. There is no real consensus over the dating of this charter. Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.141, n.61, opts for 1144, noting that the document 'displays some curious features. Geoffrey speaks as the successor of Henry I, yet he has not taken the ducal title', and that Fulk's death (10th November 1143), implied by the description of him as *bone memorie*,

'could hardly have reached his son before the capitulation of Rouen, where Geoffrey remained until his assumption of the ducal title: yet a charter issued at Rouen in such an alien style is surprising'. On the other hand, the charter issued for the priories of Cunault and Loudun (above, no.35) indicates that Geoffrey had learned of Fulk's death at precisely this time. Chartrou, p.294, settles on the weeks between 23rd April (the fall of the Tower of Rouen) and 29th June (the first dated charter in which Geoffrey uses the ducal title). Davis, in *RRAN* III, p.285, posits 1143-4 or 1150-1, expressing a preference for the former, as 'the very unusual and literary style would suit a date before Geoffrey had acquired an official Norman chancery, but the reference to Henry I as 'his' (rather than as his wife's) predecessor suggests that he was, or had been, Duke himself'.

The charter is not as curious as these analyses suggest. Dating it to the period either just before the definitive fall of Rouen or just after the tower's capitulation would account for the skewed style. If authentic, this document can be assigned to Geoffrey's return journey to Rouen from Angers, which occurred either in late March or early April (see above for dates at which Geoffrey was still in Angers). There is no foundation to Haskins' supposition that it was issued at Rouen. It seems most likely that the charter was in fact issued at Saint-Evroul itself, a stopping-point on the route back from Angers to Rouen. The recognition of Geoffrey as heir to Henry I in this context represents a tacit acceptance by the abbey of Geoffrey's victory – in much the same way as William Talvas' charter for the Savigniac abbey of Saint-André-en-Gouffern demonstrates not only his adherence to Geoffrey as the new ruler of Normandy, but also that of the monks and assembled ecclesiastics, who witnessed the charter of 18th September 1143 in which Geoffrey was named as duke. The language of the Saint-Evroul charter is a little more tentative, but the implications are along the same lines. The context was the siege of Rouen and the probability that Stephen's remaining adherents would be defeated.

Note: the possibilities suggested above must remain tentative in light of the suspicious nature of most ducal acts in the abbey's two cartularies.

Saint-Maur (Glanfeuil), Benedictine abbey Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Gennes (dioc. Angers).

86 120 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey to the abbey of vicarial and demesne rights, with the exception of *exercitu* and *equitatu*, over the land of *Lectus Ansaldi* and all the abbey's lands in the district of Loudun. Angers, 10th August 1135.

A = original, with seal pendant on yellowy-grey and black silk cord ('scellé d'un grand sceau attaché de latz de soye isabelle et noire'), lost. B = copy of 1650 (from A), ADML H1775. C = ibid., s.xv copy, torn. D = ibid., early modern copy, also torn.³²
Printed Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.48.

Witnesses: William, abbot of Saint-Maur; Geoffrey, prior; Brignaud, almoner; [Adelard? *recte* Auberdus] of Château-Gontier; Olimb' *Faunil*; Lepr' [...] *prepositus*; Loellus, his son; unnamed others (*cum multis aliis errant cum comite*).

De clericis: Herman, dean; Geoffrey, canon; Warin; Thomas; others unnamed.

Date: *Factum est hoc donum, Willermo ibidem loci abbate impetrante, apud Antegavim, die dominica, mense Augusti, anno Incarnationis Dominice millesimo centesimo tricesimo quinto.*

Note: this text confirms a grant made by Fulk V, Aremburga and the young Geoffrey in 1124 (printed Marchegay, *Archives d'Anjou* II, pp.364-5, no.22). The 1124 grant bestows the right of *vicaria* on the monks but does not refer to any rights reserved to the count. No identification of *Lectus Ansaldi* can be made further than it was in the Loudunais (*in pago Laudunensi*).

³² This item was possibly entered into the abbey's s.xii cartulary, ADML H1773 (Stein 3491), now partially destroyed by fire.

Saint-Wandrille (Fontenelle), Benedictine abbey
Seine-Maritime, arr. Rouen, cant. Caudebec-en-Caux (dioc. Rouen).

- 87 224 Writ of Duke and Count Geoffrey to the justices William of Vernon and Robert of Neubourg, instructing them to restore tithes from the renders of Arques, Dieppe and the whole *vicomté* of Arques to the abbey, in addition to weekly renders from Rouen, all as held under Henry I. Rouen, 1146 × 1149, perhaps around October 1148.

B = copy of unknown date (requires further inspection), Rouen BM MS 394, f.2, no.4.
 Printed, Ferdinand Lot, *Études critiques sur l'abbaye de Saint-Wandrille* (Paris, 1913), p.186, recueil des chartes no.119; Haskins, 'Normandy under Geoffrey Plantagenet', *EHR* 27 (1912), p.438, n.97; *RRAN* III, no.779.

Witnesses: William, count of Roumare.

Dating: undated, *apud Rothomagum*. William of Roumare was still a partisan of Stephen well after the fall of Rouen in 1144; a charter dateable to 1146 shows that he received a large grant in England from Stephen (*RRAN* III, no.494). He was also mentioned in another of Stephen's charters as his justice, most likely in 1146×1147 (*RRAN* III, no.472). But by 11th October 1148, he was one of the witnesses to Geoffrey's grant to Mortemer Abbey, issued at Rouen (no.74, above). Between c.1149 and c.1151, he was back in England, fighting against Gilbert of Gant over the earldom of Lincoln (Paul Dalton, 'Roumare, William de, first earl of Lincoln (c.1096–1155×61)', *Oxford DNB* online ed., January 2008, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24169>, accessed 19 Nov 2008]).

- 88 208 Generally addressed confirmation of Duke and Count Geoffrey of the abbey's privileges, consisting of tithes and alms of wheat and money; weekly renders from the ducal toll in Rouen; and whatever the abbey collected at Arques, Dieppe, Rouxmesnil-Bouteilles and Etran (Seine-Maritime), and at Argentan, Falaise, Exmes and Caen (Orne and Calvados) at harvest-time under Henry I. Granted with the consent and counsel of the duke's son, Henry. Argentan, 1146 × early 1147, or May 1147 × early summer 1149; perhaps around October 1148 or possibly just before Henry's investiture as duke.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy ADSM 16H14 (Stein 3604), f.309v, no.28.
 Printed, Lot, *Saint-Wandrille*, p.142, no.78; DB I, no.9*; *RRAN* III, no.780 (dated 1146-50 in both, and see below). Summarised, Round, no.170.

Witnesses: Richard *cancellario*; Robert of Neubourg; Robert of Courcy; Alexander of Bohun.

Dating: undated, *apud Argentomum*. *RRAN* III follows Delisle and Berger's dating of 1146-50, based on the movements of the young Henry. It has been shown, however, that Henry was in Anjou and Normandy rather than England at the time of the fall of Rouen: the most convincing account of his movements so far has been established by A. L. Poole, who concludes that Henry returned to Normandy prior to January 1144, after his first visit to England; he then made an aborted attack upon England early in 1147, and was back in Normandy (at Bec) on 29th May. His next visit to England was, in Poole's view, after the cession of the ducal title to him by Geoffrey. He held a court at Devizes on 13th April 1149, before being knighted at Carlisle on 22nd May; he was back in Rouen early in 1150, after an abandoned campaign against Stephen.

I would agree with this chronology except to say that Henry was not invested as duke until after being belted as a knight, i.e. in January 1150.

Crouch, *King Stephen*, p.241, argues that Henry must have been in England for a reasonable period before his Devizes court in mid-April, 'for he was able to summon to his court the earls of Cornwall, Gloucester, Hereford and Salisbury, and the barons Humphrey de Bohun, John fitz Gilbert, Roger of Berkeley, Elias Giffard and William de Beauchamp of Worcester'.

William of Roumare witnessed another charter for Geoffrey in Rouen on 11th October 1148; this document is definitely posterior to another writ for Saint-Wandrille (no.85, above) also attested by William of Roumare. This notification expands upon the terms of the above writ issued to the justices in the area around Arques and Dieppe. It refers to two clear (and large) areas, the second of which is the cluster of towns in the Hiémois (Argentan, Falaise and Exmes, in Orne) as well as Caen, just to the north.

Saumur, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Florent Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur (dioc. Angers).

89 113 Chirograph detailing an agreement with the monks, whereby Count Geoffrey will not refortify the castle situated at Saint-Florent-le-Vieil (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Cholet, chef-lieu de cant.), in return for 10,000s. Angers, in the house of the seneschal Robert fitz Reginald, 1st July 1133.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, ADML H3714 (*Livre d'argent de Saint-Florent*), ff.48-9, headed in the cartulary rubric as a chirograph and in later hand 'Carta sigillata G. Martelli di mota Sti. Florentii'. C = s.xiii cartulary copy, ibid. H3715 (*Livre rouge*), f.22v-23r. D = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1550. E = extracts, ibid., 13 part 1, no.10356.

Printed Chartrou, pièce justificative no.46. Extract, *Chroniques des comtes*, ed. Marchegay and Salmon, introduction by Mabille, p.xv, n.1 (wrongly dated to 1130, and see below).

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop of Tours; *Magister* Vaslotus (*recte* Varlotus), [and] Engelbald of Vendôme, *capellani mei*; William, archdeacon; Thomas, prior of Loches; Matthew, *magister sororum meorum qui hoc cirographum scripsit*.

Laici: Galvan of Chemillé; Hugh of Matheflon; Roland of Montrevault; William *vicecomes*; Geoffrey of Clairvaux; Brian of Martigné; Loellus Ferlus (*Lupellus Ferlus*); Joscelin Roonard; Hugh of Pocé; Robert of Pocé; Robert *Ragot*; Ridel of Rillé; Pippin *prepositus*; Guy *de Superpontem*

Matthew, abbot [of St-Florent]; Hugh of Redon, prior; Silvester, cellarer; John, prior of Saint-Florent-le-Vieil; Manerius, *elemosinarius*; Vivian of Saint-Laurent (*de Sancto Lorrentio*); Botin; Pagan, *marescallus*; William *de Culturis*.

Signa: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Matilda, the count's wife; Helias, the count's brother; Sybil, the count's sister.

Dating: *Anno ab incarnatione d[omi]ni M.C.XXX.III. kalendas Julii. Innocentio II Romanorum papa, regnante Lodovico in Francia, Henrico in Anglia, Goffrido ejus genero Andegavorum comite, civitate Andegavi fuit facta in domo roberti raginaldi confirmatio concordie predicte et concessionis.*

Mabille dated this charter to 3 kalends July 1130 (29th June), a misreading of the numerals. This was followed by Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p.70, n.27, who uses it as evidence that Geoffrey – by identifying himself as 'husband of Matilda, daughter of the king of the English and former wife of Henry, Roman Emperor' – sought a reconciliation with his wife during their estrangement. She also interprets (p.70, n.28) Mabille's reference to be a different text to that printed in full by Chartrou: they are in fact the same document. A date of 1130 is impossible, as Hugh was not invested as archbishop of Tours until 1133, and Matthew of Loudun was invested as abbot of Saint-Florent in 1132.

90 162 Confirmation by Count Geoffrey of lands granted to the abbey, free from all customs, by Robin, a tenant of Brice of Corné, before his death. Angers, in Saint-Laud, 1132 × 23rd April 1144 or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy, ADML H3714 (*Livre d'argent*), f.49. C = s.xiii cartulary copy, ibid. H3715 (*Livre rouge*), f.23v. D = s.viii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1567. Printed Chartrou, pièce justificative no.59 (57).

Witnesses: Pagan of Clairvaux; Absalon Roonard; Aimery *de Divite Burgo*.

Dating: undated, *in ecclesia Sancti Laudi*. After the investiture of Matthew of Loudun as abbot of Saint-Florent (1132-55); Chartrou ignores the possibility that it could have been issued in 1150 or 1151.

91 163 Grant by Count Geoffrey of rights of justice over the men who fall within the abbey's vicaria. No-one is to fine men within the abbey's jurisdiction for failing to join the count's army when called, unless the abbot and monks have first been called to the count's presence. Probably at Saumur, 22nd July 1136 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

A = original, formerly sealed (seal and tag lost, foot of document folded with two slits for tag) ADML H 1840, no.15. Headed in later hand 'Don de la Justice de St Florent'; endorsed in medieval hand 'De burgo sci Florentij'; other modern endorsements. B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy (from A), Angers ADML H3714 (*Livre d'argent*), f.47v. C = s.xiii cartulary copy, ibid. H3715 (*Livre rouge*), f.24v. D = s.xviii copy, BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1532. Printed Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, pièce justificative no.60 (58).

Witnesses: none.

Signa: Count Geoffrey; Geoffrey, his son; William, his son.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke; apparently after the birth of William in 1136. Cf. no.92, below; however, it is possible that both documents were corroborated by the *signa* of Geoffrey jr. and William some time after they were originally drawn up.

Note: the reference within the context to *hoc apud Salmuram* suggests that the text was drawn up there.

92 142 Grant by Count Geoffrey in perpetuity of customs over land held at Nantilly by William Sellarius which he held as a fief of the abbey. Saumur, the church of Sainte-Trinité in the castle.

A = heavily altered original, single slit for seal pendant but never sealed, ADML H1840, no.16. B = s.xii⁴ cartulary copy (from A prior to alterations), ibid. H3714 (*Livre d'argent*), f.35. C = s.xiii cartulary copy (from either A prior to alterations or B), ibid. H3715 (*Livre rouge*), f.23v. D = s.xviii extract, BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou, V (4), no.1566. Printed (from A, after alterations), *Chroniques des comtes*, ed. Marchegay and Salmon, introduction by Mabille, p.xvi, n.1, and dated to 1140-1; Chartrou, pièce justificative no.52 (from A, B and C and preferring A). This transcription from A, B and C.

Providens utilitati ecclesie providentium consilium fuit que sub memoria non deficiente teneri voluissent litteris commendare. Ego igitur Gaufredus dei gratia andegavorum comes heredibus meis perhenniter sciendum notifico. Pro remedio patris et matris mee et antecessorum animarum³³ petitionibus iustis Mathei sancti Florentii abbatis³⁴ benigne consentiens, ecclesie sancti Florentii³⁵ abbati et monachis ibi deo famulantibus, omnes consuetudines, vicariam, vendas et omnes foris factum³⁶ que habebam in terra Guillelmi Sellarii³⁷ quam ipse de feuo sancti Florentii³⁸ tenebat apud sanctam mariam de lentilliaco dono, et pro mea heredumque meorum salute in perpetuum habenda concedo. Actum in castro Salmuro in ecclesia sancti Florentii³⁹ inscripta Sancte Trinitatis. Sub his⁴⁰ testibus. Iterio⁴¹ Burgulii abbate, Petro Rufo suo monacho, Gaufrido ejusdem loci priore, Guillelmo⁴² Grandillo tunc pretore, Thoma capellano, Pipino de turoni, Absalon roignardo, N,⁴³ Briento⁴⁴ de Martigne.

+ S. Gaufridi⁴⁵ comitis andegavis + S. Gaufridi filii sui + S. Guillelmi filii sui

Witnesses: Ithier,⁴⁶ abbot of Bourgueil; Peter Rufus, his monk; Geoffrey, prior of Bourgueil (*ejusdem loci priore*); William *Grandillo*, *tunc pretore*; Thomas the chaplain; Pippin of Tours; Absalon Roonard; Brian of Martigne.

Signa: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Geoffrey, his son; William, his son.

Note and dating: this is a particularly problematic charter, in which several changes have been made; the apparent original, moreover, contains internal inconsistencies. Close inspection of the altered original shows that the text reproduced in the two extant Saint-Florent cartularies is that of the pre-alteration original; in the original itself, the amended phrases have very clearly been scratched away and replaced with text designed to favour the priory of Nantilly rather than the abbey of Saint-Florent. The hand is a reasonable imitation of the original, neat Saint-Florent hand, but displays very subtle differences: the letters lean slightly forward, suggesting a scribe more comfortable with cursive writing than the upright style of this charter.

Catalogued as a grant to the priory of Nantilly, this charter in fact originally granted the *vicaria* of certain customary privileges to the abbey of Saint-Florent. William Sellarius held land at Nantilly as a fief, presumably from Geoffrey, customs of which Geoffrey was now granting to Saint-Florent. The apparent original has been altered in several places, in order to claim that the

³³ C has 'Animabus'.

³⁴ 'Mathei...abbatis' changed to 'Gaufridi sancte marie prioris' in A.

³⁵ 'sancti Florentii' changed to 'lentilliacae' in A.

³⁶ A has 'omne forisfactum'; C has 'omne forefactum'.

³⁷ Changed to 'Tellarii' in A.

³⁸ 'sancti Florentii' changed to 'habebat et' in A.

³⁹ 'castro...Florentii' changed to 'predicta ecclesia Lentilliaca' in A.

⁴⁰ C has 'hiis'.

⁴¹ Changed to 'Petro' in A.

⁴² A has 'Wuillermo'; C has 'W(i)ll(el)mo'.

⁴³ This appears in both A and B; the most obvious explanation is that it is a curious 'et' sign.

⁴⁴ A has 'Briencio'; C has 'Brientio'.

⁴⁵ A has 'Gaufridi'.

⁴⁶ *Petro* in A.

privileges pertained to Nantilly, not Saint-Florent itself. *Sellarius*, perhaps indicating William's position as either saddler or cellarer, was changed to *Tellarius*, and the place-date was changed to the church of Sainte-Trinité of Nantilly, rather than the church of the same dedication in the castle at Saumur.

Although these obvious changes can be unpicked with the aid of the cartularies, it remains that the apparently original witness list is incompatible with the *signum* of Geoffrey's youngest son, William. Abbot Ithier of Bourgueil resigned his abbacy in 1134, two years before William's birth, when he was elected archbishop of Nantes. His successor, Peter, had been invested as abbot in time to attend a papal synod at Pisa in 1134 (Michel Dupont, *Monographie du cartulaire de Bourgueil (des origines à la fin du Moyen Âge)*, Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine 56 (Tours, 1962), p.32; cf. Chartrou's incorrect dating of the abbacies of Ithier (1135-42) and Peter (1142-8). Ithier was in fact elected after the death of Abbot Bernard, who died on 17th February 1126. Peter succeeded Ithier, and died on 24th June 1148).

One possibility, perhaps corroborated by another Saint-Florent charter (no.92, above), is that all three *signa* were added a considerable time after the original charter was drawn up or agreed. Like no.91, the names of the signatories were added in a different hand, which appears to be the same in both charters. It is therefore possible that both charters were subscribed at the same time, in 1136 at the earliest. Unlike no.91, however, this charter appears never to have been sealed (cf. Chartrou, p.384 and refer to photograph). The other possibility is that the *signa* were forged.

Saumur, men of

93 127 Three-part charter of Count Geoffrey granting *vinagium* privileges around the Loire and Thouet rivers to the men of Saumur. Issued by Geoffrey at the doors of the comital chapel, Saint-Pierre-de-la-Cour, in Le Mans; then taken to Carrouges for approval three days later by the Empress Matilda, Henry and William, and then to Saumur for the approval of the infant Geoffrey, in the house of his *nutricius*, Joscelin Roonard. In return, Count Geoffrey receives 3,000 *solidi* and his three sons each receive a silver cup. Early June 1138.

B = s.xii⁴ copy, ADML H3714 (*Livre d'argent*), f.33r-v. C = s.xiii copy, ibid. H3715 (*Livre rouge*), f.23r-v. D = copy (from B), BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1614.
Printed (from B and C), DB I, no.1* (Delisle no.1*).

Adjudicators: (*Hoc factum est per investigationem...*) Constant *Mincerii*; Achard *Arduini*; Simon of Châtillon (*de Castello*); William *Heremitelli*; Joscelin of Doué; Isembert; Stephen; Roger *Anglici*; Audebert, *militis*; Michael *Roberti*.

Witnesses: (1) *astantibus in presentia comitis* Pagan of Clairvaux; Andrew of Doué; Peter Roonard; Brian of Martigné and Maurice, his brother; John Borel; Jacquelin of Maillé; Fulconis, *forestario*; Rossell of Montfaucon; Aimery of Avoir; Reginald, *vicar* of Le Mans; Josschonis; Reginald; Fromund; Fulk and Simon, *camerariis*; Robin, *prepositus* of Saumur.

(2) William of Sillé; Guy of Sablé; William Gouet; Alexander of Bohon, *cohortis comitis* *primipilo*; Robert of Pocé.

(3) Matthew, abbot of Saint-Florent; Joscelin Roonard; William *Gandrilli*; Aimery *de Castellonio*; Aimery *de Sazilleio*;⁴⁷ Reginald of Montfort; Geoffrey *Clarembaudi*.

Signa: (1) none (2) countess Matilda; Henry, the count's son; William, the count's son (3) Geoffrey, the count's son.

⁴⁷ Perhaps the forest of Sazé (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Gennes, comm. Chemellier); cf. Port, *Dictionnaire* III, p.503.

Dating: Chartrou, p.289, dates this charter before 1st August 1138, as 31st July was the end of Louis VII's first regnal year. It can, however, be redated to the period prior to Geoffrey's fourth invasion of Normandy; Orderic indicates that he entered Normandy in June 1138, and embarked upon an ambitious series of sieges throughout the duchy with Robert of Gloucester during June and July. These included 'Bayeux, Caen and numerous Norman strongholds' (OV VI, pp.514-7). Geoffrey's two- or three-day progress from Le Mans to the Norman border fortress of Carrouges, which Orderic himself identifies as a Norman fortification (ibid., pp.468-9), was most likely the journey Orderic describes as occurring in June 1138. The presence of Andrew of Doué and Aimery of Avoir, who rebelled in 1145, indicates that they were involved in attempts to conquer Normandy, and strengthens the likelihood that their rebellion was caused by Geoffrey's failure to reward his Angevin retinue after the fall of Rouen in 1144.

The second part of the charter, the subscription by Matilda, Henry and William in Carrouges, has a different witness list, but this certainly does not preclude the likelihood that all of the men who witnessed for Geoffrey in Le Mans accompanied him to Carrouges. Rather, it makes sense that Matilda's retinue witnessed her approval of the charter to lend it extra legitimacy. The presence of Alexander of Bohun as the Empress's key supporter should be noted, as other Cotentin lords did not transfer their allegiance to the Angevins until 1142 (RT II, p.227). According to John of Marmoutier, Alexander and his elder brother Engelger interceded for the last supporters of Stephen in the Cotentin after their defeat at Cherbourg by Geoffrey (and see above, no.67 for Montebourg).

The final part of Geoffrey's grant notes the role played by Thomas of Loches, the comital notary, in the drawing-up of the text (*hec carta data est per manum Tome prioris Lochensis, notarii comitis*). Rather than Thomas working as a scribe, however, it appears – as stated in the third part of the document – that he dictated the charter to a monk of Saint-Florent, Reginald of Le Pin, 'by whose fingers the whole charter was written' (*digitis cujus tota hec carta scripta est*). Reginald and Stephen, a burgess of Saumur, took the charter to Saumur for the young Geoffrey's approval, granted in the presence of Abbot Matthew of Saumur and Joscelyn Roonard among others.

Savigny, Savigniac then Cistercian (1147-) abbey of Sainte-Trinité Manche, arr. Avranches, cant. Le Teilleul (dioc. Avranches).

94 210 Grant of freedom from tolls and general protection. Argentan, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150, probably early, and possibly 1143 × 1144.

B = 1237 sealed copy of Bishop William of Avranches, AD Manche fonds Savigny non coté, destroyed 1944.

Printed (from B) Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.142, no.11; *RRAN* III, no.807.

Witnesses: Guy of Sablé; Alexander of Bohon.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Argentomagum*. This grant confirmed an earlier grant made by Stephen rather than Henry I (original, Paris AN K23, no.23; printed *RRAN* III, no.801), using similar language and reproducing the fine of £10 for transgressing its terms. Patrick Conyers, 'Changing Habits', p.143, has shown that, at least in the Savigniac house of Saint-André-en-Gouffern, Geoffrey was pre-emptively recognised as duke in 1143; it is likely that the abbot of Savigny would have requested a confirmation of this wide-ranging protection soon after Stephen's definitive loss of Normandy. Nevertheless, despite Conyers' assertion that Geoffrey's ducal charters for the order should all be given a *terminus post quem* of 1143, I would hesitate to follow this line. This order was issued 'to all barons, faithful men and ministers in Normandy, Maine and sea-ports'; a nominal and pre-emptive recognition of Geoffrey as duke in 1143 would not by any means have extended to all intended recipients of this document. It must also be noted that the charter considered by Conyers was not in fact issued by Geoffrey, but rather the allusion to him as duke was in a dating clause to a grant made by William Talvas.

95 207 Confirmation of the abbey's possession of the priory church at Dompierre (Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Passais, comm. Mantilly) and priory church and *domus dei* at Fresneia. Argentan, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

A = original, with fold and slits for tongue but tongue and seal missing, AN L969, no.379. B = s.xii-xiii cartulary copy, Stein 3631, destroyed 6th June 1944.⁴⁸ C = s.xix copy by Delisle (from B), BnF NA Latin 1022, p.653.
Printed, *RRAN* III, no.808.

Witnesses: Guy of Sablé; Alexander of Bohon.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period; *apud Argenthomum*.

Note: *RRAN* III raises, but does not expand upon, doubts about the authenticity of this 'pretended original'. It was drawn up by an unidentified scribe, but this is no surprise. Although the question of authenticity is raised, Davis goes on to suggest that it was drawn up on the same occasion as no.94, above: it has the same two witnesses and was likewise issued at Argentan.

Fresné-la-Mère (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Falaise-Nord) is settled on by Davis as the location of *Fresneia*. However, nearby there also exists Notre-Dame-de-Fresnay and Saint-Martin-de-Fresnay, both just to the northeast of Courcy, the lord of which, Robert III, was a key member of Geoffrey's Norman entourage. The lesser lords of Fresnay were tenants of their Courcy neighbours, and by the turn of the twelfth century had risen to become stewards of all Courcy lands in Normandy (Steve Flanders, *De Courcy: Anglo-Normans in Ireland, England and France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* (Dublin, 2008), p.77). Geoffrey's ability to confirm Savigny's possession of two sites any of these Fresnays may have depended upon their location within the loyal Courcy orbit.

The Dompierre in question is probably near Mantilly, as the text is archived with others relating to the *haia* of this location.

96 232 Notification to Hugh, bishop of Rouen, of the quitclaim by Philip, bishop of Bayeux over Escures (-sur-Favières; Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Morteaux-Couliboëuf) which pertained to Savigny. Montreuil, after January 1150.

A = original, with tag but no seal, AN L969, no.399. B = s.xix copy by Delisle, BnF NA Latin 1022, p.651.

Printed, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.147, n.90; *RRAN* III, no.806. Summarised, Round, *Calendar*, no.809 (with the erroneous insertion of the ducal title).

Witnesses: Geoffrey of Clairvaux; William *de Botevilla*,⁴⁹ Master Hugh, dean of Saint-Martin.

Dating: undated, after the ducal period; *apud Mosterolium*.

Note: this document indicates that, although he had abdicated control of the duchy to Henry, Geoffrey still had interests and authority in Normandy. Like the previous charter, matters were dealt with in the presence of Bishop William in Le Mans, and then the relevant documents were drawn up and dispatched at *Mosterol'*. *RRAN* III opts for Montreuil-Bellay in Anjou which, although likely, is far from conclusive. In Normandy alone, there are at least six Montreuils and at least ten in Greater Anjou, in addition to Montreuil-Bellay,.

⁴⁸ 'Cartulaire de l'abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité de Savigny, Liber cartarum domus Savigneii (Archives départementales de la Manche (Saint-Lô), H non coté, original)', in *cartulR*: <http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/codico2482/?para=1524t19> [accessed 01/06/2011]

⁴⁹ Perhaps the same individual as William *de Bosseville* in no.55, above.

Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, pp.147-8, n.90, draws attention to Bishop William's own letter (surviving in the original) to the archbishop, which indicates that Hugh of Clefs was also present at the verdict in the ducal court (Paris BnF Latin 9215, Savigny, no.1). Significantly, it refers to Geoffrey as both count and duke, suggesting that Geoffrey dropped the ducal title between the agreement and the drawing-up of his letter to Archbishop Henry.

Sées, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Martin
Orne, arr. Alençon, cant. Sées (dioc. Sées).

97 201 Notification to all officers of the exemption of the abbey's own resources from all tolls and customs, on pain of 60s. fine. 23rd April 1144 × January 1150.

B = cartulary copy (*Cartularium rubrum* alias *Livre rouge* of Saint-Martin, Stein 3649) lost. C = s.xvii copy from B, BnF Français 18953 ('Recueil sur l'abbaye de Saint-Martin'), pp.37, 222. D = copy, *ibid.* Latin 11056, no.681.

Printed, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.141, no.9 (from C); *RRAN* III, no.815.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, during the ducal period. Gazeau, *Normannia Monastica* (prosopography volume), p.359 says it was Abbot Gilbert who received this exemption, but the date of the end of his abbacy is unknown.

Note: as Jean-Michel Bouvris points out, the lost s.xiii *Livre rouge* of Saint-Martin should not be confused with the extant *Livre rouge* of the bishops of Sées. The lost Saint-Martin cartulary contained a lot of acts from the time of the foundation, which are not duplicated in the abbey's second cartulary, known as the *Livre blanc* ('Le "Livre rouge" de l'abbaye Saint-Martin de Sées. Essai de restitution d'un cartulaire disparu', *Annales de Normandie*, 43 (1993), pp. 255-257). This act was not included in the s.xii-xiii *Livre blanc* (Sées Bibliothèque de l'Evêché MS non coté 2, containing around 350 acts; Stein 3649; copies also at AD Orne H938; Alençon BM MS 190; Flers BM MS 8; Sées, archives of the *grande seminaire*, MS non coté. Extract, BnF Latin 13818).

Tiron, Tironensian mother abbey of Sainte-Trinité
Eure-et-Loir, arr. Nogent-le-Rotrou, cant. Thiron Gardais (dioc. Chartres).

98 160 Notification by Count Geoffrey to comital officers of the monks' freedom from tolls throughout comital lands. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xii cartulary copy (Stein 3828), AD Eure-et-Loir H1374, no.191. C = 1840 copy from B (Félix André Lejeune, 'Grand cartulaire du monastère de la Saint Trinité de Tyron au Perche'), BnF Latin 10107, p.206, no.191 (from which this copy).

Summarised, *CSTT* I, no.44, n.2.

Goffredus comes Andegavorum omnibus praepositis et famulis suis salutem mando vobis et praecipio ut monachos Tyronensi[s] ecclesiae solutos et quietos per terram ire sinatis, nec consuetudinem vel paagium de propriis rebus eorum

queratis vel capiat. Valet.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke. This is a word-for-word copy (with the omission of *meam* after *terram*) of a grant issued by Fulk V, the full text of which preceded Geoffrey's confirmation in the cartulary (no.190), and is reproduced in Merlet as no.44 and dated 1120-9. Chartrou dates this confirmation to 1144 or earlier, but a date of 1150-1 is equally possible.

**- Dependent priory of Sainte-Marie Madeleine, Russé
Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Lencloître, comm. Orches (dioc.
Poitiers)**

99 111 Confirmation to the monks of Tiron of the gifts previously confirmed to the priory by Fulk V, and the new concession of a mill built and woodland acquired by the prior, Guy. 1st June 1134 or 22nd July 1136 x 1143.

B = s.xii cartulary copy, AD Eure-et-Loir H1374, f.81v, no.295. C = 1840 copy, BnF Latin 10107, no.295.

Printed, CSTT I, no.165.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated; during the period that Geoffrey was count but not duke, and after the birth of Geoffrey jr. on 1st June 1134; possibly after the birth of William on 22nd July 1136, as the confirmation is *pro remedio anime...filiorum meorum*. Apparently before the death of Fulk V, who is referred to in B and CSTT as *nunc est in Jerusalem rex*; C supplies *tunc*.

Note: this text's place in Merlet's edition obscures its context and meaning. In the cartulary, it appears on the same folio (f.81v) as two donations by laymen to the abbey of Tiron. The first (CSTT II, no.264) is a grant by Boso of *Boslantot* of land at *Rusiacum* for the purpose of building a mill and a pond, as well as half of the mill's multure, with the rest to follow on his death. This grant was confirmed by Aimery of Faye-la-Vineuse as well as, amongst others, Aimery's son Brice of *Chillo* and Geoffrey of Orches (*de Orchiis*), who was the donor in the grant which follows. This text (CSTT II, no.264) records a grant by one Geoffrey, his brother Ralph and his nephew or grandson Buchard to the church of Sainte-Marie Magdalene of *Rusaio* of seven *jugera* (1 *jugerum* = 5/8 of an acre) between *Rusaum* and Orches. This grant was witnessed, amongst others, by Aimery of Faye-la-Vineuse, his son Brice, and Boso.

Chartrou identifies Russé as an Angevin priory on the Loire (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Allonnes) but the appearance of this text in the cartulary with grants made by Poitevins to the same house indicates that this was a Poitevin church, situated to the north of Mirebeau, within Geoffrey's authority. The Cassini map indicates that it was next to Orches (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Lencloître).

**Tours, Benedictine abbey of Marmoutier
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours (dioc. Tours).**

100 125 Cartulary notice recording an agreement (*concordia*) to abolish unjust customs imposed by Geoffrey's officers upon the monks, and

confirmation of rights over the forest of Chénevoise, originally granted to Marmoutier by Count Fulk IV. (Loches?), 1136.

B = s.xvii-xviii copy, ADIL H210 (s.xvii-xviii inventory). C = s.xviii copy from A, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1587.

Printed from C, Chartrou *pièce justificative* no.49.

Witnesses: Galvan of Chemillé; Pagan of Clairvaux, *tunc temporis de Lochis prepositus*.

De monachis: Gerald *sacrista*; Ralph; John, prior of Le Loroux (*Loratorio*); Theobald, prior of Berneçay, and with him Geoffrey *Ursellus* and Geoffrey *de Basogerio*.

Dating: *Acta sunt hec anno ab Incarnatione Domini MCXXXVI, Ludovico Francorum rege regnante.*

Note: the grant of the forest, free from all customs, was originally made by Fulk IV in 1085 (Guillot, *Le comte II*, C347 a-c). Although no location is given, the *concordia* was perhaps made at Loches, as here Pagan of Clairvaux is named as *prepositus* of Loches and the issue involved the monks of Marmoutier's priory of *Berniciacum*, which Chartrou identifies as either Bréneçay or Berneçay (Indre-et-Loire, comm. Saint-Quentin-sur-Indrois, cant. Loches). The charter states that the count listened to the monks' advice; it seems feasible that they attended the comital court at Loches.

It is interesting that a *concordia* was the preferred method of resolution, rather than attempting to prove the case in Geoffrey's court (*Quo perlecto, comes ipsum donum perpendens absque aliqua consuetudine in elemosina factum, non pro iudicio, sed pro quadam dispensatione et concordia inter monachos ejusque forestarios facienda providit...*).

101 155 Decision in favour of the abbey over fishing rights on the River Cher, claimed by John of Montbazon. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = Marmoutier cartulary, lost. C = s.xviii copy from A, BnF Touraine-Anjou III (2, part 2), no.611. D = copy from B, BnF Latin 5441 (4), p.115.

Printed from C and D, Chartrou *pièce justificative* no.55 (53).

Adjudicators: Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs and his brother Hugh; Loellus (*Lovellus*) Ferlo; Peter *Letardi*; Absalon Roonard; William of Montsoreau, cantor of Saint-Martin.

Witnesses: Adelelm of Semblençay (*de Simpliciaco*); Archembald fitz Ulger; Walter *Facit Malum*; Poclín of Saint-Antoine; Peter *Valliai*; Geoffrey *Arrablart*; Pagan *Balarge*; unnamed others.

Ex parte Johannis: Andrew of Cinq-Mars; Jacquelin of Maillé; Reginald the seneschal; Odo of Foncher; Warin *de Braio Formica*; Jacquelin, *major*.

Dating: undated, during the period as count but not duke.

Note: Chartrou suggests that the now-lost original was 'without doubt' preserved at Montbazon, but this is impossible to verify.

**Tours, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Julien
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours (dioc. Tours).**

102 140 Cartulary notice detailing the history the grant of the forest of Chédon to the abbey by Countess Aremburga and Geoffrey V, and of steps taken

by Geoffrey to terminate a dispute between the monks and Isoredus,
prepositus of Montbazou. Château-du-Loir, 1142.

B = possible cartulary copy, lost. C = *vidimus* of August 1253 issued by the chapter of the college of Saint-Martin and rediscovered in 1940, ADIL H1056. D = incomplete s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1690.

Printed from D, CSJ I, no.82. This version from C, with differences noted.

Universis presentes litteras inspecturis vel audituris. Guido Decanus, Philippus Thesaurarius, totique capitulum beati Martini Turon' salutem in domino. Noveritis nos vidisse et diligenter inspexisse litteras Gaufridi quondam comitis Andegavorum non cancellatas non abolitas nec in aliqua parte sui vitiatas in hec verba. Noverint⁵⁰ presentes et secuturi quod Arenburgis⁵¹ comitissa uxor Fulconis comitis Andegavorum et postea regis Jerosolimorum cum filio suo Gaufredo et Archembaudo filio Ulgerii, donavit deo et beato Juliano mairtyri⁵² et conventui monachorum in ecclesia nomine ejusdem martyris⁵³ dedicata apud Turonum domino famulanti boscum sive forestam de Chedonio a foresta militum usque ad domum monachorum qui ibi consistunt ad extirpandum sive excolendum seu hospitandum aut prout conspectui eorum placitum vel uisum⁵⁴ foret utilius tractandum ac dispondendum. Fecerunt siquidem donum istud in capitulo sancti Juliani Turon' eo ipso tempore et eisdem diebus quo prenomatus ac reverentus et honorifice recolendus⁵⁵ Fulco comes ierusalem⁵⁶ prima vice perrexerat libere et quiete et tam comitis Andegavensis quam officialium ac ministrorum ipsius a bosco eodem vel terra seu hominibus qui in ea hospitandi essent omni exclusa in posterum vicaria, districtione, violentia, exactione et omni prorsus consuetudine. Longo postea tempore supramemorato Fulcone regni Jerosolimitani adepto gubernacula ac filio ejus Gaufredo qui donum fecerat Andegavensis comitatus ad ministrationem atque moderamina disponente tam de quantitate elemosine praelibate⁵⁷ quam de consuetudinibus oborta est contentio inter abbatem Sancti Juliani tunc temporis Hamericum et praepositum de Monte Bazonis, nomine Ysoredum⁵⁸ que⁵⁹

⁵⁰ CSJ commences here.

⁵¹ CSJ, 'Arenburgis'.

⁵² Ibid., 'martiri'.

⁵³ Ibid., 'martiris'.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 'visum'.

⁵⁵ 'prenominatus...recolendus' in C only; CSJ supplies ...

⁵⁶ CSJ, 'Jerusalem'.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 'elemosinae praelibatae'.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 'Isoredum'.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 'quae'.

controversia ipsius serenissimi comitis domini⁶⁰ Gaufredi tali dictione terminata est. Praecepit sane ut idem Ysoredus et Archenbaudus, filius Ulgerii cum pluribus aliis ad visionem procederent,⁶¹ et sic ipsi decernerent ratum maneret. Si ex hominibus Sancti Juliani <tr>es⁶² sacramento id confirmarent quod et factum est ad visionem sicut preceptum fuerat perrexunt et sicut indagatum et proculcatum fuit et metarum que hodieque extant in positoribus determinatum ac designatum tres ex hominibus Sancti Juliani <iusiurando>⁶³ affirmaverunt quod a foresta usque ad domum monachorum ita libere et absolute sicut superi descriptum est. Sancta fuit donato, quod ego Gaufredus comes sicut preceperam factum. Precepi etiam litteris annotari et ipsas litteras ut firma <meam>⁶⁴ certitudinem iugitur obtineant nec alicuius controversie scrupulus deinceps oriatur. Auctoritate sigilli nostri et <munime>⁶⁵ confirmavi.³⁰ Nomina eorum qui iuraverunt haec sunt Paganus de chedone, Girardus nepos ejus,⁶⁶ Harduinus de bosco. Testes ex parte monachorum ipse Hemericus,⁶⁷ abbas, Radulfus de banuo;⁶⁸ Guido baiulus,⁶⁹ major de Coniaco, et filius ejus, Angelardus,⁷⁰ Cosardus,⁷¹ Gaufredus famulus abbatis. Ex parte Ysoredi, Barba de monte basonis, Goscerannus et Petrus nepos Ysoredi. Facta sunt haec Anno m.c.xl.ii Verbi incarnati. Data castroledi⁷² per manum Thomae, capellani. Datu[m] huius transcripti Anno d[omi]ni m.cc.quinquagesimo iii. menso Augusti.⁷³

Adjudicators: Pagan of Chédon; Gerald, his nephew; Harduin *de Bosco*.

Witnesses: *ex parte monachorum:* Abbot Aimery; Ralph *de Bauno*; Guy *bajulus*, major *de Coniaco* and his son, Engelard; Gossard; Geoffrey, the abbot's *famulus*.

Ex parte Ysoredi: Barbe of Montbazon; Goscerand; Peter, Isore's nephew (*nepos*).

Dating: *Facta sunt haec Anno m.c.xl.ii Verbi incarnati. Data castroledi per manum Thomae capellani.*

⁶⁰ 'domini' in C only.

⁶¹ 'et sic ipsi...confirmavi' in C only.

⁶² Faint in C.

⁶³ Very faint in C.

⁶⁴ Very faint in C.

⁶⁵ This is just a jumble of minims in C.

⁶⁶ Hole in parchment in C over 'ejus'.

⁶⁷ CSJ, 'Haimericus'.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 'Bauno'.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 'Bajulus'.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 'Engelardus'.

⁷¹ Ibid., 'Gossardus'.

⁷² Ibid., 'Castro Ledi'.

⁷³ *Vidimus* dating clause in C only.

Note: C supplies a vital section of the original agreement, omitted in the edition of the Saint-Julien charters. If a further disagreement over Chédon arises, the abbey is to supply three men to settle the case by a sworn oath (*iusiurando*); three men named above had already sworn in favour of the abbey's claim.

Archembald fitz Ulger, who was a donor along with Fulk, Aremburga and Geoffrey, was the father of Ulger of Brayes whose lordship was situated near Loches; on Ulger's death in the 1140s, the lordship was inherited by his brother Ralph (cf. App. IV, no.17, for Ralph's claim to Chédon). Archembald had interests in nearby Cormery, and witnessed all three extant charters for the abbey (nos. 37-9; he was the first witness to no. 37) as well as the charter for Marmoutier dealing with rights on the River Cher (no.99). The reference here to him consenting to Aremburga's gift alongside Geoffrey perhaps suggests that he was brought up at the comital court.

103 237 Chirograph recording transfer of a house in the borough of Saint-Saturnin, Tours. 1141 × 23^d April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

A = original, top half of chirograph cut into strips and with a section missing, ADIL H466. B = s.xviii copy (complete), BnF Baluze 77, p.79.

Printed, CSJ I, no.88.

Witnesses: *De monachis:* Abbot Aimery; Bartholomew, prior; Sulio, *sacrista*; Peter, almoner; Ranulph, *armarius*; Guy Brito; Bernard *Montisicheris*, *bajulus*.

De militibus: Count Geoffrey; Hugh of Amboise; Absalon Roonard; Walter *Faimal* [*recte* 'Saimal']; Hairicus, *prepositus*; Pagan *Baillarge*.

De burgensibus: Leon Alexander; Maurice Aimer; Reginald, his brother; Bartholomew Aimer; Peter Burla; Joher; John, *aurifaber*; Nicholas, *aurifaber*; Peter, *nepos ejus*; Thomas, *capellanus comitis*; Martin of Amboise.

De hominibus Sancti: Bertrand, *prepositus*; Walter; Guito; Theobald *Villanus*; Guy, *infirmarius*; Drogo, *cocus*.

Dating: undated; during the period as count but not duke. The presence of Hugh II of Amboise, the younger brother of Sulpice II, perhaps places this text at the very end of the pre-ducal period or in 1150-1. Hugh's father, Hugh I, died in Jerusalem in 1129 and, after assisting Geoffrey deal with the chaos caused by Sulpice, Hugh II travelled to the Holy Land and spent several years at Fulk's royal court. Although the date of Hugh's return is not supplied, it was perhaps precipitated by Fulk's death on 10th November 1143: if this was the case he may have arrived back in the spring of 1144, perhaps even bearing the news himself (*GAD*, pp.118-21). JM, p.210, states that Geoffrey belted him to knighthood.

Note: Michael of Doué, from whom Abbot Aimery purchased the property, appears in no.108 (1129×36), below, as *prepositus* of Montbazou; cf. no.102, above, in which Isore or Isoredus is named as *prepositus* of Montbazou. The record does not in fact deal with the transaction between Michael and Abbot Aimery. Rather, it is concerned with the subsequent purchase of the house, with its lands and customs, from Aimery by Count Geoffrey for the enormous sum of £100. In turn, it indicates that the property and the rights that went along with it were granted to one Bernard Martin by Geoffrey, with the assent of the abbot and monks, who were owed 3s., plus 3d. in tax (*censu*) and 3d. in toll (*pedagio*).

Tours, archbishop of

104 Agreement between the archbishop of Tours (Hugh) and Count Geoffrey in his capacity as lord of Chinon to hold in common a stretch

of water, including islets, of the Vienne 'above and below' the bridges of Chinon, as far as the confluence with the Loire at Candes-Saint-Martin. 1140.

B = French summaries, ADIL G10 (register of c.1750 of titles, rights and legal cases pertaining to the archiepiscopate, the barony of Chinon, and the castellanies of Marsay and Ozon), pp.448-9 and 511.⁷⁴

This register of c.1750 records an agreement made in 1140 by Geoffrey of Anjou and Archbishop Hugh of Tours used to prove the seventeenth-century archbishop's right to *prain* over the fishermen on the Vienne, and to take a third of the salmon and shad harvest at Candes-Saint-Martin, and a quarter at Véron.

The archbishop gained these privileges as the result of a more general agreement with Count Geoffrey to hold in common the Vienne on both sides of Chinon: 'une transaction de lan 1140 faite entre l'archevesque de Tours et le duc d'Anjou, pour lors duc de Touraine pourtant que les eaux au dessus et au dessous des ponts de la ville de Chinon sont communes entre le duc d'Anjou comme comte et seigneur de Chinon, et l'archevesque' (p.448).

The 1140 agreement also stipulated that the archbishop was entitled to these revenues on Mondays and Fridays in the period between Candlemas and Ascension Day: 'une transaction de l'an 1140 entre l'archevesque de Tours et le duc de Anjou et nous avons maintenu et gardé led[it] S[ei]g[neu]r archevesque dans le droit de lever ou droit de prain dans lad[ite] Riviere de Vienne les mardis et vendredis de la semaine depuis le jour de la Chandeleur jusqu'au jour de l'ascension' (p.448).

The 1140 agreement was used as proof of the archbishop's right by virtue of holding the castellany of Candes: 'maintenu et garde led[it] Sgr Archevesque a cause de sa chastellenie de Cande dans la possession et droit de lever et percevoir dans lad[ite] Riviere de Vienne depuis ennies jusqu'a la Pierre de Baudiment depuis la chandeleur jusqu'a l'ascension le tiers des saumons et alloses qui se peschent du coste de cande et le quart de ceux qui sepechent du coste de verron au lieu des pescheres lesquels receie' (p.449).

Witnesses: none named in this summary.

Dating: this proof was referred to several times in the summary of a dispute between Archbishop Michael Amelot and the king's demesne farmer Pierre Debrille in 1683; it was dated to 1140 in all but one. On p.511, the summary cites a date of 1040; this must be an error. This reference also refers to the islets of the Vienne as being subject to the partition.

The citation on p.511 also notes that the abbess of Fontevraud was called as a witness to the arrangements, which reflects the abbey's rights on the Vienne granted by Fulk V.

The exact extent of the archbishop's rights is unknown: in addition to those around Chinon held in common with the count, he also had the right of *prain* – evidently some kind of fishing revenue – between *Ennie* and *Pierre de Baudiment*. The first can no longer be traced; the second is probably the same location as *Bodiman*, still extant in the seventeenth century (*Cassini*) and situated on the north bank of the Vienne just to the south of Saint-Germain and not far from the confluence of the river with the Loire at Candes. This is in keeping with the stipulation of different portions of salmon and shad from Candes (one third) and Véron (one quarter).

Note: see also the notification of 28th March 1190 of resolution by Richard I of dispute over revenues in Chinon etc. between the archbishops and the counts of Anjou, ADIL G1 (1783 copy of archiepiscopal cartulary *Liber bonarum gentium, alias Livre blanc*, unknown date), original foliation (noted in margins) f.47v; see below, appendix V.

105 Agreement between Geoffrey and Archbishop Engelbald, drawn up by

⁷⁴ This item refers to f.27 of the 'inventaire des titres de l'archiepiscopalité' as its source. This is probably MS London BL Lansdowne 349, which has not yet been consulted.

the archbishop, concerning the quittance of wine revenues in Tours.
Probably post-January 1150.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Tours BM MS 1271 (*Liber compositionum ecclesie Turonensis*), f.24r-v (pp.47-8), no.86, under the rubric 'De quittance banni'. C = s.xviii copy from B, BnF NA Latin 1183, p.29. D = s.xviii copy from B ('de titres de la cathédrale'), BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou IV (5), no.1730, and erroneously dated 1148-57. This copy printed from B, C, D.

Prudem patrum discretio⁷⁵ paci et tranquillitati posterorum recte consulens, quicquid ad utilitatem spectabat omnium, quicquid recordatione condignum videbatur, litteris sibi credita profitentibus mandari et in thesauro memorie docuit committendum, ut quod vel pro vetustate neglecta obsolete vel posterorum pravitate licet aetum⁷⁶ prudenter a veri nota dampnosa oblivione aut calumpnia poterat retroduci in sibi repositum, scripta fideliter observarent et succedentium hominum de hic que ante gesta sunt instruerent disciplinam. Ad bonorum igitur tam posterorum quam presentium noticiam, ad perfidorum quorum libet calumpnias excludendas dat certitudinem presentis pagina scripti, quia consuetudinem quondam banni quam donnus archiepiscopus in Turonensi urbe ad vinum vendendum per mensem habebat, et capitulum per quindecim dies, comes quoque per ebdomadas sex, et dominus turri Hugonis per dies quindecim, illam utique consuetudinem omnes unanimiter piamente⁷⁷ compuncti omnibus imperpetuum indulserunt. Cujus geste rei signum exhibet et tenorem Engelbaudi archiepiscopi sigillum hic impressum et Gaufridi Andegavensis comitis nichilominus signatus sigillum.

Witnesses: none.

Dating: during the archiepiscopacy of Engelbald of Vendôme (1146-57), and after the cession of the ducal title.

Note: the now-lost original was sealed with both Engelbald's seal and, apparently, Geoffrey's signet (*Gaufridi Andegavensis comitis nichilominus signatus sigillum*).

Tours, canons of cathedral of Saint-Maurice

106 Notification to the comital *prepositi* in Tours of Geoffrey's annual grant of 20 *solidi*, from the revenues of his tower in Tours, to the canons. If the official does not make the payment on the appointed day, he is to give the canons twice as much on the following day and to make

⁷⁵ 'paci' to 'ad bonorum' omitted in D.

⁷⁶ This word unclear in C.

⁷⁷ This word unclear in C.

amends to the count. 1131 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Tours BM MS 1271. C = s.xviii copy from B, BnF NA Latin 1183, p.13, with the cartulary rubric 'De censu qui debetur de Turre Regia capitulo Turonensi'. This copy printed from C.

G(aufridus) andegavensis comes, omnibus prepositis suis Turonensibus tam futuris quam presentibus salutem. Notum vobis facio quod ego Goffridus comes andegavensis⁷⁸ filius Fulconis regis Hierusalem constitui canonicis Sancti Mauricii ut XX solidi quod eis debebam de censu de turre mea, scilicet die floridi pasche, singulis annis eisdem redderentur. Et propter vobis precipio ut eos omni occasione postposita, die constituo sin(e) autem, die primia⁷⁹ sequenti eos ad dupplum reddetis et michi inde rectitudinem facietui.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: during the period as count but not duke, and apparently after Fulk's investiture as king of Jerusalem.

Tours, canonical college of Saint-Martin Indre-et-Loire, arr. Tours (dioc. Tours).

107 159 Pledge to defend the canons' holdings and revenues in the borough of the kings of France, Tours, against Sulpice of Amboise and William Burrell or Bucelle. 1129×1136, possibly after 1132.

B = cartulary copy of unknown date (*Pancarte blanche* of Saint-Martin, Stein 3935), f.116, lost. C = cartulary copy of unknown date (*Pancarte rouge* of Saint-Martin, Stein 3936) f.27, destroyed. D = s.xviii copy from B, BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1326. E = s.xvii copy by Jean Besly from C, BnF Dupuy 828, f.103v. F = s.xvii-xviii copy from C, BnF Baluze 77, f.268. G = s.xviii copy from either A, B or C, BnF Touraine-Anjou II (2,1) no.455, lacking a witness list and with an incorrect marginal dating of 1040-60. H = extract from C, BnF Baluze 76, f.401.

Summary, Émile Mabille, *Catalogue analytique des diplômes, chartes et actes relatifs à l'histoire de Touraine, contenus dans la collection de Dom. Housseau* (Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine 14, Tours, 1863), p.138.

Printed (from D) Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.58 (56).

Witnesses: *ex parte nostra* (Geoffrey): Thomas, *noster capellanus*; Aimery of Trèves; Michael of Doué *et tunc temporis prepositus de Montebasonis*.

Ex parte canonicorum: Fulcher, *precentor et levita*; Burchard, *presbiter*; Robert of Courcelles, *Campanie prepositus*.

Dating: dated 1129-44 by Chartrou, but the presence of Walter the treasurer provides a *terminus ante quem* of 1136 (Griffiths, *The Capetian Kings and St. Martin of Tours*, p.126). Geoffrey *magister scholarum* was a member of the seigneurial family of Montreuil: he is named elsewhere in Saint-Martin's records as Geoffrey *Berlaicus*, i.e. Berlay. The family had a long-

⁷⁸ 'andegavensis' in C, in a later hand.

⁷⁹ C, 'proximia'; presumably should read 'prima'.

standing association with the college; Reginald, lord of Montreuil-Bellay between 1067 and 1084, was the college's treasurer and latterly the archbishop of Reims.

A new *terminus post quem* of 1132 can tentatively be assigned on the evidence of the Saint-Martin cartulary tradition. The canons' earliest cartulary, the *Pancarte noire*, was drawn up c.1137 and included material dating to 1131; it appears that the *Pancarte blanche* was intended to continue where the first cartulary left off, resuming in 1132, although it was not compiled until the beginning of the fourteenth century (Mabille, *La pancarte noire*, pp.3, 9, 12).

A dating of 1132×1136 is consistent with John of Marmoutier's description of a second round of aggression by Sulpice after his initial rising in 1129. 'With an interval of time having unfolded,' writes John in the *Historia*, since the initial rebellion, Sulpice again incurred the count's displeasure by withholding his mother's dowry lands. Geoffrey sent Jacquelin of Maillé, his four brothers, and Sulpice's own brother Hugh to attack Amboise, Chaumont and Montrichard (JM, p.210).

Note: the original appears to have been sealed with a single-sided seal pendant. As Chartrou notes, Housseau – under whom the copies D and G were made – saw the lost original with its seal, as well as the copy in B. It is unclear whether he made a copy directly from A.

Copies F and G, both unknown to Chartrou, rendered *Willelmum Bucellum* as *Willelmum Burellum*. Cf. BnF Touraine-Anjou V (4) no.1491, which names one William Burrell as Fulk V's chaplain, as does *ibid.* no.1492, printed in full by Chartrou as *pièce justificative* no.35 (grant to Fontevraud, 15th January 1127). *Guillelmus Burellus* appears as witness to an agreement of 1118×1126 settling a difference between the count's officers and Saint-Florent (*pièce justificative* no.33) and *Willelmus Bobel* witnessed another agreement for Saint-Florent issued during the same period (*pièce justificative* no.34).

108 157 Oath of protection. 1129 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151.

B = s.xvii copy, Monsnyer, *Celeberrimae S. Martini*, p.220.

Printed, Chartrou, *L'Anjou*, *pièce justificative* no.56 (54).

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated; whilst count but not duke.

Note: Chartrou incorrectly identified this as protection for Marmoutier; cf. similar protection issued by the kings of France, in Sharon Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp.206-7, n.32, citing a twelfth-century addition to a Carolingian Gospel book (Tours BM MS 22, f.277). Farmer in fact notes that fifteen French kings, from 1137 to 1650, made this oath when they were invested as either abbots or canons of the college. There is no internal evidence that this is Geoffrey V – the count is titled *Gaufridus, annuente Deo, Andegavorum et Turonorum comes* – but Guillot does not include it in his catalogue of pre-1109 charters.

**Turpenay, Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Chinon, cant. Azay-le-Rideau, comm. Saint-Benoît-la-Forêt (dioc. Tours).**

109 Joint confirmation by Count Geoffrey and King Louis VI of grants made in the forest at Teillé by Fulk V when he founded the abbey c.1127. 1129.

B = cartulary copy (Stein 3988), lost. C = s.xviii summary from B, BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou 18,

f.471r, f.473r (identical summaries).⁸⁰

Noted but not catalogued by Chartrou with Fulk's foundation charter (catalogue no.86, pp.277-8), along with a confirmation issued by Richard I on either 12th or 19th April 1190 (not 1189 as stated by Chartrou; *Pl. Acta* no.3430R from a copy of 1749, perhaps from sealed original, AN K186, no.117).

The summary of this text notes that the foundation charter issued by Fulk, in which he granted four bovates of land to the new abbot, Robert, as well as rights to wood in Teillé for building and heating 'fut confirmé en 1129 par Geofroy 5 du nom son fils comte d'Anjou et de Touraine, et le Roi Louis le gros 6 du nom'.

Witnesses: none noted.

Date: 1129.

Vendôme, Benedictine abbey of La Trinité Loir-et-Cher, arr. Vendôme (dioc. Blois)

110 223 Record of an agreement reached between the abbey and John, son of Count Geoffrey of Vendôme, arbitrated by Count and Duke Geoffrey. Vendôme, in the abbey, 19th March × 23rd April 1144.

B = cartulary copy, relevant folios lost. C = s.xviii copy from B, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1707. D = copy, *ibid.* Latin 17049, f.713. E = paper register, unknown provenance, f.329, lost. F = copy from E (*ex quodam registro papyraceo, f.329*), BnF Latin 13820, ff.299v, 381v. G = *ibid.* Baluze 47, f.258. H = *ibid.* Baluze 139, f.248. I = *ibid.* De Camps 103, f.153v. J = *ibid.* Latin 12700, f.279.

Printed (from C-J), CTV II, no.499.

Witnesses: *ex parte ejus* (John): Bartholomew of Vendôme; Vulgrin, his brother; Hilgot *Bocellus*; William *Ruillatus*; Reginald *Chamallardus*; Walabrand *de Meule*; Theobald *de Gracia*.

Ex parte nostra (La Trinité): Lord Abbot Robert; Rivallon, prior; Fulcher, *altararius*; Ulric, *tesaurarius*; Simon, *elemosinarius*; Roger *de Conis*; William Rufus; Hilgot, *presbiter* of Saint-Martin; Alberic, *prepositus noster*; Donatus; Bernard, prior of Marmoutier; John Saracen, prior *de Lancei*; others unnamed.

Dating: *Anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXLIII*; 1144 in G and H; marginal note dating it to 1144 in C. Although the scribe, clearly a monk of the abbey, dates this notice 1143 it refers to events which emerged in the year leading up to Abbot Hubert's death on March 19th 1144 and which continued and were resolved under his successor, Abbot Robert. John, who is identified here as the son of Count Geoffrey of Vendôme, succeeded his father in 1145, and is known to have harassed the monks before becoming count (Johnson, *Prayer, Patronage and Power*, p.83). It is likely that the resolution of the matter occurred during the first part of Robert's tenure: the language of the document suggests that this was a matter which needed to be dealt with soon after his investiture. It was made around the same time as Geoffrey sent the letter to his son Henry (Appendix VI, no.1, below). Despite the use of the ducal title in the first instance, this resolution was made before Geoffrey's return to Rouen to end the siege there on 23rd April 1144. The inconsistent use of the ducal title seems to have arisen from the later drawing-up and copying of the text.

⁸⁰ The text of this confirmation remains to be located.

111 171 Judgment that the inhabitants of the borough of Cheviré (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Baugé), situated in the fief of Gelduin of Malicorne and in the lands of Hugh of Clefs, must pay tithes in kind, including from vines they had planted, to the abbey. Baugé, 8th April 1146.

B = s.xii-xiii cartulary copy, BnF NA Latin 1936 (fragment of cartulary, ff.252-80 remaining; Stein 4048, formerly Cheltenham MS Phillipps 2971), ff.252v-253, no.811. C = s.xvii copy, *ibid.* Baluze 47, f.278v. D = s.xvii copy, *ibid.* Baluze 139, f.270. E = s.xviii copy from A and B, *ibid.* Touraine-Anjou VI (5) no.1722.

Printed CTV II, no.514; partially printed, *RRAN* III, no.1008.

Adjudicators: Hugh of Clefs, *dapifer comitis*⁸¹; Fulk de Molinternia (of Mouliherne?); Fulk, *forestarius*; Russell of Montfaucon; Geoffrey de Villaguaii; Helias Ligerii.

The judgment was assented to by several parties separate from the witnesses to its recitation: Gelduin of Malicorne; Basil Fisardi; Barbot de Fishio; Mischin fitz Seimar.

Witnesses: Boamund, archdeacon of Anjou; Vaslotus, *magister scholarum*; Geoffrey de Vallibus; Geoffrey de Isabie; Geoffrey, *presbiter* of Vieux-Baugé; Robert, *presbiter* of Cheviré; Everard, prior of Ville-Dieu; Joscelin de Bruillio.

De famulis abbatis: John, *cubicularius*; Maurice, *coquus*; Benedict, *marescallus*; Ragot; Christopher; Evrard of Cheviré, *prepositus* of Gelduin and the monks.

De curte Chiviriaci: Robert Mulotus; Eude de Butreio; Herbert Blancus; Escotus de Baionaria; et multi alii clerici et laici.

Dating: *Actum publice apud Balgiacum, in curia Gosfredi, nobilissimi Normannorum ducis et Andegavorum comitis, anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXLVI, v idus aprilis, feria secunda.*

Note: When Housseau copied the text in the eighteenth century (E), he noted that a partially broken double-sided ducal seal was still attached by a leather strap.

A final section is added after the dating clause: 'Ego Goffridus, Dei gratia Normannorum dux et Andegavensis comes, hanc querelam iudicio terminari precepi, iudicium audiens approbavi, cartam inde fieri mandavi, factamque meo sigillo confirmavi, praecipiens dapifero Balgiacensi etque preposito ut in acquirenda decima semper monachis adjuutores existant, nulloque modo eam auferri vel minui permittant.'

112 174 Confirmation of grants in the forest of Gastines, near Villedieu (?-le-Château, Loir-et-Cher, arr. Vendôme, cant. Montoire-sur-Loir), made by Count John of Vendôme. Confirmation of grant of revenues from a section of the River Loir and markets at Saint-Bienheureux (Vendôme) by Simon of Beaugency. Vendôme, in the abbot's chamber, 23rd February 1147.

B = s.xii-xiii cartulary copy, BnF NA Latin 1936 f.252, no.810. C = s.xviii copy from B, *ibid.* Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1724. D = *ibid.* Latin 17049, f.723. E = *ibid.* Latin 12780, f.230v. F = *ibid.* Decamps 103, f.155. G = *ibid.* Baluze 47, f.282. H = *ibid.* Latin 13820, f.239v. I = s.xviii copy, BM Orléans, MS VERNINAC 394, f.242.

Printed (from B-I), CTV II, no.517; *RRAN* III, no.1009.

Witnesses: Robert, abbot of Vendôme; Fulcher, *cellerarius*; Frodo, *hospitarius*; Fulcher Viviani; Ridet of Rillé; Absalon Roonard; Goferius of Bruyères; Nicholas, his brother; Lambert, *buticularius*; Malras; Gilbert gardaroba; Geoffrey Durandi; Fraser.

⁸¹ Described earlier in text as *tunc erat dapifer Lislæ et Balgiaci* (La Flèche and Baugé). Louis Halphen, 'Le cartulaire de Saint-Aubin d'Angers', *Revue de l'Anjou* n.s. 48 (1904), pp.51-69, at 58, suggests that *Lislæ* is a transcription error and should in fact read *Fissæ*, i.e. La Flèche.

Ex parte Vindocinensis comitis: Burchard *Bucellus*; Hilgot, his brother; Philip fitz Grip; Ber[n]ard fitz Frodo; Turbod; Bartholomew fitz Oger; Bartholomew *Alfredi*.

Dating: *Actum Vindocinensi in camera abbatis, vii Kalendas Martii, die dominica, anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXLVII.*

Note: the charter terminates with a sealing clause in which Geoffrey is described, unusually, as duke and count by the grace of God ('Ego Goffredus dei gratia Normannorum dux et Andegavorum comes ut hoc firmum in perpetuum permaneret hanc cartam fieri precepi, factam legi, lectam sigillo meo confirmari feci.').

Vignats, Savigniac abbey of Saint-André-en-Gouffern Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Falaise-Sud. (dioc. Sées)

113 202 Writ notifying all officers in England and Normandy of the exemption of the priory from all tolls and customs. Argentan, 23rd April 1144 × January 1150, possibly as early as 1143.

B = s.xiii-xiv cartulary copy, AD Calvados H6510 (Stein 3299, who dates it s.xiv; cf. Fossier, s.xiii), f.22v, no.90.

Printed from B, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.142, no.10; *RRAN* III, no.747.

Witnesses: count of Ponthieu; Alexander of Bohon; Robert of Neubourg.

Dating: undated, *apud Argentomum*; apparently during the ducal period.

Note: Vignats was founded as a Savigniac priory in 1131, and joined the Cistercian order in 1147.

As Haskins notes, 'except for the insertion of *sicut mee res proprie*, [this writ] reproduces exactly the terms of a writ of Henry for the same monastery', even reproducing the address to the English (Saint-André cartulary, no.72; calendared *RRAN* II, no.1941).

Patrick Conyers proposes that all charters made by Geoffrey for the Savigniacs during the ducal period should be redated to 1143×1150, 'to reflect the possibility that a similar preemptory offering of the ducal title to Geoffrey might have been made' as that in the charter of 18th September for Saint-André-en-Gouffern ('Changing Habits', pp.138, 143). The charter to which he refers records grants by the abbey's founder, William Talvas, and refers in the dating clause to *principante in Normannia duce Gaufrido* (surviving in the cartulary and later copies, and printed in *Ponthieu actes*, ed. Fossier, no.27. The witnesses to the writ may also support Conyers' argument. All three were very early supporters of the Angevins in Normandy, and assisted Geoffrey's campaigns in the area from Cotentin to the Saosnois.

The count of Ponthieu must be William Talvas's son John.

Villeloin, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Sauveur Indre-et-Loire, arr. Loches, cant. Montrésor (dioc. Tours).

114 147 Confirmation of Fulk V's grant of a stretch of river at Chemillé-sur-Indrois (Indre-et-Loire, arr. Loches, cant. Montrésor). 1129/1131 × 23rd April 1144, or January 1150 × 7th September 1151, perhaps 1131 × early 1144.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, BnF NA Latin 92 (Stein 4106), f.24. C = different cartulary, apparently lost, f.14v. D = s.xvii copy from A or B, *ibid.* Gaignières 678, p.19. E = s.xviii copy from C, BnF

Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1522.

Printed, *Archives du Cognier (J. Chappée, Le Mans) Série H, art. 97: Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sauveur de Villeloin*, ed. L.-J. Denis (Paris & Le Mans, 1911), no.29 (from B); Chartrou, *pièce justificative* no.16, from E.

Witnesses: none recorded.

Dating: undated, whilst count but not duke and apparently after Fulk's coronation in Jerusalem. The mention of Fulk as king but with no reference to his death, and the reference to the comital seal, suggests that this text can be dated to Fulk's reign as King of Jerusalem. Chartrou dates the confirmation to 1143, after the copy in E; this is also followed by Beautemps-Beaupré, *Coutumes et institutions* II, part 1, p.27, n.1 (B). By contrast, Denis ascribes *termini* of 1129×1142 to the confirmation. There is no internal evidence for anything more precise than that outlined above.

Note: Boussard, *Le comté d'Anjou*, p.18, wrongly identifies the *eau de Chemillé* as a comital possession near the lordship of Chemillé near Saumur. The correct identification indicates that the stretch of water given was on a tributary of the Indre, extremely near the abbey. Fulk V made his grant at the request of his mother (Chartrou, *pièce justificative*, no.16).

APPENDIX II

THE BAYEUX INQUESTS

This appendix catalogues the extant documents issued by Geoffrey relating to the inquests, as well as the surviving inquest returns addressed to Geoffrey, and papal letters sent to Geoffrey or confirming lost ducal *acta*. It does not include thirteen other papal letters connected with the inquest but addressed to other recipients,¹ *acta* issued by Bishop Philip which set out to recover or delineate diocesan lands independently of Geoffrey,² or the agreement of 1146 between Robert of Gloucester and Bishop Philip of Bayeux.³

¹ These letters are as follows: (1) Innocent II to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and Bishop Philip of Bayeux, regarding the bishop's problems and confirming the excommunication of Philip of Colombières and Richard of Le Hommet, issued in Rome, 18th June 1142 or 1143 (*Livre noir* I, no.195; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.14); (2) Celestine II to Bishop Philip, exhorting him to recover Bayeux's estates, and referring to lost correspondence from Philip to the pope, issued in Rome, 9th January 1144 (*Livre noir* I, no.179; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.19); (3) Lucius II to Bishop Philip, confirming the bishop cathedral's rights and possessions (*Livre noir* I, no.154; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.23); (4) Eugene III to the clergy and people of the diocese of Bayeux, commanding them to assist their bishop in restoring the cathedral's estates, and referring to a visit *ad limina* by Philip, issued at Narni, 18th March 1145 (*Livre noir* I, no.214; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.31), the same day as (5) his reissue of Lucius' letter of 16th May 1144 to Bishop Philip (no.3, above; the reissue is *Papsturkunden ...Normandie*, no.30); (6) Eugene III to the bishops of Bath and Worcester, requesting them to persuade Robert of Gloucester to restore lands he had taken from the bishop of Bayeux's estates, issued on the same day as (4) above and Eugene's letter to Geoffrey (*Livre noir* I, no.190; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.32); (7) Eugene III to the abbots of Fécamp and Troarn, commanding them to come to terms with Bishop Philip over the placing of priests in the abbey's churches within the diocese of Bayeux, issued at Orte on 26th March 1145 (*Livre noir* I, no.159; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.33); (8) notification of the terms of (7) to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and Bishop Rotrou of Évreux, on the same day (*Livre noir* I, no.189; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.34); (9) a further letter of Eugene III to the abbots of Fécamp and Troarn, issued at Viterbo on 28th September, probably 1145 (*Livre noir* I, no.199; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.36); (10) a further letter of Eugene III to Archbishop Hugh, sent on the same date as (9), commanding him to resolve Bishop Philip's disputes with the abbots of Fécamp and Troarn (*Livre noir* I, no.186; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.37); (11) Eugene III to Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury, Bishop Simon of Worcester and Bishop Robert of Bath, giving them three months to bring Robert of Gloucester to terms, and authorising them to excommunicate him and place an interdict upon his lands should he continue to refuse to restore estates in the diocese of Bayeux, issued at Trastevere, 10th March 1146 (*Livre noir* I, no.198, erroneously giving the place of issue as Paris; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.41); (12) Eugene III to Richard of Bohon, dean of Bayeux, and the whole cathedral chapter, confirming that Bishop Philip had come to Rome and requested a confirmation from the pope of the grant of Hérils to the chapter by Robert of Neubourg, issued on the same day as (9) (*Livre noir* I, no.207; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.41); (13) Eugene III to the bishops of Worcester and Bath, commanding them to ensure that the *compositio* made by Robert of Gloucester with Bishop Philip of Bayeux is adhered to, and if not, an interdict is to be laid, issued at Paris, 24th May 1147 (*Livre noir* I, no.191; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.46).

² Confirmation in 1145 by Bishop Philip of the possessions of La Trinité of Vendôme at Cristot and Audrieu (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Tilly-sur-Seulles) in the diocese of Bayeux, and of the agreement made between Abbot Robert of La Trinité of Vendôme and Abbot Alan of Cadouin (Dordogne, founded in 1115 by Robert of Arbrissel) concerning the tithes of the fief of Robert Taillebois, made in the presence of Archbishop Hugh of Rouen (CTV II, no.511, and cf. no.510, Archbishop Hugh's original charter, dated *annum est hoc verbi incarnati MCXLV, duce Normannorum Gaufredo*).

³ RRAN III, no.58; *Gloucester Charters*, no.6.

- 1 Letter from Pope Lucius II to Count Geoffrey noting Henry I's assembling of a jury of recognition to inquire into the lands and privileges of the bishop of Bayeux, in order to restore them. Geoffrey is mandated to do the same, in order to restore the status quo of Bishop Odo's time. Lateran, 16th May 1144.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.54v.

Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.206; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.22.

Date: *Dat' Lateran. XVII kal. junii.* Lucius II reigned as pope from 9th March 1144 until 15th February 1145.

Note: Geoffrey was addressed only as count, not duke; cf. no.14, below. Cf. *Livre noir* I, no.154, a papal bull sent to Bishop Philip of Bayeux on the same day confirming the privileges and possessions of the church of Bayeux.

- 2 180 Notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and all the archbishops, bishops and barons of Normandy that Bishop Philip of Bayeux is to hold the demesne lands and fiefs of the cathedral as they stood under Bishop Odo, and that any dispute which arises is to be dealt with by oaths of sworn local men. Rouen, 16th May 1144×1147, probably 1145×1146.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.5v.

Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.16 (mistakenly attributed to Henry II); *RRAN* III, no.52.

Witnesses: Waleran of Meulan.

Date: undated, *apud Rothomagum*. Ostensibly after the arrival of Lucius' papal bull issued on 16th May 1144. As Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.205, n.37 points out, the presence of Waleran of Meulan suggests a date prior to his departure for crusade; cf. *RRAN* III, which attributes termini of '1144×1150, probably 1144-7'. Crouch, *The Beaumont Twins*, p.54-5, indicates that Waleran was absent on pilgrimage to Santiago from soon after the fall of Rouen on 23rd April 1144 until at least late in the same year and perhaps until early 1145, and (pp.66-7) that he was probably in Paris for the departure of the Second Crusade perhaps as early as February 1147. If issued prior to the Santiago pilgrimage, it must have been on the eve of Waleran's departure.

- 3 217 Writ instructing Engelger of Bohon to restore certain fiefs, which he unjustly held, to Bishop Philip of Bayeux. If Engelger refuses, the ducal justice Richard of La Haye is to hold an inquest to prove the bishop's right; Richard is also to make a recognition, according to the duke's assize, of episcopal fiefs in his *bailliage*. Le Mans, 1144×1150, probably 1145×1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.7v.

Printed, *Magni rotuli scaccarii Normanniae sub regibus Angliae*, ed. Thomas Stapleton (2 vols., London, 1840-44), I, p.xxxiv; *Livre noir* I, no.24; Heinrich Brunner, *Die Entstehung der Schwurgerichte* (Berlin, 1872), pp.80, 302; *Placita Anglo-Normannica*, ed. Melville Madison Bigelow (Boston, MA, 1879), p.392; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.210, n.58; *RRAN* III, no.54. Summarised, Round, *Calendar*, no.1439.

Witnesses: Pagan of Clairvaux.

Date: undated, *apud Cenomannum*. The same occasion as no.4, below. No.5, below, indicates that Richard of La Haye had already taken part in recognitions at Carcagny and Vouilly prior to the commencement of the larger inquest at Cambremer; this writ may therefore refer to one of these locations, suggesting that Richard's *bailliage* lay to the east of his Cotentin patrimony.

4 216 Writ instructing the ducal justices Guy of Sablé and Robert of Courcy to begin assizes of recognition concerning the fief of William Bersic to determine whether Bishop Philip of Bayeux held it under Henry I; if so, it is to be restored to him. Recognitions, according to the duke's assize, are to be made into tenurial arrangements at St-Aignan-de-Cramesnil and Rocquancourt (both Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Bourguébus) under Henry I; Walkelin of Courseulles is to be resealed if necessary. Robert fitz Erneis is prohibited from taking the profits of any fines. Le Mans, 1144×1150, probably 1145×1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.7v.

Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.25; Brunner, *Die Entstehung*, p.302; *Placita*, ed. Bigelow, p.393; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.210, n.59; *RRAN* III, no.55.

Witnesses: Pagan of Clairvaux.

Date: undated, *apud Cenomanum*; apparently on the same occasion as no.3, above.

5 177 Account sent to Duke Geoffrey by Waleran of Meulan of the recognition made into the joint tenure of the bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux at Cheffreville (now Cheffreville-Tonnencourt, Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Livarot). 16th May 1144×1147, probably 1145×1146.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.25.

Printed *Livre noir* I, no.89.

Witnesses: none.

Date: undated. Though Waleran was with Geoffrey during and after the fall of Rouen in spring 1144 it seems unlikely that Waleran – who left for Santiago very soon after this victory – would have had time to have been engaged in the process of recognition at Lisieux. See no.2, above.

6 178 Account sent to Duke Geoffrey by Reginald of Saint-Valéry of the same recognition at Cheffreville as above.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.25.

Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.90.

Witnesses: none.

Date: undated; see no.5, above.

7 185 Notification to Reginald of Saint-Valéry, William of Vernon, Robert of Neubourg and all other Norman justices and *proceres* of Duke and Count Geoffrey's confirmation of the bishop of Bayeux's possessions

and customs as they stood under Bishop Odo, including those at Carcagny (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Tilly-sur-Seulles) and Vouilly (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Isigny-sur-Mer), which had already been determined by a jury of recognition. Rouen, 16th May 1144 × January 1150, probably 18th March 1145×1147, perhaps early.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book f.6.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.19; *RRAN* III, no.57.

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop of Rouen; Richard *cancellario nostro*; Reginald of St-Valéry; Robert of Neubourg.

Date: undated, *apud Roth(omagus)*. *RRAN* III places this 'at about the time of the inquests' described in no.11, below, and points out that the witnesses are the same as those in no.8, below, and thus the same occasion. This text indicates that a separate inquest regarding Carcagny and Vouilly had already been completed by Robert of Courcy as dapifer and Richard of La Haye by the time Geoffrey ordered an inquest to be conducted at Cambremer.

8 168 Writ issued by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Reginald of St-Valéry, Robert of Neubourg and all ducal justices in Normandy, notifying them that he wishes the cathedral and Bishop Philip of Bayeux and his successors to hold the *leugata* of Cambremer (Calvados, arr. Lisieux) in the diocese of Lisieux as they did under Henry I. The justices are to make a recognition by sworn men of the boundaries of the *leugata* and its customs, and then to reassign the bishop with this area; if anyone opposes them, they are to be brought before the ducal court. Rouen, 16th May 1144 × January 1150, probably 18th March 1145 × 24th June 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.5v.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.17; *RRAN* III no.53.

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop of Rouen; Richard *cancellario*; Reginald of St-Valéry; Robert of Neubourg.

Date: undated, *apud Rothomagus*. The same occasion as no.7, above. Prior to the translation of the abbey of Val-Richer from Souleuvre to Cambremer, which was apparently achieved by 24th June 1147 (Arnoux and Maneuvrier, *Deux Abbayes*, p.69).

Davis follows Haskins' dating of the document: Haskins reasons that this and all of the documents which deal with the recovery of Bayeux's episcopal and chapter lands were issued between 1145 and 1147 (*Norman Institutions*, p.205, n.37). Davis and Haskins both date this text more precisely to the period after Geoffrey's assumption of the ducal title in 1144, but the mention of the need for an inquest at Cambremer in the bull issued by Eugene III on 18th March 1145 suggests a later date. The account of the foundation of Val-Richer in 1146-7 (*Neustria Pia*, pp.825-7) shows that some of the estates within the bishop's *leugata* were used to endow the abbey, founded by Bishop Philip and his vassal Simon of Bosville (whose toponym refers to a now-lost location which, according to Arnoux and Maneuvrier, *Deux Abbayes*, p.72, n.73, was situated in Montreuil-en-Auge, dép. Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Cambremer), some of whose own men acted as jurors in the Cambremer recognition (no.10, below).

9 169 Notification by Robert of Courcy and Robert of Neubourg to Duke Geoffrey that the inquest in the *leugata* of Cambremer had been made at Falaise, and describing the boundaries of Bayeux's enclave in the area. 16th May 1144 × January 1150, probably 18th March 1145 × early 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book f.11.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.43.

Jurors: *antiquorum et legitimorum hominum*, unnamed.

Witnesses: William of Montpichon; Ralph of Courlibove; Aitard *Poucin*⁴; William of Ouville;⁴ William Boviun; Gilbert of Bigod (*de Bigart*).⁵

Date: undated. After nos. 7 and 8; see notes to no.8, above.

10 170 Notification by Robert of Courcy and Robert of Neubourg to Duke Geoffrey that the inquest in the *leugata* of Cambremer had been conducted by eighteen jurors at Falaise. 16th May 1144 X January 1150, probably 18th March 1145 X early 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book f.11.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.44.

Jurors: *decem et octo homines magnae aetatis*: Richard of Les Autels (*de Altaribus*), from the fee of Manerbe (*de feodo Manerbae*);⁶ of the fief of the abbot of Saint-Pierre-sur Dive, Amis, Roger fitz Odo, Hugh Taisson, Richard fitz Miles; from the land of Simon of Bosville, Walter Brito, Ralph *de Luto*, Richard Parvus, Robert fitz Miles, William of Bruyères (*de Brueria*); from the fief of Roger *de Gratepanche*, Richard *durum scutum*, Hugh Plamus; from the fief of Hugh of Crèvecoeur (*de Crevecor*),⁷ Richard *de Fraissetto*; from the fief of Walter of Le Pin (*de Pinu*), Richard Verol; from the fief of Robert of Montfort, Richard *de Warlenmont*; from the fief of Robert Marmion, Joscelin Vairun; from the fief of Roger *de Gowiz*, Robert Houcemainne.

Witnesses: none.

Date: undated. After nos. 7 and 8; see notes to no.8, above.

Note: the warranty clause (*juraverunt etiam warandam infra istos terminos, sed in terra episcopi tantum*) is absent from no.9.

11 165 Notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and the bishops and barons of Normandy of the outcome of the inquest at Falaise concerning Bayeux's enclave at Cambremer, as well as another inquest which confirmed that Carcagny (Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Tilly-sue-Seulles), Vouilly (arr. Bayeux, cant. Isigny-sur-Mer), a ditch at Luchon and other possessions are within the bishop's demesne. All of these possessions are to be returned to the bishop of Bayeux. 18th March 1145 x January 1150, almost certainly before 24th June 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.9v.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.39; *RRAN* III, no.56.

⁴ Ouville-la-Bien-Tournée (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Saint-Pierre-sur-Dive).

⁵ Perhaps the fee of Bigod, in Savenay (Calvados, arr. Vire, cant. Villers-Bocage, comm. Courvaden).

⁶ Perhaps Les Autels-Saint-Bazile (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Livarot) as suggested for the same individual in *Pl. Acta*, no.2331. Manerbe is situated in Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Blangy-le-Château.

⁷ Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Mézidon.

Witnesses: Richard *cancellario*; Robert of Neubourg; Robert of Courcy; [Simon] the count of Évreux; Amaury of Maintenon (*de Maistenone*);⁸ Geoffrey of Clefs; Guferius of Bruyères (*de Brueria*).

Date: undated; posterior to Eugene III's bulls of 18th March 1145. Apparently before Bishop Philip's grant of lands at Cambremer to the monks of Val-Richer (*Neustria Pia*, pp.825-7).

12 215 Notification by Duke and Count Geoffrey to his justices and the barons of Normandy that Richard of Le Hommet has quitclaimed customs at Luchon, and renewed his fealty to Bishop Philip of Bayeux in a ceremony conducted before Duke Geoffrey in Bayeux. Bayeux, 16th-May 1144 × January 1150, probably 18th March 1145×147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.6.
Printed, *Livre noir*, no.18; *RRAN* III, no.60.

Date: undated, *apud Baiocas*. After no.11, which commands the restoration of the ditch in question.

Note: Davis identifies Luchon as being in Calvados.

13 182 Confirmation by Duke and Count Geoffrey to Bishop Philip of Bayeux and Richard of Bohun, dean of the cathedral chapter, of Robert of Neubourg's grant to the subcantor of the cathedral of half of the church of Les Hérils (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Trévières) and half of that at Sommervieu (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Ryes). Argentan, 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.27.
Printed, Bourrienne, *Livre noir* I, no.100; *RRAN* III, no.59.

Witnesses: Robert of Neubourg.

Date: *apud Arg(entonam), factum est hoc anno MCXLVII*. It is unclear whether this confirmation was issued before or after the letter of 26th July 1147 from Eugene III to Geoffrey (no.3, above). Although Eugenius urged Geoffrey to oversee restitutions to the church, he made no allusion to any specific cases.

14 Bull from Pope Eugene III to Count Geoffrey, reminding him that it is his duty to ensure the restoration of lands seized by Norman barons from the bishop of Bayeux. Auxerre, 26th July 1147.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.52.
Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.192; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.50.

Date: *Dat' Altisiodori VII kal. aug.* Eugenius was at Auxerre during September 1147. If the apparent translation date of 24th June 1147 for Val-Richer is accurate, it suggests that Bishop Philip had given the monks land at Cambremer prior to this bull; no.11, above, shows that other inquests had been conducted by the time Philip's rights at Cambremer had been confirmed and the lands restored to him, but that restitutions still needed to be made at Carcagny, Vouilly and Luchon, and these, along with the large estates still in Robert of Gloucester's possession and

⁸ Amaury was lord of Maintenon, Eure-et-Loir, arr. Chartres, and guardian of Simon of Evreux; see Power, *Norman Frontier*, pp.182 and 393, n.26.

apparently not part of the inquest process *per se*, are perhaps what this bull refers to.

Note: Geoffrey was not addressed as duke either here or in the bull issued by Lucius II (no. 1, above).

- 15 Restoration by Duke Geoffrey to Bishop Philip of Bayeux of half of the villa of Ducy (now Ducy-Ste-Marguerite, Calvados, arr. Caen, cant. Tilly-sur-Seulles) and half of that of Louvières (Calvados, arr. Bayeux, cant. Trévières), to be held in fee, in exchange for £40. Rome, 3rd February 1153.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.42.

Printed, *Livre noir* I, no.156; *Papsturkunden...Normandie*, no.64.

Note: this transaction, agreed in the ducal court, is briefly recorded in a bull issued in favour of Bishop Philip (*medietatem ville de Dussi et medietatem ville de Loueriis cum omnibus ibidem ad feudum episcopum Baiocensium pertinentibus, quas in curia nobilis memorie Gaufridi quondam Normannie ducis per iudicium obtinuisti et datis quadraginta libris ei*).

- 16 Mandate of Henry II instructing William fitz John to enquire into the bishop of Bayeux's forest as it had been established by a recognition in the time of Count Geoffrey, whose charter confirmed it; any unjust seizures were to be restored. Mirebeau, during the siege, 1156.

B = s.xiv cartulary copy, Black Book, f.9v. C = s.xix abstract from B, BnF Latin 10064 f.120v.

Printed *Livre Noir* I, no.36; DB I, no.14; *Pl. Acta*, no.155 (1390H).

Summarised, Léchaudé D'Anisy, 'Extraits des chartes du Calvados', *Memoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie* 6-7 (1834-5), ii, p.442 no.36.

Witness: Robert of Neubourg.

Note: the king's mandate indicates that Geoffrey's inquests extended to episcopal forests and were recorded in a now-lost charter (*Henricus...Willelmo filio Iohannis...Precipio tibi quod ex quo Baic' episcopus te requisierit videas forestas suas et facias recognosci quomodo fuerunt recognite tempore comitis Gaufr(idi) patris mei et precepto suo et sicut carta ipsius testatur*).

APPENDIX III
BISHOP ULGHER OF ANGERS

- 1 Grant by Count Geoffrey of the church of St-Jean-Baptiste (alias St-Lézin) to the cathedral and Bishop Ulger in perpetuity. Angers, in the chapterhouse of the cathedral, 1131; before 29th October.

A = sealed original, lost; seal missing by s.xvii. B = s.xvii copy from A, BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1527. C = s.xvii copy, ibid. no.1535, noting a provenance of 'arch. du Chapp. d'Angers'.

This transcription from B and C.

Quidquid in memoria tenatissime et diutissime haberi desideratur litterarum custodia annotatum destinetur ut <et>¹ apud presentis et futuros memorabilius teneatur, firmitusque credatur. Ego Gaufridus² igitur permissu gratia Dei Andegavorum comes perpendens quod si ea qua minus recte perpetrata sunt et divino nutui et ecclesiasticae rectitudini adversantur ad debitum statum <reducere>³ curavero id mihi ad <aeternam>⁴ remunerationis praemia cap...enda⁵ pro futurum et ad summo iudice in districto iudicio recompensandum,⁶ per praesentis scripti testimonium notificare decrevi omnibus Sanctae Dei ecclesiae fidelibus me dedisse in elemosina in perpetuum Ecclesiae Sancti Mauricii et Ulgerio Andegavensi Episcopo⁷ et successoribus ejus Episcopis pro remedio animae meae et parentum meorum et pro injuriis et contumeliis quas eidem episcopo et rebus Sancti Mauricii intuleram ecclesiam beati⁸ Johannis Baptistae quae est in suburbio civitatis andegavensis⁹ in qua eadem requiescit corpus beati Licinii, et concessisse totum jus abbatis et domini quod ego habebam in ea, ut habeant deinceps tam ipse¹⁰ praefatus episcopus quam successores ejus jus et potestatem constituendi in ea canonicos et insuper in omnes res eorum¹¹ quicquid¹² ad abbatem vel dominum pertinet disponendi. Facta est haec largitio et concessio in Capitulo Sancti Mauricii

¹ Unclear in B and C; C apparently provides 'et'.

² C *Gaufridus*.

³ Unclear in B and C.

⁴ Unclear in B and C.

⁵ This word uncertain in B and C.

⁶ B *recompensandum*.

⁷ *Episcopo* omitted from B.

⁸ C *Sancti*.

⁹ C *andegavie*'.

¹⁰ *Ipse* omitted from B.

¹¹ B *insuper in ejus vel eorum*.

¹² B *quidquid*.

Andegavis solemniter¹³ positis et redditis clavibus praefatae ecclesiae sancti Johannis a me ipso in manu Ulgerii Episcopi, et postea positis super dominicum altare Sancti Mauricii, praesenti venerabili Carnotensi Episcopo Gaufrido, praesentibus etiam Normanno Decano et canonicis¹⁴ ejusdem Ecclesia Sancti Johannis, Johanne Rufo, Guidone Aufredi,¹⁵ Auncone,¹⁶ Falcone, Leurando,¹⁷ Gaufrido bibente vinum, Pipino, Gaufrido de Ramoforti, Sicherio, Guiberto, Josleno¹⁸ de Baugeio et aliis quorum nomina subscripta¹⁹ sunt, Abbas Sancti Sergii, Abbas omnium Sanctorum, Hugo de Matefelonio,²⁰ Gauquanieus de Camiliaco,²¹ Adhelardus²² de Castrogonterii, Willelmus²³ de Tauneio,²⁴ Jocelinus Rohonardi,²⁵ Pipinus de Turonis, Guito de Supra ponte,²⁶ Renaudus²⁷ Rufus, Guillelmus²⁸ de Passavant, Aldulfus de Morena, Bassetus, Paganus Sorini Quaterius, Girardus, Morsell',²⁹ Johannes, Normannus Rufus, Gaufridus de Pothenaria,³⁰ Hugo Machefenum, Guillelmus Burel, Bonel³¹ Cambiator, Isembertus de Ambazia, Bruno³² famulus canonicorum, Thebaudus³³ Palefredus, Rollandus de Monte-revelli,³⁴ Paganus Burgundius, Abbas de Rochaforti,³⁵ Fulo Oberti,³⁶ Guillelmus³⁷ de Molendinis, Johannes de Alenceyo,³⁸ Gaufridus aurifaber.³⁹ De canonicis Sancti Mauricii Gaufridus Decanus,

¹³ C *sollempniter*.

¹⁴ B *canonico*.

¹⁵ C *Andrefedi*, cancelled; *Andefrei*.

¹⁶ C *Amicone*.

¹⁷ C *Levraudo*.

¹⁸ B *Jolleno*.

¹⁹ C *subtus*.

²⁰ C *Matafalone*.

²¹ C *Guiganicus de Camilia*.

²² B *Adhooardus*.

²³ C *W*.

²⁴ B *Canniyo*.

²⁵ C *Joscelinus Rohomardi*.

²⁶ C *Guido de Super pontem*.

²⁷ C *Rinaudus*.

²⁸ C *W*.

²⁹ B *Bassetus paganus, Sorini quaterius* (ending unclear), *Girardus Mordellus*.

³⁰ B *poconaria*.

³¹ B *Benuel*.

³² B *Brino*.

³³ B *Theobardus*.

³⁴ B *Rolendus de Monterevelli*.

³⁵ Perhaps in error in both for Abbo of Rochefort.

³⁶ B *Forco*; perhaps in error in both for Fulco.

³⁷ C *W*.

³⁸ C *Alencoio*.

³⁹ B *faber*.

Buamundus⁴⁰ et Normannus et Richardus Archidiaconi,⁴¹ Guillelmus⁴² Potardus, Guillelmus de Camiliaco,⁴³ Guillelmus⁴⁴ Frichon, Joslenus Barbotus,⁴⁵ Girardus de Jarzeyo,⁴⁶ Grafio⁴⁷ precentor, Guillelmus de poenceio,⁴⁸ Guillelmus Barraudus,⁴⁹ Guillelmus notarius,⁵⁰ Aubertus, Jonas, Petrus,⁵¹ Rohandus, Gaufridus, et alii plures, nec non et pene omnes clerici suburbani. Hanc vero donationem concessit Thebaudus de Balsonio in conspectu nostro et in praesentia nostrae curiae, qui praefatam Ecclesiam Sancti Johannis nobis cum omnibus ad eam pertinentibus dederat. Actum Andegavis in capitulo Sancti Mauricii anno ab Incarnatione domini Millesimo Centesimo⁵² et XXXI. Sed⁵³ ut hoc nostrae largitionis donum majorem obtinuet firmitatem manu propria Crucis signum impressimus et sigillum nostrum praesent(ae)⁵⁴ cartulae apposuimus. + S. Gaufridi Andegavorum comitis filii Fulconis Iherosolimitam.⁵⁵

Witnesses: Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres; Norman, dean of St-Jean; canons of St-Jean: John Rufus; Guy fitz Andefrey; *Auncone*; Fulk; Levraud; Geoffrey *Bibente Vinum*; Pippin; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Sicher; Gilbert; Joscelin of Baugé.

Et aliis quorum nomina subscripta sunt: the abbot of St-Serge; the abbot of Toussaint; Hugh of Matheflon; Galvan of Chemillé; Adelard of Château-Gontier; William of Taunay; Joscelin Roonard; Pippin of Tours; Guy *de Super pontem*; Reginald Rufus; William of Passavant; Adulfus of Morannes; Basset; Pagan *Sorini*; *Quaterius*; *Girardus*; *Morsell*; John; Norman Rufus; Geoffrey of La Poissonière; Hugh *Machefenum*; William Burrell; Bonel *Cambiator*; Isembert of Amboise; Bruno *famulus canonicorum*; Theobald *Palefredus*; Roland of Montrevault; Pagan *Burgundius*; Abbo of Rochefort; Fulk *Oberti*; William *de Molendinis*; John of Alençon (*de Alencoio*); Geoffrey *aurifaber*.

Cathedral canons: Geoffrey, dean; Bohemond, Norman and Richard, archdeacons; William Potard; William of Chemillé; William *Frichon*; Joscelin *Barbotus*; Gerald of Jarzé; Grafio *precentor*; William of Pouancé (*de Poenciaco*);⁵⁶ William *Barraudus*; William, *notarius*; Aubert or Robert; Jonas; Petrus, Rohandus; Gaufridus *et aliis pluriis*.

Date: 1131, and presumably before Bishop Ulger's rights over the church were confirmed by Pope Honorius II on 29th October 1131 (*RPR* I, no.7494 (5375); printed *Cart. noir*, no.225).

⁴⁰ B *Buamondus*.

⁴¹ B *Archidiaconus*.

⁴² C *W*.

⁴³ C *W. de Chimilliaco*.

⁴⁴ C *W*.

⁴⁵ This appears in C as two separate names.

⁴⁶ C *Jarzeio*.

⁴⁷ B *Grassio*.

⁴⁸ C *W. de Poenciaco*.

⁴⁹ C *W*

⁵⁰ C *W. notarius*.

⁵¹ C *Robertus . . Petrus*.

⁵² C *M. C*.

⁵³ C *Set*.

⁵⁴ B *presenti*; *Cpraesen*.

⁵⁵ *Signum* omitted from B.

⁵⁶ Probably Pouancé (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Segré), but perhaps Pouançay (Vienne, arr. Châtellerault, cant. Les Trois-Moutiers).

Note: Geoffrey's grant was assented to (*concessit*) by Theobald of Blazon in the presence of the count and his court (*in conspectu nostro et in presentia nostrae curia*). Unlike Ulger's notice of the grant inserted in the cathedral's cartulary (no.2, below), this charter does not mention the bishop's of 10,000s. in exchange for the church.

2 Episcopal notice of Geoffrey's grant of Saint-Jean-Baptiste (alias Saint-Lézin), in exchange for 10,000 s. 1131.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy ('cartulaire noir', Stein 131) f.115v, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xvii copy from C, Angers BM MS 691, f.449. E = s.xviii copy from B, *Index titulorum*..., p.211, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. F = s.xviii copy from B, Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1531. G = extract from B, *ibid.* no.1536.

Printed (with indications of further mentions), *Cart. noir* no.203.

Witnesses: (to Geoffrey's grant of Saint-Jean) Norman, dean [of Saint-Jean] and *de canonicis illius ecclesiae*: John Rufus; Guy fitz Andefrey; Aimo; Fulk Levraud; Geoffrey Bevin; Pippin; Joscelin of Baugé; Gilbert; Sicher; Geoffrey of Ramefort. *De canonicis sancti Mauricii*: Geoffrey, dean; Theobald, treasurer; Bohemond, Norman and Richard, archdeacons; Grafo, precentor; William of Chemillé; William Potard; William Fithun; William of Pouancé; William, notary; William Barraud; Obert; Roard; unnamed others.

(To the concession given by Theobald of Blazon and his family) Bohemond, archdeacon; Peter of Maulévrier; Geoffrey Bevin.

Date: around the same time as no.1, above.

3 117 Cartulary notice summarising an agreement brokered by Henry I and the papal legate, Bishop Geoffrey of Chartres, between Count Geoffrey and Bishop Ulger of Angers concerning compensation owed to the bishop for the detrimental effects of the count's castle at Châteauneuf-sur-Sarthe. Geoffrey promises to obtain rights over the monks of Beaulieu for the bishop, or else to compensate him with 3,000 s., underwritten by Henry I; in exchange, Ulger lifts the interdict placed on Geoffrey's lands. ?18th. December 1133 × August 1135.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.121, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xvii copy from C, Angers BM MS 691, f.499v. E = s.xviii copy from B, *Index titulorum*..., p.238, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. F = s.xviii copy from B, BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1510. G = copy from B, Angers BM MS 706, p.143. H = poor s.xviii copy from B, *ibid.* MS 747, p.346. Printed (with indications of further mentions), *Cart. noir*, no.211. Summarised, *RRAN* II, no.1920a.

Witnesses: none.

Date: undated. After the investiture of Hugh of Étampes as archbishop of Tours, soon after the death of his predecessor, Hildebert of Lavardin, on 18th December 1133. Before Henry's fatal illness began on 25th November 1135, and almost certainly before his estrangement from Matilda and Geoffrey in the late summer of 1135.

- 4 Notification by Bishop Ulger recording the detrimental effects of Count Geoffrey's construction of an *oppidum* encroaching on episcopal land at Selonnes, and summarising measures taken, including the threat of excommunication, to resolve the dispute. With the consent of Matilda, Geoffrey grants the customs of Ramefort to the bishops in perpetuity. ? Angers, 1136 × June 1138.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.109v, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xvii copy from C, Angers BM MS 691, f.494v. E = s.xviii copy from B, *Index titulorum...*, p.231, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. F = s.xviii copy from B, BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1505. G = copy from B, Angers BM MS 706, p.141.

Printed (with indications of further mentions), *Cart. noir*, no.193.

Witnesses: Countess Matilda; Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Ramefort; Geoffrey fitz Warin; Guy de *Supra Pontem*; Fulk fitz Obert; Joscelin of Tours; Adelard, *thelonearius*.

Date: undated. During the deanship of Richard II and the archidiaconate of Richard, which ended before 22nd August 1138 (cf. *Cart. noir* nos. 133, 142, 190). Matilda's presence means that much of the period 1136-21st August 1138 can be ruled out: she was in Normandy from the week after Henry I's death in 1135, through the whole of the next year, and gave birth to Geoffrey's third son, William, on 22nd August 1136 at Argentan (Chibnall, *Empress*, pp.65-7). Chibnall concludes that any visits to Anjou during this period were probably short. App. I, no.93, indicates that she was in Carrouges in June 1138.

The dating of this record any more precisely is difficult, as it gives both a history of events and a history of their resolution, which itself appears to have occurred in advance of the drawing up of the agreement. Geoffrey is said to have called Ulger and the cathedral dignitaries to his *thalamum* to resolve the matter, but he is not named as present at the recital of the agreement itself. That the ceremony in which this charter was seen and heard in public took place in Angers is suggested both by the context and the presence of local officials, such as Joscelin of Tours.

Note: granted with the approval of the Empress Matilda (*favente uxore sua Mathilde*).

- 5 135 Count Geoffrey concedes rights and revenues in and around Angers to Bishop Ulger and the cathedral chapter to make amends for the detrimental effect of Châteauneuf upon episcopal lands. Ulger receives a prebend in the college of Saint-Laud, and Geoffrey promises to remove the market at *Longum Vadum*, which was threatening the prosperity of the bishop's market at Ramefort; he receives jurisdiction over Selonnes and Cherré in return. Angers, in the chapterhouse of Saint-Maurice, 22nd August 1138×1140, perhaps winter 1138-9.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.85r, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xvii copy from C, Angers BM MS 691 f.502v. E = s.xviii copy from B, *Index titulorum...*, p.199, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. F = s.xviii copy from B, Paris BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1534. G = copy from B, Angers BM MS 706, p.144.

Printed *Cart. noir*, no.138.

Witnesses: Pippin, prévôt; Joscelin of Tours; Warin of Loudun; Turpin *Halenot'*; Burgevin *Bonell'*; Baslet; Richard, dean; Hilderic, *thesaurarius*; Bohemond, Norman and Ralph, archdeacons; Grafio, *precentor*; Master Vaslotus; Master Gordon; unnamed others.

Date: undated, *actum Andegavis in capitulo sancti Mauricii*. Chartrou follows the editors of the *Cart. noir* in dating it to the years 1136-40, but other charters in the cartulary can be dated

1136×21st August 1138 by the presence of two Richards, one who became dean in 1136 and the other, an archdeacon, who was dead by 21st August 1138 (*Cart. noir*, nos. 142, 190). Archdeacon Ralph succeeded Richard and appears in this charter.

Caution must be exercised with the dating of this charter as it was issued during the years in which Geoffrey was constantly moving between Normandy and Anjou and which are only sketchily dealt with in the chronicles. It is known that Geoffrey was in Normandy between June and November 1138 (OV VI, pp.516-29), but his movements after the retreat to Argentan from Touques in November are not described, although Orderic suggests that the army remained in Normandy, encouraging local lords who 'deceitfully supported the enemy's cause' (ibid., pp.528-9). Orderic does not state whether Geoffrey remained with his army in Normandy over the winter, and recent accounts highlight the need to rely on Orderic for this campaign (Crouch, *King Stephen*, p83; Davis, *RRAN* III, pp.xlv-xlvi, which interprets Orderic's account as a 'retreat to Anjou' in November 1138).

The assignment of a date closer to the end of 1138 than 1140 fits the evidence supplied in no.4, above, dealing with the same conflict, and issued by Bishop Ulger prior to 21st August 1138.

Note: in return for these concessions, Ulger confirmed (*reconfirmavit*) to Geoffrey the place of Matilda, their children (*filiis meis Henrico et aliis*) and Geoffrey's ancestors in the cathedral's prayers

6 (Lost) notice of (the bishop's) possession of customs on wine brought across the River Maine.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.85r, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xvii copy from C, Angers BM MS 691 f.502v. E = s.xviii copy from B, *Index titulorum...*, p.199, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. F = s.xviii copy from B, Paris BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1534. G = copy from B, Angers BM MS 706, p.144.

Printed *Cart. noir*, no.209.

Date: as for no.5.

Note: *Cart. noir* notes that this grant was in the cathedral's cartulary, but the text was not copied before the cartulary's destruction. All that remained in the records was the rubric (*De lagenagio de Transmeduanam et super pontem Meduanae*). Urseau equated this text with that of no.5, above.

7 193 Charter detailing Count Geoffrey's grant of a prebend in the college of Saint-Laud to Bishop Ulger. Angers, in the college of Saint-Laud, 22nd August 1138 × 23rd April 1144, perhaps winter 1138-9.

B = cartulary copy (s.xiii Saint-Laud cartulary, in poor condition), f.92. C = s.xviii copy from the collection of Canon Charles Urseau, perhaps *Index titulorum...*

Printed from B and C, CSL, no.50.

Witnesses: *cum comite*: Galvan of Chemillé; Geoffrey of Doué; Adam of Rochefort; Absalon Roonard; Pippin, *prepositus*; unnamed others.

Cum episcopo: Bohemond, archdeacon; Ralph, archdeacon; Vaslet, *magister scholarum*; unnamed others.

Canonici Sancti Laudi: Norman, dean; William Manerii; Galvan; Pagan ...; Guy (?); Fulcoius, *fulconiarus*; Galvanolus; Warin...; Geoffrey Manerii.

Date: undated, *hoc factum est in capitulo Beati Laudi*. Dated 1149 by Planchenault and 'before October 1148' by Chartrou. It must indeed be before October 1148, as this was the date of Bishop Ulger's death, and the charter's witnesses are noted as being *cum episcopo*, who in this context must be Ulger as he is not mentioned as deceased. It must also therefore date to the period before the assumption of the ducal title in 1144. During the archidiaconate of Ralph,

after 22nd August 1138. The grant of a prebend to Ulger was recorded also in an episcopal notice (no.5, above), though the witnesses suggest that these two documents were not issued on the same occasion.

8 136 Notice of concession by Count Geoffrey to Bishop Ulger and his successors of revenues in the episcopal vill of Morannes and demesne lordship in the curtis of Ramefort. 22nd August 1138×1140, perhaps winter 1138-9.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.121, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xviii copy from C, *Index titulorum*..., p.233, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*. E = copy from B, Angers BM MS 706, p.144. F = poor s.xviii copy, from C ibid. MS 747 (formerly MS 673), f.24, no.22.

Printed *Cart. noir*, no.210.

Witnesses: Richard, dean; Hilderius, *thesaurarius*; Bohemond, Norman and Ralph, archdeacons; Master Vaslotus; Pippin, *praepositus*; Turpin; Joscelin of Tours; Burgevinus; unnamed others.

Date: undated; as for no.5, but not on the same occasion.

Note: consented to by Count Geoffrey's sons Henry and Geoffrey, though not necessarily witnessed by them.

9 (Lost) grant by Count Geoffrey of possessions in the curtis of Ramefort.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.84v, destroyed.

Printed, *Cart. noir* no.137.

Note: this concession is known only by the recording of the cartulary rubric (*Donum Gaufridi comitis de iis quae habebat in curte de Ramoforti*), and apparently refers to the same concession as no.8, above. The context suggests that *curtis* refers to a district, rather than a palace or other building; cf. 'Cortis (4)', du Cange, *Glossarium* II, col.589b, <http://ducange.enc.sorbonne.fr/CORTIS4> [accessed 05/01/10].

10 132 Notice of notification from Count Geoffrey to Bishop Ulger that Pippin of Tours, prévôt of Angers, will act on Geoffrey's behalf and assent to the grant of the church Saint-Pierre, Angers, to Ulger by Peter of Rochefort, son of Abbo. 1140.

B = cartulary copy (Cartulaire noir of cathedral of Saint-Maurice, Stein 132) f.115v, destroyed. C = s.xvii copy, Angers BM MS 691, f.481v (from B). D = s.xviii copy, unlocated manuscript of Joseph Grandet entitled *Index titulorum*..., p.220 (from B). E = copy by André Duchesne, BnF Baluze 39, f.67 (from paper register taken from B). F = s.xviii copy, BnF Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1627a (from B). G = Angers BM MS 706 (formerly MS 636), p.132 (from B).

Printed, T. Pletteau, *Annales ecclesiastiques d'Anjou* (Revue de l'Anjou 16, 1876), p.8 (fragmentary edition from G); *Cart. noir* no.202 (from C-G); Chartrou, pièce justificative no.50.

Witnesses: none to this notification.

Dating: included in a cartulary notice of the process and history of the gift itself, dated 1140. It seems to have been one amongst a series of 'letters' or writs sent by Geoffrey to the bishop (*Hoc concessit Gaufridus, comes Andegavensis, filius Fulconis Regis Jerusalem, cum esset absens, missis litteris quarum exemplum subscriptum est*). The deputation of Pippin suggests

Geoffrey's absence, probably on campaign in Normandy.

11 187 Cartulary notice of a dispute between Bishop Ulger and Geoffrey concerning judicial rights over four thieves apprehended at Chalennes. It is decided that Ulger has the right to the thieves. 1136 × 23rd April 1144.

B = s.xii¹⁻² cartulary copy, f.119, destroyed. C = cartulary copy ('livre violet', Stein 133), lost. D = s.xviii copy from C, *Index titulorum*..., p.204, not traced, cited by *Cart. noir*.
Printed (with indications of further mentions), *Cart. noir* no.207.

Witnesses: none as such. The notice records (1) those who were present with Geoffrey as *curia sua frequentissima* to advise him on his claim and (2) those who assisted Isembert, the cathedral's archpresbyter, in the recovery of the thieves.

(1) Galvan of Chemillé; Pippin, *praepositus*; Adam of Rochefort; unnamed others.

(2) Richard, dean of Saint-Maurice; Bohemond, archdeacon; Ralph, archdeacon; William of Pouancé; William, *scriba*; Aimery, *notarius*; Master Rufellus, *clericus*; Turpin; Warin of Loudun; Ralph of Gré; Burell, *mercator*; Carter *Bibensvinum*; Butellius, *cocus*; Corbin, *marescalus*.

Date: undated; during the period as count but not duke. During the deanship of Richard (from at least 1136 onwards), the archidiaconate of Ralph (from at least 22nd August 1138, perhaps as early as 1136) and before Ulger's death (1148).

APPENDIX IV

LOST CHARTERS: POST-1151 CONFIRMATIONS AND MENTIONS

Angers, female Benedictine abbey of Notre-Dame (Ronceray)

- 1 Confirmation by Henry, Count of Anjou, of Count Geoffrey's inquest into the nuns' rights at Lattay; the nuns are to have all customs except the right of assarting and rights over collection of stakes for building locks on the Loire. 7th September 1151 × 19th December 1154.

B = cartulary copy (s.xii⁴), Angers BM MS 848A, roll 6, no.63.

Printed, *Ronceray*, no.184; DB I, no.83*; Vincent, 'Sixteen New Charters', no.13, from which this dating.

Note: this text was omitted from *RRAN* III but has been discussed by Vincent, 'Sixteen New Charters', who takes it to be evidence that a jury of recognition was used by Geoffrey to inquire into this case. Cf. *RRAN* III, no.725 (*Ronceray*, no.185), which is a notice of the termination of the dispute between Ronceray and Nivard by Henry, issued c.7th December 1154 at Barfleur.

Angers, cathedral of Saint-Maurice

- 2 Obituary summarising an agreement made by Geoffrey with the bishops of Angers, outlining his renunciation of rights to seize the bishops' possessions.

B = copy, St-Maurice obituary roll, BnF Coll. Baluze 39, f.30v.

Printed, *L'Obituaire de la cathédrale d'Angers*, ed. Charles Urseau (Angers, 1930), p.33; *Saint-Florent*, pp.191-2, n.1.

Note: compare nos. 11 and 18, below. The date of this agreement is unknown.

Aunay-sur-Odon, Savigniac/Cistercian abbey Calvados, arr. Vire (dioc. Bayeux).

- 3 Confirmation by Pope Eugenius III of various grants to the abbey at the time of its foundation (1131) by Jordan of Say and its move to a more suitable site by Jordan's son-in-law Richard of Le Hommet, the ducal constable, including twelve acres quit of customs given by the men of Richard of Saint-Rémy and confirmed by Duke Geoffrey. Albano, 5th November 1152.

A = original, AD Calvados H 681A. B = s.xviii copy, *ibid.* H 662.

Printed, G. Le Hardy, *Étude sur la baronnie et l'abbaye d'Aunay-sur-Odon*, Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de la Normandie, 19 (1897), p.255, no.3; *Papsturkunden ...Normandie*, no.62.

Note: it is known that the abbey was moved prior to 1151, and it is uncertain whether this confirmation was made in the context of the original foundation or during its transition.

Coutances, Cathedral Church of

- 4 Writ of Henry II to his justices, vicomtes and *baillis* of the Cotentin, mandating them to protect the possessions of the canons of Coutances, including markets and their appurtenances and customs granted by Geoffrey. Valognes, May 1172 × May 1175.

B = Coutances cartulary 'A', no.306, lost. C = s.xiv cartulary copy, Saint-Lô AD Manche G180 (Coutances cartulary 'B') f.351, no.287, destroyed 1944. D = s.xix copy of C by Delisle, Paris BnF N.A. Latin 1018, f.21 (also noting but not supplying the text of B). E = *ibid.* Latin 10068 f.89, (poor s.xix copy of cartulary B). F = s.xix copy from C, Coutances, Archives Diocésaines MS M27 f.20 (also noting B). G = *ibid.* MS M28 f.15 (s.xix copy from C). H = s.xix copy from C, *ibid.* MS M40 p.398. I = 1835 copy by Léchaudé d'Anisy, probably from E, Kew TNA (PRO), 31/8/140B part 1 pp.129-30 no.15.

Printed, (from C) *Melville Madison Bigelow, History of Procedure in England from the Norman Conquest: The Norman Period (1066-1204)* (London, 1880), pp.367-8, no.10; DB II, no.483; *Le cartulaire du chapitre cathédral de Coutances: Étude et édition critique*, ed. Julie Fontanel (Saint-Lô, 2003), no.293, from which the above details; *Pl. Acta*, no.701 (1791H), from Delisle and surviving copies. Summary, Round, no.963.

Eu, men of

- 5 Notification by Henry II to Archbishop Hugh of Rouen and the men of Normandy of his grant of a commune to the men of Eu, as granted by Count John of Eu under Geoffrey, and attested to by a charter of Geoffrey. Rouen, 1156 × May 1162.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Eu BM MS 6/7 (Eu Livre Rouge), f.6r (p.12). C = s.xiii cartulary copy, Paris BnF Latin 13904 (Eu cartulary, damaged), f.1v. D = s.xix copy from C by Deville, *ibid.* N.A. Latin 1244, p.201.

Printed, *Le Livre Rouge d'Eu 1151-1454*, ed. A. Legris (Rouen & Paris, 1911), pp.17-20; Delisle, p.255; DB I, no.170; *Pl. Acta*, no.865 (1578H).

La Flèche, leprosary of Sarthe, arr. La Flèche (dioc. Le Mans).

- 6 Notification by Henry II of his confirmation of the foundation established by his father and Geoffrey of Clefs, granting in addition Henry's furnace at La Flèche together with other lands and liberties and an annual fair. La Flèche, 1156 × 1159; reworked or spurious?

B = copy of 28th July 1617, Le Mans AD Sarthe H586, no.3. C = s.xviii copy of B, *ibid.* no.4. D = s.xvii/xviii copy of B, *ibid.* no.5. E = s.xvii French translation of B, *ibid.* no.7.

Printed, DB no.106 (from B); *Pl. Acta*, no.1029 (1539H).

Summarised, Round, no.1049.

Note: Vincent *et al* in *Pl. Acta* no.1029 cast doubt on the authenticity of this text: 'The distinctly episcopal address, the absence of any proper corroboration, and the fact that as it survives, the charter purports to date from 1202, may all suggest forgery. The dating clause...might possibly be taken from an inspeximus of May 1202 miscopied in B, although in May 1202 it is difficult to imagine who, other than the King of England, could claim to be issuing charters in 'our castle of La Flèche'.'

Bienvenu, 'Renouveau de l'église angevine', p.41, dates the leper house's foundation to before 1145. This date accords with the transfer of the title of dapifer/seneschal of La Flèche to Hugh of Clefs by 1146 at the latest. Cf. *Pl. Acta* no.1029 and the catalogue from AD Sarthe, which do not date the foundation.

**La Fontaine Saint-Martin, female Benedictine priory of Notre-Dame
Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Pontvallain (dioc. Le Mans).**

**7 Confirmation by Duke Henry of Geoffrey's grant of £60 a year. Baugé,
7th September 1151 × 25th or 30th March 1152.**

A = original, Le Mans AD Sarthe, H1530. B = s.xviii copy, *ibid.* (attached to original as a transcript). C = copy, Paris BnF Latin 17048, p.614. D = copy, Paris AN K186, no.69.

Printed, DB I, no.21*; *RRAN* III, no.323.

Summarised, Round, no.1051.

Note: Thomas S. R. Boase, 'Fontevrault and the Plantagenets', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 34 (1971), pp.1-10, mistakenly identifies this as a charter in favour of Fontevraud.

**Fontevraud, abbey of Notre-Dame
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Saumur-Sud (dioc. Poitiers).**

**8 Grant by Duke and Count Henry of a house in Saumur from the comital
demesne to Abbess Matilda, which Geoffrey had previously seized, as
well as other properties and rights in the town. Baugé, 7th September
1151 × January 1153.**

B = s.xii-xiv cartulary copy, Paris BnF NA Latin 2414, f.24v. C = copy of extracts from B, Angers AD Maine-et-Loire 101 H 225 *bis*, p.101, no.646. D = copy from lost sealed original, Paris BnF Latin 5480 I, p.72. D = copy from B, *ibid.* II, p.49, no.646. E = extracts from B, Paris BnF Coll. Duchesne XXII, f.416v.

Printed, DB, I, no.30* (Delisle no.26*); Marchegay and Salmon, *Chroniques des comtes*, p.xvii, n.1 (extract, dated 7th September 1151 × 18th May 1152); *RRAN* III, no.330; Bienvenu II, no.876. Summarised, Round, no.1059.

Note: both Delisle and Bienvenu interpret the meaning of the key term *saisierat* to be that Geoffrey seized the house in Saumur; this (rather than Geoffrey having seized Fontevraud with the property) appears to be correct, as the dispositive element of the charter is not in the form of a confirmation. The wording is ambiguous, however, and does not make clear from whom the property was seized. The reference in the next part of the charter to a further sixteen houses perhaps clarifies the matter: Henry confirms Fontevraud's rights over properties granted by men of Saumur to the abbey, but stipulates that if they are later identified as belonging to his demesne, he will take them back in hand.

**Le Loroux, abbey of
Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Longué-Jumelles, comm. Vernantes
(dioc. Angers).**

- 9 Notification of Richard I's confirmation of the award of grants by his predecessors as counts of Anjou, including £66 angevin given by Counts Fulk V and Geoffrey, and of recent grants at Beaufort and Coorne. Domfront, 8 April 1190.

B = copy, Paris AN JJ66, f. 7r, no. 14 (register of Philip VI). C = s.xviii copy, Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.2051 (s.xviii). D = copy, ibid. Français 5308, ff.50-69 (extracts from the register of the Chambre des comptes of Angers), no.3.

Printed, *Pl. Acta*, accession no. 3409R, from which this text.

Summarised, Lionel Landon, *The Itinerary of King Richard I: with studies on certain matters of interest connected with his reign* (London, 1935), no. 272; Gaëtan Sourice, 'L'abbaye cistercienne du Loroux (1121-1370): Essai de reconstitution du patrimoine (formation et gestion)', Mémoire de maîtrise d'histoire (2 vols., University of Angers, 1996), I, pp.125-6 and II, no.11.

Ric(ardus) Dei gratia rex Anglorum, dux Norm' et Aquitan' et comes Andegau', archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, comitibus, vicecomitibus, baronibus, senescall(is), prepositis, iusticiariis et omnibus balliuis, ministris et fidelibus suis, salutem. Sciatis nos concessisse et presenti carta nostra confirmasse donationes illas octoginta sex librarum andeg' monete que ab antecessoribus nostris ecclesie beate Marie de Oratorio facte fuerunt scilicet a Fulcone comite Andegau' et comite Gaufrido filio eius sexaginta sex libr' andeg' et a patre nostro rege Henrico viginti libr' eiusdem monete. Et eidem ecclesie eosdem redditus certis in locis assignasse. Damus igitur et concedimus predictae ecclesie duos nostros molendinos de Belfort ut in eadem libertate, integritate et potestate eos habeant et possideant sicut nos habebamus ea die qua monachis prefate ecclesie eos dedimus et concessimus. Eadem libertate et potestate et honore eis dedimus et concessimus quicquid habemus in duobus molendinis et in duobus furnis de Molihera. Insuper dedimus eis et concessimus tantum de pratis nostris que sunt in longa insula apud Coorne, quantum sufficere possit ad centum solidos annui redditus sine aliqua missione et expensa. Hec omnia libere et quiete et honorifice in perpetuum possidenda ecclesie beate Marie de Oratorio dedimus et concessimus et presenti carta nostra confirmauimus. Testibus istis Radulpho episcopo Andegau' et Mauricio Nannaten' et Herberto Redonen' et Pagano Ruppisfortis senescallo tunc temporis Andeg', lues de Meduana, Roberto de Sabrolio et Raginaudo Bernoun. Data per manum Iohannis de Alencione vicecancellarii nostri, anno primo regni nostri .vi. idus

Aprilis apud Danfront.

**Loches, college of Notre-Dame
Indre-et-Loire, arr. Loches (dioc. Tours).**

- 10 Purported confirmation by Henry II of statutes issued by Geoffrey on the internal ordering of the church and the canons' portions and residence. 1172 × 1189. Possibly forged.

B = Paris BnF Coll.. Touraine-Anjou 12 part 1, no.6149, transcript from the lost s.xvii/xviii cartulary of Loches.
Printed, *Pl. Acta* no.1618 (3724H).

Note: Vincent *et al*, *Pl. Acta* no.1618, suggest that 'forgery seems almost certain' given the suspect nature of several other Loches documents from the lost cartulary.

Le Mans, cathedral of Saint-Julien

- 11 Obituary summarising an agreement between Geoffrey's son, Henry, and the bishops of Le Mans not to seize episcopal goods following a bishop's death, originally made by Geoffrey.

B = s.xvii copy, Paris BnF Latin 5211B, p.92 (Gaignières' copy from Le Mans necrology of c.1280). C = abbreviated copy, *ibid.* Latin 10037, p.270.
Printed from C, *Nécrologe-Obituaire de la cathédrale du Mans*, ed. G. Busson and A. Lédru, *Archives Historiques du Maine* 7 (1906), pp.155-6.

Note: cf. nos. 3 and 18.

**Mortain, female Savigniac/Cistercian abbey of Notre-Dame la Blanche
(L'Abbaye Blanche, Abbaye-des-Blanches)
Manche, arr. Avranches (dioc. Avranches).**

- 12 Notification by Henry II of his gift of demesne land at Grangeray and of his confirmation of a rent of 40s. Le Mans from Le Teilleul (Manche, arr. Avranches) earlier confirmed by Geoffrey, and of corn from royal mills of Mortain. Caen, May 1172 × May 1175.

A = original, formerly sealed *sur double queue* (seal and tag missing), Paris AN MS L971, no.555 (endorsed in a s.xii/s.xiii hand *de Grangere Henrici regis Anglie Abrinc'* and in s.xix hand *L1146/18*), assigned by Bishop, *Scriptores regis*, to scribe XXXV (no.635). B = *ibid.*, L979 no.130 (inspeximus of September 1282 by Crispian Cambellinos, bailiff of Coutances). C = *ibid.*, no.152 (inspeximus of obligations of the vicomte of Mortain of 6th February 1427/8 by John le Marchant, keeper of the seal). D = s.xvii copy, perhaps from A, Paris BnF Latin 10065, f.130, no.146. E = s.xix copy of A by Delisle, *ibid.*, N.A. Fran. 21823 ff.270r-v. F = *ibid.*, f.272. G = s.xix copy from A, *ibid.*, Latin 10078, p.141.
Abstracts, *ibid.*, p.155 (s.xix, from A); *ibid.* p.158 (s.xix, from C).

Printed (with facsimile of A), DB I, no.474, and *Atlas*, pl.xviii; *Pl. Acta*, no.1877, from which these notes.

Summarised, Nicholas Vincent, *Acta of Henry II and Richard I: Part II, a Supplementary Handlist* (Kew, 1996), no.113.

Note: this charter confirmed grants made initially by Stephen and his son William, themselves discussed by Nicholas Vincent, 'New Charters of King Stephen with Some Reflections upon the Royal Forests During the Anarchy', *EHR* 114 (1999), pp.899-928: 906-7 and 924-5, no.9. With regard to Geoffrey, this grant provides valuable evidence of activity in Mortain, Stephen's demesne, which fell to the Angevins in 1142. It is possible, therefore, that Geoffrey confirmed the grants made by Stephen well before the fall of Rouen in 1144; it also indicates that he was concerned with maintaining Stephen's provisions for religious foundations, as well as those made by Henry I.

Roscelin fitz Clarembald

- 13 Notification by Henry II of his confirmation of Longchamp and rights in the forest of Roumare, granted to Roscelin by Geoffrey. Rouen, 1156 × June 1159.

B = s.xiii cartulary copy, Rouen BM MS 1227 (cartulary of St-Georges de Boscherville), f.63v. C = 1833/4 copy from B by Deville, Kew TNA, 31/8/140A, no.99.

Printed, DB I, no.114; *Pl. Acta*, no.941 (1543H).

Summarised, Round, no.202.

Note: *RRAN* III, no.116a, is a confirmation by the Empress Matilda of 1152×67 of Roscelin's subsequent grant of the land in question to the abbey of Saint-Georges-de-Boscherville near Rouen, itself detailed in *RRAN* III, no.306a, Henry's original grant to Roscelin between September and December 1151. The 1151 act, however, does not mention the original grant by Geoffrey.

The *Longus campus* referred to is a now lost location in the 12km between the abbey and Rouen itself, rather than the modern Longchamps (Eure, arr. Les Andelys, cant. Étrépagne), east of Rouen and near Lyons-la-Forêt. Part of the forest of Roumare still survives, and this is the area referred to in the text, where Roscelin's men could collect dead wood free from custom (*ita quod homines sui mortuum boscum habeant foreste de Roumara sine consuetudine et quod sint quieti de herbagio et de omni forestagio et consuetudine de foresta sicut carta patris mei testatur*).

Rouen, men of

- 14 Charter of liberties issued by Duke Henry for the residents of Rouen, based on a similar charter issued by Geoffrey following the fall of the town in 1144. Rouen, 1150 × 1151.

B = *inspeximus* of Henry VI, 1445, Rouen BM, Archives de la ville tiroir 9, no.1. C = *ibid.*, *Registre* 5.3, f.168.

Printed, La Roque, *Maison d'Harcourt*, IV, pp.1295, 1581; Cheruel, *Histoire de Rouen pendant l'époque communale*, I, pp.241-5; DB I, no.14; *RRAN* III, no.729.

Summarised, Round, no.109.

Sureties: (*Has etiam concessionones tenendas ceperunt in manu*) Philip, bishop of Bayeux; Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux; (*et eas affiduciaverunt tenendas*) Waleran, count of Meulan; Helias, the

duke's brother; William Lovel; Richer of L'Aigle; William of Vernon; Roger of Tosny; Baudry *de Bosco*; Amaury Crispin; Gilbert Crispin; Gochel Crispin; Henry of Ferrières (-sur-Risle); Robert of Courcy; Richard of La Haye; Engelger of Bohon; Alexander (of) Bohon; Guy of Sablé; Absalon Roonard; Geoffrey of Clefs (*de Cleris*); Hugh of Montfort.

Witnesses: Hugh, archbishop [of Rouen]; Reginald of Saint-Valéry; Pagan of Clairvaux (*de Claraual'*); Enguerrand of Say.

Dating: undated, *apud Rothomagum*. As Davis points out, the witnesses and sureties are clearly Geoffrey's entourage, not Henry's. This suggests that the text was drawn up after the fall of Rouen in 1144, just before or just after the capitulation of the Tower; the application of the ducal title in the reference to Helias suggests that this charter was issued on the day of Geoffrey's investiture, 23rd April 1144.

Saumur, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Florent Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur (dioc. Angers).

- 15 Notification by Archbishop Engelbald of Tours of the outcome of Count Geoffrey's instruction, whilst dying, to the archbishop and Bishop William of Le Mans to restore seizures from Saint-Florent, including revenues from the town's market and customs unjustly levied on dead wood the monks collected at La Vallée (*Valeia*, almost certainly Beaufort-en-Vallée, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers). Baugé, 1st January 1152.

B = s.xii cartulary copy, ADML H3714 (Livre argent), f.72. C = s.xviii copy, Paris BnF Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.1754.
Printed, DB I, no.22* (Delisle 24*).

- 16 Restoration by Henry, duke of Normandy and count of Anjou, of land at Le Mou(l) (*Molli*; Maine-et-Loire, arr. and cant. Saumur, comm. Les Rosiers-sur-Loire), taken by Geoffrey, as well as rights to dead wood in La Vallée. Angers, 1st January 1152 × January 1153, probably soon after 1st January 1152.

A = original, Angers ADML among 'chartes originales du Livre noir de S. Florent', photographed by Delisle who described a seal in red wax on a white cord. B = s.xii cartulary copy, Angers ADML H3714 (Livre argent), f.52v. C = s.xiii cartulary copy, *ibid.* H3715 (Livre rouge), f. 23v. D = copy of November 1320, Paris AN J178, no. 60³.
Printed, DB I no. 27*; *RRAN* III, no.799.
Summarised, Teulet, *Layettes* I, no. 137; Round, no. 1155.

Tours, Benedictine abbey of Saint-Julien

- 17 Notice of the claim made by Ralph of Brayes, son of Archembald (fitz Ulger), to customs in the forest of Chédon, originally granted by Countess Aremburga and Geoffrey (V), as well as customs in the meadows of Nitrav, Brechenay and Leugny, the latter having been granted to a hermit, Reginald, by Geoffrey (V?). These claims were all

settled by Geoffrey's seneschal, Joscelin of Tours, in the count's court.
29th January × 11th September 1156.

B = s.xiii copy, ADIL H483 (parchment, formerly sealed *sur double queue*). C = BnF Latin 5443, p.101 (s.xvii extracts from St-Julien cartulary by Gaignières).
Printed, CSJ I, no.97.

Date: undated; dated to February-September 1156 in CSJ I, as it refers to both Archbishop Engelbald (d. 11th September 1156) and Abbot Warin, successor to Abbot Aimery (d. 29th January 1156).

Chartrou, p.125, dates the settlement by Joscelin of Tours to August 1147, though her rationale is unclear.

Note: the grant to Reginald the hermit appears to have been made by Geoffrey V; although the grantor is named only as *venerandus comes Gaufredus*, he is not named as deceased. The text states that Ulger, Ralph of Brayes' brother, professed as a monk at Saint-Julien whilst dying.

Tours, archbishop of

- 18 Duke Henry confirms the agreement made by Count Geoffrey that the household goods of the archbishop of Tours are not to be seized upon the prelate's death; wine, victuals, gold and silver are exempt. September 1151 × April 1153. Spurious?

B = s.xiii med. cartulary copy, London BL MS Lansdowne 349 (archiepiscopal cartulary), ff.18r-v (19r-v). C = s.xv copy from B, Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica MS Regin. Lat. 2114 (Tours cartulary, Stein 3930), f.14v, no.10. D = s.xvii-xviii copy from C, Paris BnF MS Latin 11888, ff.24v-25r.

Printed, from B and C, *Cartulaire de l'archevêché de Tours*, ed. Grandmaison, II, pp.283-4, no.308; Vincent, 'Sixteen New Charters', no.16.

Note: Vincent suggests that this text is suspect, as it 'is peculiarly worded and lacks and conventional address or any witness list or place-date, suggesting that at best it was drafted by the beneficiary, the archbishop of Tours, and at worst that it may be a thirteenth-century forgery, perhaps concocted after 1204 when the archbishops of Tours would have been anxious to safeguard, and perhaps to augment their privileges in light of the recent Capetian conquest of the Touraine'. However, Vincent also notes the existence of similar privileges for the bishop of Le Mans (above, no.11), and no.3 in this appendix shows that the bishops of Angers had also received assurances along the same lines.

Walter the Goldsmith

- 19 Notification by Henry II to the vicomte of Arques and the master moneyer of Rouen of his grant to Walter, the duke's exchanger and goldsmith, of the lands of his father Robert at Arques, and the exchange and goldsmithery of the castlery of Arques and Dieppe, confirming all customs, quittances and liberties granted to Robert, Walter's father, by charter of Geoffrey count of Anjou, the King's father. St-Pair, 1165×1173.

B = Paris BnF Latin 9209, f.2 no.2 (*inspeximus* under the seal of the vicomte of Arques, 22 February 1396/7, noted by *Pl. Acta* as 'faded but mostly legible under ultra-violet light'). C = Rouen ADSM G851 (Coutumier de Dieppe, copy of 1396), f.55v.
Printed, DB I, no.328 (from C); *Pl. Acta*, no.2760.
Extract, Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, p.152 n.121 (from B and C).

APPENDIX VI

PETITIONS FOR AND ATTESTATIONS/CONFIRMATIONS TO NON-COMITAL CHARTERS

Bec-Hellouin, Benedictine abbey of Eure, arr. Bernay, cant. Brionne (dioc. Rouen).

- 1 184 Grant of church of Saint-Hymer (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Pont-l'Évêque) to the abbey by Hugh IV of Montfort, with the consent of Duke Geoffrey and his son Henry. 23rd April 1144 × 1147, probably soon after 23rd April 1144, and before 1146.

B = cartulary copy, Paris BnF Latin 17049, f.639 (s.xvii⁴ copy by Gaignières of original cartulary, s.xiii⁴, now Coll. part. Le Prévost, non coté, Stein 3446). C = cartulary copy, Paris BnF NA Lat. 2097 (1752 copy by Abbot Roquette of original, of unknown date, now at Institut de France, Paris, non coté, Stein 3447).

Printed, *Cartulaires de Saint-Ymer-en-Auge et de Bricquebec*, ed. Charles Bréard (Rouen and Paris, 1908), no.2.

Witnesses: ('sigillum') Hugh of Montfort; Robert of Montfort; Waleran of Meulan;¹ Helias of Bailleul; Robert of Mandeville; William of Saint-Léger (*Sancti-Leodegarii*); Walter *Pipart*; Robert *Pipart*; Roger *de Burgevilla*; Jordan *de Fulleia*;² Philip *de Bevredan*; Hugh *de Bevredan*.³

Dating: undated; dated 1145-7 by Chartrou and Bréard. Waleran of Meulan's presence suggests a date of either immediately after the fall of Rouen on 23rd April 1144 or between his return from Santiago and his departure on crusade; cf. App. II, no.2.

Châteauneuf (Tours), men of

- 2 145 Agreement between King Louis VII and the local *burgenses*, whereby the men will be exempted from customs in exchange for 30,000s., granted at the request of Count Geoffrey and Archbishop Hugh of Tours. 1st August 1143 × 25th March 1144.

B = s.xviii copy of lost *vidimus* of 1325 (s.xviii), Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou VI (5), no.1699, from which this copy.

Partial extract, Arthur Giry, *Les établissements de Rouen: Études sur l'histoire des institutions municipales* (2 vols., Paris, 1883-5; repr. Geneva, 1975), I, p.190, n.1; catalogued, Achille Luchaire, *Études sur les actes de Louis VII* (Paris, 1885), no.120.

In nomine Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis, Ludovicus ego Dei gratia Rex Francorum et Dux Aquitanorum notum facimus omnibus tam futuris quam praesentibus quod consilio et rogatu Hugonis Turonensis Archiepiscopi et Goffridi Andegavorum comitis fidelium amicorum que nostrorum Burgensibus⁴

¹ Bréard has *Valerani de Monteforti* in error.

² Perhaps La Feuillie (Manche, arr. Coutances, cant. Lessay); cf. *Pl. Acta*, no.1484.

³ Bréard notes that this family held the castle of Ablon (Calvados, arr. Lisieux, cant. Honfleur).

⁴ Giry's transcription begins here.

omnibus Beati Martini de Castro novo tam presentibus quam futuris dedimus atque concessimus quod neque nos nec aliquid successorum nostrorum neque per rapinam⁵ neque per vim aliquam ab eis pecuniam queramus, nec causabimus ea⁶ de usura neque de turpi lucro neque de aliqua multiplicatione pecuniae suae. Quod si forte evenierit ut nos ipsi in aliis causis offendant non eos vel nos vel successorum aliqui nostrorum inde gravabimus, quamdiu ipsi nobis satisfacere voluerint apud Turonum in domo thesaurarii. Facta vobis⁷ hac conventionem predicti Burgenses bona nobis voluntate dederunt XXX millia solidorum;⁸ nos autem ut firmum est ratum habeatus in posterum scripto commendari, sigilli nostri auctoritate muniri, nostri que nominis subtus inscripto K' corroborari precepimus actum publice Turonis anno ab incarnatione domini M.C.XLIII. regni vero nostri VII astantibus in palatio nostro quorum nomina subtitulata sunt et signa, Radulphi Viromandorum comitis, S. Mathei Camerarii..S. Mathei constabularii..S. Guillelmi buticularii. Videntibus etiam et audientibus ex nostra parte Hugone Turonensi Archiepiscopo, Henrico Thesaurario, Gaufrido de Roncoino, etc...ex parte vero burgensibus, Goffrido Comite Andegavorum, Pagano de Claris Vallibus, Goffrido de Cleers, Matheo preposito, Absalando Roignardo. Datum hujusmodi transcripto sub sigillo quo in curia domini Regis apud Turonis utitur die Dominica quam cantatur jubilate anno domini M.CCC vicesimo quinto.

Witnesses: Ralph, count of Vermandois; Matthew *camerarius*; Matthew *constabularius*; William *buticularius*.

Ex nostra parte (Louis): Hugh, archbishop of Tours; Henry *thesaurarius*; Geoffrey of Rancon; others unnamed.

Ex parte vero burgensibus: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Pagan of Clairvaux; Geoffrey of Clefs; Matthew *prepositus*; Absalon Roonard.

Date: *actum publice Turonus anno ab incarnatione domini M.C.XLIII. regni vero nostri VII.* Louis' seventh regnal year began on 1st August 1143, and the calendar year 1143 ended at the latest on 25th March 1144.

Conan, duke of Brittany

3 123 Assent to a grant made by Conan to the monks of Saint-Nicolas, Angers. 1129 × May 1136, perhaps 1129 itself.

⁵ *neque per rapinam* missing from Giry's copy.

⁶ Giry *eos*.

⁷ Giry *vero*.

⁸ Giry's transcription ends here.

B = copy from partial reconstruction of lost cartulary, Le Peletier, *De rerum scitu...S. Nicolai Andegavensis*, pp.23-4, from which this copy.

Audiat & intelligat tam futurorum quam presentium fidelium memoria quod Ego Conanus Britannorum dux. Cum aliquando Andegavim pervenissem causa videndi Goffredum comitem, & Matildem Imperatricem, ab eisdem hospitio honorifice susceptus sum. Cum vero *sequenti* die Monasterium S. Nicolai cum aliquibus ex Baronibus meis orationis causa adire voluissem: praedictus Comes, ac etiam Imperatrix, eadem causa qua & ego praefatum Monasterium expetierunt. Nos itaque simul venientes, Ecclesiamque simul ingredienti, Deum adorare, sanctumque Nicholarum attentius exorare coepimus. Cum autem finita oratione regredi voluissemus: Abbas & Monachi rogare nos ceperunt quatinus in capitulum venientes, beneficium, et orationes eiusdem loci suscipere quod annuente Deo fecimus. Ego siquidem Conanus ne tanti accepti beneficii ingratus existerem: Donavi et concessi Ecclesiae B. Nicolai insulam quae vocatur Deneralis, quam antea dedit avus meus Hoellus in perpetuum libere & quiete possidendam. Dedi etiam eis unam navem quittam ab omnibus cosdumis meis in ligeri & in mari per totam terram meam. Et exclusam quae vocatur Capellus, sicut unquam liberius & quietius mater mea Ermengardis comitissa possedit & habuit. In Parrochia vero Cordimensi quae de feodo meo esse dignoscitur concessi eis quaecumque ab antecessoribus meis, sive a cunctis fidelibus data sunt, si vel in posterum data fuerit quitta & libera ab omni cosduma servitii mei. Huic dono & concessionem plures ex Baronibus meis, & hominibus meis qui mecum perrexerant, adfuerunt. Inter quos praecipue adfuerunt Daniel de Ponte, & Eudo de Rocha; quorum Daniel in manu mea concessit elemosinam illam, quam Rimarros filius *Restinet*, & filii sui Ecclesie S. Nicolai dederant. Eudo vero nihilominus mea, & Comitum Andegavorum, & Imperatricis concessit elemosinam illam, quam Tualdus de Condimense & filii sui dederant Ecclesie S. Nicolai libere & quiete sine aliquo retinaculo alicuius servitii sui habeant & possideant. Ne igitur haec dona aliquorum successorum malitia violentur: Hanc presentem cartam in manu Ioannis Abbatis traditam sigilli mei auctoritate confirmavi; testibus istis Gauffredo Comiti Andegavensi, Mathilde Imperatrice. Fulcone Decano, Gosleno de Turnon : De militibus meis Gauffredo de Ansenis, Daniel de Ponte, Eudone de Rocha, Brientio de Varada, multisque aliis, locus sigilli.

Witnesses: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Empress Matilda; Fulk, dean; Joscelin of Tours.
De militibus meis (Conan): Geoffrey of Ancenis; Daniel *de Ponte*; Odo *de Rocha*; Brian *de Varada*; others unnamed.

Date: undated; before the death of Abbot John in May 1136, and while Geoffrey was count but not duke, and on an occasion when Matilda was in Anjou. Duke Conan made a grant soon after Geoffrey's sister Matilda was officially ordained as a nun at Fontevraud in February 1129 (Bienvenu I, no.99).

Fontevraud Abbey and the family of Reginald of Saumoussay

- 4 Cartulary notice enumerating gifts made by Reginald of Saumoussay and his extended family and vassals to the abbey, some of which were witnessed by Geoffrey after Reginald's death at Le Mans and around the time of his burial at Fontevraud. Likely 1134.

B = cartulary copy (*Grand cartulaire de Fontevraud*, f.110), lost. C = copy from B, untraced 'Ste Fam., III', p.307. D = copy from B, ADML 101 H 225 *bis*, p.85, no.444. E = copy from B, Paris BnF Coll. Gaignières II, p.33, no.444, after lost cartulary. Printed, Bienvenu II, no.743, from D and E.

Witnesses: *Quando Raginaudus supradictus deffunctus est apud Coenamanicam urbem, crevit suam elemosinam supradictae ecclesiae, scilicet sarcos quos dederat Josbertus de Saxo sanctimonialibus aecclesiae Fontis Ebraudi ad rumpendum ultra vadum Raleii et ad hoc fuerunt isti*: Geoffrey, count of Anjou; Joscelin Roonard; Absalon Roonard, and Geoffrey and John *armigeri ejus*; others unnamed.

Dating: undated; while Geoffrey was count but not duke; around the same time as no.9, below.

Fontevraud Abbey and Reginald of Saint-Valéry

- 5 Confirmation by Henry, duke of Normandy and count of Anjou, of Reginald's grant of revenues from the port of Dieppe to the abbey, made in the presence of Geoffrey, Henry and his brother William. Tours, 9th September 1151 × January 1153.

A = original, ADML *242 H 1(6), formerly sealed; seal and tag missing. B = copy of 1699, Paris BnF Latin 5480, f.258, with drawing of seal. Printed, DB I, no.44; Charles Ernest de Fréville de Lorme, *Mémoire sur le commerce maritime de Rouen depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle* (2 vols., Rouen and Paris, 1857) II, p.8, no.5; RRAN III, no.329. Summarised, Round, *Calendar*, no.1058.

Witnesses: Joscelin of Tours; Geoffrey of Clefs, and Hugh, his brother; Gosbert *sine terra*; Brian of Martigné; Goffarius of Bruyères; Bartholomew *Frestel*; Hugh *de Bello ramo*; Matthew *doctore meo*; Maurice, *cancellarii mei clerico*; Archenuif; Gastinel; Ralph *Garderoba*; Matilda, Henry's aunt (*amita mea*), abbess of Fontevraud.

Dating: undated; *apud Turonim*. While Henry was count of Anjou and duke of Normandy, and before the assumption of the title duke of Aquitaine.

Note: Reginald's original grant was made in the chapterhouse of Fontevraud in the presence of Geoffrey, Henry and William (*donum quod Raginaldus de Sancto Walerico in capitulo Fontis*

Ebraudi conuentui prefate abbacie in presentia patris mei et mea fratrisque Willelmi fecit). Reginald's original grant (Paris BnF Latin 5480, f.259; the original, as noted by Round, *Calendar*, no.1057, is partially destroyed⁹) gave £20 roumois for revenues at Dieppe to the abbey in order to buy herrings, stipulating that when Reginald recovered his English inheritance and Dieppe reverted to Geoffrey (*comes Andegavensis*), the gift will be replaced by £10 sterling from English revenues.

Gerald Berlay of Montreuil-Bellay

6 115 Charter issued by Gerald founding a Tironensian colony at Asnières (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Montreuil-Bellay, comm. Cizay-la-Madeleine), assented to by Count Geoffrey. 1133.

B = copy, Angers BM MS 863 (formerly 775, collection of documents relating to Angevin Benedictine houses), Asnières section ff.4-4v. C = *ibid.*, f.7.
Printed, from an unspecified copy ('ex apographo'), *Gallia Christiana* 14, col.154, no.14.

Witnesses: *hanc dona et hanc eleemosynam concesserunt filii et filiae meae* (Gerald): Berlay; Gerald; Ralph; Agnes; Amelina.

Huis eleemosynae interfuerunt et testes sunt: Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux; Ulger, bishop of Angers; Norman, archdeacon [of Angers]; Menier, *sacerdos*; Geoffrey, count of Anjou, *qui hanc eleemosynam voluit et concessit*; Aimery of Doué (*de Doc*); William of Montsoreau; William of Mirebeau; Simon of Châtillon (*de Chastellum*); Aimery *Galoï*; Gerald of Artannes (*de Artennis*); Walter *cubicularius*; Raymond of Montfort; others unnamed.

Signa: Gerald; Ada, my wife; Berlay, his son; Gerald; Ralph; Agnes; Amelina.

Date: *actum anno Incarnat' Domin' 1133, regnante Ludovico Magnifico, rege Franciae, tunc duce Aquitaniae existente.*

Joscelin of Tours and the abbey of Saint-Aubin, Angers

7 Witness to Abbot Robert of Saint-Aubin's grant of Roche, to be held *in beneficium* by Joscelin and his heirs. ?1149 × January 1150.

A = fragmentary original, ADML H176. B = s.xvii copy, *ibid.* H394.
Printed, CSA II, no.453.

Witnesses: Bartholomew, abbot of Saint-Nicolas; Hervey, abbot of Saint-Serge; Geoffrey, duke of the Normans and count of the Angevins; Walter, dean of the church of Angers; Adelard of Château-Gontier; Ralph of Gré (*de Creio*); Warin of . . . ; Bartholomew of . . . ; Salomon of . . . ; Peter . . . ; Warin *Bertelot*; Adelard, lord of Rillé.

Date: this act is dated 1149-51 in CSA II. Abbot Hervey of Saint-Serge, however, died on 31st March 1150 (*Saint-Serge* I, p.311, n.812); moreover, Geoffrey is identified here as duke, placing the *terminus ante quem* as January 1150.

Note: Walter, dean of the cathedral of Saint-Maurice, appears only in this act (and see *CN*, p.xxxviii).

⁹ Printed Ernest de Fréville, *Mémoire sur le commerce* II, p.9, no.6.

Le Mans, priory of Saint-Martin (dep. Marmoutier)

- 8 Notice of a grant of land at Le Coudray (Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Sablé-sur-Sarthe, comm. Gastines) and vines, meadows and tithes at Sablé made by William Martin of Grez (-en-Bouère, Mayenne, arr. Château-Gontier) while on his deathbed in Marmoutier, with the later consent of Robert of Sablé and Count Geoffrey, and authenticated by the comital seal.

A = original, sealed *sur double queue*, seal missing, AD Sarthe H360, pièce 2. B = Paris BnF MS Latin 12679, f.167r. C = *ibid.*, f.183r (from A). D = Paris BnF Latin 12878, f.225r, no.242. E = BnF MS Latin 13900, f.58r (extract).

Printed *Cartulaire manceau de Marmoutier*, publié sous les auspices de la Commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne (2 vols., Laval, 1911-45) I, no.21.

Witnesses: Recapitulatum est etiam idem donum in sepedicte terre mansura, et deinceps in presentia Roberti Sabloliensis domini confirmatum, audientibus et videntibus multis quorum aliqui sunt ad testimonium subter ascripti: Fulk of Bouère (de Boeria);¹⁰ Auger of Saint-Brice; Salomon, his son; Borell of Plessis (de Plaxicio); Hugh Versutus; Pagan, his brother; Richer; Geoffrey Virdarius; Reginald, presbyter of Bouère.

De fratribus quoque nostris hii affuerunt: Ralph of Sablé, Ralph of Bouère, Stephen of Saint-Loup, priors; many others unnamed, including Hildearde, wife of William Martin, with her son Bartholomew and daughter Hamelina.

Date: unknown, apparently during the period as count but not duke.

Note: the wording of this grant makes the extent of Geoffrey's involvement unclear. After the recital of the gifts, the text reads thus: 'Nos autem viri illius devotionem et studium potius quam temporale emolumentum considerantes, precipue autem domini et precipui protectoris nostri Gaufridi, Andecavorum comitis, petitioni et precibus annuentes, desiderio illius satisfacimus et monachum ei sacerdotem, Petrum nomine, contradentes, donum omnium suprascriptorum in capitulo nostro prius factum et postea super altare suscepimus.'

The act terminates with another reference to Geoffrey and the authentication of the grant: 'Nos autem totius actionis executionem sicut ab initio processit, litteris assignare curavimus et supra memorati domini nostri comitis, pro cuius amore id maxime fecimus sigillo confirmari, sicut in promptu cernere est, optinuimus.'

Pippin of Tours and the abbey of Saint-Nicolas, Angers

- 9 154 Geoffrey requests the cession of possessions at Linières (St-Jean-de-Linières, Maine-et-Loire, arr. Angers, cant. St-Georges-sur-Loire), by Abbot Nigel of Saint-Nicolas to Pippin. 1144.

B = s.xviii copy, Paris BnF Collection Touraine-Anjou 13 (I), no.9676, from 'the first book of the Saint-Nicolas cartulary', f.181.¹¹

Nigellus Abbas Sancti Nicholai rogatu Goffridi Comitis Andegavorum concepit

¹⁰ Mayenne, arr. Château-Gontier, cant. Grez-en-Bouère.

¹¹ If by this Chartrou means the first (lost) cartulary, it is Stein 124, s.xii-xiii. I have been unable to consult Yvonne Mailfert, *Le premier cartulaire de Saint-Nicolas d'Angers (XI-XIIe siècles). Essai de restitution précédé d'une étude historique*, unpublished doctoral thesis (École des chartes, Paris, 1931).

Pipino de Turoni filio Hugonis, et suis haeredibus quidquid monachi Sancti Nicholai habebant de Lineriis. Abbas etiam Herbertus sive etiam Domni Nigelli idem Pipino et ejus haeredibus concepit inde que filium ejus Nicholaum in hominem suscepit. Testes: Hubertus Abbas, Guido de Super pontem, Laurentius de Leone, Goslenus Turonensis. Actum est hoc anno ab incarnatione Domini millesimo centesimo quadragesimo quarto, Ludovico Rege Francorum, Goffrido filio Fulconis regis Jerusalem filio Andegavorum comite. Ulgerio Andegavorum Episcopo.

Witnesses: Abbot Herbert Guy *de Super pontem*; Laurence *de Leone*;¹² Joscelyn of Tours.

Date: 1144; apparently during the period as count but not duke, and during Fulk's reign as king of Jerusalem. Fulk died in November 1143, however, and comparison with App. I, nos. 42 and 85 suggests that this act may have been drawn up early in 1144, before news of Fulk's death reached Anjou. Geoffrey does not appear to have been present at the grant itself; cf. App. I, no.34, at around the same time.

Saint-Maur (Glanfeuil), Benedictine abbey and the family of Reginald of Saumoussay

- 10 Assent to the distribution of earlier grants of tithes in alms to the abbey's church of Saint-Cyr-en-Bourg (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Saumur, cant. Montreuil-Bellay) by Rainald of Saumoussay, a descendant of the church's founder, who died whilst at Le Mans with Geoffrey. Witness to the distribution of the alms by Joscelyn Roonard. 1134.

B = s.xii cartulary copy, ADML H1773 (partially destroyed, Stein 3491), no.39.¹³
Printed, *Cartulaire de Saint-Maur-sur-Loire*, ed. Marchegay, no.39.

Witnesses: (to the distribution of alms) Geoffrey, count of Anjou (*consul Andegavis*); Gerald Berlay; Joscelyn Roonard;¹⁴ Geoffrey, Reginald's *armiger*.

Et ut concessio hujus doni, videlicet decime, firmior esset abbas Drogo in audientia Goscelini, qui distributor elemosine erat, ab uxore Rainaudi supradicti et a fratre Gaufrido et ab aliis parentibus in manu sua concessionem hujus rei accepit, videntibus istis: Stephen, monk; Huo; Ebles of Champchévrier; Hugh the monk, Ebles' brother; John prepositus.

Date: *regnante Gaufrido comite, Ulgerioque episcopo Sancti Mauricii, Willermo episcopo Pictavis. Donum hujus rei factum fuit anno ab incarnatione domini MCXXXIV, indiccione XII.*

Note: cf. above, App. VI, no.4. This grant was issued in the same circumstances, and shows that Reginald died at Le Mans while with Count Geoffrey (*quidam miles nomine Rainaudus de Salmunciaco ejusdem ecclesie parochianus, dum quadam die cum comite Andegavorum tenderet Cinomannis, ipso die qua ibi devenit graviter quadam infirmitate percussus est*).

¹² Perhaps Le Lion d'Angers (Maine-et-Loire, arr. Segré).

¹³ For the state of the Saint-Maur cartulary and the multiple extracts and copies elsewhere, see 'Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Maur-sur-Loire [indéterminé] (Archives départementales de Maine-et-Loire (Angers Cedex 01), H 1773, fragment (d'original))', *cartulR*, <http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/codico1232/?para=787t10> [accessed 18/12/08].

¹⁴ Described in the next sentence as *distributor elemosine erat*.

Vendôme, Benedictine abbey of La Trinité

- 11 176 Record by Aimery, abbot of Saint-Julien, Tours, cataloguing the rights of La Trinité over the three chapels of La Chartre-sur-le-Loir and promising papal confirmation. Witnessed by Duke and Count Geoffrey. 1145, January-15th February or soon after; before the Annunciation (25th March) or Easter (15th April).

B = s.xii-xiii cartulary copy, BnF NA Latin 1936 (fragment of cartulary, ff.252-80 remaining; Stein 4048, formerly Cheltenham MS Phillipps 2971), f.255v, no.816. C = s.xviii copy from lost original, noting that the seal was lost, Paris BnF Latin 5419A (copies of La Trinité charters by Gaignières), f.107r, from lost original. D = ibid. Latin 13820, f.327v. E = ibid. Coll. Touraine-Anjou V (4), no.10865, from B? F = Orléans Médiathèque MS 394 (extracts from B, Dom. Jean Verninac), f.242v.

Printed CSJ I, no.85; CTV II, no.500.

Witnesses: (at St-Julien) *fratres ejusdem ecclesie*: Peter Syroti, prior; Bartholomew, *helemosinarius*; Julio, *sacrista*; Rivallon, monk; Gerbert, monk; Guy, monk; and the whole chapter of St-Julien.

De capitulo Vindocinensis ecclesiae: lord Robert, abbot; Rivallon, prior; Hilary, *sacrista*.

De clericis: Engelbald, *thesaurarius* of St-Maurice of Tours;¹⁵ Robert, *archipresbyter*; Vaslet, *magister scholarum Andegavensis*; William Rufus of Vendôme.

De famulis Vindocinensis abbatis: Dano, *cubicularius*; Maurice, *coquus*; Herbert, *marescaldus*; John; Christopher.

(at Angers) lord Geoffrey, count of the Angevins; Reginald Rufus; Oliver of Neuville (*de Novovico*); Pippin, *prepositus*; Joscelin of Tours.

(to the document's sealing by Abbot Aimery) Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux; Master (*magister*) Peter, *clerico ejusdem archiepiscopi...assistente, qui, ex mandato nostro et prefati Vindocinensis abbatis, hanc cartam scripsit*.

Dating: *Actum hoc atque firmatum Dominice Incarnationis anno MCXLVIII; Ludovico, rege Francorum et duce Aquitanorum; Romano pontifice domno Lucio papa II; domno Hugone, Turonensi archiepiscopo; Willelmo, Cenomanensi episcopo.*

Although this text is dated 1144 in the charter, this agreement was drawn up after the election of William of Passavant as bishop of Le Mans in January 1145 and before the news of the death of Pope Lucius on 15th February reached Anjou.

Note: the text states that an agreement was reached in Geoffrey's presence at Angers, and that it was confirmed in various locations before different witnesses, listed above. Cf. the confirmation of this agreement issued by Archbishop Hugh of Tours at the same time and which also mentions Lucius II in the dating clause, but which was not attested by Geoffrey (CSJ I, no.86; CTV II, no.502).

- 12 186 Confirmation by Louis VII and Queen Eleanor, at the request of the abbot of La Trinité and Duke Geoffrey, of the abbey's possessions in Saintonge and Poitou. Paris, 1146.

A = original, with traces of two seals pendant on yellow silk cords, Blois AD Loir-et-Cher, H non coté (La Trinité, priory of Saint-Georges d'Oleron). B = s.xiii copy, Paris AN J174 (Trésor des chartes; Layettes, Vendôme), no.1.

Printed, A. Teulet, *Layettes du trésor des Chartes* (Paris, 1863), p.61, no.92; Arthur Giry, 'Chartes de l'abbaye de la Trinité de Vendôme concernant le Poitou et la Saintonge', *Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis* 12 (1884), charter A, pp.378-80; *Cartulaire saintongeais de la Trinité de Vendôme*, ed. Charles Métais (Archives historiques de la

¹⁵ I.e. the cathedral. This is the future archbishop.

Saintonge et de l'Aunis 22, 1893), p.100.

Signa: Count Ralph of Vermandois, *dapifer noster*; William, *buticularius*; Matthew, *camerarius*; Matthew, *constabularius*.

Date: *Actum publice Parisius, anno ab incarnatione Domini M°C°XL°VI°, regni vero nostri X°, astantibus in palatio nostro quorum nomina subtitulata sunt et signa.*

Note: sealed by both Louis and Eleanor as queen. Granted *petitionibus Roberti venerabilis Windocinensis abbatis et monachorum loci ejusdem, rogante pro eis dilecto fidelique nostro Gaufrido duce Normandie et comite Andegavensi.*