

*The Bretons and Normans of England 1066-1154: the family, the fief and the feudal monarchy**

In memoriam R.H.C.Davis

1. The Problem

(i) the non-Norman Conquest

Of all the available studies of the Norman Conquest none has been more than tangentially concerned with the fact, acknowledged by all, that the regional origin of those who participated in or benefited from that conquest was not exclusively Norman. The non-Norman element has generally been regarded as too small to warrant more than isolated comment. No more than a handful of Angevins and Poitevins remained to hold land in England from the new English king; only slightly greater was the number of Flemish mercenaries, while the presence of Germans and Danes can be counted in ones and twos. More striking is the existence of the fief of the count of Boulogne in eastern England. But it is the size of the Breton contingent that is generally agreed to be the most significant. Stenton devoted several illuminating pages of his English Feudalism to the Bretons, suggesting for them an importance which he was uncertain how to define.¹ To be sure, isolated studies of these minority groups have appeared, such as that of George Beech on the Poitevins, or those of J.H.Round and more recently Michael Jones on the Bretons.² But, invaluable as such studies undoubtedly are, they tend to achieve no more for their subjects than the status of feudal curiosities, because they detach their subjects from the wider question of just what was the nature of the post-1066 ruling class of which they formed an integral part.

My aim in this paper is to present some preliminary conclusions of a full-scale study of the Bretons in England from 1066-1220. I shall suggest new ways of looking at some well-known features of English feudal society and shall conclude by focussing on one facet of what might be called the political aspect of the problem of regional origin, namely the formation of the parties in Stephen's reign. In doing so I shall depart altogether from the theses of Le Patourel's Norman Empire by describing an 'English' (i.e. of England) feudal or ruling class, based primarily in England, containing within it divided and divisive elements whose attitude to the English king was determined in part by reference to the extra-English politics of their places of origin, a class that is wholly distinct from the "one homogeneous Norman-French baronial society" described by Le Patourel.³

Le Patourel did not ignore the diversity of regional origin of those who held land in England after 1066, but was it reasonable to expect, as the notion of homogeneity demands, that the lion would lie down with the wolf after 1066, given the strength of the eleventh-century rivalries between Normandy and Brittany or between Brittany and both Anjou and Blois?⁴ And given the lack of national unity among the new ruling class imposed on England between 1066 and 1086, can we reasonably expect to find the king's authority untouched and untroubled by the ancient rivalries of these groups, or even by the tensions existing between the members of any individual group? Domesday Book answers in the negative by describing the many forfeitures incurred by Bretons and others who supported the revolt of Ralph of Gael, earl of Norfolk, and his allies Roger of Breteuil and Earl Waltheof. The origin of successive English kings in Normandy, Blois and Anjou affected and was affected by the regional composition of the feudal class. Although the feudal class began to see itself as 'English' after 1200, at no time in the Middle Ages was it homogeneous. Despite the remarkable degree of assimilation, especially with the native English, that had been achieved by 1200, the perennial conflicts of the post-Norman kings with France and with Brittany entailed a steady process of coming and going, or simply going, amongst the king's vassals and pensioners, whether these were drawn from England or from the Angevin

lands overseas. Small the numbers involved may have been; insignificant they were not.

These questions concern what I have loosely termed the political aspect of the problem, viz. the effect of his national or regional origin on a person's relationship with the king in times of crisis such as wars of succession, wars of aggression or baronial revolt. It is necessary now that we further define our terms by coming back to the nature of the feudal class.

It will be noticed that I have not so far referred to the 'Anglo-Norman state' rather than to England, or used the terms 'Anglo-Norman' or even 'Norman-French' in reference to the feudal class. In this discussion feudal class is synonymous with ruling class and refers to any person holding a whole or part of a knight's fee, or a serjeanty, from any other, be he a tenant-in-chief of the king or a sub-tenant of such a tenant-in-chief. Because of the psychological and social nature, so to speak, of the fief (i.e. a collection of fees) as a patrimony protected by subinfeudation to members of a kin-group - a process in which every individual great or small played a vital part - the notion of aristocracy has no place in this discussion, though we shall refer to a 'nobility' when we come to discuss the close kin of the dukes of Normandy. This ruling class will be termed 'English' with reference to fees held in some relationship in the feudal chain from the king of England, whether the holder be Norman, Breton, Manceau, Poitevin, Fleming or Anglo-Saxon.

It might seem that by such a definition I have further buried the existence of that national diversity in the English feudal class to which I am concerned to draw attention. However, discussion of the history of post-Conquest England needs a clear point of reference, and the benefit of hindsight provides the historian with a focus of startling obviousness in England itself. That the fates of England and of the duchy of Normandy were briefly joined is a matter of fact; it was not a matter of over-riding necessity at any time after 1087.⁵ This statement is designed to put the matter in perspective. England could and did survive the loss of Normandy in 1204, because a sufficient proportion of the English feudal class had created a community of interest in England itself, rather than in any individual part of the overseas territories held by the English king of his own inheritance. This is not to deny the central importance of Normandy for those few who did hold considerable cross-Channel estates, as we shall see, but this itself comes back to the close affinity of such persons with the English king, who was by inheritance the duke of Normandy. We are dealing not with a kingdom or a duchy as a recognizable political entity, such as would now be termed a state, but with a patrimony, an inheritable fief that the heir was bound to defend as his right. Though this assertion may seem over-simplified, it is perfectly consistent with the general nature of land-tenure at this time. The question of patrimony was the same for a king or duke as for his greater or lesser vassals. Each landholder sought to protect his patrimony by subinfeudation of his land to his relatives, thus setting up a sort of informal banking system by giving the care of his landed wealth into the hands of those bound to him by family loyalty and family tradition as well as by oaths of fealty. Protected by subinfeudation to relatives, the patrimony was extended and further protected by marriage within the kin-group to which the baron belonged, i.e. a family network that included the relatives of his mother and of his wife. For the most part the Church turned a blind eye to the frequent, and frequently blatant, infringements of the prohibited degrees by the feudal class, for the simple reason that its personnel were drawn from that class and were committed to up-holding its interests. The pivot of every baron's life and career was his patrimony. In the last analysis, his purpose in life was to defend the patrimony he had received from his ancestors, so as to be able to hand it on intact, and preferably augmented, to his own heirs. The king or duke was one heir among others and he was nothing without his barons or tenants-in-chief. Here then is the crux of the matter: the politics of the feudal monarchy were the politics of the family and the fief.

(ii) The Bretons of England 1066-86: the background

Between 1066 and 1075 there were three groups of Breton landholders in England.⁶ After 1075 there were only two. The revolt of 1075 led by the previously loyal Breton Ralph of Gael, earl of Norfolk, and his brother-in-law Roger of Breteuil, son of one of the Conqueror's loyalest supporters, William fitz Osbern (d.1071), entailed the destruction of the third group of Bretons. This event has been seen as a 'Breton revolt' against William I, but such a view is seriously misleading.⁷ Ralph of Gael's position among the post-1066 Bretons of England was anomalous in that he and his father had held land in England before the Conquest. His father, indeed, had been associated with England since the time of Cnut.⁸ His mother was an Englishwoman, who was quite probably a kinswoman of Edward the Confessor.⁹ Significantly, Ralph involved in his revolt the Old English earl of Northumbria Waltheof and the Danes. Although many of his vassals were executed by William, Ralph himself escaped to Brittany where he joined the revolt against Duke Hoël led by Geoffrey Grenonat of Rennes. The forfeited estates, which lay mostly in Norfolk and Suffolk had been re-granted to other men by 1086. The lands of Alan of Richmond⁴ included some of those forfeited by Ralph of Gael, clearly indicating that Alan had remained loyal to William and was not directly involved in Breton affairs.¹⁰

Alan Rufus of Richmond was the most important and the wealthiest of the Bretons in England. He owed his position among the ten wealthiest landholders of 1086 to his relationship to William I.¹¹ Alan was the grandson of Geoffrey I of Brittany (992-1008) and Hadvise of Normandy, whose brother Richard II, grandfather of William, had married Geoffrey's sister Judith. William and Alan were thus second cousins. Alan was one of the many sons, legitimate and illegitimate, of Eudo, called 'of Penthièvre'(d.1079),¹² the younger brother of Alan III of Brittany (1008-1040). Eudo had been loyal to his brother throughout his reign, but he subsequently spent many years trying to wrest ducal power in Brittany from his nephew and ward, Conan II (1040-66).¹³ Eudo was not finally defeated until 1057, but the loyalty of both his eldest son Geoffrey I Boterel and his nephew Geoffrey Grenonat, count of Rennes (1066-84), a natural son of Alan III, remained dubious until their respective deaths, in revolt, in 1093 and 1084. Such a protracted pattern of dissent and revolt was possible because ducal authority in Brittany, loosely focussed on the count of Rennes, was weak throughout the eleventh century. The centralization of ducal power achieved by the Norman dukes, powerfully backed as they were by their blood relationship to most of their chief men,¹⁴ contrasted strongly with the relative isolation and weakness of their Breton counterparts.

At least three of Eudo's legitimate sons and three of his natural sons occur as English landholders after 1066. His son Count Brien held land in Suffolk that passed eventually to Robert of Mortain,¹⁵ and apparently also in the West Country.¹⁶ There is nothing to indicate that he stayed in England beyond 1069, when he is evidenced in William's support in the West.¹⁷ His brother Alan Rufus was associated with English landholders in Normandy from 1067, and was probably granted the core of his honour of Richmond in the wake of the revolt of the North, 1069-70.¹⁸ It is uncertain whether his younger brother and successor, Alan Niger, occurs in England between 1066 and 1086 (see appendix).

Although consistently loyal to William and his successors, the family of Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre maintained its rivalry with its ducal cousins into the next century. This pattern of loyalty to the English kings and rivalry with the Breton dukes led to divisions within the house of Penthièvre. In 1066, when Count Brien and his brothers went to England with William, the Norman and Breton dukes were enemies. Significantly neither Eudo of Penthièvre nor his eldest son Geoffrey I Boterel took part in the conquest of England. When Ralph of Gael fled from England to Brittany in 1076 Geoffrey Grenonat of Rennes was holding the castle of Dol against Duke Hoël, together with Geoffrey I Boterel. Hoël and William jointly invested Dol, but the siege was raised by Philip I of France and Fulk IV of

Anjou. Ralph of Gael probably joined the rebels, but the event has been seen as the result of William's support of Archbishop Juhel of Dol, a simoniac whose years of misrule had finally led to his deposition.¹⁹ William not only failed to reinstate Juhel - who took refuge in Normandy - he suffered a serious military defeat as well.²⁰ Of greater significance for the alignments of Stephen's reign was the split that occurred in the Penthièvre family in the early twelfth century, when two of the sons of Alan Rufus's youngest brother and eventual heir, Stephen of Penthièvre-Richmond (d.c.1138), quarrelled over their father's inheritance in his lifetime. The eldest son Geoffrey II Boterel of Lamballe took over the Breton lands, while the younger son Alan was sent to England to take over the honour of Richmond, where he occurs by 1123.²¹ By the time he became earl of Richmond early in Stephen's reign he had married the Breton ducal heiress Bertha, daughter of Conan III (1119-48), a move that exacerbated the tension with his brother because of the new prominence it gave him in Brittany.²²

The third group of Bretons was not dominated by a figure such as Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre or Ralph of Gael. It was composed of men whose homelands lay in the north-east Breton seigneuries of Dol-Combour and Fougères. Among the most prominent were William fitz Baderon, nephew of Wihenoc of La Boussac, lord of Monmouth,²³ and Ralph I of Fougères (d.1124). Ralph had married a daughter of Richard de Clare and Rohesia Giffard,²⁴ a marriage that connected him to the extensive kin of the Conqueror, from whose half-brother Robert of Mortain he held land in Normandy.²⁵ The size of Ralph's English holdings was, however, small, and there is nothing beyond his appearance in Domesday Book to connect him with England during his lifetime.²⁶ Although the individual holdings of this group were often quite small, their number and their concentration in the south-west of England are alike noteworthy. Apart from the Bretons of Herefordshire and Gloucestershire, whose lands were grouped around those of William fitz Baderon, there were several Breton landholders in Devonshire, some of whose lands were to form the later honour of Plympton,²⁷ elevated into the earldom of Devon in 1141 by the Empress. The undertenants of Robert of Mortain, who held vast estates in Cornwall,²⁸ Devon, Dorset and Somerset, included several Bretons.²⁹ The extensive honour of Totnes in Devon was held by one Judhael, whose father Alfred had probably held land in England before 1066.³⁰ The largest landholder in Devon was Baldwin the Sheriff, brother of Ralph of Fougères's father-in-law Richard de Clare. Baldwin's second marriage to a woman who held land in the Avranchin brought some of his continental interests close to those of the many Bretons in south-western England. Baldwin's eventual heirs as lords of Okehampton³¹

Baldwin d.1090, = 1) Albreda, cousin of William I
 2) by 1066 (Actes caennaises)
 no.2) Emma

sons N Adelia uicecomitissa
dsp = 1) William fitz dsp 1142
 Wimund of Avranches
 2) Ranulf Avenel, d.1128-9

Robert of Avranches
 = N [Havise] of Dol

Matilda = 1) William of Courcy
 2) Robert fitz Roy

Baldwin's first wife was a cousin of William I (Ord. Vit. iii, 208); His second wife Emma

seems to have come from the Avranchin. She may have been a daughter of Richard Goz *vicomte* of Avranches and Emma, who was probably the sister of Robert of Mortain (see K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 'The prosopography of post-Conquest England: four case studies', *Medieval Prosopography*, 13.2 (1992). Both Hugh fitz Richard Goz and Robert of Mortain were Devonshire tenants-in-chief in 1086. were the descendants of his daughter and William fitz Wimund of Avranches, whose son Robert married a daughter of Gilduin of Dol.³² Robert's daughter married a natural son of Henry I and supporter of the Empress.

It was the geographical position of their homelands that had brought the third group of Bretons to England with William. The lands of the seigneuries of Dol-Combour and Fougères looked out towards the Avranchin and the county of Mortain in Normandy; some of them actually lay within these areas. During the 1050s William of Normandy had been careful to compel the recognition of his overlordship of this area from the Breton seigneurs who held or acquired land there. Unambiguous evidence of this process is provided by the charters of Ralph of Fougères's father Main II of Fougères.³³ The interpenetration of this marcher area by Bretons and Normans is in itself unsurprising. Its importance, as we shall see, is that it helped to create a community of interest between the Bretons of north-east Brittany and the men of western Normandy. Once we recognize the interdependence of the West Normans and the marcher Bretons the pattern of the English settlement after 1066 becomes much clearer. Its most extreme form occurs in the settlement of Devon and Cornwall, and when we compare this with the great blocks of land held in the north and east by Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre, William de Warenne and their affinities, we are at once aware of a broad geographical division between these two groups, in England as well as on the Continent. Based as the 1086 fiefs were on the generally scattered land-holdings of the dispossessed Anglo-Saxon thegnage it cannot be claimed that the territorial division I have outlined was rigidly delineated. But its existence was still sufficiently marked by the reign of Stephen to be associated with the so-called geo-political division of England at that time. It is unlikely to have been achieved purely by accident, but, if it was deliberate, why was it necessary?

The answer to this question itself lies in marcher politics. The connexion between the marcher Bretons and the West Normans implies a distinction between the West Normans and those of the east. In the early years of William's reign as duke of Normandy most of the great men of Normandy, his own kin, were major landholders in eastern Normandy, where the ducal seat at Rouen was located. William had done much to extend the influence of his kin-group to western Normandy, and thus to make it a more integral part of his duchy than it had been under his predecessors.³⁴ Although many men from western Normandy followed William to England, the largest fiefs there were granted to the traditionally great men of Normandy, the duke's East Norman kin. In itself this situation led to a cleavage between two groups of Norman landholders in England, and it also led directly to many of the problems faced by the English kings after 1087, since William's partition of his domains divided the allegiance of his East Norman kin between the Norman duke and the English king. Marcher politics directly concerning Brittany were also responsible for a cleavage between the two groups of Bretons who established themselves in England.

The north-eastern part of the seigneurie of Fougères and the neighbouring seigneurie of Vitré formed part of another march, that governing the border between Brittany and Maine. The relations of the Bretons dukes and the counts of Maine had traditionally been good or very good. The onslaught of the Norman campaign of conquest in Maine after 1060 dramatically changed the situation in the area by embroiling Brittany in Maine at least partly in support of its long-standing enemy the count of Anjou, whose fifty-year-old hegemony in Maine was in danger of collapse. By the end of 1063 William had completed his conquest of

Maine, and in the middle of the following year he launched a campaign against Brittany, designed to punish the Bretons for their raids in Maine of the previous year, as well, probably, as to compel an oath of fealty from Conan similar to the one that his father Alan III had sworn to William's father Robert in 1029-30.³⁵

The campaign was thoroughly unsuccessful and the Normans were soon forced to retreat. It did, however, have one lasting result. The hostility between the Bretons of the south-west of England and those of the northern honour of Richmond that lasted until 1154 had its origins in the events of 1064. The Norman attack was met in Brittany by an unusual unity that rallied all men around the duke, Conan II, with the isolated exception of Rivallon of Dol (d.1065). He had probably been compromised by a recent oath of loyalty to William for the land of Céaux in the Avranchin.³⁶ He had been with William at Domfront some time between the end of 1063 and mid-1064,³⁷ and he was probably aware of William's intentions towards Brittany. His support of the Normans in 1064 may well have been lukewarm,³⁸ but it was sufficient to mark him out as a traitor to Brittany. For a Breton, with his unusually highly developed sense of patriotism, the idea of treating with a foreign power for the sake of personal gain was perfectly acceptable: the idea of aiding and abetting foreign aggression against his Breton homeland was wholly unacceptable. Henry II was later to discover this when many of the Bretons who had fought for him before 1154 actively opposed his aggressions in Brittany thereafter. Many of the Bretons of south-west England after 1066 had probably either directly or indirectly supported Rivallon and William in 1064.

By 1086 there were clearly two parties among the Bretons in England. The affinities of Dol and Fougères in the Mortain-dominated south and west faced the affinities of Penthièvre-Richmond in the north and east. The party of Alan of Richmond included the lords of Wolverton in Buckinghamshire, descended from Maino Brito from Ercé-en-Lamée in Châteaubriant, who was allied by marriage to the king's kinsman William de Warenne.³⁹ These parties, marked more clearly still by 1139, were chiefly the result of the strange events of 1064, when the actions of Rivallon of Dol had been in the interests not of the Breton duke but of William of Normandy, against whom the fractious barons of Brittany had temporarily united. It is clear that the events of 1064 had driven a wedge between certain vassals of Dol and the house of Penthièvre, and that the events of 1076 reflected a cleavage in the house of Penthièvre itself, which divided into the affinities of what I have called for convenience Penthièvre-Richmond on the one hand, and Lamballe on the other. The Lamballe branch, represented by both Geoffrey I Boterel and his nephew Geoffrey II, had close affinities with the house of Dol. The lands and tenants of Dol and Lamballe also naturally overlapped at many points, since part of the archdiocesan lands of Dol lay within the county of Lamballe.⁴⁰ The cluster of Dol-derived feudatories in England had no one unifying leader among them, such as had the vassals and affinities of Alan of Richmond, so the natural focus of their loyalties became the affinities of Penthièvre's rivals, the dukes of Brittany, which, by the date of Matilda's marriage to Geoffrey le Bel of Anjou, were markedly Angevin in orientation. Conan III, son of Ermengarde of Anjou, was married to Maud, natural daughter of Henry I;⁴¹ Geoffrey II Boterel was married to a daughter of John I of Dol. The accession of Henry I proved a turning-point for the Bretons in Brittany and for the Bretons in England. The fateful alliance of the Breton ducal house with that of Anjou had determined the future course of Breton affairs long before the dukes attempted finally to sink their differences with Penthièvre by the marriage of Conan's heiress Bertha to Alan of Richmond in c.1136-7. In the event, the benefits of this marriage - which was unhappy - proved ephemeral (witness the career of Conan IV), and it did not achieve any rapprochement between the two hostile groups of Bretons in England before the death of Alan of Richmond in 1146.⁴² The chief result of the period 1135 to 1154 and its aftermath was that the Breton feudatories of the English king identified their interests ever more closely with England itself. Those few that

retained lands of some significance in Brittany, together with their West Norman kin, were among those who chose the French allegiance in 1204. The others stayed in England, where they became increasingly difficult to distinguish from the Normans and the rest.

The Bretons of Dol-Lamballe had settled in England chiefly under the aegis of Robert of Mortain and Earl Hugh of Chester. They did not of necessity have a close relationship with Robert himself, who was after all the man imposed by his half-brother upon Mortain to hold it for the duke, although the marriages of Robert's daughters allied Mortain to Vitré and to Laval and did much to create a community of interest between Mortain and the already inter-related barons of north-east Brittany and Maine.⁴³ This close-knit and closely-related group of West Normans and Bretons survived the fall of William fitz Robert of Mortain in 1106, and indeed their ranks were swollen by Henry I's recruitment of their affinities in their homelands after 1100. It was probably the events of 1106 that finally furnished the Dol-Lamballe party in England with its future leader in that Brien, son of Alan IV Fergant, who was brought up by Henry I and who became the Empress Matilda's most loyal supporter.

* * *

This account of the three groups of English Bretons 1066-86 and their background in Breton history has been given to illustrate the formation of two hostile groups of Bretons, members of which were settled in England after 1066. That the culminating phase of these hostilities was played out in England during the succession crisis of 1135 to 1154 I shall seek to demonstrate below. Two related points should also be noted. The first is that, although his Breton campaign in 1064 was unsuccessful, the significance of William's intervention in Brittany should not be underestimated. It came at a time when he had succeeded in bringing western Normandy under his sway and had compelled the acknowledgement of his suzerainty from Bretons holding land in that area. The second point to note is the intense love of the Bretons for their native country. The Bretons are unusual among mediaeval peoples for having a highly developed awareness of their national and cultural distinctness, and this awareness was not confined to the predominantly Celtic Bretons of the west of Brittany. Eleventh-century seigneurs of north-east Brittany, not yet part of the Norman adventure but having contact with Normans and holding Norman lands, were apt to give charters referring to themselves with clamant pride as Haimo, patria Brito, or Riuallonius, Britannicus gente.⁴⁴ This patriotic pride may account for the marked hostility towards the Bretons displayed by some Norman chroniclers, though it did not hinder, and may have helped, their advancement in England under the Norman kings.⁴⁵ Once we are aware of this Breton particularism, the shape of the Breton settlement in England after 1066 and the subsequent conduct of Bretons in English affairs, based as these were on Breton politics, becomes immediately intelligible.

2. Henry I

(i) Henry's New Men

However desirable William the Conqueror may or may not have thought his willing of Normandy to his eldest son Robert, England to his second surviving son William, and a gift of money to his youngest son Henry, it rapidly led to open conflict between the three brothers, conflict that was not to end until Robert of Normandy's defeat by Henry I at Tinchebrai in 1106.⁴⁶ Whether we define the Norman duke's kin as the descendants of Gunnor or of Herlève, this group had emerged somewhat depleted from the struggles of the years 1075-1106. Casualties included the house of Montgomery-Bellême, Odo of Bayeux, William of Mortain and the sons of Hugh de Grandmesnil. The forfeiture of these tenants-in-chief provided Henry I with lands to grant elsewhere without demands on his demesne. These by and large went to his 'new men', in Orderic Vitalis's famous phrase.⁴⁷ Thus one of the new major tenants who stepped into the

vacancies left in Shropshire by the fall of the Montgomery earls of Shrewsbury was William FitzAlan, son of Alan fitz Flaad, servant of Henry I and brother of the hereditary seneschal of the archbishop of Dol, whilst part of the Warwickshire fief of Ivo de Grandmesnil was given to another Breton, Orderic's Guigan Algason (recte: agaso), i.e. Wigan the Marshal.⁴⁸

At the same time as he was obliged to bring down some of the mighty among his kin, Henry was busy creating an entirely new kin for himself. This group comprised the twenty or so known illegitimate children that Henry fathered on noble women for marriage among the families of the Norman borderlands. He aimed to create a kin-group loyal to the Crown but without pretensions to it, because of their bastardy, a kin that could be used to strengthen the borders of the Norman duchy he was determined to retain.⁴⁹ The creation and patronage of this group was probably also designed as a counterpoise to the might of his existing kin among the East Normans. In Robert fitz Roy, earl of Gloucester, he created a power to rival that of Stephen of Mortain or Robert de Beaumont, to name but two of his East Norman kin who profited from his favour. We can see in this a reflection of William's policy in the west c.1050 as described by Orderic Vitalis, who concluded: "Thus he harshly cut down the exalted relatives of his father and raised up the obscure kindred of his mother" - a quotation that demonstrates the conservative cast of Orderic's mind and goes some way towards explaining his disparaging reference to Henry's 'new men'.⁵⁰

* * *

The fullest account to date of the personnel of Henry I's government is that of Judith Green, who has examined at length the social and regional origins of his administrators and pointed out that the newness of this class consisted chiefly in two things: its members were professional administrators, a new class in itself, and they had not made their way by the more usual method of knight service.⁵¹

Behind the reference to men of humble birth is the uncomfortable realization that social mobility was a marked feature of post-Conquest England. Some of the traditionally great men of Normandy, i.e. the duke's kin, had lost favour with the English king. Their lands had been redistributed in part among the younger sons of knightly families who had earned their rewards by the novel means of administrative service. The creation of an administrative class as such was the work of Henry I, but his predecessors William I and William II had used men of lesser-knightly origin as sheriffs and other local officials.⁵² The territorial settlement of England was itself in large measure an exercise in the creation of 'new men', whether as lesser tenants-in-chief of the crown or as subtenants of major tenants-in-chief. This process was essential to the holding of England. The Conquest had been undertaken for the sake of gaining land to dispense as patronage and it had been possible because of the participation of men who could hope to establish in England the patrimony they lacked in their homelands. The endowment of such men sowed the seed for a class of men whose interests would be predominantly or solely English, and for whom the English king would be only incidentally duke of Normandy. With his marked determination to be both king and duke, Henry I, in particular, saw the necessity for the creation of a group of men whose interests were primarily in England, for only then could he be absent from England or from Normandy without leaving the other at the mercy of his cross-Channel kin. Identification with and responsibility for the governance of England increased the dependence of his administrators on England. Of course, there were some among them who worked in England and held land in Normandy, or vice versa. That they were part of the king's government entitles us to view them as members of the feudal or ruling class, however we view the quality of their families' landholdings. Since the feudal class had a common interest in maintaining its deeds of possession, whatever they were, under the Anglo-Norman kings, the only 'aristocracy' we can realistically discern at this period is the group formed by the king-duke's ancient affinity

among the East Normans, a group whose prestige suffered a serious blow in the reign of Stephen.⁵³

The identification of the new men of Henry I is a matter of importance for the alignments of Stephen's reign because it affects the existence of the two hostile parties among the Bretons and the West and East Normans which have been outlined above. It was suggested by J.H.Round that many of Henry's new men had come originally from the Cotentin and from north-east Brittany, a suggestion confirmed by Judith Green's analysis.⁵⁴ What is significant is that the Bretons concerned all came from Lamballe-Dol and so swelled the numbers of those Bretons opposed to Richmond-Penthièvre who would support the Angevins in the following reign. Henry's association with the area began after the death of his father in 1087. Left a sum of money by his father, Henry purchased the Cotentin from his brother Robert and subsequently found himself obliged to fight for it. Having escaped from Mont-St-Michel where Robert was besieging him in 1091, he fled to Brittany, whence he shortly afterwards emerged to take charge of Domfront and Argentan, not far from the Breton border. Subsequently allied to his brother William Rufus, he was in England at the crucial moment of the latter's death in 1100, when he seized the throne.⁵⁵ His promotion of new men was in part a process by which he rewarded men who had helped and supported him in the difficult years before his accession, or, in some cases, the younger, landless, sons of such men. These men had to work for their gains and many did so with conspicuous success, such as the FitzAlan of Dol, and the de Redvers of the Cotentin, distant connexions of the Norman ducal family and future pro-Angevin earls of Devon.

Many of these new recruits were given land in the South and West, where they already had connexions among the existing Breton and Mortain landholders. Another tenurial link between these groups was the fact that many held land from the abbey of Mont-Saint-Michel, which in turn had profited from Mortain grants of land in Cornwall and the foundation of the cell of St Michael's Mount, off the Cornish coast.⁵⁶ The Bretons old and new of this area were all affiliated to the seigneurs of Dol-Combour in Brittany, as we have remarked. Where they were also given land in the east of England it tended in general not to be held in direct association with the Penthièvre honour of Richmond. But a handful of Dol-affiliated Bretons were included among the tenants of the honour of Richmond. Their antecedents normally cannot be traced back to 1086, and many threw over Alan of Richmond as well as King Stephen after 1139. An example of the latter category is furnished by the sons of Geoffrey Boterel of Nettlestead, Suffolk, who gave a charter for Hatfield Regis Priory in 1138, attested by two barons of Count Alan, of whom one, Alan fitz Aimeric, was probably Geoffrey's brother;⁵⁷ Geoffrey and Alan Boterel, sons of Aimeric, were among the barons of Gilduin II (fitz John) of Dol listed in a charter associated with Archbishop Baudri of Dol of c. 1125-30.⁵⁸ Geoffrey of Nettlestead's sons were both active among the barons of Brien fitz Count's Honour of Wallingford from 1139 to 1154. The eldest of them, William Boterel, was Constable of Wallingford from c. 1150 until his death in 1154.⁵⁹ One of his colleagues in Wallingford's constabulary was Riulf de Saissun, i.e., probably, of Cesson, near Rennes (though perhaps from Cesson near St-Brieuc), another of Brien's knights, who survived in Henry II's service until his own death in 1161.⁶⁰ Also from around 1150 until 1154, the steward of the Honour of Wallingford was Ansfrid fitz Ruald,⁶¹ whose father Ruald fitz Wigan held land in Devonshire, Cornwall, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire in 1130;⁶² Ruald was probably the brother of Wigan, the Marshal of Henry I and, like him, one of Henry's new men. This Ruald fitz Wigan is probably to be identified with the vassal of Geoffrey I Boterel of Lamballe who subscribed a number of Geoffrey's charters from c.1086 until 1093, the year in which that inveterate rebel was finally killed, at Dol, while fighting Alan Fergant.⁶³ Another of Geoffrey's vassals was one Geoffrey fitz Aimeric, who was probably also the vassal of Gilduin of Dol and afterwards lord of Nettlestead, a Suffolk fee held of Alan of

Richmond-Penthièvre.⁶⁴ Geoffrey I Boterel is not known to have had any son other than the Conan who was killed during the First Crusade in 1098,⁶⁵ but it is probable that the sons of Aimeric were somehow descended from him, in view of the close association of the descendants of Geoffrey Boterel of Nettlestead with Dol and with the dukes of Brittany.⁶⁶

Presumably Henry showed such marked favour to men from this area because it was to the marcher lands of Dol that he fled after the siege of Mont-St-Michel. Certainly, the help and support given by certain Breton barons to Henry I in the years from 1087 to 1106 were recognized in this new tenurial settlement of Bretons in England in the years after 1100. None was an outstanding figure in either the England or the Brittany of his time. With the exception of the counts of Penthièvre and the seigneurs of Fougères, the Bretons in England from 1086 onward tended to be only modest landholders in both England and Brittany. They had to make their way in the Anglo-Norman world by forging ever closer links with, primarily, the West Norman families with whom they had close ties. That this settlement sharpened the division of the Breton clans in England, between the Dol-allied group, linked to the pro-Angevin dukes of Brittany on the one hand, and those allied to the counts of Richmond-Penthièvre on the other, did not long await the proving.

When Stephen's reign began in 1135 the Breton duke's mother Ermengarde was the aunt of the Empress's husband Geoffrey le Bel of Anjou; his wife was the Empress's half-sister, and his half-brother was the Empress's close friend Brien fitzCount. That the Dol gens among the English Bretons, concentrated in the south and west of England, where there was also a concentration of their connexions the West Normans, declared with one voice for Matilda in 1139 is not in these circumstances surprising. Nor is it surprising that Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre and his vassals and affinities, who included Stephen's son-in-law Hervé of Léon, took the other side, given that Henry I had so favoured the affinities of his relatives and rivals the dukes of Brittany and the counts of Lamballe.

(ii) Henry I and the Succession

Though the allegiance of the two principal groups of Bretons in England to William I and his heirs remained constant down to 1135, the situation on the Continent changed considerably during that period. The long-standing rivalry between Brittany and Anjou over the Nantais yielded to a new understanding between Fulk IV le Réchin of Anjou and Hoël of Brittany (1066-84). On the death of his first wife, Constance of Normandy, Hoël's son Alan III inaugurated a new, Angevin-dominated, phase in Breton history by his marriage to Fulk's daughter Ermengarde. This meant the final rejection of an ancient friendship with Blois, last expressed by the marriage of Alan III and Bertha of Blois in 1027. The ancient and bitter rivalry between Anjou and Blois had been resolved in favour of the former in 1044 when Geoffrey Martel conquered the Touraine, obliging the count of Blois to direct his attentions to his more northerly domains. Nothing intervened to improve relations between Blois and Anjou, but in 1080 William of Normandy, another long-standing opponent of Anjou, married his daughter Adela to Stephen of Blois. During the 1070s Fulk IV began a series of campaigns that seriously undermined the Norman position in Maine. During the time of his son Fulk V Angevin control of Maine was placed beyond doubt by his first marriage to the daughter and sole heiress of Helias count of Maine, whom both the Normans and Angevins had agreed to recognize in the 1090s.

The last fifteen years of Henry I's life were dominated by the need to find a successor following the death of his only legitimate son in 1120. Though it led to continuing war in Normandy until Clito's death in 1128, Henry was determined not to designate as heir his nephew William Clito, son of his elder brother and defeated rival Robert Curthose. Since his second marriage was childless, and all his natural sons were excluded from the succession by virtue of bastardy, Henry's field of choice was strictly circumscribed. The available

candidates were limited to his sole surviving legitimate child, Matilda, wife of the German king and Roman Emperor Henry V, and his sister Adela of Blois's sons Theobald and Stephen. Matilda cannot have been a realistic candidate so long as she remained married to the ruler of two of the most ungovernable units in mediaeval Europe, Germany and Italy.⁶⁷ Stephen of Blois, however, was clearly a serious candidate by 1125 when, having already been granted the county of Mortain and the honour of Eye, he was married to the heiress of the county and honour of Boulogne. Matilda of Boulogne was moreover the niece of Henry's first queen, and like her she would pass on the blood of the Anglo-Saxon kings to her descendants.⁶⁸ Stephen's candidature was never made official, perhaps because Henry still hoped for the situation that eventually materialized on 23 May 1125. The death of Henry V on that day freed Henry's daughter Matilda for the succession. Not without some opposition, Henry obliged his barons to swear an oath to recognize Matilda as his heir in early January 1127. By the middle of 1127 he had provided her with the husband who was to defend and enforce her claims, Geoffrey son of Fulk V of Anjou.

There has been a recent tendency to claim that the eleventh-century hostility between Anjou and Normandy was a thing of the past by the time of Fulk V and Henry I, yet this is an error liable to render many of the events of the reigns of Henry I and Stephen incomprehensible.⁶⁹ The problems that resulted in Normandy during Henry's protracted struggles with Curthose and Clito played into the hands of the king of France, the count of Flanders and the count of Anjou, who each sought in different ways, often in alliance, to turn the situation to his advantage. Some of those who opposed Henry in these years, such as William III Crispin and Amaury of Montfort, heir to the Norman county of Evreux, were related to the Angevin count, whom they supported against Henry. Others, such as Robert of Bellême, were driven into the Angevin camp by their opposition to Henry. The Angevin control of Maine continued to be a threat to Normandy, though the Angevins might well have feared a renewed Norman conquest of the county. Anjou tended to combine with France and Flanders against Normandy, but it was always possible that Henry would reach a lasting peace with Louis of France, and one of his Breton relatives was countess of Flanders from 1112-19. Although neither side troubled to hide its hostility to the other, both Henry and Fulk were aware that some accommodation between them was necessary. Henry had previously married his legitimate son to Fulk's daughter, and though this had not prevented the marriage of her sister to William Clito, Henry soon had that dissolved. When Clito, now married to a relative of the French king's wife, became count of Flanders in 1127, the marriage of Henry's heiress to an Angevin became more desirable than ever. The marriage was undoubtedly unpopular among the Normans, but its greatest advantage was that the Angevins had become the guaranteed defenders of Norman interests instead of potential aggressors. Stephen of Blois was an obvious threat to Matilda in 1127. Her second marriage to the Angevin count was, among other things, a pointed statement by Henry that he intended his daughter to succeed, whatever earlier plans he had had to make.

3. The family, the fief and the alignments of Stephen's reign, 1139-1154

Our aim here is not to rehearse the events of Stephen's reign nor to attempt to account for such events. We are concerned simply to identify the membership of each party in the dispute and to account for them in the terms we have already outlined.

There was no concerted opposition to Stephen in England before 1139.⁷⁰ In 1136 many of Matilda's future supporters had been present at Stephen's Easter Court and had thus publicly acknowledged his authority.⁷¹ One exception was Baldwin de Redvers, lord of the Devonshire Honour of Plympton and future earl of Devon.⁷² The acephalous nature of the nascent opposition to Stephen in the years before 1139 left Matilda's cause without a rallying-point, a situation reinforced by her own inactivity even though certain Norman towns

had been delivered to her by Guigan Algason (i.e. Wigan the Marshal), vicomte of Exmes, upon her father's death. Her appearance in England in September 1139 changed the situation dramatically and the parties finally declared themselves.⁷³

Stephen had become duke of Normandy at the time he took the English throne as the nephew and nearest adult male heir of Henry I, to whose favour he owed also the title of count of Mortain, the site of his only real influence in Normandy prior to 1135. This assured, or seemed to assure, him the support of the East Norman kin of the duke. Their ranks were thinner now, but still included Warenne, Beaumont, Clare and Giffard. The first three were represented in Stephen's party in 1139, but the last male of the direct line of Giffard of Longueville remained neutral in Normandy throughout the reign. Giffards of the junior branches in Devonshire and Buckinghamshire, relatives of the Giffards of Maine and Fougères, are found in Matilda's party. The East Norman kin of the duke still included the Breton earl of Richmond, now Alan III, son of Count Stephen, who accordingly threw the weight of his vast Honour of Richmond behind King Stephen, a decision partly determined by his personal animosity toward Breton members of the Angevin party. Another great northern landowner, Gilbert de Gant (Ghent), created earl of Lincoln by Stephen in 1149, was the son of Walter de Gant (d. 1139) and Maud, sister of Alan III of Richmond. The Breton Hervé vicomte of Léon, briefly earl of Wiltshire in 1141, was Stephen's son-in-law and held from him the Honour of Eye in Suffolk.⁷⁴ Stephen's marriage to Matilda, heiress of the county of Boulogne (in the Empire), provided him with the resources of the Honour of Boulogne in eastern England, where he had held the Honour of Eye as a gift of Henry I. Boulogne gave Stephen his greatest single advantage in that its importance for the wool trade of Flanders and of England assured him the support of London, as well as permitting him access to a supply of mercenaries from Flanders, of which Boulogne was a dependency. Flanders also supplied Stephen with his most loyal and dependable commander in William of Ypres, bastard pretender to the county of Ypres who enjoyed virtual comital authority in Kent under the king.

Stephen's greatest single disadvantage, his own character apart, was his accession to the duchy of Normandy as well as to the throne of England. If the Norman kings of England and their East Norman kin had been less determined to maintain their position in both Normandy and England the two might have been finally separated long since. But neither the king nor his kin could be expected willingly to relinquish their patrimony and so the struggle to maintain the union remained a central concern, despite the increasing size of the element in the feudal class for whom the question of Normandy was important only insofar as it directly affected the matter of England. Among this group were the Bretons, who were prepared to hold such Norman lands as they possessed from whoever was duke of Normandy, whether or not he was king of England. Many of the Bretons in England at this date had little to lose either in Brittany or in Normandy. It is significant that those Bretons who were also seigneurs in Brittany were either those who supported Stephen until 1141-6 and then withdrew to Brittany or those who took no part at all in the English events of Stephen's reign. Otherwise, the position taken by the English Bretons was entirely determined by their pre-existing affinity with one or the other of the two hostile groups of Bretons in England.

Although the question of Normandy little concerned the Bretons, whose position was largely predetermined, it mattered a great deal to the king-duke's East Norman kin who had much to lose by the loss of Normandy. That such a loss was not regarded as inconceivable is at least suggested by the will of William the Conqueror, and by the agreement between the Beaumont twins, who divided the family's lands between Robert in England and Waleran in Normandy, that each should be entitled to share in the other's portion if one of them lost his land.⁷⁵ Concern to retain both sides of the inheritance naturally led Waleran to desert Stephen when Geoffrey of Anjou overran Normandy in 1141, whilst Robert remained a nominal

supporter of Stephen in England, doing his best to ensure his own survival, which finally meant deserting Stephen for the Angevins in July 1153. The question of the union of England and Normandy did much to produce the crisis of Stephen's reign, to maintain it in being and to produce what is regarded as the anarchy characteristic of the period. This anarchy, wherein some Normans repeatedly changed sides, was the understandable reaction of that element of the baronage that was truly 'cross-Channel' in nature, i.e. the king's kin, to a situation that threatened the integrity of their patrimonies.⁷⁶ At no time could a lord who was unable to protect his vassal's patrimonies expect the continued allegiance of that vassal. The same was true of those who believed that they had been disinherited by Henry I or by Stephen and, initially at least, declared for Stephen or Matilda on that basis. An example of the former is Count Amaury of Evreux who joined the Angevins in Normandy, and of the latter, William Peverel of Dover. The allegiances of these men were entirely dependent on their own self-interest in recovering what they thought was rightfully theirs. This was complementary to the position in which Henry I's new men found themselves: since they had often acquired land at the expense of Henry I's 'disinherited' for them allegiance to Matilda seemed the obvious choice.

Therefore a large part of the feudal class engaged in the struggle between Stephen and Matilda purely in order to establish their rights in what they regarded as their own patrimonies and their right to pass them on to their own heirs. The extraordinary complexity of the family arrangements by which a baron protected his fief became markedly more so in this period, when the Norman supporters of either side intermarried so as to provide insurance policies against the eventual outcome of the struggle. In this sense the Norman attitude to the kin-group at this time was prospective to the need to adjust family alignments in order to preserve a delicate balance of interest in England and in Normandy. This need understandably subjected their party alignments to some fluidity and goes some way towards explaining the marked reluctance of either side to fight a pitched battle with an army containing its own relatives. By contrast, as we shall see, the Breton attitude to the kin-group was retrospective, in that pre-existing family alliances determined the position they held until 1154. Such a fixed position among one element of the feudal class has not been suspected hitherto, but it was possible, in the first place, because the issue of Normandy was not a central concern for either group of Bretons and, in the second place, because the Bretons in England constitute a group divided into two hostile elements whose hostility had its origins in Breton history and who played out their rivalries against the background of Breton affairs. The English civil war provided them at last with a neutral theatre of war in which to settle their ancient feud. In part this is unremarkable when one considers that the alignments of the disinherited also had the connotation of feud, but the fact remains that the attitude of the Bretons to the crisis of Stephen's reign was somewhat anomalous.

Like the Normans, however, they were landholders and certain generalizations hold true for the whole feudal class at this time. If, as will be illustrated below, the Bretons can be exonerated from the charge of perfidy sometimes levelled at the aristocracy of this time so too can the Normans. As we have said, the pivot of the life and career of every baron was his patrimony. In the last analysis his purpose in life was to defend the patrimony he had received from his ancestors, so as to be able to hand it on intact to his own heirs. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in Stephen's England. When we realise that the issue of the patrimony as a family inheritance protected by a family network was the crux of a baron's career, we can see more clearly the significance of the fact that the chief result of Stephen's reign was that the heritability of fiefs, according to a fixed system, became a principle enshrined in law for everyone from the king downwards.⁷⁷ The events of Stephen's reign can thus be seen less as a comment on the personalities of Stephen and his Angevin rivals, and more as a necessary and inevitable conflict that established the legitimacy of a principle by

which everyone anyway sought to live. In the words of Stephen's most lucid biographer, R.H.C.Davis: 'Wherever we turn, the politics of Stephen's reign seem to dissolve into family history'.⁷⁸

(i) the geo-political divisions

Having stressed the importance of the patrimony, based as this was on the kin-group, in determining an individual's conduct in the English civil war, which was as important to the class of 'new men' created by Henry I and the class of 'disinherited' created by Henry and Stephen as it was to the older, established class of the king's East Norman kin, we still have to glance briefly at the question of the 'geo-political' division of England at this time.

It was J.H.Round in his Geoffrey de Mandeville who did most to stress baronial perfidy in Stephen's reign, a notion that subsequent appreciation of the difficulties facing the cross-Channel element in the English feudal class has done much to correct. Round also noted the existence of a certain geographical division of England between the parties at this time,⁷⁹ and indeed we have pointed to the same phenomenon in describing the division of the lands of the two groups of Bretons we have identified. This notion needs clarification.

The main action in Stephen's reign was essentially confined to the small area between Bristol, Wallingford and Lincoln. Wallingford was held for the Angevins throughout 1139 to 1154 and there was strong Angevin support in the south and west in general. Matilda's half-brother Reginald fitz Roy, one of Henry's natural sons, successfully ousted the king's nominee Alan of Richmond from Cornwall and became earl of that county in 1141. (Nor was this surprising since the only ground for intruding Alan into that county was the one-time link of his uncle Brien of Penthièvre with Cornwall, something that did not survive even into the time of Domesday Book.) Another of Henry's natural sons, Robert fitz Roy, eventually married (1142) the heiress of Robert of Avranches, lord of Okehampton in Devon, though he is mainly evidenced in the vicinity of Oxford, where Matilda had her court and where his uterine brother Robert d'Oilly, who became an Angevin supporter in 1141, was most influential.⁸⁰ Baldwin de Redvers, lord of Plympton and earl of Devon after 1141, had supported the Empress since 1135. After 1143 the Empress also controlled Dorset and Somerset, despite William de Mohun's defection to Stephen. Stephen also intruded his 'new man' Henry de Tracy into the Devonshire Honour of Barnstaple, a division of the Honour of Totnes. Stephen held the castle of Malmesbury in Wiltshire from 1139 until 1153, long after it had been surrounded by Angevin lands. This mirrored the position of Wallingford castle, a solitary outpost of Angevin power after Stephen had captured Reading, Oxford and Faringdon. Stephen thus did have some authority in what remains the Angevin-dominated south and west. Other important Angevin supporters in this area were Robert earl of Gloucester, the Empress's half-brother, and the lords of Monmouth, descendants of Baderon of Epiniac and La Boussac in Dol.

There was also the fief controlled by Miles of Gloucester, the basis of which went back to his Domesday Book ancestor Durand of Pîtres, sheriff of Gloucestershire. But it had been augmented by the favour of Henry I, partly at the expense of others, and included the lordship of Brecknock through Miles's marriage to Sybil, heiress of Bernard of Neufmarché, a kinsman of King Henry. Miles's position was therefore somewhat vulnerable. He supported Stephen until the arrival in 1139 of Matilda, who claimed that he immediately recognized her authority. Edmund King believes that Miles's change of allegiance was based on the necessity of working with rather than against the powerful earl of Gloucester, whose lands were in part contiguous with his own and who was anyway the overlord of some of Miles's fees.⁸¹ On this view, Miles sought the protection of a greater feudatory than himself, nor is this view unreasonable. But if Miles saw the wisdom of joining forces with Robert of Gloucester, it is as least as true that Robert saw the value of asking Miles's support immediately the Empress arrived, support that was promptly given. In addition, one must consider the fact that, with

the isolated exception of Baldwin de Redvers, most men in England had recognized Stephen until 1139. The parties formed then because only then had Matilda herself arrived in England and Robert earl of Gloucester finally made his position known. Until then, one can argue, Miles was merely doing what many were doing in extorting as much as he could from Stephen before being obliged to make his choice. The charters of Miles's earldom of Hereford are frequently attested by the many Bretons of Herefordshire and Gloucestershire, whose origins can be traced to Dol.⁸² Significantly, the other powerful man to declare for Matilda in 1139 was Brien fitzCount of Wallingford, the man who at once became the leader of the pro-Angevin Dol-Lamballe faction among the English Bretons.

Matilda was not without support in the rest of the country, any more than Stephen was in the south and west, yet it is as true in outline that Stephen was strongest in the north and east, particularly the east, as that Matilda was in the south and west. Stephen's strength in the east has already been discussed, but Matilda had at least the somewhat dubious support of Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk, and the vigorous support of the Boterels of Nettlestead, Suffolk, the Lamballe tenants, relatives and rivals of Alan of Richmond.

A broad geographical division between the parties did exist. The problem of interpreting that fact remains to some extent. Obvious explanations concern, on the one hand, the economic strength of the Honour of Boulogne in the east, which put London in the bag for Stephen, and, on the other, the fact that in the south and west Matilda could rely on the vigorous support of her half-brothers Robert earl of Gloucester and Reginald earl of Cornwall, as well as on the Angevin affinities of her kin among the Bretons led by Brien fitzCount, a group that taken together included Henry I's creation, Miles of Gloucester. Nor should we forget that broad geographical division, between the Bretons of Penthievre and the East Normans in the north and east of the country and the Bretons of Dol-Lamballe and the West Normans in the south and west, which can be perceived in Domesday Book.

Yet, marked though these territorial divisions are, one should not insist too much on the 'geo-political' division of England at this time. The boundaries are not absolute, nor can they be, and there are grey areas such as the fief of the earl of Chester who spent the entire reign looking to the protection of his fief in any way that offered itself.⁸³ To try to explain the party alignments in terms of the geographical location of a fief will fail to take account of the way in which these fiefs were acquired, retained and protected, i.e. by the operation of the kin-group. The lands of Henry I's new men, from whom Matilda's party derived such strength, were largely composed of the lands forfeited by those who had opposed Henry and therefore their location was a feature of their availability. Nevertheless, the forfeiture of the count of Mortain's vast estates in the south and west made land available there to a group of men who, though they were themselves being given land in England for the first time, could find already settled in that area many of the kin with whom they shared tenurial relationships in their homeland. In other words, marked though the geo-political divisions are, they are subordinate to the kin-grouping that governs their disposition. It is the kin-group that determines the individual's position *vis à vis* Stephen or Matilda. Since for the average baron the crux of the matter was his patrimony, his kinship was a vital element in determining his allegiance. If he was an East Norman kinsman of Stephen as duke of Normandy that made only his initial alignment obvious; after Stephen's loss of Normandy, his concern for his patrimony would compel him to extend his kin among the Angevin supporters, to whom such alliances were welcome because their eventual success was not assured until late in 1153.⁸⁴

There is a strong vein of sentiment in the formation of the parties before 1153,⁸⁵ a sentiment that was rarely focussed on the person of either Stephen or Matilda but was sharply focussed on the patrimony and the kin-group of the individual. In this respect another difference between Norman and Breton attitudes at this date can be discerned. The problem of Normandy by and large did not exist for the Bretons, who tended on the whole not to have

landed wealth in Normandy or even to have considerable landed wealth in both England and Brittany. For the Normans, land in Normandy represented the patrimony, the basis of family power and of their wealth; their sentiment was attached to these two notions. By contrast, the Bretons felt a passionate attachment to Brittany itself, the *patria* so frequently referred to in their charters. This explains why so many Normans appear to vacillate between the two parties, and why the Bretons of either side could maintain a consistent position since, even for those Bretons whose interests were being more and more associated with England, their position was fixed with reference to Breton and not to English or to Norman affairs.

(ii) Brien fitzCount and the Dol Bretons

Brien fitzCount unhesitatingly joined Matilda's party upon her arrival in England in 1139. Like Miles of Gloucester, Brien is taunted with the fact that he attended Stephen's court and witnessed his charters between 1135 and 1139, and yet in Brien's case there are peculiarly cogent reasons for believing that he, like Miles, had merely been waiting for a signal from the Empress. There was every reason for him to support her and his conduct underlines the fact. He was the son, probably illegitimate, of Duke Alan IV Fergant of Brittany and thus half-brother or brother to Conan III of Brittany. Conan's mother Ermengarde was aunt of the Empress's husband Geoffrey of Anjou, and his wife was the daughter of Henry I (perhaps by Alix Boterel of Lamballe), half-sister of the Empress. Matilda and Brien were anyway related by the affinity of the Breton and Norman ducal houses which went back to the early eleventh century. Brien owed his considerable wealth in England - he had none in Brittany - to the favour of Henry I, by whom he had been raised. He had acquired the Honour of Wallingford on his marriage to Matilda Crispin, daughter and heiress of Miles Crispin who had held the castle and Honour in 1086.⁸⁶ He had also been given the Honour of Abergavenny, forfeited by the Ballon family early in Henry's reign. This latter Honour he gave to Miles of Gloucester in recognition of the masterly tactics by which he had saved Wallingford when it was besieged by Stephen in 1139-40. The Honour of Wallingford comprised land in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Wiltshire, Buckinghamshire, Gloucestershire and Middlesex. Apart from all of this, Brien was genuinely devoted to the Empress herself.⁸⁷ He was the only man to ruin himself in the service of either party, a position he could afford since he and his wife had no direct heirs.⁸⁸

The survival of Brien's reply to a letter written to him by Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, in c.1142-3 provides a remarkable insight into Brien's own view of what he was doing.⁸⁹ (1910), 297ff. From it we can infer that Henry had rebuked Brien for continuing to uphold the Empress against the king. Brien's reply again and again insists that he is doing no more than Henry himself had ordered him to do. This is a repeated reference to Henry's desertion of his brother in 1141, something he had had great difficulty in living down ever since. In a sentence stating that 'neither I nor my men are doing this for money or fief or land, either promised or given', Brien also made a pointed reference to Henry's command 'and the lawfulness of myself and my men', no doubt alluding to the oath of January 1127 that had been perjured by Stephen and Henry.

Though Brien's military activities were not in themselves significant - he was immobilized for much of the time by the need to defend his frequently-besieged castle at Wallingford - there can be no doubt of the quality of his leadership.⁹⁰ Not only did his vassals of Wallingford, Bretons and Normans alike, maintain unfalteringly the cause of the Empress, even after both she and Brien withdrew from England in 1148, but so too did the burgesses of Wallingford, who suffered greatly during the sieges, unlike the burgesses of Exeter who rebelled against Baldwin de Redvers, for example.⁹¹ The absence of tension between feudatories and burgesses in Wallingford and the continued support of the barons of Wallingford for the Angevins after Brien's withdrawal into religion⁹² are considerable

testimony to the great and genuine affection inspired by Brien fitzCount and to the quality of his leadership.

Brien can be claimed as the leader of the Dol-Lamballe Bretons because he alone among them represented the Angevin-allied Breton ducal family to whom the Dol-Lamballe Bretons looked in order to oppose the pretensions of Penthièvre-Richmond. However, sometime in or before 1141 the count of Lamballe himself appeared in England, but only briefly. We must now turn to the history of this complicated episode since it gives the clearest illustration of the fact that for the Bretons the reign of Stephen was primarily the time when they sought to settle ancient scores, the genuine devotion to the Empress inspired by Brien fitzCount notwithstanding.

(iii) Lamballe versus Penthièvre

It will be recalled that the death of Stephen of Penthièvre-Richmond in 1138 had left grounds for conflict between two of his sons. In a revolt against their father during his lifetime, Geoffrey II Boterel had seized the counties of Lamballe and Penthièvre, while Alan had been sent to England to take over the Richmond estates. Sometime before his father's death, Alan of Richmond had been recalled to Brittany for marriage with the heiress of Conan III in a move designed to end the ancient hostility of the ducal house and its Penthièvre cadets. After Count Stephen's death it might well have occurred to Alan to make war on Geoffrey II Boterel with the aim of retrieving some of the Breton patrimony from which the earlier settlement had excluded him. According to Le Baud such a war did take place, lasted several years and was fought in Brittany. Le Baud claimed to have based his assertions, many of them misleading, on fragments of ancient chronicles that for the most part do not survive except in the inedited copies he made of them, now in the archives at Rennes.⁹³ This particular assertion lacks all support in the surviving evidence, although the brothers' parts in the wars of Stephen's reign is certainly a clear indication of the hostility between them. The picture has been further complicated by the fact that some documents, notably a thirteenth-century inquest, state that Geoffrey II Boterel predeceased his father, and this was the view taken by La Borderie.⁹⁴ It was not, however, the case.

Alan's marriage to Bertha had not precluded him from taking an active part on behalf of Stephen from 1135 to 1139. That it was he to whom Orderic Vitalis refers whenever he mentions 'Alan of Dinan', a quite separate person,⁹⁵ can be demonstrated from other sources, which establish Alan's part in King Stephen's Norman campaign, in the fall of Roger of Salisbury in 1136-39, and his part in the battle of Lincoln (2 February 1141), from which he and William of Ypres, among others, fled, leaving Stephen to be taken prisoner by Matilda's army.⁹⁶ It is at this time that we find his brother and rival Geoffrey II Boterel fighting in England on the Angevin side. The identification of Count Geoffrey as a supporter of Matilda is provided by the reference of the Gesta Stephani to Boterellus quidam comes Britanniae, elaborated by John of Hexham who describes the valorous conduct of Gaufridus Boterel, frater Alani comitis de Richemont at the siege of Winchester in 1141.⁹⁷

Geoffrey II Boterel's wife was a daughter of John fitz Rivallon of Dol. Stephen son of Geoffrey Boterel is mentioned with Noga (Imogen), mother of John II fitz Gilduin II of Dol, as the custos of land granted by Hervé de Herland.⁹⁸ In another charter John II refers to this Count Stephen as nepos noster, i.e. 'my cousin'.⁹⁹ The Lamballe-Dol affinity was reflected in the affinity of both with Fougères. John I of Dol had married a sister of Ralph I of Fougères, and Ralph's son Henry had married Oliva of Penthièvre, sister of Geoffrey II Boterel and Alan of Richmond. Henry's son Ralph II of Fougères was one of those English landholders who, as Breton seigneurs, took no active part in the wars of Stephen's reign. In England the lands of men originally from Fougères lay mostly in the pro-Angevin Honour of Plympton, now the basis of the de Redvers earldom of Devon. Also married to a sister of Alan and

Geoffrey was Oliver of Dinan, who held land in Devon. Like his brother Alan of Bécherel, he took no active part in English affairs at this time. A third brother, Josce de Dinan, whose interests were apparently mainly English, is found in Shropshire holding Ludlow for the Empress or, rather, against the de Lacy, to whom it had formerly belonged. He did, however, maintain the Empress's cause with the barons of Wallingford and like them was rewarded for his service by Henry II after 1154.¹⁰⁰ Although Dinan shared a common ancestor with Dol, relations between the two were frequently strained.¹⁰¹ The relative positions taken by the three Dinan brothers illustrate the problems posed by the Lamballe-Penthièvre rivalry at this date, when the rivals were brothers. Alan and Geoffrey II Boterel had two other sisters whose marriages further illustrate the dilemma. Maud had married Walter de Gant and was mother of Gilbert de Gant, created earl of Lincoln by Stephen in 1149.¹⁰² Tiffania was the wife of the Angevin supporter William de Tancarville, son of Rabel de Tancarville, one of Henry I's new men. In other words, the rivalry of Alan and Geoffrey was reflected among their siblings; and real though that rivalry was, the marriages of these siblings gave each a foot in the other's camp in respect of both English and Breton affairs.

1141 was perhaps the most eventful year of Stephen's reign. According to the *Gesta Stephani*, after the battle of Lincoln Alan of Richmond sought to avenge the capture of Stephen by attacking Ranulf earl of Chester, who had done much to make it possible. He was defeated by Ranulf and thrown in chains, until he made some concessions to his captor. At the same time, Reginald fitz Roy overran Cornwall, of which Alan was the nominal earl.¹⁰³ The complete absence of any trace of Geoffrey II Boterel after this time suggests that he had returned to Brittany. Alan, however, remained in England. He is found later in 1141 at Stephen's Christmas Court at Canterbury.¹⁰⁴ At Easter 1142, according to John of Hexham, a tournament between him and William of Aumale, Stephen's earl of York, was stopped by the king.¹⁰⁵ In the following year he further earned his reputation for *saeuitia et crudelitas* by attacking the archbishop of York in the church of Ripon.¹⁰⁶ Although he is not specifically mentioned again in the chronicles, Clay was probably right, on the basis of Yorkshire charters, to date his return to Brittany to the end of 1145.¹⁰⁷ Alan died in 1146, apparently without having gained anything from his brother and before his father-in-law's death, so that all his Breton ambitions came to nought.¹⁰⁸ He did, however, leave a son of the house of Penthièvre as heir to the Breton duchy, the future Conan IV. There is no reason to believe that Alan's support for Stephen was lukewarm, as is sometimes suggested. His partisanship was at bottom insincere, his own concerns being of primary importance, but that makes him no different from any other baron except, of course, Brien fitzCount. One cannot, however, find anything to commend in the generally ineffectual Hervé *vicomte* of Léon, Stephen's son-in-law, who in 1141 was driven from the castle of Devizes, in his earldom of Wiltshire, by a mob of rustics and was then exiled from the kingdom.¹⁰⁹

(iv) The end of the conflict

It is clear that the Angevin cause owed much to the support of the Dol-Lamballe group of English Bretons, some of whom we have examined in detail. Lack of space precludes an examination of their kin-groups among the West Normans of Devon and Cornwall though they too supported the Angevins. We can note the descent of both William FitzAlan of Dol and Patrick of Chaources (in Maine), another Angevin supporter, from daughters of Arnulf de Hesdin, himself hanged by Stephen at the siege of Shrewsbury in 1139, from which FitzAlan escaped. We may further wonder if the support of the barons of Wallingford was due not only to the leadership and pre-determined position of Brien fitzCount and his Bretons, but also to the fact that his wife was a Crispin. The marriage of a member of the Crispin family of Le Bec in central Normandy produced the Crispin seigneurs of Champtoceaux in Anjou, near the Breton border, the first of whom occurs in the early twelfth century.¹¹⁰ By the late eleventh

century the Crispins of Bec were related to Fulk IV of Anjou, whose wife Bertrada de Montfort was a niece of the wife of William I Crispin, father of Gilbert abbot of Westminster (d.1117).¹¹¹ Indeed, after the return of Henry of Normandy in 1149, it is his Angevin and Manceaux affinities which come to the fore. They obviously figure prominently in his charters between 1149 and 1154, but their impact is most noticeable as the next flood of immigrants to the English feudal scene in the years immediately following his accession. Many of them were already related to Breton families, most notably to Dinan, Vitré and Fougères.

After the death of Alan of Richmond in 1146 the situation for the Bretons in England had changed dramatically. Alan's son Conan was his mother Duchess Bertha's heir, so that the line of Eudo of Penthièvre had at last merged with that of the dukes. Alan's brother Geoffrey II Boterel, who died in 1148, was left in undisturbed possession of Lamballe and Penthièvre, which duly passed to his son Rivallon. In England, therefore, the pro-Stephen Bretons of Richmond were left without a leader, though Gilbert de Gant, son of Maud of Richmond-Penthièvre, remained in Stephen's party. Before 1141 Richmond had been represented in the witness-lists of Stephen's charters only by Alan himself (who does not appear thereafter); and after his withdrawal, probably late in 1145, and then his death leaving a minor as heir, there was none to take his place. His barons of Richmond can be assumed to have supported him in his pro-Stephen stance, with those exceptions noted above, but little can be said with certainty about their alignments after 1146. One can, however, infer from the fact that none of them received the mark of Henry II's favour, in the years immediately following his accession, that they continued to support Stephen or stayed neutral.

The only Breton of any significance left to Stephen's party was that Mainfelin fitz Maino Brito of Wolverton, Bucks, whose son claimed kinship with William de Warenne, himself a loyal supporter of Stephen. Mainfelin, whose possessions included land in Northamptonshire and Hertfordshire, is found attesting Stephen's charters throughout the reign.¹¹² His brother Wigan of Wallingford, on the other hand, is found attesting only once and then for Duke Henry in 1153.¹¹³ Wigan may have been only half-brother to Mainfelin, since he is otherwise distinguished by the appellation *Wigan nepos Brientii*.¹¹⁴ Wigan probably supported the Angevins from at least 1141 onward, for he was married to Edith, daughter of Robert II d'Oilly, who joined the Empress's party in 1141, shortly before his death in 1142.¹¹⁵ The mother of Edith and of Robert's successor Henry d'Oilly was also the mother of Robert fitz Roy of Okehampton, another Angevin supporter.¹¹⁶ Both Brito brothers remained loyal to the position dictated by their own family alliances, which neatly included both Stephen and the Angevins.

The purely personal grounds for Breton partisanship had now gone. The hostile parties had buried the hatchet along with Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre. This was made easier by the complicated alliances of Alan's sisters, divided as they were between the parties of Boterel of Lamballe and the Angevins on the one hand, and Richmond-Penthièvre on the other. Such a phenomenon was now common among the feudal class as a whole. The boundaries of the kin-group had extended considerably in these years, as Breton and Norman, Norman and Angevin, disinherited and disinheritors sought to marry their way out of their difficulties. The troubles of Stephen's reign acted as a catharsis in this sense, for hand in hand with this process went the disappearance of that curious territorial division of England we have so often remarked. All of this helped to create the consciousness of membership of a genuinely English feudal class, the seeds of which had long been sown and which only the loss of Normandy could finally bring into being. That this was achieved by the complete ineptitude of the eventual heir, who further succeeded in dividing the new, self-consciously 'English' feudal class, is well known. But, if Henry II had rightly perceived Normandy to be the key to England in the years before 1154 and had thereafter successfully maintained his vast

'Angevin empire', all of it under the suzerainty of the king of France, it was inevitable that all or part of it should fall to the French king as soon as the weakness of the English heir permitted. Ironically, it was Brittany, rather than Normandy, that figured most prominently in the English king's intrigues against the French king for the rest of the Middle Ages, despite the fact that Brittany had never been a truly integral part of the Angevin empire.

* * *

Because there was a clear-cut and remarkably stable division of allegiance amongst the Bretons in England, one might be tempted to wonder whether this in any respect tipped the balance between the parties. The Bretons in England were numerous and accounted for perhaps a quarter of all men holding fees in England;¹¹⁷

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Lincs	53	7	8	63	15	19%	
Yorks		25	3	4	80	14	18%
Cambs	29	1	2	70	15	16%	
Norfolk		43	5	1	121	24	18%
Nthant	40	5	11	56	5	10%	
Glocs		46	3	2	86	19	17%
Devon	37	8	1	63	14	22%	
Cornub		3	1	0	19	7	37%

A = county **B** = tenants-in-chief, excluding ecclesiastics and Anglo Saxons **C** = Bretons **D** = Picards **E** = subtenants excluding ecclesiastics and Anglo-Saxons **F** = Breton subtenants **G** = percentage of total Breton (the figures refer only to those who were certainly Breton and to those actually holding land in 1086).

An attempt to calculate the number of tenants-in-chief in Domesday, excluding ecclesiastics, Anglo-Saxons and those whose holdings were no more than serjeanties, gives 206 Normans, 25 Bretons and 18 Picards, i.e. 21%, or 1:5 of the total were non-Norman. with their West Norman connexions they accounted for roughly half the total, but the only landholder of any significance among them was Alan of Richmond, whose earldom dwarfed those of his nearest competitors, Brien fitzCount of Wallingford and Baderon of Monmouth. Their numbers and the size of their holdings were therefore of no great moment, but the unity of aim displayed by the pro-Angevin faction under the leadership of Brien fitzCount may fairly be taken to have underpinned the ultimate success of Henry of Anjou.

The civil war saw little in the way of armed conflict between the two parties except in the early years when twice, after the Rout of Winchester and during the siege of Oxford, Matilda's personal safety had been assured by Brien fitzCount. Brien's steadfast support of the Empress established Wallingford castle as the flagship of the Angevin cause. After his withdrawal into religion in 1148, in the wake of Matilda's return to Normandy, Wallingford was controlled by men appointed from his officers by Matilda and Henry, of whom we have met Ansfrit fitz Ruald and William Boterel. When the garrison was sorely pressed by a siege late in 1153 they sent an appeal to their lord Henry of Normandy, who was unable to resist it lest irreparable damage be done to his cause by the loss of Wallingford.¹¹⁸ He returned early in 1153 to fight the one brilliant campaign of the whole war, which led to his acceptance as Stephen's heir in the Treaty of Winchester (once known as the Treaty of Wallingford, whose castle Henry had finally relieved in August, the month before he gained the kingdom by treaty). Indeed, the prompt rewards he gave to the personnel of both the Honour and Borough of Wallingford after 1154 tell their own tale.¹¹⁹

The allegiance of Brien fitzCount and the Bretons of Dol was, as we have seen, imposed

on them by the force of a complex series of feudal and familial relationships, but the personal devotion of Brien to the Empress, as well as the devotion of his own men to Brien himself, lent a quality to the Angevin side that the other totally lacked. The Breton leader on Stephen's side, Alan of Richmond, was undoubtedly brave and loyal, but he had his own ambitions in Brittany, where he was the husband of the ducal heiress Bertha, and he died in 1146 in the middle of the crisis. His successor was his infant son Conan, later Conan IV, the puppet-duke of Henry II. Of his vassals or associates, Hervé of Léon, Stephen's son-in-law, was ineffectual and rapidly lost his earldom of Wiltshire in 1141, after which he returned home, while Aubrey de Vere¹²⁰ took the opportunity to feather his nest by deserting Stephen between 1141 and 1145. Stephen's biggest handicap was the fact that he was also duke of Normandy, his loss of which in 1144 placed his Norman supporters in an impossible position. The great Norman magnates were all drawn from East and Central Normandy, and all of them descended from Richard I or from the family of his wife Gunnor, holding lands in Normandy that had originally been part of the ducal demesne.¹²¹ This both ensured the support for Stephen of these East Norman magnates and accounts for the fact that their support was often lukewarm or even positively wanting by virtue of their need to defend their patrimonies, which entailed alliances with the other side, to the compromise of their allegiance to Stephen.

The behaviour of both Bretons and Normans in the civil war was determined by the same basic tenets, but demonstrates in practice a marked difference in psychology between the two groups. The polarization of, on the one hand, the Bretons of Dol and the West Normans and, on the other, the Bretons of Penthièvre and the East Normans may have been exacerbated by the fact that many of the first group owed their position to the favour of Henry I in the wake of his Norman wars, which may have caused them to be looked down upon by such of the ancient nobility of East Normandy as survived the Norman crises of that reign. Certainly, the Norman wars of Henry's reign and the way in which he exercised his patronage in England did much to ensure the eclipse of the traditionally dominant East Normans during Stephen's reign, when none of them achieved the various centre-stage roles played by William of Ypres, Brien fitzCount, Ranulf earl of Chester, Alan of Richmond and Baldwin de Redvers, among others. Some of them, such as William de Warenne and Simon de Senlis, as well as Alan of Richmond, were consistently loyal to Stephen until their deaths, though the fact remains that the neutral or vacillating position taken by Giffard, Clare and Beaumont obliged Stephen to rely on 'new men' such as William of Ypres and Henry de Tracy. However that may be, it must now be concluded that the pattern of allegiance, both Breton and Norman, in the conflict between Stephen and Matilda is one that has an inevitability and a momentum that should be taken as characteristic of the way that the feudal barons organized their affairs to protect their own interests at least as much as those of their ultimate overlords. The actual events of the war could have been predicted by neither side, but the steadfastness of aim achieved by the one side as the result of the baronial organization we have described, and the steadfastness of aim that the other side was prevented from achieving by an unforeseen threat to the same organization - to wit, the loss of Normandy - do not permit us to talk of 'the Anarchy' with any validity. The civil war of Stephen's reign was perhaps one of the most coherent events of the Middle Ages, the logical result of a process that had been set in motion by two marriages around the year 1000, a process that had gained impetus between 1066 and 1106, and that continued until the reign of Henry II broke the mould.

K.S.B.Keats-Rohan, Linacre College, Oxford

Appendix
The lords of Richmond 1086-1138

Though English historians now accept the obituary dates of Alan I and II of Richmond as 1093 and 1098 on the basis of two letters of Archbishop Anselm, it is worth reviewing this evidence in the light of that rejected by Clay and Wilmart, who gave the dates as 1089 and 1093 despite the difficulties to which these dates lead.

The obituary date of 1089 for Alan I Rufus rests on the entry in the generally unreliable Margam Annals (Ann.Monast.,i,4) and receives some support from an equally unreliable thirteenth-century chronicle of St Mary's, York, (Mon.Ang. i, 546), which dates Alan I's death to a few days after the abbey's foundation in 1088. The abbey was in fact founded in the time of William I by the king and Alan I. William I gave the church of St Olaf and the manor of Clifton to Alan c.1080-86 (EYC iv, no. 101, 131-2), both of which were among the early endowments of the abbey confirmed to it by William II early in his reign (EYC i, 264-5). His charter refers to Alan I as 'post me et patrem meum huius abbacie inceptor et institutor'. No reference is made to the death of Alan, and the count Alan who attested the charter together with Miles Crispin was clearly Alan I, the abbey's co-founder.

Alan I's death in 1093 is attested in the Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey (Rolls ser. i, 350). The entry refers to his death 'circum istum annum [1093]', but a thirteenth-century chronicle of the house states the year as 1093 (see EYC iv, 87 note 2). The first notice stated that Alan was 'instructor nobilis cenobii sancte Marie extra urbem Eboraci', i.e. that he was Alan I, and that he was first buried at St Edmund's, but later reburied at St Mary's at the request of its monks. The date is further supported by Anselm's letters (ed. F.Schmitt, nos. 168-9) to Gunnilda daughter of Harold II, apparently written some time between his consecration on 4 December 1093 and 1095. According to Anselm Gunnilda had been the concubine of Alan I before his recent death and was currently involved with his brother and successor Alan Niger.

This is the first clear evidence we have of Alan Niger's presence in England. He is never mentioned with Alan Rufus in England during the latter's lifetime. Around the time of his brother's death and the archbishop's letters he made a gift to Bury St Edmund's, where Alan I was buried, for the souls of his parents and of his brother the count. Clay dated the charter 1089-93 on the strength of the Margam Annals, but it is better dated 1093-5 (EYC iv, 4). Alan II also granted lands given by William II to St Mary, York, for the soul of his brother the count (*ibid.*, 3-4). Clay's date of 1089-93 should be revised to 1093-94/96, i.e. between the date of Alan II's accession and the date when Geoffrey Baynard ceased to be sheriff of York, as he was when he attested the charter. The beneficiaries of these charters identify the brother count as Alan I, though the death of another brother, Count Geoffrey Boterel had occurred on 24 August 1093 at Dol (Preuves, 102).

Stephen of Richmond first occurs in 1098 (RRAN ii, App. p.405), the year in which Alan II presumably died. The fact that Alan I and II shared an obituary date of 4 August in the necrology of St Mary, York, suggests either that by some conceivable coincidence they died on the same day of the year, or that the obituary date of Alan II was unknown at York. There is no reliable English evidence about either the date of his death or his burial-place, and no evidence to suggest that he was in England until shortly before or after the death of Alan I. It is possible that he spent much of his life in Brittany and that he died there, though there is no reliable Breton evidence for any of Eudo of Penthievre's sons apart from Geoffrey I Boterel and Robert during this period. This idea is possibly supported by the fact that Alan II's charter for St Mary's was attested by his brother Ernald, who is otherwise unknown in English documents. Geoffrey Boterel was apparently succeeded after 24 August 1093 by his youngest brother Stephen, which would indicate that Alan had already taken over the honour of Richmond. Stephen regularly appears after 1098 in charters that clearly demonstrate his position as a cross-Channel magnate with predominant interests in Brittany. He attested three

charters of Henry I in 1101 (RRAN ii, nos. 515, 544, 548), but his own subsequent charters indicate that he was domiciled in Brittany for most of the reign. He died in 1138 (Wilmart, 602, note 85) and was interred in the Breton abbey of Bégard, though his heart was buried at St Mary's, York.

Notes

* I should like to thank the following for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper: the late Professor R.H.C. Davis, Professor E.J. King, Dr D. Bates, Dr R.I. Moore, Dr H. Guillotel, Dr P. Dalton, Dr K. Daly and Dr E. Jefferson. My greatest debt is to the generosity of Prof. Michael Jones, whose wide knowledge of Breton history and clear eye for detail has guided this paper through its many stages. My thanks also to the seminar at the Institute of Historical Research, organized by Dr Michael Clanchy, to which the first draft of this paper was read in 1989. The responsibility for all opinions expressed and any remaining errors is mine.

Abbreviations

EHR - English Historical Review

MSHAB - Mémoires de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Bretagne

PR - Pipe Roll

RRAN - i Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, ed. H.W.C. Davis and R.J. Whitwell (1913)

- ii ed. C. Johnson and H.A. Cronne (1956)

- iii ed. H.A. Cronne and R.H.C. Davis (1961)

Anc. Ev. - Anciens Evêchés de Bretagne, ed. J. Geslin de Bourgogne and A. de Barthélemy, 6 vols. (St-Brieuc and Paris, 1855-79)

Preuves, - H. Morice, Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne, 3 vols (Paris, 1742-6), vol. 1

DB - Domesday Book; first reference is to the Philimore edition, and second to folio edition by A. Farley, 1783.

EYC iv, - Early Yorkshire Charters, vol. iv, ed. C. Clay (1936)

Ord. Vit. - The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1968-80)

GEC - The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, (rev. edn. 1910-59)

Mon. Ang. - Monasticon Anglicanum, ed. W. Dugdale: new edn., 6 vols. (1817-30)

¹ F.M. Stenton, English Feudalism (1932) [2nd edn. 1961], 24-6; see also D.C. Douglas, William the Conqueror (1964), 267-8.

² G. Beech, 'The participation of Aquitainians in the Conquest of England 1066-1100', Anglo-Norman Studies, ix (1986), 1-24; J.H. Round, 'The origin of the Stewarts', in Studies in Peerage and Family History (1901), 115-31; M. Jones, 'Notes sur quelques familles bretonnes en Angleterre après la conquête normande', MSHAB, 58 (1981), reprinted in Jones, The Creation of Medieval Brittany (1988), 69-83; see also Round, 'The Counts of Boulogne as English Lords', in Round, 147-80 (especially interesting for showing how a tenant-in-chief settled the vassals of his Continental fief on his English fief); R. George, 'The contribution of Flanders to the Conquest of England 1065-1086', Revue belge de philologie de d'histoire, v (1926), 81-96.

³ J. Le Patourel, The Norman Empire (1976), 195, and 'Norman Barons' in Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet (1984), no. VI, p.27. There is now an important corrective to some of Le Patourel's views in D. Bates, 'Normandy and England after 1066', EHR, 104 (1989), 857-80.

⁴ Le Patourel, Norman Empire, 91-5, 161-2, 288-9. For Anjou and Blois see O. Guillot, Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au xi^e siècle, 2 vols. (Paris, 1972), M. Bur, La formation du comté de Champagne (Nancy, 1977).

⁵ On the relationship between England and Normandy see Bates, 'Normandy and England after 1066', 857-73.

⁶ K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 'William I and the Breton Contingent in the non-Norman Conquest', Anglo-Norman Studies, xiii (1991), 157-72.

⁷ Douglas, William the Conqueror, 232-4.

⁸ Morice, Preuves i, col.371, charter of Alan III for St Georges, Rennes, attested by his mother (d.1034) and Ralph Anglicus. Ralph I and II of Gael were known as Anglicus in Breton charters at least until 1075.

⁹ The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle [D 1075] was surely wrong to state that Ralph II was the son of an English father and a Breton mother (trsl. G.N.Garmonsway, 1972, 210); see the discussion of his parentage in GEC x, 568-74.

¹⁰ e.g. DB Suffolk 3.15;40-1;61 (fols.293a, 294a, 295a).

¹¹ C.W. Hollister, 'Magnates and Curiales in Early Norman England', Viator, 8 (1977), 63-81, repr. in id. Monarchy, Magnates and Institutions in the Anglo-Norman World, (1986), 97-116; J.F.A. Mason, 'The "Honour of Richmond" in 1086', EHR, 78 (1963), 703-4.

¹² The term 'county of Penthièvre', also called 'of Lamballe' after its chief place, to describe the lands held by Eudo's family was not current during our period. It must be stressed that throughout this essay the terms Richmond-Penthièvre and Dol-Lamballe are intended solely to describe two groups of men who performed contrasting political functions during the reigns of Henry I and Stephen in England; they should not be confused with Breton geography.

¹³ H. Guillotel, 'Les origines de Guingamp', MSHAB, 56 (1979), 93-4; id., 'La place de Châteaubriant dans l'essor des châtellenies bretonnes (xi^e-xii^e siècles)', MSHAB, 66 (1989), 18-19.

¹⁴ D. Bates, Normandy Before 1066 (Longman, 1982), 94-128, 147-82; E. Searle, Predatory Kinship and the Creation of Norman Power 840-1066, (Univ.California Press, 1988).

¹⁵ DB Suffolk, 2.5-7;9;13 (fol.291a-b);cf. B. Golding, 'Robert of Mortain', Anglo-Norman Studies, xiii (1991), 132.

¹⁶ See Golding, 126-8. There is nothing in Great Domesday Book or the Exon Domesday to indicate landholding by Brien in the West.

¹⁷ Ord.Vit. ii, 224, 228. Brien occurs no later than 1069 in RRAN i, nos. 26 and 28. A. Wilmart, 'Alain le Roux et Alain le Noir', Annales de Bretagne, 38 (1929), 576-95, suggested that Brien died in Brittany by 1085 (p.583); see also P. Jeulin, 'Aperçus sur le comté de Richmond en Angleterre...1066/71-1398', Annales de Bretagne, 42 (1935), 265-302.

¹⁸ RRAN i, nos. 46, 96, 111, 114; Calendar of Documents in France, ed. J.H. Round (1899), no. 88; Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St-Vincent du Mans, ed. Menjot d'Elbenne, (Mamers, 1886-1913), no. 252. For the grant of Richmond cf. EYC iv, note p.2, citing Mon.Ang. v, 574.

¹⁹ H. Guillotel, in a paper to be published shortly, elaborating 'Des vicomtes d'Alet aux vicomtes de Poudouvre', Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de l'arrondissement de Saint-Malo, Annales 1988, 206, note 31.

²⁰ Cf. Douglas, William the Conqueror, 235-40.

²¹ EYC iv, 89; Stephen spent most of his time outside England from c.1107-c.1130; Alan occurs in England in 1123, where he attested a charter of King Stephen as earl of Richmond in 1136.

²² Guillotel, 'Guingamp', 94-6.

²³ H. Guillotel, 'Une famille bretonne au service du Conquérant: Les Baderon', Droit priué et institutions régionales: Etudes historiques offertes à Jean Yver, (1976), 361-6.

²⁴ Robert of Torigny Interpolations in William of Jumièges Gesta Normannorum Ducum (ed. J. Marx, Rouen, 1914), 325-6.

²⁵ J. Pouessel. 'Les structures militaires du comté de Mortain xi^e et xii^e siècles', Revue de l'Avranchin, lviii (1981), 11-74, 81-156.

²⁶ He held land in Devonshire, Buckinghamshire, Norfolk and Suffolk.

²⁷ i.e. Robert Bastard (DB Devon 29), Ruald Adobed (id. 35), Alfred Brito (id. 39), Osbern of Sacey (id. 43, holds one fee from Robert Bastard in 29.3). Sacey is in the Avranchin, a few miles east of Sougéal, which was within the seigneurie of Fougères.

²⁸ Golding, 'Robert of Mortain'. On Cornwall see also E.M.R. Ditmas, 'Breton settlers in Cornwall after the Norman Conquest', Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, (1977), 11-39, and P. Flatrès, 'Les Bretons en Galles du xi^e au xiii^e siècle', MSHAB, 36 (1956), 41-6, neither of which is better than lightweight, and I.N. Soulsby, 'The fiefs in England of the Count of Mortain, 1066-1106', unpublished MA thesis, University of Wales, 1974.

²⁹ Alfred Brito, Alfred pincerna, Ansgar Brito, Dodemann of Sougéal; in Cornwall Brien, Blohin, André de Vitré, Wihomarc and Even occur. The non-Cornish group probably all came from the seigneurie of Fougères and probably some of the Cornish group also. André de Vitré was the count's son-in-law; his grandmother was Ralph I of Fougères's aunt.

³⁰ He was probably the Alfred the Marshal who occurs in DB Cornwall 5,1,3 (fol.121c); Alfred was Judhael's predecessor in two Devonshire manors (DB Devon 17.15-6, fol. 108d).

³¹ The descent of this important honour is given in GEC iii (sub Devon) 308-9, 317 as follows:

³² For Gilduin's daughter Havise see PR 31 Henry I, 155, and Cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel, Bibliothèque de la Ville d'Avranches MS 210, fol. 83^{r-v}.

³³ Preuves 470-1; Main's gift of the church of Savigny to the abbey of Marmoutiers was witnessed by William, count of Normandy, William, count of Mortain, Niel of the Cotentin, Main of Fougères, Adelaide, his wife, and Judhael, their son, Richard fitz Turstin [Goz], Roger of Montgomery, Ralph Taisson, Airald the Seneschal, Robert fitz Gerogii, Hugh Brito, Theobald fitz Berner, Tuduald Rufus. This charter is no. 162 in Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie ed. M. Fauroux (Caen, 1961); nos. 160 and 161 (dated c.1050-66, and relating to the Cotentin and the Avranchin) are witnessed by the same persons, except for Adelaide and Judhael.

³⁴ Cf. Douglas, William the Conqueror, 42-56, Bates, Normandy, 103-5, Searle, Predatory Kinship, 100-5, 222-9.

³⁵ This campaign and its date are discussed in Keats-Rohan, 'William I and the Breton contingent', 163-7, and id., 'Le problème de la suzeraineté et la lutte pour le pouvoir: la rivalité bretonne et l'état anglo-normand 1066-1154', MSHAB, 68 (1991), 57-60.

³⁶ Keats-Rohan, 'William I and the Breton contingent', 165; this explanation of Rivallon's conduct was suggested to me by H. Guillotel.

³⁷ Fauroux, no.159, the date of which must be sometime between William's acquisition of Maine at the end of 1063 and the Breton campaign of mid 1064; Rivallon is unlikely to have been in Normandy after the campaign and before his death in 1065.

³⁸ Cf. William of Poitiers, Gesta Guillelmi, ed. R. Foreville (Paris, 1952), 112.

³⁹ C. Bouvet, 'A propos des premiers seigneurs de Châteaubriant aux xi^e et xii^e siècles', Bulletin de la société

archéologique et historique de Nantes et de Loire-Atlantique, 122 (1986), 77-105; Rotuli de Dominabus, ed. J.H. Round (Pipe Roll Society, 1913), 38-9.

⁴⁰ On the archiepiscopal lands of Dol see A. de La Borderie, 'La régairie de Dol et la baronnie de Combour', Bulletin et mémoires de la société archéologique du département d'Ille-et-Vilaine (1862), J. Allenou, Histoire féodale des marais territoire et Eglise de Dol (Paris, 1917), F. Duine, La métropole de Bretagne. Chronique de Dol composée au XI^e siècle et catalogue des dignitaires jusqu'à la Revolution (Paris, 1916).

⁴¹ The Breton historian Pierre Le Baud, Histoire de Bretagne (Paris 1638), 173, claimed on the authority of the now lost Chroniques Annaux that during his exile in Brittany 1090-1 Henry had married Alix, daughter of Geoffrey I Boterel of Lamballe, by whom he was father of Conan III's wife Maud. Le Baud's work cannot be regarded as trustworthy, though his claim to have used now lost sources have made historians reluctant to dismiss his testimony. I am, however, tempted to accept it in this case, since such a liaison (rather than marriage) would account for much in the pattern of the Breton settlement in England after 1100.

⁴² cf. Preuves, 624.

⁴³ On the marriage policies of Robert of Mortain see Keats-Rohan, 'The prosopography of post-Conquest England', case-study no. 4.

⁴⁴ Preuves, 411 (Haimo of Sougéal, in Fougères); Preuves, 425 (Rivallon of Dol-Combour).

⁴⁵ See, for example, the bias of Ord. Vit. vi, 467-8.

⁴⁶ For discussions of William's intentions see Le Patourel, 'The Norman Succession 996-1125', EHR, 86 (1971), 225-50, and id. Norman Empire, 180-5; Douglas, William the Conqueror, 360-1; Searle, 248-9; F. Barlow, William Rufus (1983), 40-50.

⁴⁷ Ord. Vit. vi, 16-7. On the various aspects of the tenurial changes in Henry's reign see C.W. Hollister, 'The Anglo-Norman civil war of 1101', EHR, 88 (1973), 315-33; J.C. Holt, 'Politics and Property in Medieval England', Past and Present, 57 (1972); R.W. Southern, 'The place of Henry I in English history', in Medieval Humanism (Oxford, 1970), 206-33; C.W. Hollister and J.W. Baldwin, 'The rise of administrative kingship: Henry I and Philip Augustus', Amer.Hist.Rev., 83 (1978), 867-905, repr. Monarchy, Magnates, 223-46; W. Kapelle, The Norman Conquest of the North (1979), esp. 228-9, and the review of this by C.W. Hollister and R. Fleming, Speculum, 56 (1981).

⁴⁸ For Guigan Algason see K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 'Guigan Algason, alias Wigan the Marshal and Other Bretons in Orderic Vitalis's Ecclesiastical History', Journal of Medieval History (1992).

⁴⁹ William of Malmesbury, Historia Regum, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls series, 1887-9), ii, 488; Searle, 249; cf. C. Given-Wilson and A. Curteis, The Royal Bastards of Medieval England (1984).

⁵⁰ Ord. Vit. interp. in Will. Jumièges Gesta Guillelmi, 172-3.

⁵¹ J. Green, The Government of England Under Henry I (Cambridge, 1986), 134-93.

⁵² J. Green, 'The sheriffs of William the Conqueror', Anglo-Norman Studies, v (1983), id., Government, 142-6; Barlow, William Rufus, 186-91, 446-8.

⁵³ Green, Government, 136-9.

⁵⁴ Round, 'Origin of the Stewarts', 124-5; Green, Government, 146-51.

⁵⁵ Ord. Vit. iv, 94-6, 120, 220, 250-2 (esp. 250-2 for Henry and the Bretons), v, 288-90.

⁵⁶ cf. Golding, 126-7.

⁵⁷ British Library Additional Charter 28322, printed in English Historical Documents 1042-1189, ed. Douglas

and Greenaway, (2nd edn. 1981), 908.

⁵⁸ Preuves, 455; the fief of the sons of Aimeric is mentioned among the episcopal lands of Dol in 1181 (Preuves, 685), but this refers to the sons of Aimeric maior, Hugh and William, who all three attested a charter of Geoffrey I Boterel in company with Aimeric fitz Geoffrey (Anc.Ev. iv, 297).

⁵⁹ See RRAN, iii, no. 88. William was succeeded by his brother Peter (Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon, ed. J. Stevenson, 2 vols., Rolls series, 1858), ii, 230-2. Geoffrey Boterel occurs in the carta of Wallingford in 1166 (Red Book of the Exchequer, ed. H.Hall, 3 vols., Rolls series, 1896, i, 309).

⁶⁰ PR 7 Henry II, 54. For the Cesson of Rennes see Preuves, 617-8, 681-2; the Esveillard de Cesson mentioned in these charters appears as Esveillard de Saissun, or Seissun, holding terra data in Comberton, Cambs, from 23 Henry II (Pipe Roll, 180).

⁶¹ RRAN, iii, no.88.

⁶² PR 31 Henry I, 46 (Cambs.), 99 (Suffolk), 161 (Cornwall); on p. 155 he is pardoned a murder fine in a Devon Hundred (Ermington), but the roll is damaged at this point and Ruald's name does not survive in the Danegeld accounts.

⁶³ See Anc. Ev., iv, 301-3, 304; Preuves 460.

⁶⁴ Anc. Ev., iv, 300; see nn. 57-8 above.

⁶⁵ He was killed by the Turks at Antioch, 9 February 1098. Ralph of Caen subsequently visited his tomb there; see Ralph of Caen in Historiens des Croisades Occidentaux, iii, 648.

⁶⁶ He was perhaps a natural son of Geoffrey I Boterel. See PR 2 Henry II, 54, 56; PR 3 Henry II, 105, PR 4 Henry II, 171, EYC, iv, 38; Preuves, 632; Missenden Cartulary, ed.J.G. Jenkins, 3 vols, 1938-62, Bucks.Rec.Soc.) iii, nos. 700-3; PR 11 Henry II, 72; EYC iv, 35, 38, 41; PR 4 Richard I, 221; PR 2 John, 91; Preuves, 687.

⁶⁷ For the opposite view see K. Leyser, 'The Anglo-Norman Succession 1120-1125', Anglo-Norman Studies, xiii (1991), 225-242.

⁶⁸ C.W. Hollister, 'The Anglo-Norman Succession Debate of 1126', Journal of Medieval History, 1 (1975), repr. Monarchy, Magnates, 145-70, here 152, suggests that Henry began negotiating Stephen's marriage in 1124.

⁶⁹ C.W. Hollister, 'The Anglo-Norman Succession Debate', in Monarchy, 163, M. Chibnall, The Empress Matilda, (Oxford, 1991), 54.

⁷⁰ For the various revolts of 1138, by Walchelin Maminot, Robert fitz Alfred of Lincoln, Geoffrey Talbot, William Peverel, Ralph Lovel, etc., see Ord. Vit. vi, 520-1.

⁷¹ The motives attributed to Robert earl of Gloucester at this point by the undeniably biased William of Malmesbury are nonetheless important: 'he saw that if he submitted to King Stephen it would be contrary to the oath he had taken to his sister, but understood that if he resisted it would bring no advantage to his sister or nephews and would certainly do enormous harm to himself...Therefore he did homage to the king conditionally, that is to say, for as long as the king maintained his rank unimpaired and kept the agreement', Historia Novella, ed. K.R. Potter (Oxford, 1955), 16-18.

⁷² Richard of Hexham, De Gestis Regis Stephani (ed. R. Howlett, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I, Rolls series, 1886), ii, 146; Gesta Stephani, ed. K.R. Potter (Oxford, 1976), 30-42; for the years 1135-39 see R.H.C. Davis, King Stephen (3rd. edn. 1990), 22-33, D. Crouch, The Beaumont Twins, 29-51, H. Cronne, The Reign of Stephen (1970).

⁷³ An important discussion of the Empress's position during these years is given in Chibnall, The Empress Matilda, 64-87.

⁷⁴ The appearance of Hervé of Léon is something of a mystery. According to Will. Malmesbury, writing about the trial of Bishop Roger in 1139 (Hist.Nov., 31), Hervé of Léon had been invited to England by Henry I, but his haughtiness had prevented his acceptance. Hervé I vicomte of Léon in 1128 was the grandfather of Hervé II (fl.1149-68), who called himself count of Léon. England's Hervé of Léon has to be identified with Hervé II on chronological grounds, though Henry's invitation is likely to have been to Hervé I. Why the invitation was issued is unknown, though it could have been related to the fact that Henry's daughter Maud was duchess of Brittany from 1119, and that Stephen of Penthièvre, lord of Richmond, was domiciled in Brittany. Stephen's wife Havise was possibly a close relative of Hervé I. Such a relationship would have created an affinity between Léon and Henry's family, helping to account also for the fact that Hervé II married a daughter of Stephen of Blois.

⁷⁵ RRAN, ii, no. 843 and appendix 1 no. 51; Crouch, 8-10.

⁷⁶ See R.H.C. Davis, 'What happened in Stephen's reign', History, 49 (1964), 1-12.

⁷⁷ This is the view taken by R.H.C.Davis, 'What happened in Stephen's reign'; for the opposite view see now the discussion by J. Hudson in Anglo-Norman Studies, xii (1990). Davis made an important reply to his critics in App.IV of King Stephen, 3rd, edn, 150-3, observing that: 'The doctrine of seisin ... came to be the sine qua non of the pacification of England.'

⁷⁸ Davis, 'What happened...!', 11.

⁷⁹ J.H. Round, Geoffrey de Mandeville (1892), esp. 93-7.

⁸⁰ Robert II d'Oilly became an Angevin supporter in 1141 according to Gesta Stephani, 116-8. According to the Annals of Oseney (Annales Monastici iv, 23, ed.H.R. Luard, Rolls series 1869), a later source but produced in the d'Oilly's family abbey, Robert had been with the Angevins since 1139: 'Tunc rebellauerunt multi contra regem; scilicet Brianus quoque de Walengeford cum imperatrice agens prouinciam circumquaque uastare cepit. Robertus uero de Oily imperatricem dominam suam in municipio de Oxonia recepit.'; the same source (20) says of Stephen: 'primo anno regni sui castellum Oxonie obsidem in deditionem accepit.'

⁸¹ E.J. King, 'King Stephen and the Anglo-Norman aristocracy', History, 79 (1974), 180-94, here 185-6; cf. R.H.C. Davis, 'Treaty between William earl of Gloucester and Roger earl of Hereford', in A Medieval Miscellany for D.M.Stenton, (Pipe Roll Soc., 1960), 1-24.

⁸² Charters of the Earldom of Hereford 1095-1201, ed. D. Walker (Camden Miscellany XXII, 1964), 1-77; cf. Ancient Charters, ed. J.H. Round, nos. 11-12.

⁸³ See now P. Dalton, 'In neutro latere: The Armed Neutrality of Ranulf II Earl of Chester in King Stephen's Reign', forthcoming in Anglo-Norman Studies, xiv (1992), and id., 'Aiming at the Impossible: Ranulf II Earl of Chester and Lincolnshire in the Reign of King Stephen', Journal of the Chester Archeological Society, 71 (1991), 109-34.

⁸⁴ Or 1154; see G.J. White, 'The end of Stephen's reign', History, 75 (1990), 3-22.

⁸⁵ For a view almost exactly opposite to the one taken here see E. King art.cit., esp. 186, n.33: 'There is no suggestion that Miles, as one of the 'new men' of Henry I, had a natural affinity to his daughter, which her landing enabled him to declare. The growth of the Empress's party, as Round long ago suggested, is to be explained not in terms of sentiment but of political geography.'

⁸⁶ An account of the career of Brien fitzCount is given in K.S.B. Keats-Rohan. 'The devolution of the Honour of Wallingford 1066-1154', Oxoniensia, liv (1989), 311-18.

⁸⁷ There is a tribute to their personal friendship in Gesta Stephani, 134.

⁸⁸ Cf. A.L. Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (Oxford 1951), 139.

⁸⁹ H.W.C. Davis, 'Brien fitzCount and Henry of Blois', EHR, 25

⁹⁰ cf. Gesta Stephani, 134.

⁹¹ Gesta Stephani, 30-2.

⁹² Keats-Rohan. 'The Devolution of the Honour of Wallingford', 318, dates Brien's withdrawal to 1148 and suggests (316) that he might have become a monk of Bec; I owe to Dr. M.Chibnall the much more convincing suggestion that he retired not to Bec but to Reading Abbey.

⁹³ P. Le Baud, Histoire de Bretagne, (Paris, 1638), 179; Archives départementales d'Ille-et-Vilaine, IF 1003 (I owe this reference to Michael Jones).

⁹⁴ La Borderie, Histoire de Bretagne, iii, 92.

⁹⁵ Alan of Dinan occurs in PR 31 Henry I 46, 104, 157, 159, PR 3 Henry II. During the reign of Stephen he is evidenced only in Brittany, where he attested a charter of Alan III of Richmond 1145-6 (EYC iv, no. 27), and gave a charter for Léhon in 1149 (Anc. Ev., iii, 359, Preuves 604).

⁹⁶ Ord. Vit. vi, 468, 532, 542; William of Malmesbury, Historia Novella, para. 469; John of Hexham, in Symonis Monachi Opera Omnia, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1885), ii, 306; Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1979), 268-74.

⁹⁷ Gesta Stephani, 128; John of Hexham, 310-11; RRAN iii, no. 581.

⁹⁸ Preuves, 597.

⁹⁹ Preuves, 596.

¹⁰⁰ For Josce see RRAN iii, nos. 820, 840, and Reading Abbey Cartulary, ed. B.Kemp, ii, nos. 667 and 668; Book of Fees, 106.

¹⁰¹ Dinan remained loyal to Conan II in 1064, and a charter of St-Florent reveals a war between Gilduin II of Dol (d.1137) and Geoffrey of Dinan (Preuves 435-6). Although the family first came to prominence in the reign of Henry I, the fact that the Devonshire manor of Widworthy, later associated with the Dinham family, was held in 1086 from Theobald fitz Berner (DB Devon 36.26, fol. 115d) by one Oliver may indicate a Dinan presence in Devon before 1100. Such a presence was asserted in 1212 when the manor of Nutwell, Devon, then held by the priory of St-Malo-de-Dinan, was claimed as a gift of William I to the ancestors of Geoffrey de Dinan (Fees, 96). Oliver de Dinan occurs on the damaged Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I (p.157). The champion of Henry I against Louis VI at Gisors was probably Alan of Dinan-Bechérel who held much land in England in 1130, in Cambs, Beds, etc. (PR 31 Henry I, 46, 104, 159). Although Alan of Dinan-Bechérel has been claimed as a supporter of Stephen I can find no convincing evidence of this. He had the dubious distinction of being confused with Alan of Richmond-Penthièvre by Orderic Vitalis, but otherwise he is evidenced in Stephen's reign only as a witness to charters of Count Alan given in Brittany. See M. Jones, The Family of Dinan in England in the Middle Ages (Dinan, 1987).

¹⁰² See Davis, King Stephen, 50, 92, 122, 135.

¹⁰³ Gesta Stephani, 116-7 (which erroneously states that Alan returned to Brittany after his release by Ranulf); for Alan and Cornwall see Cartulary of Launceston Priory ed. P. Hull (1987), xviii-ix.

¹⁰⁴ RRAN iii, no. 276.

¹⁰⁵ John of Hexham, 312. On William of Aumale see P. Dalton, 'William Earl of York in Yorkshire in the Reign of Stephen', The Haskins Society Journal, ii (1990), 155-65.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid.*, 315.

¹⁰⁷ See Clay, EYC iv, 89-92.

¹⁰⁸ Gesta Stephani, 116, describes Alan as 'a man of boundless ferocity and craft'; cf. Henry of Huntingdon, 269; in Curia Regis Rolls ix, 142 (4 Henry III), Peter duke of Brittany refers to his wife's ancestor Alan III of Richmond as 'Alain le Sauvage'. An obituary in the Chronicon Britannicum reads: 'Obiit Alanus, Comes in Anglia atque in Britannia strenuissimus, cui mentis erat minoris Britanniae Regiam dignitatem reintegrare, inuenis quidem fuit crudelissimus et praedo; uir autem factus, fuit pater patriae et Ecclesiae uigilantissimus amator'. The same source gives the obituary of his brother Geoffrey II Boterel in 1148: 'Obiit Gaufredus Comes Boterellus incomparabilis miles.' (Preuves, 5).

¹⁰⁹ Gesta Stephani, 116; for Hervé as earl of Wiltshire see Davis, King Stephen, 136-7.

¹¹⁰ Preuves 450; see J. Crispin, The Falaise Roll (1938), App.17, 133-6, which contains numerous errors.

¹¹¹ See GEC vii, app. D, 708-9.

¹¹² RRAN iii, nos. 4, 317, 588, 626, 627, 630; in id. no. 744 Stephen confirmed a gift to Reading Abbey by Mainfelin's son Hamo.

¹¹³ RRAN iii, no. 104.

¹¹⁴ There is nothing to suggest that the appellation nepos Brientii referred to Brien fitzCount. The man in question may have been Brien of Caversfield, a tenant of William of Warenne (DB Buckinghamshire 15.2, fol.148b, Caversfield is in Oxfordshire); he also held from William at Gatehampton (DB Oxfordshire 22.2, fol.157d).

¹¹⁵ Robert d'Oilly may have been with the Empress as early as 1139; see above note 80.

¹¹⁶ Eynsham Cartulary i (ed.H.E. Salter, Oxford Hist.Soc. xlix, 1906), nos. 69, 101, 643; Oseney Charters, (ed.Salter, 6 vols, Ox.Hist.Soc., 1926-36) iv, 158-9.

¹¹⁷ An exact figure for this date must await further analysis. The following table can be compiled from the information in Domesday Book:

¹¹⁸ Gesta Stephani, 228-30.

¹¹⁹ e.g. PR 2 Henry II, 34; PR 3 Henry II, 80; Calendar of Charter Rolls, ii, 38.

¹²⁰ From Vern-sur-Seiches, south of Rennes, Ille-et-Vilaine; see Keats-Rohan, 'William I and the Breton Contingent', 170.

¹²¹ See G.H. White, 'The sisters and nieces of Gunnor, Duchess of Normandy', The Genealogist, n.s. 37 (1921); Searle, 100-105.