King Henry II and the conflict of 1173-74

A study of the many aspects of the conflict of 1173-74

David Moen

Master thesis
Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2018

King Henry II and the conflict of 1173-74

A study

of the many aspects of

the conflict of

1173-74

2018

King Henry II and the conflict of 1173-74. A study of the many aspects of the conflict of 1173-74

David Moen

http://www.duo.uio.no/

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

The conflict of 1173-74 took place during the reign of king Henry II of England. It was a conflict that involved much of what is now commonly referred to by historians as the "Angevin Empire". Involved in the conflict against king Henry II was his eldest son, Henry the Young King, Queen Eleanor and their two younger sons, Richard and Geoffrey. Also involved in the conflict was a large group of barons from both England and France, as well as king William the Lion of Scotland and king Louis VII of France.

This dissertation provides a thorough study of the causes of the conflict between king Henry II and his family members that fought against him. It also compares the conflict of 1173-74 to a range of other conflicts involving king Henry II and other similar conflicts, in order to ascertain what type of term used to describe the conflict is the most suitable. The dissertation will also provide a discussion of several of the greater barons from the conflict, and it gives a small insight into the pollical culture of twelfth-century Northern France. The historical rivalry between king Henry II and king Louis VII is also analysed and discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor Hans Jacob Orning for guiding me through this project by giving me helpful feedback and good advice. Even with projects of his own he still had the patience to help a student who at times was quite slow and forgetful. I would also like to thank John Hudson who provided me with a much-needed understanding of twelfth century historical writing, and who in a short time read and corrected many of my drafts. I also have to thank Stephen White for sharing with me some of his knowledge of Jordan Fantosme.

The friends I have made during these two years, both in Oslo and in St. Andrews also deserves mentioning. You have provided me with much help and many fantastic moments. I am also in much debt to my dear partner Victoria Hansen for her amazing support and for reading through and commenting on my English. Finally, I would like to thank my grandfather Torbjørn Moen for providing my life with such love, kindness and knowledge that only a man who has lived life to the fullest could provide. It is to you that I dedicate this dissertation, knowing that you will always be remembered.

Blindern, May 2018

David Moen

Abbreviations

Chronica = Howden, Roger of. *The Annals of Roger De Hoveden: Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D 732 to A.D 1201.* Translated by Henry Thomas Riley.

Chronicle = Fantosme, Jordan. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle.* Translated by R. C. Johnston.

Historia = Newburgh, William of. *The History of English Affairs : Book 2.* Translated by P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy

Content

1 Introduction

In the spring of 1173, king Henry II of England experienced the biggest crisis of his reign. A large coalition of both kings, counts, earls and other barons had proclaimed their support for Henry's eldest son, Henry the Young King, in his bid to replace his father as ruler over a vast assembly of land, sometimes referred to as the "Angevin Empire". First among the supporters of king Henry II's son, the Young King, were his mother, Eleanor, queen of England and duchess of Aquitaine. Queen Eleanor had in her custody two of the Young King's younger brothers, the fifteen-year-old Richard, duke of Aquitaine, and the fourteen-year-old Geoffrey, future duke of Brittany. The Young King also had the strong support of his father-in-law, king Louis VII of France, king Henry II's long-time rival, and William the Lion, king of the Scots. Furthermore, elements of the aristocracy in England, Normandy, Anjou, Brittany and Aquitaine also gave their support to the Young King. King Henry II was suddenly at war with his own family, several of his own vassals, and the kings of France and Scotland.

The conflict of 1173-74 was not the first time an English king had to use military force a member of his own family. King William I of England had several conflicts with his eldest son, Robert Curthouse, yet Curthouse never enjoyed the same support as the Young King, both from his family and outside it, which ensured that William never faced the prospect of having large parts of his dominions up in arms against him. The conflict of 1173-74 was not the first conflict where the barons of England supported two different persons in a conflict over who should be king of England. The latest example of this was a conflict king Henry II and his parents had fought against king Stephen of England, a conflict that lasted from 1138 to 1153. That conflict had not involved the French king, and the counts of Flanders and Blois to such an extent as the conflict of 1173-74. In 1168, king Henry II faced rebellions in both Brittany and Aquitaine, with the support of king Louis VII, who supported the rebels by attacking king Henry's lands.

The conflict of 1173-74 shared aspects from all of these conflicts and more, which motivates the question of what this conflict was really about. Was this a conflict where the Young King wanted to break free from his father's control and take control of his patrimony at an early age, with the help of so many loyal friends and supporters? Or was this a conflict where the barons of king Henry II sought to create disunity within the king's family, and use the Young King as a way of changing the governance of the kingdom to one more suitable to their

ambitions? Could the conflict of 1173-74 have been caused by the French king Louis VII in his attempt to break up king Henry II's control over his "Angevin Empire"?

1.1 Conflict Typology

In this dissertation I will be using several different terms of conflict, and as such it is necessary for the reader to be familiar with my understanding of these terms. When I make use of the term **family conflict**, I use it to describe a conflict, military or otherwise, were the main participants are members of the same core family. Their grievances would be with each other, and not with anyone outside the family. For example, in the conflict of 1173-74, the family conflict involves the King, his wife, and his three eldest sons. A conflict involving a royal family in medieval Europe certainly also involved outsiders, as the king, the queen and his other family members were major landholders, and in medieval Europe that meant that a large number of barons would be tied to them through bonds of loyalty. The vassals of the king would have to choose whether to support the king, or the family members opposing him. It may also involve persons from outside the kingdom, who decided to support one or the other side of the conflict, for example a neighbouring king, duke or count. With prominent and powerful characters, it is more difficult to determine if the conflict remains one concerning the family, or if it has evolved into something else. A family conflict should therefore be one where the leading forces on both sides are related, and they, or other members of the family continue to be the leading force till the end of the conflict. If for example the family member opposing the king appears as a mere figurehead, and there are others who are really in control, then the conflict should no longer be seen as a family conflict.

The term **rebellion** or **revolt**, in this case they will be treated as synonyms, is used to describe a person or groups violent protestation of the king's authority. As the conflicts discussed in this dissertation were exclusively those between the barons or the higher aristocracy, the term rebellion means that of a baronial rebellion. One or several barons rebelling formed one of the more typical forms to seek redress of grievances or to express political discontent in a monarchical government in the middle-ages. A large portion of warfare waged in England, Normandy and the other Angevin dominions in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, arose from

this type of armed opposition to the crown.[1] In the period this dissertation is concerned with, the eleventh and twelfth centuries, a rebellion was usually concerned with the personal concerns of an individual noble, dynastic issues, or quarrels between kings and sons.[2]

The term **war** is here used to describe a violent conflict across two perceived "borders", whether they be between two lower barons harassing each other's holdings, or between counts, dukes or kings. The obvious difference between rebellion and war, is that a rebellion takes place inside a principality and the vassals wage war against its ruler, while a war goes across the borders and is waged between the rulers of principalities. A rebellion is thus an internal conflict, while war is an external conflict. Of course, there are elements of external and internal aspects in both war and rebellion, but the extent of the external or internal aspect dictate whether the conflict should be considered a rebellion or war.[3]

1.2 Historiography

A lot of research has been done on the subject of Henry II and his reign in England and Normandy in the twelfth-century. A large contribution in the study of Henry II and his reign which the modern historians still owes a lot to, came from the historian William Stubbs, who, in addition to writing the *Constitutional history of England*, edited ten volumes of chronicles from Henry's reign, with long introductions where the background of the authors of the chronicles were explored, and the historical events that the chronicles described.[4] Kate Norgate provided a longer narrative on the Angevin rule of England, based on Stubbs work.[5] J.E.A. Joliffe wrote a lengthy, but much disputed biography on Henry II, with its many miscitations of its sources, it is still a work that provides useful insights into Henry and his government.[6] The most thorough biography of Henry II from the modern day was written by

[1] Matthew Strickland, "Against the Lord's Anointed: Aspects of Warfare and Baronial Rebellion in England and Normandy 1075 - 1265," in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (1994), 56.
[2] Claire Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England* (2003), 10.
[3] Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought (1996), 230-40.
[4] William Stubbs, *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages : 49 1 : Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis : The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I A.D. 1169-1192 ; Known Commonly under the Name of Benedict of Peterborough*, vol. 49 1 (1867).; *The Constitutional History of England : In Its Origin and Development*, Clarendon Press Series (1874).
[5] Kate Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings* (1887).
[6] John Edward Austin Joliffe, *Angevin Kingship* (1955).

W.L. Warren, and although it was published in 1973, it is still the most recent and most comprehensive work on Henry II's life.[7] A much older work by R.W. Eyton, published in 1878, attempts to create an itinerary for Henry II.[8] Nicholas Vincent has published more up to date research on the court of Henry II.[9] In a similar fashion to Warren, Matthew Strickland has recently published a biography on Henry the Young King.[10]

When it comes to the aristocracy in England, Judith Green has published a book on this subject along with articles on the aristocratic families on the frontier in both Normandy and Northern-England.[11] Daniel Power has written a more substantial book on the subject concerning the frontier society in Normandy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[12] For the aristocracy in Brittany, Judith A. Everard has written a book on Brittany under the Angevins, which gives a thorough account of Brittany and its affairs from 1066 up until its secession from England in 1203.[13] Jane Martindale gives good insight into the life of Eleanor of Aquitaine, and the Poitevin nobility, with older research on the families around Poitou done by Sidney Painter.[14] All of these works on Henry II's continental territories are based more heavily on French archival sources.[15] For the Norman aristocracy, in addition to Judith Green, David Crouch has written several books, both about the aristocracy as a whole from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, and books specifically on the aristocracy during Stephen and Henry II's reign.[16]

---

[7] W. L. Warren, *Henry II* (1973).
[8] Robert William Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of King Henry II: Instancing Also the Chief Agents and Adversaries of the King in His Government, Diplomacy, and Strategy* (1878).
[9] Nicholas Vincent, "The Court of Henry II," in *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (2007).
[10] Matthew Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183* (2016).; Nicholas Vincent, "Introduction: Henry II and the Historians," in *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (2007), 10-17.
[11] Judith A. Green, *The Aristocracy of Norman England* (1997).; "Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier," in *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (1990).; "Lords of the Norman Vexin," in *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. John Gillingham and J. C. Holt (1984).
[12] Daniel Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries*, vol. 62, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. 4th Series (2004).
[13] Judith Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins : Province and Empire, 1158-1203*, vol. 48ibid. (2001).
[14] Jane Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power : Aquitaine and France, 9th-12th Centuries*, vol. CS488, Collected Studies Series (1997).; Sidney Painter, "Castellans of the Plain of Poitou in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Speculum* 31, no. 2 (1956).For research on the Lusignans, see "The Houses of Lusignan and Chatellerault 1150-1250," *Speculum* 30, no. 3 (1955). & "The Lords of Lusignan in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Speculum* 32, no. 1 (1957).
[15] Vincent, "Introduction: Henry II and the Historians," 20-21.
[16] David Crouch, *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300* (1992).; *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300* (2005).; *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (2000).; *The Beaumont Twins : The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century* (1986).

The first French historian to have any significance on the study of Henry II was Léopold Delisle, who edited more than 800 of Henry II's charters, and whose work was continued by his pupil Élie Berger, resulting in three further volumes that was published in the years between 1916 and 1927. The principal trends in metropolitan French history, both political, constitutional and social history, tended to avoid Plantagenet history, and thus only those few scholars who were willing to diverge from this trend, engaged in the study of Henry II and his successors. The two French works that stands out in the early-to-mid twentieth century on Henry II are Raymond Foreville's *L'Église et la Royauté en Angleterre sous Henri II Plantagenet*, published in 1943, and Jacques Boussard's *Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt*, published in 1956, both written with intense political overtones, and at a time when French researchers were denied access to English archives.[17] In the later part of the twentieth century French historians began to involve themselves more in the research on Plantagenet history with perhaps Martin Aurell standing out as the leading authority on Henry II, and the English historians began to more heavily take use of French archival sources.[18]

Research on the conflict of 1173-74 appears most often as part of bigger studies on king Henry II and his reign. William Stubbs gives the conflict some attention in his *Constitutional History*, but it is a rather short and inaccurate description of the conflict. Kate Norgate and James H. Ramsay give more complete accounts of the conflict, yet both are part of a wider study of the reigns of Henry II and his successors Richard I and John, and their accounts on the conflicts offers little more than the sources themselves.[19] Warren too, gives a detailed account of the conflict, but he is also short on the *how* and *why* of the conflict, and the second half of his book is only concerned with England, offering little but possible motives for the Young King's supporters in England.[20] The most thorough account of the conflict to date is to be found in Matthew Strickland's biography on the Young King, where a longer discussion on the Young King's motives, and a more in-depth description of the Young King's

[17] Jacques Boussard, "Le Gouvernement D'henri Ii Plantegenet" (Paillart, 1956).; Raymonde Foreville, *L'eglise Et La Royaute En Angleterre Sous Henri Ii Plantagenet : (1154-1189)* (1943).
[18] Aurell's primary work on Henry II being Martin Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire: 1154-1224*, trans. David Crouch (2007)., and on the conflict of 1173-74 "Political Culture and Medieval Historiography: The Revolt against King Henry II, 1173–1174," *History* 102, no. 353 (2017).; Vincent, "Introduction: Henry II and the Historians," 13-21.
[19] Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*.; James H. Ramsay, *The Angevin Empire: Or the Three Reigns of Henry II, Richard I, and John (A.D. 1154-1216)* (1903).
[20] Warren, *Henry II*.

supporters. John Gillingham reflects upon the conflict from the perspective of Richard, and in extension, Eleanor in his biography on Richard I.[21]

On the subject of how the historians have perceived the conflict, the view has changed since Stubbs, who viewed both the conflict of 1173-74, and Henry's other conflicts in the 1170's and 1180's, as a 'feudal reaction' to king Henry's reforms, and stirred up by Louis. Concentrating on the Norman landholders, and their hatred of "Henry as the Count of Anjou".[22] Kate Norgate continued to build on Stubbs' views, but with a somewhat more continental view, and the thought of the conflict as a 'feudal reaction' is less apparent than with Stubbs, as Norgate gives some attention to those English barons who remained loyal to king Henry. The conflict is nevertheless dealt with as a rebellion, where the dealings of the barons are given more attention than that of the French king.[23] Thomas M. Jones also discusses the conflict of 1173-74, where he also refers to the conflict as a revolt. With Warren's biography on Henry, published later in the same year as Jones' article, we see a shift from the perception that the conflict was a rebellion, to the more open and inclusive term "war". He describes the conflict as a result of a conspiracy between the Young King, his mother, the French King and some leading magnates.[24] Warrens book thus marks a change in the study on the conflict of 1173-74, as it offers a more optional view on how the conflict can be seen. It is a view which has been adopted by more modern historians such as Matthew Strickland, who in his biography on Henry the Young King places himself in Warren's camp. This view is nevertheless rejected by others, such as Robert Bartlett, who places the conflict of 1173-74 in one of his three types of rebellion, when dealing with the subject of rebellion in Angevin England. To him, the conflict of 1173-74 was a result of a general movement among the aristocracy who "opposed the king on behalf of a member of the ruling dynasty."[25]

The view on what type of conflict this really was is then split into two camps, with Strickland and Bartlett two of the more modern examples on how differently the conflict can be seen. Strickland, like Warren before him, avoids the term rebellion in favour of the broader term war, which allows for the idea that this conflict was not solely based on tensions inside the

[21] John Gillingham, *Richard I* (1999).
[22] Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England : In Its Origin and Development*, 514-15.
[23] Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, 134-47.
[24] Warren, *Henry II*.: 118-119; Thomas M. Jones, "The Generation Gap of 1173-74: The War between the Two Henrys," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 5, no. 1 (1973).
[25] Robert Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225* (2000), 54.; for Strickland's take on the conflict, see Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 118-205.

"Angevin Empire". It is also worth adding that Strickland and Warren's work were biographies on Henry and his son, so the term "war" may merely have been used because they believed that for Henry and the Young King this was not a rebellion, but a war. Bartlett, like Stubbs before him, uses the term rebellion in their books on England, with a focus on the aristocracy there. Their view is supported by Power's book on the Norman Frontier, where he describes the conflict as a revolt, and Gillingham in his biography on Richard I, who also refers to the conflict as a revolt.[26] Outside the biographies and studies of the aristocracy in England and Normandy, David Carpenter in his study of the relationship between the rulers of England and its neighbours equally supports the view that the conflict was a rebellion.[27] Martin Aurell, in an article published as late as 2017, also discusses the conflict of 1173-74 as a revolt, in an article dealing with the source material for the conflict.[28]

The research done on the conflict reveals a rigidness and a lack of discussion around the terminology involved in describing the conflict. With aspects that points to the conflict being more than just a rebellion, it is peculiar that it has not been discussed by the many historians who have touched upon the subject. It is with this in mind that I hope that this dissertation can inspire a debate on the subject.

1.3 The Sources

In my dissertation, I will rely on several contemporary, or close to contemporary sources describing the events during the reign of King Henry II of England, and especially the events of 1173-1174. These are some of the most commonly used sources among historians on Henry II, and they all give attention to the conflict of 1173-74. My relatively low knowledge of Latin prevents me from using the Latin editions for anything more than cross-checking certain words, and the quotations used in the dissertation. I have therefore relied on four chroniclers whose works have been translated. This is also the reason why chroniclers such as Ralph Diceto and Gervase of Canterbury have not been used, although they also wrote about the conflict of 1173-74.

[26] Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries*, 62, 398-99.; Gillingham, *Richard I*, 43.
[27] David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain, 1066-1284* (2003), 223.
[28] Aurell, "Political Culture and Medieval Historiography: The Revolt against King Henry II, 1173–1174."

The authors of these sources can be divided into two groups, as Antonia Gransden does. The first group, the seculars, were all clergymen, who unlike the canons and monks, lacked a concentrated devotion to a particular church, monastery or locale. Roger of Howden and Jordan Fantosme are usually considered as "secular writers", while William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigny were more religious writers, with William of Newburgh belonging to the priory of Newburgh and Robert de Torigny was the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel.[29]

The most contemporary of the sources used in this dissertation is the one written by Jordan Fantosme. Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle was written at the end of 1174, or in 1175, shortly after the end of the conflict of 1173-1174, and it is solely concerned with the conflict. It was originally written in vernacular French, but has been translated to English, by Francisque Michel in 1840, and later by R.C. Johnston in 1981. The Johnston translation is the one being used in this dissertation, as it is acknowledged as a better one than the older translation from Michel.

Fantosme's Chronicle is mostly focused with the Scottish invasion of England, but he records some of the events on the continent during the conflict. His work is based mostly on eyewitness-accounts and his own imagination.[30] Jordan Fantosme's work is a mixture of historical data and literature, a non-fictional narrative poem. With this close mixture of history and literature, it is a difficult source to use, because this is the sort of text where history and literature can least be separated. It is still a very valuable source, as it is very accurate, despite the author selecting and organizing the chain of events after his own perceptions.[31] The chronicle is an accurate description of king William of Scotland's two invasions of England in 1173 and 1174, with an account of the castles he besieged, the defenders of these castles and the outcome of the sieges. Fantosme provides a good overview over the English barons in support of Henry the Young King, and those allied with king William of Scotland, as well as the barons who remained loyal to Henry II and fought against the invaders. Fantosme's chronicle has its value in other ways as well. Mainly the fact that Fantosme is not overly favourable to Henry II, and not too critical of Louis VII. It provides a more balanced view, and the work was intended to create a conciliatory mood between the

[29] John D. Hosler, "The "Golden Age of Historiography": Records and Writers in the Reign of Henry II," *History Compass* 12, no. 5 (2014): 399.; Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England : 1 : C. 550 to C. 1307*, vol. 1 (1974), 219.
[30] Jordan Fantosme, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, trans. R. C. Johnston (1981), xxii.
[31] Anthony Lodge, "Literature and History in the Chronicle of Jordan Fantosme," *French Studies* 44, no. 3 (1990): 257-59.

different sides in the conflict. This also makes Fantosme a more trustworthy author, as he is not suspect of making up events that would put one of the actors in an unfavourable light.

Roger of Howden provides two pieces of work for the reign of Henry II. The first, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, records events from the year 1169 to 1192, and it appears to have been written contemporary with the events. The second work, the *Chronica*, covers the events from the death of Bede to 1201. For the events up to 1148, it borrows from well-known sources, and from 1148 to 1169, it only uses one source, the same used by the Melrose Abbey Chronicle. From 1169 to 1192, it is a copy of the first work, but with some alterations. And from 1192 to 1201, it is a contemporary record of events. The text is in Latin, and is written by someone who was close to the court, with copies of official documents. The *Chronica* was written in the period 1192 to 1201, and the alterations to the *Gesta* was made in the same period. Both texts are in annals form, but Howden often supports events with copies of letters, especially during the Becket controversy. Howden therefore makes little mention of Eleanor's role in the conflict of 1173-1174, for example, as she was a prominent person at court during Richard's reign.[32] Roger of Howden was a secular clerk and a royal chaplain, and he was both interested and involved in the business of the king's government up until his death. Out of all the medieval historians, Roger of Howden was probably the most widely travelled of them all. He went on the third crusade in 1190, and travelled as an envoy through Britain and most of western Europe and the Mediterranean, including several trips to Rome.[33]

Howden's works are generally considered the most reliable and well informed of the works on English history produced during the twelfth century, but with a lack of individuality with few opinions, and according to Frank Barlow, his work had little value more than that of inflated annals.[34] Barlow is in the minority with his rather low regard of Howden, who is very useful for a study on the reigns of Henry II and his successor Richard I. For the conflict of 1173-74, Howden provides a complete account of the major events in England, Normandy, Brittany, Anjou and Maine. He provides a full list of king Henry's prisoners after the surrender at Dol in 1173, an account of the failed peace conference late in 1173, and a copy of

[32] Gransden, *Historical Writing in England : 1 : C. 550 to C. 1307*, 1, 219-26.
[33] Doris M. Stenton, "Roger of Howden and Benedict," *The English Historical Review* 68, no. 269 (1953).; John Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century : Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values* (2000), 69-92.; "Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh," in *The Haskins Society Journal 12*, ed. Stephen Morillo, 2002. Studies in Medieval History (2003).
[34] Frank Barlow, "Roger of Howden," *The English Historical Review* 65, no. 256 (1950).

the peace agreement in 1174.[35] Howden's background as a clerk with close ties to the government of Henry II and Richard I, which shows in his works, which are clearly pro-British, and anti-French.

William of Newburgh is another source who covers the reign of Henry II, and gives attention to the 1173-1174 conflict. He wrote his *Historia Rerum Anglicarum* from 1196 to his death in 1198. William of Newburgh was a canon in Newburgh Priory, and, according to himself, that is where he was brought up. Newburgh priory was an Augustinian house, founded by Roger de Mowbray in the 1140's. Unlike Howden, who was a widely travelled man, there is no evidence that Newburgh ever left North-East England.[36]Although Newburgh implements Howden's writings in his own work, he also adds a fair bit of original material on Northern-England.[37] Newburgh offers his own critical judgement on several occasions, which gives the reader a taste on how a religious historian viewed the events he wrote in Latin, and the best and most up to date translation of the first two volumes of "The history of English Affairs" has been done by P.G. Walsh and M.J. Kennedy, and it is this translation that is used here.[38]

Robert of Torigny was a monk from Torigni elected as abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel in 1154, and through this post he enjoyed friendly terms with Henry II. His Chronicle was started in 1150, and is written fairly contemporary with the events up until Torigny's death in 1186. Henry II was a benefactor of the abbey, and Torigny does not criticise the king much. His account of the Becket affair is, for example, glossed over. He does not describe Henry's quarrels with his sons in too great details, but he offers great insight into King Henry's affairs on the continent, and he is both factual and accurate.[39] The translation of Torigny is a rather old one, by Joseph Stevenson, who also translated a wealth of other medieval texts from Latin to English.[40]

[35] Gillingham, "Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh."
[36] "Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh."
[37] Hosler, "The "Golden Age of Historiography": Records and Writers in the Reign of Henry II," 400.; Gillingham, "Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh," 20-25.
[38] Gransden, *Historical Writing in England : 1 : C. 550 to C. 1307*, 1, 263-68.
[39] *Historical Writing in England : 1 : C. 550 to C. 1307*, 1, 261-63.
[40] Robert de Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," in *The Church Historians of England Vol. 4 Part Ii., Containing the History of William of Newburgh, the Chronicles of Robert De Monte; Translated from the Original Latin*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (1858).

1.4 The Comparative Method

The aim for this dissertation is to do an analysis of the conflict of 1173-74, and to determine whether this conflict was a normality in the myriad of conflicts in twelfth-century England and France, or if the conflict of 1173-74 was something out of the ordinary. To achieve this, it will be necessary to perform a study of the major participants in the conflict through how they are being presented by the sources in use, and to study the possible motivations these characters had for taking the choices they did during the conflict. There is of course no way to completely determine these motivations, but by looking at how the chronicler described this character, and keeping in mind that the chronicler had his own agenda when writing, and then, if possible, looking at this character's past actions, it will give some picture of what this person this was. A study of the character's relationship with king Henry II will also be necessary to give a fuller picture of the motivating factors behind their actions.

The analysis of the major characters involved in the conflict, and their motives, will not only give us a better insight into the character of the conflict, but will also allow us to discuss whether the characters were behaving outside the norm of twelfth-century medieval society. This will be done by comparing the characters actions with what we today perceive as the norms in the political culture of twelfth-century Western-Europe, how the sources commented on the actions of the characters, whenever they made such comments, and lastly by comparing the actions by the characters in the conflict of 1173-74 with earlier conflicts.

The main method used in this dissertation when trying to explain or reach conclusions will be a comparative method. A comparative method can be used for different purposes. For example, you can use comparison to test how valid a theory is by comparing it with several parallel phenomena. Say for example that you have a theory on how peasant-revolutions begin. Then you will have to try this theory on several revolutions, the French revolution in 1789, the Russian revolution in 1917, and the Chinese revolution in 1911. The achievement here will then be to either prove that the theory is a good one and explains much, or that the theory is weak, leaving us to create new theories in order to explain such phenomena.[41]

The direct opposite way of using a comparative method is by seeking knowledge or an explanation, rather than showing that an explanation is good. This is done by comparing the

[41] Knut Kjeldstadli, *Fortida Er Ikke Hva Den En Gang Var* (1992), 255-56.

subject of our study, in this case the conflict of 1173-74, with other conflicts of the same character, or in the same time period or with the same participants. The goal here is then to discover the individuality of the subject. Although sometimes the comparative study ends when you discover this individuality, the study can also be taken a step further with this method by asking why the conflict is different in important areas. This takes us over into using comparative method as a mean to test causal explanations.[42]

In this dissertation, I intend to use the second of these forms for comparative method. Without creating or using an already established theory, I will compare the conflict of 1173-74 with a series of other conflicts. The comparisons will not always follow the same pattern, sometimes due to a lack in source material. Some conflicts are covered more thoroughly both in the primary sources used in this dissertation and in available secondary literature. When comparing the conflict of 1173-74 with other conflicts, I will look at the main persons involved, as described by the primary sources, and compare their position and status, their actions and the repercussions of these actions. A comparison between the geographical scope of the conflicts will also be done. As well as a comparison with the political situation in the areas that the conflicts occurred.

1.5 A Summary of the Conflict of 1173-74

To familiarise the reader with the conflict that forms the basis of this dissertation, I have included a short summary of the conflict. The relevant events will be discussed more in detail throughout the dissertation, but I think it will be helpful if the reader is familiar with the chain of events in the conflict.

The breach between king Henry II of England and his eldest son, Henry the Young King, came at a conference at Limoges in the Limousin in Aquitaine.[43] At Limoges king Henry II and his son met with the king of Aragon-Barcelona, the count of Toulouse and the count of Maurienne, where king Henry created peace between all of them. First of all, by agreeing on a betrothal between his youngest son, John, and the daughter of the count of Maurienne, with the intention that John were to inherit much of the Count's land in the event of his death. Then the count of Toulouse, Raymond de St. Giles, paid homage to king Henry, his son,

[42] *Fortida Er Ikke Hva Den En Gang Var*, 256.
[43] For a map of king Henry's domains in 1173, and for the location of Limoges, see Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 76.

Henry the Young King, and king Henry's second son, Richard, the future duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitou.[44]

Differences between king Henry and his son, the Young King, came to a braking point at Limoges when king Henry promised that John would receive three castles in Anjou as part of the betrothal pact with the count of Maurienne. King Henry had by then rejected a request from the Young king to be given one of his father's principalities to rule. The Young King, furious at how he was being treated by his father, waited until they had reached the castle of Chinon in Anjou before he fled to the court of his father-in-law, king Louis VII of France.[45]

King Louis summoned a great council, where great magnates such as count Philip of Flanders, his brother, count Matthew of Boulogne and the count of Blois, to name only the greatest of the barons gathered there. Here the Young King made many grants of land to those who supported him and they in turn swore that they would help him to expel his father from the kingdom. The Young King then made an oath to make no peace with his father without their approval.[46]

After Easter in the beginning of April, in 1173, king Henry's Angevin "Empire" erupted into warfare. The counts of Flanders and Boulogne, accompanied by the Young King, invaded the north-eastern border of Normandy, attacking the castle of Aumale, whose count quickly surrendered, followed by the counts of Eu and Evreux. The Flemish army moved on to besiege Drincourt, where the count of Boulogne was killed by an arrow, but the castle surrendered. The French King Louis waited until June before he began his attack on southern Normandy, where he laid siege to Verneuil.[47] King Henry captured the castle of Breteuil, which had been abandoned by its lord, earl Robert III of Leicester. From Breteuil, king Henry marched to support Verneuil, forcing king Louis to abandon the siege, managing only to burn

[44] Roger of Howden, *The Annals of Roger De Hoveden: Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D 732 to A.D 1201*, trans. Henry Thomas Riley, vol. 1 (1853), 366.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.
[45] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 367.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.; William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs : Book 2*, trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy, vol. Book 2, Aris & Phillips Classical Texts (2007), 117.; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 5.
[46] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 367.
[47] For a map of Normandy and its borders, see Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries*, 62, xix-xxiii.

parts of the town.[48] King Henry then quickly secured this part of the frontier by capturing the castle of Damville before returning to Rouen.[49]

In Brittany, the baron Ralph de Fougères and earl Hugh of Chester had rebuilt the castle of Fougères, and taken the castles of Tilleul, Combour and Dol. King Henry sent a force of mercenaries called brabancons, accompanied by a Norman army led by the constable of Normandy, William du Hommet, to counter the aggression of Fougères and Chester, and the two armies battled outside Dol. The Brabancons were victorious, and Ralph de Fougères and earl Hugh of Chester sought refuge inside the tower of Dol. When news of the battle reached king Henry at Rouen, he quickly marched from Rouen to Dol and besieged the tower. Seeing that the king had arrived with an army and siege engines, Ralph de Fougères and Hugh of Chester quickly surrendered.[50]

The king of the Scots, king William the Lion, invaded Northumbria, but his army consisted of mostly light infantry, lacking any siege engines, which made the situation difficult for king William when the castellans of both Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Carlisle refused to surrender. When an army led by king Henry's justiciar, Richard de Lucy, and his constable, Humphrey de Bohun, king William decided to retreat into Scotland, to the castle of Roxburgh. The royalist army had only time to burn the Scottish part of Lothian before they were informed that earl Robert had landed in England and had joined forces with another rebellious earl, Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk. Taking advantage of this information, Richard de Lucy was able to negotiate a truce with king William of Scotland, as king William was still unaware of Leicester's presence in England.[51]

The earl of Leicester left earl Hugh Bigod at Framlingham, intent on relieving his own castle of Leicester. Humphrey de Bohun had quickly travelled south, where he met up with the earls of Cornwall, Gloucester and Arundel, who had assembled a small force of men. When their scouts spotted Leicester and his army, they surprised them at Bury St. Edmunds. The earl of Leicester, though he had the larger force, quickly lost the battle, and was captured.[52]

---

[48] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 370.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 123-25.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 780-81.
[49] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 371.
[50] *Chronica*, 1, 371-73.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 781-83.; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 15-19.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 125-27.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 168-70.
[51] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 45-63.; Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 374-75.
[52] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 73-79.; Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 375.

A truce was agreed upon between king Henry and king Louis until Easter 1174, on whence the fighting resumed. King William of Scotland invaded yet again Northumbria, allied with a powerful Yorkshire baron, Roger de Mowbray. The renewed invasion proved more successful, with king William capturing several smaller castles, while besieging Carlisle. Several of the northern barons, among them the sheriff of York, Robert de Stuteville, William de Vesci and Ranulph de Glanville, collected a force large enough to force king William to retreat, and instead he laid siege to Alnwick castle, while sending most of his army to loot and pillage the surrounding areas. When the barons learned that king William was besieging Alnwick with just a small force, they gathered a small force of cavalry and under the cover of fog, they were able to take king William by surprise and capture him.[53]

While all this took place, the Young King and the count of Flanders had been gathering a large army, with the intention of invading England. But due to strong winds they were prevented from embarking. King Henry, having heard of their plans to invade, quickly travelled through Normandy, and risking the strong winds, landed at Southampton. On the day after his landing, king William of Scotland was captured. With his capture, and the appearance of king Henry in England, the warfare quickly ended, and the barons who had supported the Young King surrendered.[54]

While king Henry had travelled to England, king Louis had abandoned all caution and marched his army to besiege Rouen, the capital of Normandy, summoning the Young King and the count of Flanders to join him there with their army. The siege dragged on however, and king Henry was able to conclude his affairs in England, and cross the channel and land in Normandy, only bringing with him his brabancons and a force of Welshmen. When he arrived at Rouen, he sent his Welshmen into the woods near the city, from where they raided the supplies being sent to king Louis army. Running short of supplies, and conscious of king Henry and his army having reinforced Rouen, king Louis began negotiation for peace, while retreating with his army.[55]

The peace negotiations were hindered by the fact that Richard, king Henry's second son, was still fighting against his father in Poitou, aided by barons Queen Eleanor, king Henry's wife,

[53] *Chronica*, 1, 379-82.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 133-39.
[54] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 380-83.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 143-51.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 784-85.
[55] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 383-85.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 785.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 153.

had rallied to her son's cause. King Henry and king Louis agreed on a truce, and that Richard would receive no help from king Louis or the Young King. On his father's approach, Richard fled from castle to castle, until he was informed that his brother and king Louis had abandoned him. Realising he was abandoned, he went to his father and begged for his forgiveness. A peace conference was thus held at the end of October 1174, between Tours and Amboise. The count of Flanders and king Louis gave up the castles they had conquered in Normandy, and king Henry was reconciled with his sons.[56]

1.6 Structure

The dissertation will be composed of an introductory chapter, the main part consisting of three chapters, and a short conclusive chapter at the end. The introductory chapter will include a discussion of the sources used in the dissertation, as well as a summary of the research done on the subject of Henry II and the conflict of 1173-74. A short summary of the conflict will also be included in the introductory chapter, as a way of making the reader familiar with the main subject of this dissertation.

The first chapter of the main part of the dissertation will be a study of the nuclear family of the king of England in 1173, Henry II. The relationship between Henry II and his family members will be analysed and discussed, as well as an analysis of the motives of Henry II's family members. A comparison with another conflict with a strikingly similar family situation will also be included in the chapter.

The second chapter will be an analysis of Henry II's relationship with the barons in the principalities under his control, and also analyses of the most important of these barons that were involved in the conflict. Some of Henry II's earlier conflicts with these barons will be compared to the conflict of 1173-74, with the dual purpose of discovering possible motivations for the barons in question, as well as highlighting similarities and dissimilarities.

The third chapter, and the final chapter of the main part of this dissertation will be an analysis of the role of the external participants, mainly the kings of Scotland and France. An analysis of their motives and their relationship with Henry II and his son will be included, as well

[56] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 385-88.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 785-86.

comparisons of the conflict of 1173-74 with some of the major conflicts that involved these actors.

2 Family Conflict

The conflict of 1173-74 began over a dispute between king Henry II and his son, the Young King at a conference in Limoges. The dispute soon evolved into a complete breach in their relationship, as the Young King fled from his father's company to the court of his father-in-law, king Louis VII of France. From the court of his father-in-law, the Young King was able to create a large coalition with the purpose of usurping his father's place as the head of the Angevin domains. The Young King was supported in this conflict by two of his younger brothers, Richard and Geoffrey, as well as his mother, Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine, who were responsible for sending Richard and Geoffrey to the Young King, as well as recruiting several of the Aquitanian barons to the Young King's cause. Henry II was in turn supported by other members of his family, his uncle, Reginald, earl of Cornwall, his nephew, William, earl of Gloucester, and his bastard-son, Geoffrey.

2.1 The Royal Family

At the head of the family was the king, Henry II. He was the grandson of King Henry I. His father was Geoffrey Plantagenet, Count of Anjou, and his mother was Mathilda, the daughter of Henry I, and the widow of Henry V, the Holy Roman Emperor. After his father's death in 1151, Henry became Count of Anjou, and he had previously that year been formally recognised as Duke of Normandy. With the county of Anjou came also the county of Maine, and the county of Touraine.[57]

Henry's dominions were greatly expanded when he, on the 18th of May 1152, married Eleanor of Aquitaine, the ex-wife of King Louis VII of France. This marriage, took place only six weeks after Eleanor's divorce from the French King, and it gave Henry control of the great duchy of Aquitaine. Eleanor and Henry had eight children who survived infancy, four sons and four daughters. After a long civil war against king Stephen of England that ended in 1153, with Stephen adopting Henry and proclaimed him his heir, Henry was crowned king of England in 1154, when Stephen died.[58]

[57] Warren, *Henry II*, 30-42.
[58] *Henry II*, 43-53.

King Henry's eldest son was also named Henry, and nicknamed "the Young King". He was born on the 28th of February 1155, a year after his father and mother had been crowned King and Queen of England. He was the first of the Angevin line to be born as the son of a king, unlike his father, who was only the son of a count. He was only three years old when he was betrothed to King Louis VII's daughter, Margaret. Only five years old, young Henry was married to Margaret as a means for King Henry to secure important castles in the Vexin, the border county between Rouen and Paris.[59] Young Henry was crowned king on the 14th of June 1170. His father was still king and the head of the family, but being crowned and anointed as King of England would secure Young Henry's inheritance in the eventuality of his father's death.[60]

Queen Eleanor was the eldest surviving child of duke William X of Aquitaine and count of Poitou. After her father's death, she became the heiress to the duchy of Aquitaine, and in 1137 she was married to the king of France, Louis VII. She had two daughters and no sons with King Louis, a fact that may have been a cause for their divorce in 1152. Some weeks later she was remarried to Henry of Anjou, later King Henry II of England. Henry was only nineteen years old at the time of their marriage, while Eleanor was around thirty. On the 19th of December 1154, she was crowned Queen of England at the same time Henry was crowned King of England. From 1168 and until 1173, she acted as Henry's regent in Aquitaine together with their son Richard.[61]

Richard was born in 1157, and was the second surviving son of Henry and Eleanor. As part Henry's plans for dividing his lands between his sons, Richard was early on associated with the rule in Aquitaine. As part of a peace agreement between Henry and Louis in 1169, Richard was betrothed to king Louis VII's daughter Alice. Soon he was made count of Poitou, and in 1172 he was formally installed as duke of Aquitaine.[62]

---

[59] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 17-31.
[60] *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 39-48.
[61] Jane Martindale, "Eleanor [Eleanor of Aquitaine], Suo Jure Duchess of Aquitaine (C. 1122–1204), Queen of France, Consort of Louis Vii, and Queen of England, Consort of Henry II," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006).; See also "Eleanor of Aquitaine," in *Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries*, ed. Jane Martindale, Collected Studies Series (1997). and Jean Flori, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel* (2007).
[62] John Gillingham, "Richard I [Called Richard Coeur De Lion, Richard the Lionheart] (1157–1199), King of England, Duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2009).

Geoffrey was the third surviving son of Henry and Eleanor. He was born in 1158 and was, like Richard, early associated with a future as a duke. In 1166, he was betrothed to the only child of Duke Conan of Brittany, and Conan at the same time transferred the administration of the duchy to King Henry. At Montmirail in 1169, King Louis confirmed the Angevin control over Brittany by allowing the Young King to do homage for it. Geoffrey in turn did homage to his elder brother the Young King, for Brittany, confirming his future as Duke of Brittany and vassal of the King of England.[63]

2.2 The Young King's motivation

"Then between you [Henry II] and your son arose deadly ill will, which brought about the death of many a noble knight, unhorsed many a man, emptied many a saddle, shattered many a shield, and broke many a coat of mail. After this crowning and after this transfer of power you took away from your son some of his authority, you thwarted his wishes so that he could not exercise power. 'Therein lay the seeds of a pitiless war. God's curse be on it!'"[64]

Jordan Fantosme introduces his chronicle on the conflict of 1173-74 like this, where he states that the conflict was caused by king Henry's refusal to give power to the title he had bestowed on his son. In the next verse, Fantosme further emphasizes the Young King's position by writing: "A king without a realm is at a loss for something to do: at such a loss was the noble and gracious Young King. When through his father's actions he could not do what he wished, he thought in his heart he would stir up trouble for him."[65] Fantosme thus lays the cause of the conflict in the coronation of the Young King in 1170, where king Henry had his son crowned king of England at Westminster, and where he received the homage of all the barons of the kingdom. William of Newburgh also points to the Young King's coronation in his explanation on how the conflict started.

"Now that the son had grown up and become a young man, he wished to possess with the oath of allegiance and the title the reality of that oath and title, and at least to share the kingship with his father, for, as certain persons whispered in his ear, he should by rights be sole ruler on the grounds that when he was crowned, his father's kingship had come to an end. He was especially angry that the outlays which had to expended by himself as king

[63] Michael Jones, "Geoffrey, Duke of Brittany (1158–1186), Prince," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).
[64] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 1.
[65] *Chronicle*, 2.

were too skimpily bestowed on him by his father. So he seethed and growled against his father, and secretly took refuge with his father-in-law, the king of France, intending to cause his father annoyance."[66]

Newburgh shows here an agreement with Fantosme, but elaborates that the Young King was also annoyed by the lack of money he was given by his father, and that it was not sufficient enough for his status as a king. He also adds that the Young King was willing to share the kingship with his father, but that he should really be alone in the kingship. So not only did his father refuse to share the power of rule with his son, despite the fact that the Young King was a child no longer, but a young man, and in addition to this, he also refused to give the Young King the money he needed to maintain the appearance of royalty, suggesting that this was also a matter of honour and appearance. On the matter of how 'certain persons' whispered in the Young King's ear that the coronation in 1170 had in fact marked the end of his father's kingship, Newburgh gives a hint of who one of these persons might have been. When king Henry sent envoys to king Louis after the Young King had fled from Chinon, king Louis mocks the envoys by claiming that king Henry had given over the kingship to his son, before the eyes of the world, and that "his continuing to pass himself off as king would soon be corrected."[67]

Roger of Howden gives a more thorough explanation for the background of the conflict between father and son in his *Chronica*, where he tells of a meeting between the Young King, his wife and king Louis, prior to the conference at Limoges. And Howden explains: "From this circumstance great injury resulted to the kingdom of England, and to the kingdom of France as well."[68] Howden goes on to explain that king Louis always held king Henry "in hatred", and that he counselled the Young King to ask king Henry to give him either Normandy or England, where the Young King and his wife might reside. Now, this meeting appears to have happened, as also Torigni mentions it, and the meeting took place in 1172, some time before the king held his annual Christmas court.[69] It's important to keep in mind that Howden was an English chronicler, and could very well have concluded with the fact that king Louis must have convinced the Young King to demand a principality for himself, rather than face the possibility that the Young King had grown up, and strongly resented the fact that he was being excluded from the rule of his inheritance. Whether this happened or not is

[66] Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 117.
[67] *Historia*, Book 2, 117-19.
[68] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 362.
[69] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.

impossible to prove without other sources confirming it, but Howden has given no reason to believe that the story is fabricated.[70]

Howden is the only one to give a full account of the conference at Limoges, where he also writes that king Henry had already rejected the Young King's demand for either England, Anjou or Normandy, and that the Young King was greatly offended by this. To make matters worse, at Limoges, king Henry arranged for a betrothal between his youngest son John, and the eldest daughter of the count of Maurienne and Savoy, who as of yet had no male heir. John was promised a good deal of land even if the count of Maurienne should procure a male heir. And king Henry granted John three important castles in Anjou, among them Chinon, where the king had recently held a large Christmas court. Granting these castles to John would ensure that king Henry would retain control of them until John came of age, at the earliest, cementing the fact that the Young King would not receive Anjou.[71] According to Torigni, after Limoges, king Henry removed several of the Young King's younger retainers, among them Hasculf de St. Hilaire, further provoking his son, and underlining his status as still that of a youth.[72]

From what the chroniclers have written, it is clear that the Young King was unsatisfied with how his father had neglected to elevate his "real" status, despite crowning him and in theory at least, giving him the same title as himself. It was a matter of honour just as much as it was a matter of territorial ambitions, if they ever existed in the Young Kings mind, and was not placed there by outside influence. In an article on the rebellion of princes against their fathers, Björn Weiler highlights the subject of shame and dishonour in the case of the Young King.[73] Weiler uses a letter sent by the Young King's household to Pope Alexander III, citing the Young King's grievances against his father. His argument is that the Young King was denied his authority as king, when cases brought before him were ordered to be treated by judges of lesser stature than him, forcing him to publicly be humiliated in front of his subjects and followers. The judges in question is most likely a reference to the royal administration led by the chief-justiciar Richard de Lucy, who governed England in Henry II's absence. King

[70] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 362.
[71] *Chronica*, 1, 366-67.
[72] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 128.
[73] Björn Weiler, "Kings and Sons: Princely Rebellions and the Structures of Revolt in Western Europe, C. 1170-C. 1280," *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (2009).

Henry II would also frequently change the councillors and advisors of the Young King, further shaming him.

King Henry's insistence on choosing the members of the Young King's household was not only shameful because the Young King was anointed and crowned as king, but it further highlighted the Young King's status as a minor. A man in medieval Europe was usually considered a minor until he became married. In the case of the Young King, that was a problem, since he was only five years old when he was married. Another mark of manhood for an aristocratic youth was when he received land to govern over, with his wife. This usually happened through the death of the father, by the marriage to an heiress, or by the wife receiving land as her dowry, although in theory the wife was to keep sole possession of her dowry.[74] Another way was for the father to grant his son part of the patrimony before his death. This was not an uncommon practice among rulers, as it served to prepare their eldest son for when he received full control over his inheritance. King Henry II's father, count Geoffrey of Anjou, had given Normandy to Henry in 1149, while Geoffrey continued to rule Anjou. This is a slightly bad example however, as Normandy was conquered by Geoffrey, and not a part of Henry's patrimony, but rather his matrimony. King Henry had no claim on Normandy through his father, but he had a strong claim on Normandy through his mother, who had been the daughter of king Henry I of England and duke of Normandy. In any case, Henry II had been given a principality as large as Normandy to rule over in his own right, from a very early age. This provided the Young King a very close example of an heir being given large responsibilities at a young age. King Stephen's son Eustace had been twenty-one years old when his father wanted to officially mark his coming-of-age, as he was knighted and formally invested as the count of Boulogne in 1147. King Henry II was knighted two years later, which marked his coming of age. This shows that it was very much up to the father to decide when the son was to become an adult.[75]

A recent successful example of shared rulership between father and son came from king Henry II's cousin, Philip, who had been left in charge of his county of Flanders when his father left on crusade. Philip was only fourteen years old at the time, but even so when his father returned from crusade two years later, Philip maintained much of the administrative responsibility, although Philip's father remained involved, making theirs a co-rulership. Philip

[74] Georges Duby, *Medieval Marriage : Two Models from Twelfth-Century France*, vol. 11, The Johns Hopkins Symposia in Comparative History (1978), 5-6.
[75] David Crouch, *The Normans: The History of a Dynasty* (2002), 271.

did not become sole-ruler until his father left on a final crusade in 1164.[76] This type of co-rulership could very well have been what the Young King envisaged when he was crowned in 1170. Whether this was king Henry II's intention as well is not certain, but from what Jordan Fantosme claimed to be the reasons for the Young King's grievances, it appears that the Young King did not take a part in the rulership.[77]

The Young King's coronation might have raised his expectations of being involved in the rule of England, but king Henry most likely had other concerns on his mind when he had his son crowned king. The practice of a king having his heir crowned in his lifetime is by modern historians called "Anticipatory association of the heir", and was a practice introduced in France by the first Capetian king, Hugh Capet, with the intention of securing a peaceful succession for the heir, should the old king die. It was a practice the Capetians continued to use until Philip Augustus was crowned in king Louis VII's lifetime.[78] The situation of Hugh Capet and Henry II were much the same, both were the first king of a new dynasty, and they were of course eager to secure their dynasty's hold on the throne after their own death. Having their heir crowned were also meant to secure a peaceful succession when they died. It would be much more difficult for someone to claim the throne with the closest heir already crowned and anointed. For Henry II this was even more crucial, as he himself had experienced how destructive a civil war could be, especially for the crown's authority. In England, this practice was new, although king Stephen had made attempts to have his son Eustace crowned, and king Henry I had his barons swear fealty to his daughter Matilda. Whether this practice of anticipatory association worked as intended is more difficult to prove. The later Capetians, such as Louis VII and Philip Augustus had no trouble in their succession, but neither did they have any brothers who could offer them trouble, nor did they have to wait very long after their coronation before their fathers died. Louis VII was only seventeen when his father died, and his eldest brother was only thirteen, and could pose no

[76] David Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders* (1992), 70-71.; Eljas Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World, 1066-1216*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought (2012), 34-35.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 745-60.
[77] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 1-2.
[78] Andrew W. Lewis, "Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France," *American Historical Review* 83 (1978): 906.; *Royal Succession in Capetian France : Studies on Familial Order and the State*, vol. 100, Harvard Historical Studies (1981), 18-21.

threat to the succession. Philip Augustus was only fourteen when his father died, and he had no brothers who posed a challenge.[79]

2.3 Inheritance and division of the "Empire"

The Young King's coronation was most likely, from king Henry II's point of view, meant to ensure the succession of his eldest son to the kingdom, rather than give him any real status as king, other than in name. The coronation was an important piece in the puzzle of providing for his sons. At a peace conference with king Louis of France in early January 1169 at Montmirail, king Henry proclaimed his plans for how his lands were to be distributed between his sons in the event of his death. The Young King did homage to king Louis for the county of Anjou and the duchy of Brittany, while Richard, the second son, did homage to king Louis for the duchy of Aquitaine, queen Eleanor's inheritance. Richard doing homage directly to king Louis signalled that the duchy of Aquitaine and Richard would not be a vassal of the Young King, but would be a fief under the king of France, and remain as independent as the other principalities who were held directly of the French king. At a later conference the same year, Geoffrey, king Henry's third son, did homage to his brother the Young King for the duchy of Brittany.[80]

Following the peace conference at Montmirail, Geoffrey was sent into Brittany, and at Rennes in May 1169, he received the homage of the barons in Brittany. This was a formal occasion and the barons recognised Geoffrey as the future duke of Brittany. According to John le Patourel and Judith Everard, Geoffrey did not receive any independent authority until 1181, but, as will be discussed later, he would spend a lot of time carrying out his father's authority.[81] The Young King was, as already mentioned, crowned king of England in 1170, and would inherit all of the lands his father had once inherited. It took two more years before Richard, at the age of fourteen, was formally installed as duke of Aquitaine. Warren wrote that Richard was first confirmed as count of Poitou in the same year as Geoffrey received the

[79] Jim Bradbury, *The Capetians : Kings of France, 987-1328* (2007), 147-68.; Lewis, *Royal Succession in Capetian France : Studies on Familial Order and the State*, 100, 57-77.
[80] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 771.; Warren, *Henry II*, 108-09.
[81] Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 93-94.; John Le Patourel, "Henri II Plantagenêt Et La Bretagne," in *Feudal Empires : Norman and Plantagenet*, ed. John Le Patourel, History Series (1984).: 99-116, For a collection of Le Patourel's essays on Normandy and England, see *Feudal Empires : Norman and Plantagenet*, vol. 18, History Series (1984).; Warren, *Henry II*, 110.

homage of the Breton barons, while Gillingham only mentions the ceremony where Richard received the ducal office.[82]

King Henry's division of his lands between his sons was, for him, an effective way of ensuring his dynasty's control over all these provinces, and to establish a more effective control over all parts of his dominions. He himself could not be everywhere, although he certainly tried, by being constantly on the move, travelling through his dominions.[83] With Richard installed as duke in Aquitaine, and Geoffrey as duke of Brittany, he would have two loyal sons who could execute his will there. The king and his sons would thus be able to provide more flexible and speedy responses as was required when ruling over such vast territories in medieval Europe, with its limited forms of transport and communication. Whether this was what Henry intended is not certain, but he had already sent Eleanor to Aquitaine in 1168, where she acted as duchess until 1173, and Geoffrey and Richard acted with their father's authority in Brittany and Aquitaine after 1174.[84] The problems with this type of policy were evident throughout the later part of Henry's reign. John Gillingham discusses the problem more thoroughly, and both Le Patourel and Ralph V. Turner also touches upon the subject.[85] Firstly, Richard and Geoffrey might not always agree with their father's policy, and being overruled by him could create a growing sense of resentment. With Geoffrey and Richard acting in Brittany and Aquitaine, Henry's movements would limit themselves more to Anjou, Normandy and England, giving his younger sons more freedom and responsibilities, but leaving his eldest son, the Young King in the permanent shadow of his father.[86]

This division of Henry's lands was confirmed again in 1170, when Henry was struck by a severe illness and thought he was dying. He now added that his youngest son John, were to be given the county of Mortain.[87] King Henry officially dividing up his dominions so early must have given his sons some expectations towards early rulership. One of the proclaimed intentions behind having his sons perform homage to king Louis in 1169, and the subsequent

[82] *Henry II*, 110.; Gillingham, *Richard I*, 39-40.
[83] Eyton, *Court, Household and Itinerary of King Henry II*.
[84] Gillingham, *Richard I*.: 37
[85] *Richard Coeur De Lion : Kingship, Chivalry, and War in the Twelfth Century* (1994).: 34-37; Ralph V. Turner, "The Problem of Survival for the Avengin 'Empire': Henry II's and His Sons' Vision Versus Late Twelfth-Century Realities," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 1 (1995).; John Le Patourel, "The Plantagenet Dominions," *History* 50, no. 170 (1965).
[86] Gillingham, *Richard Coeur De Lion*.: 35
[87] Howden, *Chronica*, 1.: 326-327; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte.": 774

crowning of the Young King in 1170, was so king Henry could join king Louis on a new crusade to the Holy Land.[88] The only source where Henry's desire to go on crusade is mentioned, is in John of Salisbury's letters, where he recounts the meeting at Montmirail and the details of the agreement. The case on whether king Henry ever intended to go on crusade is discussed by Hans E. Mayer, who reached the conclusion that in 1169, Henry had no intention of going on crusade.[89] John Gillingham reaches the same conclusion, implying that it was just a ploy to tempt king Louis to come to a peace agreement.[90] But considering the fact the next big conflict only happened three years later, and in the space of that time the internal troubles with Thomas Becket reached its climax, and the following conquest of Ireland also demanded king Henry's attention, it is too harsh to say that king Henry never intended to go on crusade. The fact that king Henry never went on crusade must have been a disappointment for the Young King, who might have hoped to be left in charge of king Henry's dominions while he was off on crusade, with the example of Philip of Flanders in mind, and the disappointment when this did not happen could only have added to decision of breaking with his father.

By 1173 little had changed since the arrangements made in 1169. King Henry still remained in control of all his dominions, sharing little of his responsibilities with his sons, preferring to rely on his ministers instead. That the Young King was restless and not prepared to wait for his father was clearly beginning to show, and it culminated in a very public quarrel at the conference in Limoges early in 1173. The conference began with the count of Toulouse, Raymond de St. Gilles, giving homage to king Henry, then the Young King, and finally Richard, as the duke of Aquitaine. This appeared as positive for the Young King, because it signified that his father intended Aquitaine to remain a part of the Angevin dominions. The county of Toulouse had long been claimed by the dukes of Aquitaine, and for the count to pay homage first to king Henry and the Young King before giving his homage to duke Richard underlined the fact that Aquitaine was the subject of the kings of England, and would remain so after king Henry's death.[91]

---

[88]

[89] Hans Eberhard Mayer, "Henry II of England and the Holy Land," *The English Historical Review* 97, no. 385 (1982).

[90] Gillingham, *Richard I*, 37.

[91] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 366.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.; Warren, *Henry II*, 116-17.

As already mentioned, it was also here at Limoges that a betrothal pact between king Henry II and count Humbert de Maurienne was concluded, concerning king Henry's youngest son John, and the count of Maurienne's eldest daughter. This was an attempt by king Henry to provide for John with territories outside his control, as John now stood to inherit all of count Humbert's lands should he die without a son, and even if he had a son, John would still inherit a large share of land, in addition to king Henry granting him three castles in Anjou. In Howden's words: "the king, his son, would in nowise agree thereto, nor allow it to be done."[92] Howden continues by writing that the Young King was already offended because king Henry had denied his request for a principality, but Howden does not attribute this to the reason he refused to acknowledge the grant to John, rather that the grant was another reason for the Young King's conflict with his father. The reason for the Young King's rejection of John's provision must have some other reason. The Young King stood to inherit England, Normandy and Anjou, and the three castles John was to receive were located in Anjou, and Chinon was of great strategic importance for the count of Anjou located in the heart of the county.[93] This would of course limit the Young King's own authority in the county, but it also ensured that king Henry would remain in control of these castles until John came of age. From the Young King's reaction, it does not seem likely that king Henry had discussed the issue with the Young King beforehand, despite the castles being taken from his own inheritance.

The conference at Limoges did not only mark the breaking point in the relationship between king Henry and the Young King, it is also here one might find the possible reason for queen Eleanor and Richard's support for the Young King. Discussing king Henry's two younger son's motives for opposing their father in 1173 is difficult for two reasons; first of all because they are hardly mentioned in the chronicles during the conflict. Secondly, because of their young age and both of them being in the custody of their mother when the Young King fled from his father at Chinon, it is not easy to decide whether it was on their mother's command they arrived in Paris to support their brother, or how much it was of their own accord.

"The story goes that with the tacit agreement of their mother he sought their [Richard and Geoffrey] support and took them with him to France. The reason for this was that their father had bestowed Aquitaine on the one and Brittany on the other to be their possessions during his lifetime, and the younger Henry realised through the

[92] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 366.
[93] For a detailed map of the castles in Anjou, see Bernard S. Bachrach, "The Angevin Strategy of Castle Building in the Reign of Fulk Nerra, 987-1040," *The American Historical Review* 88, no. 3 (1983).

imitations of the French that the Aquitanians would be more easily won over to his faction through the one, and the Bretons through the other."[94]

From this passage it seems that the two boys at least had the freedom to choose whether they were to lend their support to the Young King or not. But note that he begins the passage with "the story goes", which suggests that he based this on mere rumours, or that he dared not write it down as a fact. He was after all writing in the period of 1196-98, at a time when Richard was king, and Eleanor still very much alive. Howden who wrote his *Chronica* in the same period, only mentions that Richard and Geoffrey were among those who attacked king Henry.[95] Torigny, who were writing while Henry II was still alive, is equally short, and only writes that king Henry was deserted by queen Eleanor, and his sons Richard, count of Poitou, and Geoffrey, count of Brittany.[96]

Historians touching upon the conflict usually cites Eleanor as the reason for Richard and Geoffrey's participation in the conflict, and John Gillingham is probably correct when saying that the initiative for their participation came from their mother, and that it was unlikely they would have played a role without her initiative.[97] But the conflict did provide opportunities for adventure and chances to prove themselves as warriors. Geoffrey remained in the background throughout the conflict, but Richard was knighted by king Louis in Paris, and he led the fighting in Aquitaine in late 1173 and 1174, after the capture of Eleanor.[98] During the failed peace conference in October, king Henry attempted to make peace with his sons by offering them a small advance on their inheritance. Richard were offered as much as half of the revenues from Aquitaine, along with four castles there, while Geoffrey were offered the lands belonging to his betrothed, the daughter of the previous duke of Brittany, should the pope consent to their marriage.[99]

In the final peace agreement in October 1174, Richard was given two castles in Poitou, along with a money grant from the revenues in Aquitaine, while Geoffrey was given a grant of money from the revenues in Brittany. King Henry also began to rely more on Richard and Geoffrey to execute his authority in Aquitaine and Brittany, sending them in 1175 to destroy

[94] Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 119.
[95] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 368.
[96] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 780.
[97] Gillingham, *Richard I*.
[98] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 376.
[99] *Chronica*, 1, 373-74.

the remaining castles opposing him, while the Young King appears to have remained in king Henry's company in the same period.

Queen Eleanor's break with her husband was most likely a reaction to count Raymond of Toulouse's homage to king Henry. Queen Eleanor was the eldest daughter and heir of duke William X of Aquitaine, and she held a claim on Toulouse through her grandmother, Philippa, who had ruled over Toulouse for a brief period along with her husband, duke William IX of Aquitaine. King Henry had in 1159 gone to war against count Raymond of Toulouse over his wife's claim on Aquitaine, but now he was prepared to forgo the claim in order to secure an alliance with count Raymond and secure the southern borders of Aquitaine, which appears to have been his main objective at Limoges, with the presence of the king of Aragon-Barcelona there too. The homage of count Raymond to king Henry and subsequently to the Young King and Richard was a deathblow to Eleanor's own claim, as it confirmed count Raymond's rulership of the county of Toulouse. Apart from this fairly recent conflict between the Counts of Toulouse, and Eleanor's own family, who in addition to being dukes of Aquitaine also held the county of Poitou, where her family originated from. The rulers of the two counties had been rivals over the duchy for some centuries, with both of them holding the ducal title at different times.[100]

Queen Eleanor was also sensitive to the status of her duchy under her husband's "Angevin rule", and she was concerned that it would become a duchy along the same lines as that of Brittany, where the duke was the vassal of the king of England and duke of Normandy. The agreement at Montmirail in 1169 had seemed to confirm that Aquitaine would become an independent duchy on the same lines as Normandy was, with the duke paying homage directly to the French king. But with count Raymond paying homage first to king Henry and the Young King, and then to the future duke of Aquitaine, Richard, it must have been seen as a signal that king Henry intended Richard to have the role as a vassal of the Young King in the future. Her fear was all confirmed in the peace conference in 1174, where Richard and Geoffrey gave homage to their father, king Henry, for his grants to them.[101]

[100] Martindale, "Eleanor."
[101] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 388.

2.4 Another family conflict: Robert Curthose in 1078

The Young King's forced minority and subsequent restlessness and dissatisfaction was not something new, and the conflict it provoked was neither a new phenomenon. The early Capetians suffered much the same troubles as Henry II. King Robert II Capet had four sons, and he crowned his eldest son, Hugh, king when he was only ten. Robert II kept his son from having any royal power however, and gave him no land, preferring to keep him fed and clothed, rather than giving his son the means to provide for himself.[102] A lack of available source material prevents a proper comparison between Robert II's son and the Young King, but another conflict, with the same nature, and closer in both time and place, provides an equally good comparison, namely the first family conflict after the Norman conquest of England, between William the Conqueror and his son, Robert Curthose.

Robert Curthose was the eldest son of William the conqueror, Duke of Normandy and from 1066 king of England. He had from an early age been proclaimed as the future duke of Normandy, and he already held the title of Count and was the titular ruler of Maine.[103] As the future duke, Robert attracted the attention of several younger members of the Norman court. He had, despite his formal titles, no real power or active part in the government of Normandy. Robert became more and more interested in having an income and an independent establishment of his own, as he grew into manhood. Charles David cites Orderic Vitalis when he describes Robert as "generous to the point of prodigality, giving to all who asked with an unstinting hand, and lavish of promises when more substantial rewards were lacking."[104]

His generous nature, and with an entourage of young and restless nobles certainly created pressure on him to receive lands and income he could distribute among his followers. Already here one sees similarities between Robert and the Young King. It was only natural that the household of the future duke would attract the interest of young nobles who had hopes of increasing their own station through Robert. It was much the same with the Young King,

[102] Bradbury, *The Capetians*.: 92; Lewis, *Royal Succession in Capetian France : Studies on Familial Order and the State*, 100, 24.
[103] John Le Patourel, "The Norman Succession, 996-1135," *The English Historical Review* 86, no. 339 (1971): 10.
[104] Charles Wendell David, *Robert Curthouse: Duke of Normandy* (1920), 17-19.; For Orderic Vitalis' writings on the Norman dukes see Guillaume de Jumièges et al., *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni : Vol. 1 : Introduction and Books I-Iv*, vol. Vol. 1 (1992). & *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni : Vol. 2 : Books V-Viii*, vol. Vol. 2 (1995).

although king Henry exercised a tighter control over the Young King's household, which according to Torigny did not help their relationship.

In 1078, a quarrel broke out between Robert and his father, where Robert demanded full control over Normandy and Maine. The demands were not without some form of justification, as Robert backed his demands by claims through his deceased fiancé, who had been the heiress to the county of Maine, and the repeated grants his father had made to him of Normandy. On both these occasions the barons had sworn him fealty and pledged loyalty to him as their lord. King William had officially left Robert as duke of Normandy in 1067 before he left Normandy for England. Coming back to Normandy four years later, William then resumed his position as duke of Normandy, with full ducal authority, completely side-lining his son Robert.[105] William, as Henry II did almost a century later, refused his son after some time of consideration. There was however no immediate break between father and son, but neither refused to give up their stance.[106]

William Aird discusses the reasons for Robert's demand for Normandy. He argued that William's refusal to give Robert resources adequate for him to establish his own court, satisfy his followers, and fulfil his social role as a future king, was a means of controlling him. The restrictions were felt as an insult to Robert and his followers however, and he felt humiliation at not being able to fulfil the social roles that was expected of him. He was caught in a dilemma between obeying his father and responding to the demands of his retinue. His brothers were also a point of pressure on Robert, as they were also competing for their father's affection.[107] Aird's argument has merit, and they are much the same reasons as has been discussed concerning the Young King's own motives for his demands towards his father. The only point of difference, if there are any, must be that for Robert, the need of assurance of his status as heir must have been greater. He had been commonly accepted as duke of Normandy in the years his father was absent in England, albeit with much control still in the hands of his mother Mathilda and other designated ministers. He was only sixteen in 1067, when he was made duke by his father, but he was twenty when his father returned to

[105] R. H. C. Davis, "William of Jumièges, Robert Curthose and the Norman Succession," *The English Historical Review* 95, no. 376 (1980).
[106] David, *Robert Curthose*, 20-21.
[107] William M. Aird, *Robert Curthose: Duke of Normandy C. 1050-1134* (2008), 78-79.

Normandy, which is a huge difference and must have left Robert somewhat confused, as he was now at an age that warranted more inclusion in the rule, and certainly not less.

The final break between Robert and his father happened after a quarrel between Robert and his two brothers, William Rufus and Henry. This is interesting and serves to highlight the pressure Robert must have been feeling for him to react in such a way after a squabble with his brothers. One of the sources says that William Rufus and Henry were amusing themselves by peeing down on their brother and his companions, who were on the floor below them. Their father came and broke up the fight, but Robert felt offended and he secretly left his father's company, only accompanied by some of his followers. They attempted a surprise attack on Rouen, but the attack failed and Robert fled into exile. William responded by ordering the arrests of Robert's followers. Some managed to flee, and were aided by enemies of the King who now saw their opportunity and raised their troops against the king. Fighting broke out all across the Norman border, and Robert was supported by several barons on both sides of the border.[108]

Again, there are similarities to the Young King here. Both fled with only a handful of companions, but in the Young King's case, he was deserted by some of his, who thought better of having king Henry II as an enemy.[109] Robert's desperate attempt to capture Rouen, the capital of Normandy, suggests that he did not have a lot of support at the time of his flight from his father, and that having control of Rouen would help provide more widespread support for his cause. The Young King however, fled directly to Paris and to the protection of the French King, and a widespread revolt among the barons soon followed, suggesting that he already had support among the barons, or at least knew there were good possibilities that his conflict would snowball into a wider one.

The French king, Philip I, supported Robert some months after the outbreak of the rebellion by granting him a castle, Gerberoy, close to the Norman border. From here, Robert became a rallying point for his supporters, adventurers from the rest of Europe, and to those unhappy with his father's rule. He was able to build up a significant military force. They then started harassing the borderlands by raids, until king William brought his army up and laid siege to the castle, inside the French King's territories, for three weeks after Christmas in 1078-79. At

[108] David, *Robert Curthose*, 22-23.
[109] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 133-34.

this point, the French King had withdrawn his support for Robert, and was participating in the siege on William's side.[110]

The defenders, led by Robert, attacked the besieging army, and won, sending the King in retreat to Rouen. During the battle, Robert wounded his father, and his brother, William Rufus, was also wounded, fighting on his father's side. After William's defeat, the older generation of Norman barons sought to negotiate a reconciliation between Robert and his father. The thought of fighting against their sons, who supported Robert, was not a tempting one, so they put pressure on William to make peace with his son.[111]

As we have already seen, there were many similarities between the two different conflicts. In both cases the eldest son and heir appears as the main instigator, pushed into rebellion by advice from others. The conflicts between them and their fathers are also quite similar and the nature of them are practically identical. Though Robert was older, in his late twenties, they had both yet to receive land from their fathers. The Young King's age in 1173, eighteen years old, is quite a bit younger than Robert Curthose, but his status as king, and married to a French princess, should have elevated his expectations to those of Robert, if not beyond them.

Although they both had titles, Robert as count, and Henry as king, they were only titular. Henry's regency in England while his father was on the continent, did not give him much real power. The day-to-day business was taken care of by the royal administration, led by the chief-justiciars. Robert's situation was similar, where his mother Matilda, and the chief advisors administered the duchy, while Robert was left as regent only in name while his father was in England. The pressure on both of them to support their household and supporters would also have been much the same, although there is little evidence that Henry II was specifically shorthanded with the money he gave his son. He did however, take the liberty to choose the members of the Young King's household, something that would surely have demonstrated the Young King's lack of freedom.

In both cases the son's dissatisfaction with their fathers came to a head when they demanded a principality of their own. King Henry's refusal of his son's demand resulted in an immediate breakdown in their relationship, whereas Robert seem to have been able to cooperate with his father until he suffered humiliation from his brothers and their companions. Although Robert

[110] David, *Robert Curthose*, 26-27.
[111] David Bates, *William the Conqueror* (1989), 160-62.

made a quick attempt to capture Rouen, which could suggest that a conspiracy was already in motion that would secure Robert the capital, but the attempt to capture the city failed, and that makes it look more like a desperate attempt to stir up some support. After that Robert apparently spent months in exile searching for supports. The Young King on the other hand, could very possibly have been involved in a conspiracy. King Henry was warned of a conspiracy against him, involving family members, at Limoges in 1173, and the widespread revolts after the Young King's flight to Paris gives credit to the possibility of a conspiracy. But it could very well be a testimony to the lack of support king Henry II's rule had at that time, especially on the continent, where most of the baronial support for the Young King was located.

The conflict inside Robert's family seem to have been between himself and his father. Robert's brothers both supported their father, and William Rufus took an active part in the warfare against Robert. Only Robert's mother, Matilda, supported him. She sent him money to buy mercenaries while he was in exile. The conflict between Robert and his father has been discussed earlier, and the fact that William Rufus not only fought on his father's side, but was also an active part in the argument that sparked Robert's flight, suggest that there was tension between the two brothers as well. When their father died he had still not proclaimed an heir to England, which caused a conflict between the two brothers over who should become king. This clearly indicate that Robert was well aware that his father's hesitation in proclaiming him his heir to England gave William Rufus hopes of succeeding his father to the kingdom. In the Young King's case, he was actively supported by his mother and his two younger brothers, Richard and Geoffrey. His mother was captured, but especially Richard played a role in the later part of the conflict. This mostly reflects the young age of Richard and Geoffrey. The early 1180's was full of the conflicts between the Young King and Richard, further pinpointing the threat younger brothers posed to an heir who had yet to be invested with the lands he was set to inherit. The frequency of conflicts between lords and their sons is not always because of greed, but rather a consequence of the primogeniture inheritance practice that was becoming so common in Europe

The Young King's support was far more widespread than Robert's. This was of course also due to king Henry II's dominions being double that of king William's, but looking at only Normandy and England, the Young King's support was still bigger. Robert was supported by the younger generation of nobles, and some border baron's hostile to William. The French

King supported Robert with a castle, but signed a treaty with William before long, and took part in the siege against Robert. The fighting was contained to the border area in the south of the duchy. In 1173, the Young King's cause was helped by revolts in both Brittany, Anjou and Aquitaine. There were several more nobles in Normandy who also supported the Young King, and in England the midlands were embroiled in fighting. There were also invasions made by the count of Flanders, the French king Louis VII, and king William of Scotland.

In 1173, the elder generation of nobles seem to have been more split in their support of the king. Four earls in England supported the Young King's cause, while the support for Robert seem to have been limited to the sons of the nobility in Normandy. The barons Robert's father had conquered England with were now becoming the older generation, and as they died, they were replaced with the younger generation. This new generation of barons did not always share the same goals and ambitions as the older generation and the duke who belonged to this generation. While the old duke still relied on the elder generation in the governing of Normandy and England, he found it hard to replace them with their sons. Robert thus became the hope for the new generation of nobles who wanted to receive the same offices and influence as their fathers had enjoyed. The Young King's supporters were not only from the younger generation, many of them the same age or older than king Henry.

The rebellion of Robert Curthose seems then to have been a very Norman affair, with the younger generation against the older one. At the centre of it was the royal family, the son against the father. Robert's role was more prominent than the Young King's, either because his supporters identified their goals with his in a better sense than those fighting for the Young King, or simply because he was the most prominent among them. The Young King was overshadowed by the more experienced king Louis VII and Philip, the count of Flanders. Where Robert appears as the true leader, the Young King comes more of as a figurehead the greater nobles used to achieve their own goals. The outside involvement was also far greater in the Young King's conflict, with invasions from the French King, from Flanders and from Scotland, whilst with Curthose, the support was more passive from the French king, and Curthose had no other outside support. By comparing the two conflicts, Robert Curthose's conflict appears to be very much a conflict between Curthose and his father and it remained as such until the very end, where the Conqueror was forced to acknowledge Robert as his heir to Normandy. The Young King's conflict shares many similarities with Robert Curthose, but as

we shall see in the next chapters, the conflict gained more aspects as other major characters both inside and outside the Angevin dominions involved themselves.

2.5 Chapter Summary: A family conflict or more?

From what we have seen, the conflict of 1173-74 began as a quite typical family conflict where the eldest son, restless and eager to assume his inheritance while still young and full of energy, rebelled from his father's authority and proceeded to make war on him. This was not a new phenomenon in medieval Europe, with the eldest son forced to wait until his father either died early in battle or from illness, or became old and too weak to rule. In some cases, this was prevented by sharing the rule with the heir when he came of age, but in other cases the ruler was reluctant to do this, for one reason or the other, and this tended to spark a conflict between the ruler and his son.[112] The issue was complicated further if the ruler had several sons whom he provided lands for. Sometimes this could create a powerful family alliance, but other times it could create rivalries and internal hostilities, as was the case with the sons of William the Conqueror and Henry II.[113] Henry II was also at war with his younger brother on two occasions, due to a conflict over their father's will.[114] The eldest heir was forced to wait, sometimes for many years after reaching maturity, before he could succeed his father, while his younger brothers succeeded to their lands, as was the case when the Young King allied himself with some Aquitanian barons in 1183, in a bid to overthrow Richard as duke of Aquitaine. The conflict escalated and ended prematurely with the death of the Young King.[115]

As much as the political culture in Normandy and the rest of France decided that the eldest son was bound to a long wait and destined for frustration, it was also down to a matter of individual disposition and personal traits. In some cases, the eldest son cooperated well with his father, and the second son proved more rebellious, as the case was with William the Conqueror's grandfather, duke Richard II of Normandy, who enjoyed a good relationship

[112] Weiler, "Kings and Sons: Princely Rebellions and the Structures of Revolt in Western Europe, C. 1170-C. 1280."
[113] Crouch, *The Normans*.; Le Patourel, "The Norman Succession, 996-1135."
[114] Thomas K. Keefe, "Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 6, no. 3 (1974).
[115] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 282-305.

with his eldest son, and several of his younger sons, but the second son proved less cooperative and was at conflict with his father.[116]

One aspect that set the conflict of 1173-74 apart from the other conflicts mentioned was the heavy involvement of the Queen, who was taking an active part in the early stages of the conflict by gathering support for the Young King in Aquitaine. Usually the involvement of the wife of a ruler in these conflicts limited themselves to passively supporting the son through financial aid, or by attempting to mediate between the two parties in such family conflicts, but it was quite unusual for the wife to openly oppose the king in such a manner, and Eleanor were as such imprisoned until her son Richard became king after Henry II's death in 1189.

The most important objection to placing the conflict of 1173-74 in the same group as these more standard family conflicts is twofold. Firstly, the amount of support for the Young King is much larger compared to the conflict of Curthose for example. And secondly, the role of the Young King as the leading opponent of king Henry II soon disappears when king Louis of France, king William of Scotland and the counts of Flanders and Boulogne becomes involved. From the great council in Paris, held after the Young King's flight from his father, king Louis becomes the chief opponent of Henry II.

[116] George Garnett, "Ducal Succession in Early Normandy," in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett, John Hudson, and J. C. Holt (1994), 90-97.

3 The barons

The intention behind this chapter is to discuss the extent of the baronial support that the Young King received during the conflict, as this was the first major baronial uprising that king Henry had to deal with in England and Normandy after he became ruler. I will discuss some of the barons and their motives, combined with the policy that king Henry was conducting in order to get a better understanding of their choices and the nature of their rebellion. I have consciously refrained from using the terms rebellion and revolt in this chapter to avoid making any presumptions of whether the barons were rebelling against king Henry, or supporting king Louis in his war.

3.1 The barons' motives for conflict

"And nearly all the earls and barons of England, Normandy, Aquitaine, Anjou, and Brittany, arose against the king of England the father, and laid waste his lands on every side with fire, sword, and rapine"[117]

One of the aspects of the conflict of 1173-74 that set it apart from the conflicts discussed in the previous chapter was the large number of barons involved against the king. While Warren, whose biography on Henry II still holds great value today, denies the chronicler's claim that almost all of king Henry's barons rose against him. He claims that those supporting the Young King "were not overwhelmingly numerous", and that the list of those supporting king Henry is almost just as long.[118] Warren may be right, but the Young King had supporters in all of king Henry's dominions, and many of the barons also preferred to wait and see how the conflict evolved, rather than committing to one side early on. The chroniclers, who were mainly writing in support of Henry II, were most likely counting everyone who did not actively support king Henry, as being against him.

The family members engaged in the conflict were supported by a large number of barons on either side. In 1173, king Henry controlled the kingdom of England, three duchies and the great county of Anjou, which made him the lord of a large number of landholders, all with different titles and different amount of income and military "power". The most powerful of

[117] Howden, *Chronica*, 1.: 368
[118] Warren, *Henry II*.: 123a

these barons, called magnates, usually held titles as counts and earls, and they could be close to a king in terms of income and tenants owing them military service. The smallest of the barons were often only lords of a manor or castle and on their own could not exercise much influence. The king's job was to keep these magnates happy and loyal by including them in his administration, giving them a certain influence at his court, and providing them with favourable marriages, tax exemptions and such. The magnates in their turn provided the king with either money or knights in times of war. They also relied on the king to control their family estates and safeguarding their heir should they die without an adult heir.

The Young King's supporters from outside the Angevin Dominions affected the decisions of a large number of barons, namely those who held lands on the borders to foreign rulers, the marcher barons. The Young King's largest support came from the marcher barons in Normandy, who were entangled in the rivalry between the duke of Normandy and the French king, whose own lands were bordering on Normandy. There were several reasons for why a baron would rebel against his lord. The most normal one was to protest against what the baron perceived as a breach of the "feudal contract", to use a modern term. The baron felt that the lord was not receiving what he was promised when he performed homage to his lord. This could for example be that the baron felt his lord was violating his rights either by not upholding justice, or by excluding the baron from influence.[119] For an example of a baron rebelling because of perceived injustice from the king, it is necessary to take a look at king Henry's predecessor, Stephen, and two incidents during the civil war of his reign.

3.1.1 The case of king Stephen, earl Ranulf and Geoffrey de Mandeville

The first baron in question, earl Ranulf of Chester, had seized the castle of Lincoln before Christmas in 1140, and thereby putting himself in a dispute with king Stephen who formally controlled the castle. Why Ranulf seized Lincoln in the first place is not certain, it was either due to his local ambitions in Lincolnshire, or due to a wider dispute with another earl in northern England. Nevertheless, king Stephen marched north to confront Ranulf, and settled

[119] See Joel T. Rosenthal, "The King's "Wicked Advisers" and Medieval Baronial Rebellions," *Political Science Quarterly* 82, no. 4 (1967). for the standard propaganda used by barons in revolt, and to the role of the king and the rights of his subjects.

the issue by granting Ranulf a very large portion of land across northern England. On his way back, the king changed his mind however, and returned to Lincoln, catching earl Ranulf by surprise, and the earl had to escape over the walls by night. Stephen had simultaneously attacked other of earl Ranulf's castles.[120]

The second example is the case of Geoffrey de Mandeville, who was imprisoned by king Stephen in the end of September 1143. Geoffrey de Mandeville was at the time of his imprisonment a powerful figure at king Stephen's court, and had come to the king's presence without any suspicions of imprisonment and without a military escort. He was charged with treason, by plotting against the king. Geoffrey was imprisoned for a time, before being released after the king had seized most of his lands.[121]

In both of these examples the king's actions prompted the two barons to revolt against the king. Earl Ranulf joined an already existing party of barons fighting against king Stephen, and attacked the king directly while he was still at Lincoln. Geoffrey de Mandeville formed a small party of his own and proceeded to pillage and plunder the area he had previously been lord of. These are two quite drastic examples of barons reacting to what they perceived as the king's abuse of power.

There were of course other reasons for why a baron might take up arms against the king. Going back to the example of earl Ranulf of Chester, we saw that he seized Lincoln prior to the king's own attack on him. It was seized as a way for earl Ranulf to achieve some of his local ambitions by the use of military force against king Stephen, who was distracted with fighting against other barons in England. The goal for Ranulf in this case was merely to pressure the king into fulfilling Ranulf's own ambitions. When king Stephen regretted the deal he had negotiated with earl Ranulf, he then promptly attacked him, and earl Ranulf in turn switched his support to the person who was contesting Stephen's rule and was willing to grant Ranulf the lands Stephen would not.

A claimant to the crown provided the barons with new opportunities to fulfil their ambitions. Usually these ambitions were of the local sort, concerned with increasing their control over areas they considered to be theirs, and by expanding their influence in nearby areas. These

[120] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*.: 137-139; Graeme White, "King Stephen, Duke Henry and Ranulf De Gernons, Earl of Chester," *The English Historical Review* 91, no. 360 (1976).; J. H. Round, "King Stephen and the Earl of Chester," ibid.10, no. 37 (1895).
[121] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 208-10.

ambitions almost always came at the cost of rivalling barons, with grants to one baron coming at the expense of another. Since everyone held their land from the king, it was through his authority to get more, or at the least getting confirmation of what was already in one's possession.

The king possessed the means of rewarding his barons in several different ways. Usually the king's royal demesne provided him land he could give away. When a baron died without an heir, the land reverted back to the king, who could then keep it under his own administration and enjoy the revenues himself, or he could hand it out to those he wanted to reward, or to those he wanted closer ties to. In the cases where a baron died and only left daughters and no sons, the king would receive custody over her, and decided who she was going to marry and receive the control over her lands. Being married to such an heiress, or having one of their sons being betrothed or married to her would give the baron control over her land and its income. In some cases, this could greatly increase the baron's status.[122] The king's control over marriages extended to all the marriages performed by his tenants-in-chief, meaning those who held land directly from him. It was king Henry I who first wished to be consulted whenever his vassals wished to marry off their female relatives. It was a clever way of preventing alliances among his enemies.[123] The king also received the guardianship heirs still in their minority, and could give these away as well as rewards. This did not give a baron any permanent new land, but could give him a large increase in income for several years if the heir was very young.[124]

Having influence with the king was therefore important for those barons who had ambitions of expanding their wealth and landed power, as well as their prestige by being appointed to offices such as justiciars and constables, as well as preventing their rivals from achieving influence which might have negative impacts on themselves. There were of course several ways to gain influence with the king. Loyalty through service in the king's administration was usually rewarded, and under king Henry's reign, this was usually a good way for barons of lesser stature to receive advancement. The other option was to spend time at the king's court, which could become a toxic place with different baron's contending for the king's patronage.

[122] J. C. Holt, "Presidential Address: Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England: Iv. The Heiress and the Alien," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35 (1985).
[123] Green, *The Aristocracy of Norman England*, 364-66.
[124] *The Aristocracy of Norman England*, 371-72.; S.F.C Milsom, "The Origin of Prerogative Wardship," in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett, John Hudson, and J. C. Holt (1994).

The king would also often reward loyalty during conflicts where the baron was involved. The barons who were in a position where they could trade their loyalties between two lords could profit from this by selling their loyalty to the highest bidder, but they always ran the risk of overplaying their hand and incurring the wrath of the other lord.

3.2 The barons in England

The conflict of 1173-74 saw a great deal of fighting in England. The invasion of William, king of the Scots, ensured that at least northern England would be embroiled in war, but there were also fighting in the Midlands and East Anglia between barons supporting the Young King, and the supporters of king Henry. The supporters of the Young King were not too numerous but they included four earls, and combined they controlled a good amount of land and castles. The invasion of the Scottish king also threatened to destabilize the northern frontier, and tested the northern barons' loyalty to king Henry. The conflict was the first time King Henry had to deal with resistance in England on such a large scale since he became king in 1154. Ever since the end of the civil war with Stephen, England had remained in a tranquil state, without any long or widespread military campaigns. That does not mean that there had been no resistance to the king's policies in England, but these had been more isolated incidents, and 1173 provided the English barons with a good opportunity to protest against king Henry's regime.

As a part of the settlement between king Stephen and duke Henry (later king Henry II) in December 1153, all the castles that had been built without royal permission since the death of king Henry I., in 1135, were to be demolished. The civil war that had been fought between the supporters of king Stephen and king Henry II had led to an increase in the building of castles as the warfare in Western-Europe in the twelfth century usually consisted of raids performed by soldiers stationed in nearby castles, the siege of these castles, and more seldom the larger pitched battles. The castles provided both protection and control over the surrounding area of land and was thus the baron's most important source of military power.[125] Usually the building of castles required the sanction of the king, but the civil war had limited the king's authority, and as such there had been a rise in the building of unauthorised castles. The king

[125] Sidney Painter, "English Castles in the Early Middle Ages: Their Number, Location, and Legal Position," *Speculum* 10, no. 3 (1935).; John H. Beeler, "Castles and Strategy in Norman and Early Angevin England," ibid.31, no. 4 (1956).; John D. Hosler, *Henry II : A Medieval Soldier at War, 1147-1189*, vol. 44, History of Warfare (2007), 171-93.

also used castles to impress his own authority on his dominions, through the use of trusted castellans. The castles controlled by the king were also garrisoned by his men in times of war, and were used to enforce loyalty in the surrounding districts.[126] The settlement between Stephen and Henry in 1153 thus represented Henry's wish for increased royal control over England, and it was a treaty he exercised to the fullest when he became king in 1154. This policy naturally came at the expense of baronial power, which Henry was keen to curb. Another agreement that was made between king and duke, was the reversal of all land taken by force since the death of the old king. This not only restored estates to those who had been the unfortunate ones in the civil war, it also meant that all those who had been granted lands out of the royal demesne after 1135 were at risk to lose it.[127]

These two agreements made before Henry assumed the crown was something he pursued with vigour once he became king in 1154. There are several reasons for this. By ensuring the destruction of almost a hundred castles spread across England, Henry would remove a great deal of the baronage's ability to resist royal authority.[128] Reclaiming previously royal castles and land now occupied by a baron would augment the king's control in England, and greatly increase his revenue. Not everyone was as enthusiastic about this major increase in royal authority as the king was, and some of them chose to resist the king, rather than giving up land they felt they had a legal right to occupy. One of those who resisted were William 'le Gros', the count of Aumale, and earl of York. He had received large grants of land from king Stephen, probably to keep him from supporting Henry during the civil war. When the king ordered him to give up his castle of Scarborough and to give back control of all the land and manors he had been granted by king Stephen, he refused. Only when the king marched his army up to Scarborough did he give up his estates in Yorkshire. He also gave up his title Earl of York.[129] The seizure of the count's lands probably had two functions. First of all, it was important for king Henry to retrieve all land that he felt belonged to the crown, and that was unlawfully held by others. Second of all, Henry's policy in the northern part of England was to promote men whose loyalties he was sure of, and to ensure that the lordships in the north were controlled by these men. Besides having supported king Stephen during the civil war,

[126] R. Allen Brown, "Royal Castle-Building in England, 1154-1216," *The English Historical Review* 70, no. 276 (1955).
[127] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 273-77.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 735.
[128] Edmund King, *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign* (1994), 69-70.
[129] Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 17.; Warren, *Henry II*, 60.; Paul Dalton, "William Le Gros, Count of Aumale and Earl of York (C. 1110–1179), Magnate," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).

which probably did not earn him any favours with king Henry, he was also a marcher baron in Normandy, and in times of conflict with the counts of Boulogne and Flanders his loyalty would be tested. The barons king Henry promoted in Northern-England did not possess important lands on the continent, and their ties of loyalty were thus less complicated.[130]

The count of Aumale was not the only baron to resist the king in 1155. The earl of Hereford, Roger, was the son of one of Henry's most important supporters during the civil war, but that did not prevent Roger from desperately trying to keep on to his disputed lands. Allied with another baron from the welsh marches, Hugh de Mortimer, he fortified his castles against the king. Earl Roger and Henry negotiated a peace, but Hugh de Mortimer still resisted. He only surrendered after his castle of Cleobury was destroyed. In the case of Roger, the earl of Hereford, it seems that the king chose caution and negotiated an agreement that kept most of Roger's lands intact. However, he died soon after, and the king then took the opportunity to reclaim the contested lands, in addition to refusing to recognise Roger's heir as Earl.[131]

Henry's other intention behind limiting castles outside royal control was to establish tranquillity, restore peace and order between the barons and to reassert royal justice. The reclaiming of lands lost to the crown served to somewhat reduce the financial and territorial power of barons who had aggrandized themselves during the civil war, and the king could then hand the land back out again to those he felt to be better deserving of the land. King Henry preferred to elevate men from the lower branches of the baronage, ensuring that these men were totally dependent and loyal to him, as a way of establishing control throughout England through these loyal barons. Although these examples give the impression that king Henry practiced an aggressive policy of seizure of the barons lands, so called *disseisin*, it was not so compared to his predecessors. King Henry appears to have rejected the means of confiscation of property as a penalty for political misbehaviour. Although it did happen, as the example of the count of Meulan in Normandy will show, it was nowhere near the scale of that under king Henry I for example. This ensured that the lands at king Henry's disposal were much less than that of previous kings. What lands king Henry received was mostly reserved for himself and his close family. The king's friends also received lands from him, but always

[130] Green, "Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier," 98-100.
[131] Emilie Amt, *The Accession of Henry II in England : Royal Government Restored, 1149-1159* (1993), 24-25.

small portions of the honours forfeited to him[132] This policy is best shown in the peace agreement after the conflict, where most of the barons who supported the Young King did not lose their property, and those who did, Robert of Leicester, received most of it back some years later.

Rivalries between neighbouring barons were usually a factor in the outbreak of warfare, and it was Henry's intention to encourage settlements between barons, to establish a lasting peace in England. This was probably one of the reasons why he in 1157 seized the castles of both Hugh Bigod, the earl of Norfolk, and Count William of Boulogne, the earl of Sussex. The earl of Essex was also relieved of his castles. Although the chroniclers only mention the dispossessions of Bigod and Count William, the Exchequer provides a record of payment the same year, made for the destruction of the castles belonging to the Earl of Essex, payments made by the king's command. Warren points out that the measures taken by Henry here was more drastic than the previously mentioned examples, suggesting East Anglia was at the point of breaking out into war between the different earls, and the only way to prevent it was to completely disarm them. They were drastic measures, but they were done in accordance with the other major barons called together at a great council.[133]

The period from 1154 to 1173 saw an increase in the king's administrative control over the execution of justice. King Henry passed a number of reforms that served to enlarge the royal jurisdiction over the pleas of land, by providing jury trials before the king's own justices as an alternative to the seignorial courts, the courts of the barons.[134] Further limiting the baron's control on the local level, the king in 1170 proceeded to perform an inquest into the sheriffs in England, removed many of the sheriffs and required everyone, including the barons, to swear on the Gospels that they would tell the truth about how much money the sheriffs and their bailiffs had taken from them. The sheriffs were required to pay a fine, and then some of them were reinstated, while others were replaced.[135]

---

[132] Ralph V. Turner, *Men Raised from the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England*, Middle Ages Series (1988), 6.; J.E Lally, "Secular Patronage at the Court of King Henry II," *Historical Research* 49, no. 120 (1976): 1-2.
[133] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 743.; Warren, *Henry II*, 66-68.
[134] Margaret H. Kerr, "Angevin Reform of the Appeal of Felony," *Law and History Review* 13, no. 2 (1995): 1-2.
[135] Julia Boorman, "The Sheriffs of Henry II and the Significance of 1170," in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett, John Hudson, and J. C. Holt (1994), 256.; Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 325-26.

The earlier inquest into the knight service of his barons in 1166, required the barons to provide a full list of all of their tenants and how much knight service each of them owed. Knight service was a term used to determine how many knights their lands could provide for, and was used as a measurement of the wealth of each baron. The inquest of 1166 was to enable scutage to be paid, a sum of money the barons could pay instead of providing the required military service they owed to the king. After 1166 the baron was required to pay scutage on the total knight service he owed the king, and also on the knight service he was owed by his tenants. The Inquest also made sure that all the under-tenants of his barons had sworn allegiance to him.[136]

Of the big landholders in England that supported the Young King, four of them held the title of Earl, signifying that they were the elite of the barons. They each deserve a small case study, and a discussion around what their motives were and whether they took part in the conflict out of loyalty to the Young King, other domestic issues or due to external pressure from king Louis of France or king William of Scotland. While still on the subject of the earls in England, it is also worth mentioning that king Henry's policy towards the earls in his kingdom had been to limit their power at every possible occasion when felt that it was safe to do so. As we shall see, two of the earls mentioned below had reason to feel that king Henry was limiting the right that came with the title of earl. Wherever he could, the king prevented the title from being inherited, and refused to acknowledge several others.[137]

3.2.1 Robert, earl of Leicester

Robert de Breteuil, the third earl of Leicester, was the son of Robert de Beaumont, the second earl of Leicester, and a former Justiciar of England. The second earl of Leicester had been a prominent youth at the court of Henry I, although in the shadow of his elder twin Waleran, count of Meulan. He had been a key member at court in the early part of Stephen's reign, and he had survived the transition to king Henry by becoming an important advisor and together with Richard de Lucy he supervised the kingdom when Henry was in the continental parts of his domains. His son, the third earl of Leicester did not gain any such influence with king Henry. Robert was however confirmed as the lord of the honour of Pacy and Breteuil in

[136] Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain, 1066-1284*, 201.
[137] Nicholas Vincent, "Did Henry II Have a Policy Towards the Earls?," in *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, C. 1150-1500*, ed. Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle, and Len Scales (2008), 6-7.

Normandy, and he received the Grandmesnil heiress in marriage and with her a substantial amount of land in both England and Normandy. These grants were given to him in his father's lifetime however, and Robert himself was not a part of Henry's court and he was neither allowed the same office as his father, the justiciarship of England. During his father's lifetime, he was entrusted with ruling his father's and his own Norman estates, while his father was busy in his role as Justiciar. His father died in 1168, and in the period between this and the conflict in 1173, Robert did not receive office or make any impression on the court. He is notably absent from the witness-lists on the surviving Charters from king Henry's reign.[138] There were also a disagreement between earl Robert and king Henry concerning the rights earl Robert had to the third of all revenues from his honour of Leicester, which was normally most important of the earl's rights. The peace agreement earl Robert had to make with king Henry after the conflict in 1173-74 ensured that the third penny became nominal in Leicester, with king Henry only paying a small sum to the earl, rather than the full third of all the revenues from Leicester.[139]

There was also the question of honour. A magnate such as Robert of Leicester, with a large cross-channel enterprise under his control, most likely viewed himself as someone important, and expected or at least desired a place in the king's council. A failure to achieve this would touch on his pride and his honour. The other possible explanation lies with his family connections. His cousin, Robert the count of Meulan, was the son of Waleran of Meulan, the twin brother of the second earl of Leicester. Count Robert's own reasons for supporting the Young King will be discussed later, but it is important to note that the earl and the count were closely connected. Strickland notes that two of earl Robert's sons were closely connected with the count of Meulan's court. With earl Robert spending so much of his time in Normandy, it is not unlikely that they enjoyed a close relationship. Thus, the wish to improve his cousins standing in the Angevin kingdom could be a factor that played a part in his decision. Underplaying his more selfish motivations would be unwise in any case, but his cousin's own exclusion from the king's court could definitely have helped. The theme in earl Robert's case looks to be a consequence of the king being too selective in whom he included in his inner circle. A continued exclusion from the court for a magnate of Robert's stature could in the

[138] "The Court of Henry II," 289-91.; For the difficulty of using the witness list of charters as a source, see David Bates, *The Prosopographical Study of Anglo-Norman Royal Charters*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, Family Trees and the Roots of Politics : The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century (1997).
[139] Vincent, "Did Henry II Have a Policy Towards the Earls?," 6-7.

long term very well lead to doubts and fears about his ability to maintain his status. This in the end would lead to desperate measures being taken, such as throwing his support behind a disaffected son, eager to rule on his own.[140]

Resentment for not being given the same office as his father, or for being excluded from having any influence at court might be a reason why he gravitated towards the Young King's camp. The loss of prestige that this exclusion entailed would also have encouraged his resentment towards king Henry. The exclusion from the same office and influence that his father held could very well be one of the reasons for Robert's support of the Young King. Supporting a family member of the king as a dynastic rival was a common method for those excluded from royal influence, as their support would be repaid if the eventual conflict was successful. This is evident from Robert's later attachment to king Henry's other son, Richard, whom Robert took the cross with in 1188 and followed around England and Normandy after Richard became king. It is therefore viable to conclude that Robert did not find a place at king Henry's court and sought other means to gain influence.[141]

3.2.2 Hugh, earl of Chester

Earl Hugh was, like the earl of Leicester, the son of a prominent character during the civil war. Hugh's father Ranulf had been somewhat notorious for fighting only for himself, defecting to the Angevin side of the conflict only to revert back to king Stephen later, before he yet again supported king Henry. In the process he secured major gains from both the old king, Stephen, and the future king, Henry. Unfortunately, Ranulf died in 1153, before his son Hugh had reached manhood, and when Hugh in 1162 was old enough to assume control of his inheritance, he only received what his father had held at the death of king Henry I, with Ranulf's acquisitions since then reverting back to the previous owners or to the king himself.[142]

A desire to regain lands and castles he, because of his father's conquests, felt he had a strong claim to, might very well be Hugh's decisive reason for siding with the Young King. After Hugh had been confirmed in his inheritance, there are no evidence that suggests the king

[140] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 143.
[141] David Crouch, "Breteuil, Robert De [Robert Ès Blanchmains, Robert the Whitehanded, Robert De Beaumont], Third Earl of Leicester (C. 1130–1190), Magnate," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 148.
[142] *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 148-49.

made any further territorial demands of Hugh. If so, Hugh had adopted his father's ambitions in Lincolnshire which had caused so much trouble in northern England during the civil war. Ranulf had on several occasions attacked and seized the castle of Lincoln. These ambitions had been suppressed by Stephen, admittedly changing his mind after first granting Ranulf the custody of the castle, and major grants of land in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, Leicestershire and Staffordshire. Stephen quickly changed his mind concerning the grant, forcing Ranulf to side with the Angevins.[143] King Henry had also made very generous grants to earl Ranulf at a later date, in order to secure his loyalties. According to D. Crouch king Henry: "Conceded him [earl Ranulf] a large part of the Trent Valley, added the county of Stafford and created for him a county of Avranches in Normandy."[144] The grant of Stafford also included the more unusual term "totus comitatus", which was the term used to describe the French counts rights in their county.[145]

Henry's retention of his grants to Ranulf may have stopped a dangerous expansion of the earl's power, as Crouch states that: "If the charter had ever been implemented, Ranulf would have been the most powerful man in England", but it probably didn't curb the Chester family's ambitions.[146] It's impossible to know exactly what Hugh sought to achieve from the conflict, but it is possible to theorize nevertheless. Besides the ambitions Hugh possibly had in England, he may have had territorial ambitions in Normandy as well. In Normandy, Hugh was the viscount of the Avranchin, the Bessin and the Val de Vire. In addition to this, he controlled the honours of St. Sever and Briquessart. He also held a castle on the border with Brittany, St. James de Beuvron. With such substantial holdings in Western-Normandy, he most likely had ambitions there too. Henry's broken promise to his father of creating a county of Avranches for him, may well have been a motivating factor for earl Hugh. His choice of resistance being in the borderlands between Brittany and Normandy would be explained by his Norman ambitions, but as has already been mentioned, he was returning home when war broke out, and might not have had the freedom of choice. His untimely capture at Dol may also have prevented any plans he had of returning to England to pursue his goals there.[147]

[143] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 137-39.
[144] *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 263.
[145] *Totus comitatus* in this sense meaning the kings collective rights, more than just the earl's third penny. Diana E. S. Dunn, *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain* (2000), 91.
[146] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 263.
[147] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 144.

Hugh's claims to land in England, as well as ambitions in Normandy appear to be main cause of his support for the Young King. But he, just like Robert of Leicester, was similarly excluded from the court even though Hugh's father had played a central part in Henry becoming king of England. Supporting the Young King may then have been the only possible solution for Hugh to achieve some of his ambitions, as Henry's rule did not allow him that.

3.2.3 Hugh Bigod, Earl of Norfolk

Hugh Bigod was the oldest of the earls mentioned, and had been active in Henry I's reign, but he saw his rise to the upper echelon of the baronage under king Stephen. Hugh had been a royal steward under Henry I, and continued in his position under Stephen. During the civil war, Hugh was able to profit by securing the castle of Bungay, and the earldom of Norfolk by transferring his loyalty to the Angevin party. As already mentioned, king Henry seized Bigod's castles of Framlingham and Bungay in 1157 due to his rivalry with another earl located in East-Anglia.[148] Although Hugh's main estates and powerbase lay in Suffolk around Framlingham, his ambitions were clearly to extend his influence into Norfolk, probably due to his status as earl of Norfolk. In 1136 he had seized Norwich after believing the king was dead, only to surrender it when the king showed up to reclaim it. And that only reluctantly, according to Howden.[149] His request to be made earl of Norfolk in his negotiations with the Angevin's suggests the same. A grant of Norwich and the honour of Eye is also what the Young King promised him in return for his aid in 1173. It is worth noting that he is the only one of the four earls in England mentioned by Howden when he lists the Young King's grants, suggesting that his motivation was territorial.[150]

What earl Hugh's motivations were in 1173, for him to side with the Young King are harder to determine. His eldest son, and heir to Framlingham and Bungay, Roger Bigod, stayed loyal to the king, making this look more like a very calculated move by Hugh to attempt to improve his fortunes while at the same time ensuring that his son and heir remained in the king's good graces. Hugh did have two other sons, so a wish to provide lands for them to inherit might have been a reason, considering Hugh's old age in 1173. A personal grudge against the king

[148] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 743.
[149] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 229.
[150] *Chronica*, 1, 369.

might also have played a part, as he had lost control of his castles for a time after the seizure in 1157, but if so, he was the only one of the three earls who had been dispossessed at that special incident that proceeded to support the Young King in 1173. The earl of Sussex had followed Henry on his expedition to Toulouse, and died on his way back. The earl of Essex had also continued to be a frequent member of the king's court, and his brother and heir fought for the king in 1173. The earl of Essex was, together with earl Hugh the only two cases in Henry's reign where the king confirmed their hereditary right to their earldoms. This was special considering the king's policy towards the earls had been to refuse to acknowledge them, let them lapse, or refuse to acknowledge the earldoms as being hereditary.[151] This proved to be a problem for Roger Bigod, Hugh's son, as he was not recognised as earl of Norfolk, despite fighting for king Henry, where he acknowledged himself when Robert of Leicester was captured.[152]

3.2.4 William de Ferrers, earl of Derby

The earl of Derby is difficult to discuss as little is known of him before the conflict. William's father, Robert, must have died in 1159, as the earldom of Derby was placed under the wardship of the king until 1161, when William must have come of age. To gain some measure of de Ferrers stature it's worth mentioning that during a survey in 1166, William accounted for 79 knight's fees in England and Wales. In comparison, Robert, the second earl of Leicester accounted for 157 knight's fees, Hugh Bigod accounted for 161, while Chester accounted for 198.[153]

William's role in the conflict seems to have been much the same as Bigod's. Jordan Fantosme describes his personality and his role in the conflict; "And Earl Ferrers, a simple knight, more fitted to kiss and embrace fair ladies than to smite other knights with a war-hammer."[154] This appears as a critic of the Earl's martial prowess, clearly stating that he was not a great warrior. His activity during the conflict is somewhat harder to trace. Howden mentions the earl taking part in the sacking of Nottingham, supported by knights from the earl of Leicester's lands. The targeting of Nottingham is quite telling in the same as Bigod's attack on was Norwich. But it could also simply be that these were the major royal strongholds closest to their own

[151] Vincent, "Did Henry II Have a Policy Towards the Earls?," 2-7.
[152] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 79.
[153] Vincent, "Did Henry II Have a Policy Towards the Earls?," 14-15.
[154] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 71.

powerbase. Nottingham had previously been under the control of the Peveril's, whose lands had been forfeited to the crown in 1155. Earl William had a reasonable claim to the Peveril lands through his mother, who had been the daughter of the last William Peveril. The Peveril's had also held extensive lands in Derbyshire, which was where the Ferrers had their powerbase, with the castles of Tutbury and Duffield. When king Henry seized the lands of William Peveril in 1155, he did not concede any lands to earl William Ferrers, leaving the issue of the disputed lands that had caused the rivalry between the Ferrers and the Peverils still in the open.

Earl William was like the other three earls completely un-associated with the court and saw his chances of further local expansion and influence on the higher level to lie with the Young King. King Henry's reliance on a close clique of friends must have alienated these earls, and they were not often to see at the king's court.

3.2.5 The barons loyal to king Henry II

Without going into a long discussion on the barons that remained loyal to king Henry, and led the defence of England in 1173-74, it is worth highlighting the differences between them and those who supported the Young King. Among those who remained loyal we have king Henry's uncle, Reginald, earl of Cornwall, who had been a frequent member of king Henry's court and council, despite not having any official office in the administration. He had been a solid supporter of king Henry's cause during the civil war, and there are no reports that he experienced any confiscation of his lands.[155] The other most noteworthy of king Henry's supporters in England was Richard de Lucy, who held the title of Justiciar, and had been an important member of the royal administration in England since 1154. He had not been granted much land by the king, but his role as justiciar gave him sufficient influence and status that he made marriage alliances and bargains with the wealthier barons, allowing him to increasingly improve his own status and wealth. Others who remained loyal were those who frequently witnessed charters, or had their fortunes tied to king Henry through his patronage. An example of this is the sheriff of York in 1173, Robert de Stuteville, who had seen a revival of his fortunes under king Henry. When king William of Scotland invaded northern England, he

[155] David Crouch, "Reginald, Earl of Cornwall (D. 1175), Magnate," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2008).

remained loyal along with most of the other northern barons. A testimony to Henry's policy of granting lands and placing royal castles in the custody of barons from the lower tier.[156]

3.3 The Norman barons

123 In discussing the earls in England, we have already mentioned two major magnates in Normandy, the earls of Leicester and Chester. While Chester held lands in the Bessin, close to Bayeux, and on the border to Brittany, the earl of Leicester held his lands in the south of Normandy, and with his honour of Pacy and Breteuil he was a prominent influence north of the border with the county of Blois.[157] His connection to the count of Meulan has also been discussed. But both of these barons taking the side of the Young King in 1173 made sure that much of South-Normandy became embroiled in warfare. As mentioned, earl Robert's castle of Breteuil lay some way north of the border, but the earl was supported by Gilbert de Tilliéres who controlled the castle of Damville, not far from Breteuil. Unfortunately for both of them, the border was still under Henry's control, with loyal constables in the important castle of Verneuil. This meant that earl Robert and lord Gilbert were cut off from any military aid from the French king, who were unsuccessfully besieging Verneuil. When the king assembled his army and marched on Breteuil, earl Robert was forced to flee, and Breteuil was burned. King Henry moved on to relieve Verneuil, forcing king Louis to retreat into Blois instead of risking a pitched battle. The king was then free to take Damville. It is not mentioned if Gilbert was captured, suggesting he fled.[158]

Although there is little mention of Gilbert de Tilliéres elsewhere in the chronicles, his reason for supporting the Young King must have been the same as most of the other Norman barons who held lands in the border regions. They were the first to suffer during military conflicts between the duke of Normandy, in this case king Henry of England, and external enemies such as the count of Blois or the king of France. King Henry preferred to retain most of the castles in Normandy under his control. Those marcher lords who were in a position between the kings of England and France may have been tempted by the apparent weakness of Louis VII control over his own fiefs, compared to king Henry's more strict control. King Henry's

[156] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 377.; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 71.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 148.; Edmund King, "Peverel, William (B. C. 1090, D. After 1155), Baron," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006).
[157] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 143.
[158] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 371.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 780-81.

control through castles were also much greater in the central parts of Normandy, while his authority in the border regions were opposed by counts who traditionally possessed more authority in the region they controlled than their counterparts in England, the earls.[159]

3.3.1 The case of the count of Meulan and the problem of dual loyalties

The count of Meulan in 1173, Robert, was the son of Waleran de Beaumont, a prominent figure late in Henry I's reign, and all through Stephen's. Under Henry II's reign he had seen his fortune fall drastically and his influence in the administrative part of Normandy had disappeared completely under Henry II.[160] Waleran's county of Meulan was situated in the very sensitive area between Normandy and the Capetian demesne, the Vexin. While the Norman duke, and the Capetian king had preferred to split the Vexin into two parts, the count of Meulan held lands on both sides, putting him in a position where he had to choose sides in the many conflicts between king Henry and king Louis.

Henry's wish to gain control over the Norman-Vexin had led him to several conflicts with king Louis, and in 1161, Henry had seized the castles of the count of Meulan and several other barons in Normandy. That the count of Meulan would side with the Young King in 1173 would have come as no surprise when the French king also gave his support. The old count, Waleran, had gone on crusade with king Louis, and the family held much land in in the French part of the Vexin. Henry's tough stance against the marcher barons in Normandy made any hope of further patronage from the English king a distant dream for the young count. Waleran died in 1166, and he had already by that time retired to a monastery, leaving Robert in charge of Meulan.

Count Robert of Meulan was the nephew of Simon, the count of Evreux, another baron with extensive lands in the south-eastern parts of Normandy who supported the Young King in 1173. Count Robert was also the cousin of earl Robert of Leicester, who held the honours of Pacy and Breteuil north-west of Meulan. The choice of supporting king Louis in 1173 must have been a rather easy choice for him, considering king Henry had made no efforts to maintain his loyalty, and Robert's lands on the French side of the border also tied him to king

[159] Martin Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire : 1154-1224*, trans. David Crouch, L'empire Des Plantagenêt, 1154-1224 (2007), 208.
[160] Crouch, *The Beaumont Twins : The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century*, 64-79.

Louis. The count's extensive lands in Normandy probably ensured that he too felt he had a right to influence with the king, and the exclusion from this, combined with the continuously bad relationship between king Henry and king Louis, which constantly put the barons in Normandy who also held lands from the French king, at risk of the lands being raided during conflicts.[161] Considering king Henry's antagonism towards him, the Young King offered the prospects of influence at court, possible expansion in terms of land, and with the support of the French king also came the hope of less conflict along the border.[162]

In the rest of Normandy in 1173, it was mostly barons with lands close to the borders who ended up supporting the Young King. That the duke's power was strongest in Central-Normandy is only a partial explanation to this. Henry had been just as busy consolidating his power in Normandy as he had been in England. In 1171, he performed an inquest in Normandy, much like the one in England in 1166. Robert de Torigny writes of this that "by this process he [king Henry] nearly doubled the rents which he had in Normandy.[163] And because his authority and control was strongest in the middle of the duchy, the victims of his consolidation of power were the barons in the regions were his control was weaker, namely the outskirts of Normandy. Henry had been relieving the Norman barons of lands and castles he viewed as rightfully belonging to the ducal demesne, and this would of course conflict with the barons, who probably saw the lands they held as rightfully theirs. As Daniel Power puts it: "What the barons regarded as their patrimony did not correspond with the opinion of Henry II."[164]

The Norman barons who supported the Young King came mostly from the border regions of the duchy, and these barons had in the last century built up a culture of quickly changing sides in conflicts. That some of these border barons had been main beneficiaries in the same conflicts had caused a clash with king Henry II when he became duke of Normandy and began his policy of reclaiming lands and castles that he meant belonged to the duke rather than being part of the patrimonies of the barons. The pattern in Normandy is also quite similar to that in England. Those barons who held offices and took part in the administration of the duchy remained loyal to king Henry, while those who had seen their fortunes and influence dwindle under king Henry were seeking other options. It is important to stress the fact that the

[161] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 764.
[162] Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries*, 62, 398-401.
[163] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 774.
[164] Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries*, 62, 399.

external pressures on the marcher barons in Normandy clearly affected the choices of support. The count of Aumale on the eastern border of Normandy appeared to have a difficult time deciding where his loyalties were. When the count of Flanders invaded Normandy from the east, the count appeared to have offered resistance, but the castle surrendered so quickly that several of the chroniclers commented on it. The chroniclers also state that he had in his company the count of Evreux, who supported the Young King and was tied to other supporters of the Young King through marriage.

3.4 The barons of Brittany

While England and Normandy had been relatively peaceful in the interim between Henry's successions to the respective titles of duke and king, Brittany had experienced a more turbulent period. The earl of Richmond, Conan, had in 1156 taken the county of Rennes by force, after a dispute over his inheritance with his father-in-law, Eudo de Pörhoet. Conan was the grandchild of the previous duke of Brittany, but Eudo de Pörhoet appeared to want the ducal title for himself rather than giving it to his son-in-law. King Henry was prepared to let Conan rule as duke of Brittany, as long as Conan accepted king Henry's overlordship. Henry's main policy at this time was to secure Brittany's borders with the Angevin dominions, namely Normandy, Anjou, Maine and Poitou. Judith Everard, who has done a thorough study on Brittany under Angevin rule, explains that "it was sufficient for Henry's purposes that Brittany should be ruled by a trustworthy native ruler, provided the frontiers were secure. If not, it would represent a haven for rebellious subjects of the adjacent provinces, who might easily slip across into Brittany to escape royal authority."[165] Henry appeared to seek a co-operative ruler in Brittany that would conform himself after Henry's policies.

The policy of king Henry concerning Brittany began to change, mostly as he felt the need to provide for his other family members, and Brittany offered opportunities for exactly this. After defeating his brother, Geoffrey, in an insurgent in 1155, the citizens of Nantes expelled their count, Hoël, and appealed to the Angevins for a new count. Henry offered the county to Geoffrey, and he was installed as count of Nantes in 1156. Geoffrey died in 1158, a few months before Henry's third son, also called Geoffrey, was born. With a claim on Nantes, and

[165] Judith Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins : Province and Empire, 1158-1203*, vol. 48ibid. (2001), 35.

another son to provide for, Henry claimed the county of Nantes in his own right, and took control of it. Conan had tried to take Nantes after Geoffrey's death, but Henry seized his lands in England as retaliation, and threatened to invade if Conan did not give up Nantes. A treaty between Conan and Henry was signed where Henry's possession of Nantes was confirmed. After traveling to personally secure control of the city, he then proceeded to besiege the castle of Thouars, apparently to force the surrounding barons to admit his rule, and to prevent them from allying with nobles in Poitou.[166]

The border with Brittany was dominated by the lord of Dol, and the lord of Fougères. When John de Dol died, and left his heiress and his lands in the charge of Ralph de Fougères, the king demanded control of the castle of Dol in much the same way as he had secured castles in England and Normandy. It was probably also an attempt to prevent Ralph de Fougères from controlling the whole Norman-Breton border through the castles of Fougères, Combourg and Dol. Ralph and king Henry appears to have reached some sort of understanding at the time, as Ralph was left in charge of Combourg and the rest of John de Dol's estates and also his heiress. Henry must have changed his mind regarding Ralph de Fougères, because in 1164 the constable of Normandy, Richard du Hommet, led an army to Combourg and took the castle on behalf of the king. The king proceeded to seize the whole barony of Combourg and left it in charge of John de Subligny, a Norman baron from the Avranchin, a region not far from the Breton border.[167]

Ralph de Fougères name appears again in 1166, when the king himself took an army on a campaign through Brittany and Maine, where he punished certain nobles for failing to obey the orders of queen Eleanor while Henry had been in Wales. Ralph must have been one of these as his castle of Fougères was taken and burnt. Henry's policy with Brittany had by now changed and he became now more directly involved in the duchy. Shortly after the siege of Fougères, the king met with Conan, and agreed on a betrothal between Conan's only heir, his daughter Constance, and Henry's third son, Geoffrey. As part of this agreement, Conan gave up control of the duchy, but kept his own patrimony, which was the barony of Trèguier in Brittany and his earldom of Richmond in England. King Henry received the rest of the duchy

[166]Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 31-33.;Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 32-37.:; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 740.
[167] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 756-62.; Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 41-42.

as a grant from Conan, keeping the duchy and Constance in his custody until Constance and Geoffrey could marry, which did not happen until the 1180's.[168]

In 1168, Henry was again fighting in Brittany. Eudo de Porhoët had apparently refused to arrive at the king's court, when he was summoned, and this displeased the king to the point that he felt the need to arrive in person with an army. Eudo was not the only Breton baron to refuse the king's summons. He had allied with Oliver and Rolland, the son and nephew of Oliver de Dinan. He was also the first to be punished by the king. Eudo's chief castle, Chateau-Joscelin was destroyed, and the king took the county of Briac and added it to his demesne. He also took the castle of Aurai and garrisoned it with his own troops. Henry then moved on to punish Eudo's allies, taking the castle of Hédéé, and destroying the castle of Tintienac. He then relieved Rolland de Dinan of his impressive castle of Becherel, capturing it in a matter of days. The king then moved on to the county of Lehon, but he was running out of time, as a meeting with king Louis was soon to take place. Before leaving, he set his troops to burning and plundering the countryside.[169]

The incident mentioned above was somewhat special compared to Ralph de Fougères earlier conflict with the king. Eudo and the Dinans had allied themselves with king Louis, in the same way as the barons of Poitou, who were embroiled in their own conflict with king Henry around the same time. Eudo had given hostages to the French king in exchange for his support against king Henry. The Bretons were however abandoned by king Louis when he and king Henry negotiated a settlement early in 1169, where Brittany was recognised as being a part of the Angevin "Empire". The Young King did homage to king Louis for Brittany, and king Henry's third son, Geoffrey, did homage in turn to the Young King for Brittany. During Christmas in 1169, the bishops and barons of Brittany did homage to Geoffrey and king Henry. [170]

Count Conan died in February 1171, securing prince Geoffrey's eventual succession to the duchy, though it would still be in king Henry's control until he seemed fit to relinquish control of it to his son. Conan's death also provoked another military campaign by Henry into Brittany. Guihomar de Léon had already been the subject of a campaign led by Conan in 1169 or 1170, and Guihomar seemingly used Conan's death as an opportunity to seize lands from

[168] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 764-65.
[169] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 769.
[170] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 771-72.; Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 45-48.

his neighbours. Guihomar was in any case forced to submit to the king, and give back land he had seized. The campaign in 1171 was to be the last military action Henry would have in Brittany until 1173.[171]

The pattern of conflicts in Brittany appears then to be a mixture of king Henry's own attempts to increase his control in Brittany through conquest, and then the Breton barons in turn resisting the king. Unlike the barons in England and Normandy, the tradition of ducal lordship in Brittany was weak, with the barons being more occupied with internal rivalries and local ambitions. Ralph de Fougères stands out as the most frequent of those barons who were in conflict with king Henry. As a baron who had his lands concentrated on the border to Normandy this was only natural when the king began the policy of securing the Norman border, as well as increasing his influence in Brittany through conquest.

In 1173, Ralph de Fougères is mentioned as being one of the Breton barons refusing to appear at king Henry's summons. Torigny seemed to believe that he was the first of the Bretons to defy the king, but he was soon joined by Hasculf de St. Hilary and the lord William Patric and his three sons. Eudo de Porhoët and earl Hugh of Chester also joined Ralph. Ralph's first action was to rebuild his castle of Fougères, but he was slightly hindered by mercenaries the king had sent into Brittany to harass him. Ralph's troops succeeded in destroying the mercenaries' supplies, and they went on to burn the castles of St. James and Tilleul. Ralph was forced to flee from his base at Fougères when the king arrived with an army, and the whole barony of Fougères was pillaged by Henry's troops. Ralph managed to take both Combour and Dol by bribing the constables in the castles, A large force was sent against them however with both Brabancons and Henry's own troops, led by William du Hommet. The Bretons lost a battle in the field, and they were forced to take shelter at Dol, where they were besieged until the king quickly arrived with more troops and siege engines. Ralph and the others then decided to surrender. Eudo de Porhoët had not stayed with Ralph de Fougères. He had instead travelled to his own castle, Château-Josselin, fortifying it and taking another castle, Ploesmel.[172]

The Breton barons appears to have done much the same as in previous conflicts with king Henry, and focused their fighting in and around Brittany. Ralph occupied the three castles he

[171] *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 44-49.
[172] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 781-82.; Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 371-73.; Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 11-17.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 125-27.

had claims on, his own seat at Fougères, that the king had previously destroyed, and the two castles that had previously belonged to the lord of Dol. Ralph appears to have been more on the offensive this time, probably due to Henry's other problems. The destruction of St. James and Tilleul shows that the Bretons raided the Norman side of the border. Whether Ralph intended to use the conflict to establish himself as lord of Dol and Combour as well as Fougères is not entirely unrealistic, as these were the castles he preferred to occupy, rather than destroy, like he did with St. James and Tilleul. Judith Everard, in her book on *Brittany and the Angevins*, rejects the notion that the Breton barons were resisting ducal authority out of a tradition of self-governance. As the previous examples has shown us, Henry's military actions in Brittany were usually directed at specific barons, at different times, much the same as in England in the years after Henry's coronation. Both Ralph de Fougères and Eudo de Porhoët had grievances against the king, and while Torigny almost makes it sound like they were allies in 1173, Eudo quickly left for his own lands, and was not assisting Ralph at Dol or any other places. While Ralph was taken prisoner in 1173, Eudo was left alone until 1175, when king Henry sent Geoffrey to deal with him. Eudo and Ralph never appear to have assisted each other previous to 1173 either, and Everard points to the fact that he was present with the king at the siege of Fougères in 1166.[173]

Both Ralph and Eudo had personal grievances with the king, and their actions in 1173 points to these grievances as being the reason for them revolting in 1173, rather than the wish for an independent Brittany. Ralph's dispossession of the lord of Dol's lands from 1162 to 1164 by king Henry had been a blow to his ambitions of establishing himself as the de-facto controller of eastern Brittany, and from what we have seen of his actions during the conflict of 1173, he obviously attempted to secure the three castles of Dol, Combour and Fougères that provided the necessary means of controlling this rather large area of land. Money and influence were no doubt the motivators for Ralph to be so interested in the control of these castles. From here he could in the future assert his dominance over the lesser barons in the area, and probably establish a county of his own. His ambitions unluckily collided with king Henry's own intentions of establishing his son Geoffrey as duke of Brittany. As such king Henry had no interest in allowing a baron to establish control over such a large and important part of the duchy. Following this line of thought, Everard's rejection of the notion that the Breton barons did not rebel out of a tradition of self-governance is valid. For Ralph de Fougères to be able to

[173] Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins*, 48, 53.

pursue his personal ambitions, he had to resist king Henry's attempts of increasing the ducal authority in Brittany, but it was not out of a tradition of self-governance, but rather out of a wish, or need for self-governance if they were to achieve their local ambitions. As we have seen all through this chapter, there was no place for self-aggrandising barons under king Henry's regime.

3.5 The barons of Aquitaine

King Henry had acquired the duchy of Aquitaine through his wife, queen Eleanor, who was the heiress to the duchy. Their second son, Richard, was early on associated with the duchy, and the intention was for him to inherit the duchy. Unlike Brittany, Aquitaine had no previous history of being subject to the duke of Normandy's power, but they had been under direct control of the French king, Louis, while he was still married to Eleanor. This made Aquitaine not just a source of internal trouble for Henry, but also a source of enmity between king Henry and king Louis. Besides the campaign against Toulouse in 1159 where king Henry attempted to make good queen Eleanor's claims on the county of Toulouse, Henry had very little to do with Aquitaine until 1167. He had a short campaign in Gascony in 1161, when he besieged Castillon-Sur.Agen. In 1167, the count of Auvergne allied with the king of France, after king Henry had demanded that he stand trial for his deposition of his nephew, who most likely was supposed to inherit the county. King Henry began to devastate the count's lands, but with the French king attacking the Vexin, Henry left Auvergne, and the conflict evolved into another dispute between Henry and Louis. Contributing to the hostilities was a conflict over where the money they had collected for a new crusade were to be deposited, resulting in the city of Tours being burnt.[174]

The king returned back to Aquitaine in 1168, after agreeing on a truce with the French king. Other barons had apparently also decided to rebel against the king, and Torigny lists the count of Angouleme, William de Taillefer, the count de la Marche, Adelbert, and also the lord of Lusignan. King Henry captured the castle of Lusignan and set his soldiers to destroy the surrounding lands as punishment. When the king left for Normandy again, queen Eleanor, Patrick, earl of Salisbury, and the count of Perche was left in charge and tasked with controlling the rebels. The peace negotiations that had been held in Normandy between Henry

[174] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 765.; Warren, *Henry II*, 105-06.

and Louis broke down, as Henry was not willing to agree on a peace while Louis was still consorting with Henry's vassals. It is worth noting that barons from Aquitaine was present at the peace talks, in Louis' company, along with barons from Brittany. After the peace talks broke down, the fighting continued, and the earl of Salisbury was killed in a skirmish with the lords of Lusignan.[175]

A peace agreement was finally concluded at Montmirail in 1169, and the Young King did homage to king Louis for Anjou and Brittany, while Henry's second son, Richard, did homage to king Louis for Aquitaine. With king Louis out of the conflict, king Henry returned to Aquitaine, where he, through a show of force, came to an agreement with the count of Angouleme and the count de la Marche, successfully restoring peace to the duchy. With the betrothal of Richard to king Louis' daughter Alice, the disagreement between the two kings regarding Aquitaine was to a point resolved, with the future intention that Richard as duke of Aquitaine would become the vassal of king Louis' son, and not the Young King, as the French king had feared.[176]

The relationship between king Henry and king Louis played an important role in how the barons in Aquitaine reacted towards the attempts of king Henry to establish a stronger presence in the duchy. With their relationship being so strained, and with Aquitaine bordering on the French king's own territory in the western parts of the duchy, it was an area where both king's claimed lordship and were eager to defend their rights. The conflicts during 1168 and 1169 bears close resemblance to that of 1173-74, where the barons around Poitou, the centre of ducal power in Aquitaine, took part in a larger conflict within the Angevin "Empire".

In the conflict of 1173, many of the same barons were involved in the conflict on the Young King's side. The lord of Lusignan is mentioned by Robert de Torigny, and so is also a newcomer, Ralph de Faye, queen Eleanor's uncle. That queen Eleanor herself, and Richard, the newly made count of Poitou and duke of Aquitaine, were both supporting the Young King encouraged the barons who had suffered in the aftermath of the previous conflict. The count of Angouleme, and the lord of Taillebourg also supported queen Eleanor and Richard. The Queen was captured in November 1173 by king Henry's forces, when she was trying to move out of the duchy. Eleanor had been in Ralph de Faye's lands, but Henry had moved into Anjou, where he was stifling resistance while putting pressure on Ralph de Faye by raiding

[175] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 767-69.; Warren, *Henry II*, 108-10.
[176] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 772.

his lands. Richard, having been knighted by Louis late in 1173, arrived in Aquitaine in 1174 to continue the fighting against Henry. He failed to take the city of La Rochelle, whose inhabitants remained loyal to the king, but he was admitted into the city of Saintes. The king made a surprise attack on the city, forcing Richard to flee to Taillebourg, where he joined forces with the lord there, Geoffrey de Rancon. As in 1169, when king Louis in reality abandoned the Aquitanian rebels by making peace with Henry at Montmirail, he did the same in 1174, when he and the Young King agreed on a truce with king Henry. Richard's continued fighting was preventing Henry and Louis from agreeing on a general peace agreement, so they agreed to give no help to the barons still fighting with Richard in Aquitaine.[177]

The hostilities in Aquitaine appears to be a mix of the barons resisting Henry's rule, and queen Eleanor's own unhappiness with king Henry. Her role was quickly taken by Richard when she was captured, ensuring that the fighting continued well after it had stopped in Henry's other dominions. It is not easy to understand why the count of Angouleme and the lord of Lusignan, Geoffrey, were fighting the king in 1168 and 1169, but with king Henry seemingly occupied with fighting king Louis, it is not unreasonable to think they saw opportunities to reduce the ducal power around Poitou. Their return to hostilities in 1173 suggests that they were rather unhappy with the harsh treatment they had received from king Henry in 1169.

In the case of the conflict in 1173, the support promised to the barons in Aquitaine was also much greater than in 1168. Queen Eleanor's own motives also happened to coincide with those of her barons in Aquitaine. She did not want to see Aquitaine become a province in the great Angevin "empire" that her husband had created. The barons, naturally wanted to prevent king Henry from achieving the same sort of control that he enjoyed in England and Normandy, with a strong centralized government and highly effective tax and judicial system. Another thing that needs to be given attention is that the prospect of a strengthening of ducal authority and its administration did not offer the barons in Aquitaine any prospects of profitable offices. Throughout his dominions, king Henry preferred to rely on Normans or Anglo-Normans, as was the case with Brittany, where he installed a Norman as the castellan

[177] Gillingham, *Richard I*, 47-50.; Warren, *Henry II*, 122-23.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 190-91.

of Dol for example, and in Aquitaine as well, where he relied on Patrick, the earl of Salisbury, to aid queen Eleanor.[178]

3.6 Chapter Summary

What we have seen in this chapter is the full geographical extent of the conflict, from the earls in England, to the discontent marcher barons in Normandy, the struggle against conquest in Brittany and the Aquitanian baron's resistance to king Henry's rule. The sources available are more focused on England and Normandy than they are of Aquitaine, Anjou and Brittany. The nature of king Henry's rule in the different duchies were also fundamentally different, which is clearly reflected in the motives of the barons fighting against king Henry in 1173-74. In England and Normandy, the motives the barons had were more tied to the inclusion and exclusion from royal influence, and the benefits that brought with it. This very much guided their decisions to support the Young King.

Going into the next chapter concerning the external supporters of the Young King, it is worth noting their importance in the political world of the marcher barons of Normandy, who counted for a significant amount of the barons that supported the Young King. The differences in the motives in Brittany and Aquitaine compared to Normandy and England is also significant towards this thesis main theme. In Brittany and Aquitaine, the conflict of 1173-74 looks more like just another conflict in which the barons continuing struggle against Angevin dominance was the main theme. In England and Normandy, which had enjoyed a relatively continuous period of peace from 1154 to 1173, and where the conflict of 1173-74 really stands out, the external pressure from king Louis and the internal policies of increased royal expansion of rights at the expense of the barons. This suggests that the Aquitanian and the Breton barons were fighting for their own cause in 1173-74 as well, and the Young King merely provided the opportunity for them to fight their own war while king Henry was distracted by a more widespread conflict. The Young King's cause concerned them little, as he would replace king Henry as the head of the same "empire" that they were fighting to resist.

[178] Aurell, *The Plantagenet Empire*, 189.

4 King Louis VII and his allies

King Louis' involvement in the conflict of 1173 began when the Young King sought refuge at his court after fleeing from his father at Chinon. King Louis was the Young King's father-in-law, as well as the king of the French, and king Henry II's greatest rival. Shortly after the Young King's arrival, king Louis summons his barons for a conference at St. Denis, outside Paris. At St. Denis, king Louis and his vassals promised to aid the Young King in his struggles against his father. In return, the Young King promised to make no peace without king Louis consent. Louis was a natural choice for the Young King to seek out and ask for help in his conflict with his father. The Young King was king Louis' son-in-law, and they were already on familiar terms with each other. King Louis was also the Young King's lord, just like king Henry, putting the Young King in a position where he could appeal to king Louis for help, over king Henry's head. Last, but not least, king Louis had been king Henry's main rival since 1153. If someone was going to support the Young King against his father, it was king Louis VII of France.

In this chapter I want to discuss in what capacity king Louis VII took part in the conflict of 1173, and if it was as the Young King's father-in-law, the Young King's lord, or as king Henry's rival, seeing an opportunity to support dissidents within the Angevin domains and in the Angevin core family, to reduce the power of his rival. The chapter will include comparisons between the 1173 conflict and earlier conflicts between king Louis and king Henry. King Louis' possible motivations will also be discussed, including what the sources indicate that his motivations were. Finally, I will discuss the relevance in defining king Louis' role in the conflict, and whether the conflict of 1173-74 had more resemblance to the other conflicts between king Louis and king Henry, and could as such be seen as more of a conflict between the two kings, rather than one between the Young King and Henry, or between king Henry and his barons.

4.1 The Scottish invasion and the counts of Blois and Flanders

The Young King had in 1173 several allies among king Henry's neighbours who offered their support to him. Two of them, the count of Blois and the count of Flanders, accompanied by his brother Matthew, the count of Boulogne, were present at the great council at Paris which

king Louis called together, while King William invaded northern-England in July, the month after king Louis and count Philip of Flanders began their invasion of Normandy. This chapter will deal heavily with king Louis and his relationship to king Henry and the Young King, but it is also necessary to look at these other great lords who thought it necessary to support the Young King. The focus of most of the chronicles who deal with the conflict gives their attention to king Louis and king Henry, but the count of Flanders is also frequently mentioned, while the count of Blois' role is more obscure, but he is also mentioned, and along with the count of Flanders, he plays a prominent role in Jordan Fantosme's version of the council at Paris in 1173. It is necessary to include a discussion of their role in the conflict and their previous history with king Henry in order to gain a better understanding of the conflict as a whole and the nature of it.

4.1.1 William the Lion, King of Scotland

King William was the grandson of king David I of Scotland, who had established Scottish rule over the earldom Northumbria during king Stephen's reign in England, and also supporting king Henry and his mother Matilda in the same period. King Henry had been knighted by king David in 1149 as well.[179] But when king Henry was on his business of establishing control of England after his coronation, he forced the then king, Malcolm IV, to give up Carlisle, Cumberland and Westmorland, and in return he was given the earldom of Huntingdon. King Malcolm was only fifteen at the time, and must have been forced into this concession to prevent war with king Henry.[180] This was land that king Henry had confirmed to king David I as being under Scottish overlordship in 1149, when Henry was only sixteen. In 1157, he had thus reversed the situation with the young king Malcolm. Malcolm did accompany king Henry on the Toulouse campaign in 1159, and was knighted by Henry on their return.[181]

King William the Lion demanded in 1173 exactly what his brother Malcolm had lost in 1157. According to Jordan Fantosme, king William sent messengers first to king Henry demanding

[179] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 140-41.; Warren, *Henry II*, 36.
[180] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 741-42.; G. W. S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots : Government, Church and Society from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century* (1973), 147-48.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 140-41.
[181] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 741-51.; G. W. S. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity : Scotland 1000-1306*, 2nd ed. ed., vol. 2, The New History of Scotland (2003), 43.

these lands as a price for king William remaining faithful to the homage he had done to king Henry.[182] King Henry's answer to William's messengers is blunt:

"Tell the king of Scotland that I am in no anxiety about any war my son is now waging against me, nor about the king of France and his men, nor about the count of Flanders, who is invading my lands not for the first tie. I shall make their war bring wrath and sorrow on them, and, God permitting, I shall prove a deadly opponent to your king."[183]

Besides rejecting king William's demands, Henry made an effort to dislodge William's brother, David, from him by offering him lands; "But tell his brother David, my kinsman, from me to come to my aid with all the men he can command. I shall give him such lands and fiefs as will satisfy all his demands."[184] King William, after a council with his barons, decides to take the Young King's side, who promised king William the whole of Northumbria as far as the River Tyne, and to David, the earldom of Huntingdon and Cambridgeshire.[185]

King William's war was more or less an attempt to claim the prize he had been promised, but there was of course the issue of honour and prestige involved as well. The memory of king Malcolm's submission to king Henry and the surrender of all the conquests made by their grandfather, king David I, was probably still fresh in king William's mind. The fact that king Henry had given king David assurances that he would be allowed to keep his conquests in return for his support against king Stephen must have made it all the more bitter for king William. In the end, all William achieved was to take a few lesser castles, while his armies pillaged and burned the countryside. His campaign met more resistance due to king Henry's improvement of the castles in the northern counties of England, and securing lordships in the north for men loyal to him.[186] Agreeing to a truce with the royal army under Richard de Lucy's command, he unknowingly abandoned the earl of Leicester who had very recently arrived in England. The earl was captured at St. Edmunds, and king William met the same fate outside Alnwick in 1174, when a small force of knights defeated the small force he besieged the castle with, while the rest of his forces were plundering Northumbria.[187]

[182] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 368.
[183] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 27.
[184] *Chronicle*, 27.
[185] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 368.
[186] Green, "Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier," 98-99.
[187] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 63 & 131-35.

The peace agreement king William had to agree to, was the harshest of the settlements Henry made with his enemies in 1174 by a long shot. King William had to renew his homage to king Henry and also to the Young King, and the Church of Scotland was made subject to the English church. King Henry confiscated several castles on the Scottish side of the border, most importantly the one at Roxburgh, which king William had used as a base for his invasion. That king William was one of the few that had to surrender lands to king Henry does not imply anything other than the fact that William was captured, which gave king Henry a strong bargaining chip in the peace negotiations. Like the earls of Chester and Leicester, king Henry stood more freely to punish their treason due to them being captives without the threat of continuing to fight if an agreement could not be made. And it is quite clear from how Jordan Fantosme's chronicle depicted the exchange of messages between king William and king Henry, and especially king Henry's reaction to this.[188]

4.1.2 Count Philip of Flanders

The count of Flanders, together with his brother Matthew, the count of Boulogne, provided Louis with a second invasion into Normandy, from the north-eastern border. The two brothers were king Henry's cousins. Their mother, Sibylla, had been the sister of count Geoffrey of Anjou, and king Henry's aunt. They were, all things considered, mostly motivated by greed, with count Matthew being promised the county of Mortain in Normandy, and in England he was promised Kirketon and the honour of Hay, while count Philip was promised the county of Kent, and the castles of Dover and Rochester and an annual income of a thousand pounds from the revenues in England.[189] Howden only provides us with the grants the Young king made to his allies at Paris, but Newburgh is more blunt and explains that they only used their support for the Young King as a pretext: "But in reality they were seeking the business of private hatred, as in the case of the king of France, or that of gain, as in the case of the count of Flanders.[190]

Count Philip had been associated with the rule of Flanders as early as 1157, when his father confirmed him as count before leaving for the Holy Land. Flanders was placed under the protection of king Henry, most likely due to the close family connection between them. But

[188] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 398-402.
[189] *Chronica*, 1, 367.
[190] Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 121.

Philip, as a fourteen-year-old boy, issued charters, changed some of the advisors his father had chosen and directed policy on his own, showing himself as a mature ruler at an early age.[191] Count Matthew appears in the chronicles in 1160, when he married king Stephens daughter, the abbess of Rumsey, which according to Torigny was something completely unheard of. With earl William, the last remaining son of Stephen, dead on his return from the Toulouse campaign in 1159, the county of Boulogne was without a ruler, and Mary, William's sister was left as sole heir to Boulogne. Matthew, possibly assisted by king Henry, abducted and married her, most likely against her will, as she a few years later returned to her abbey when the marriage was annulled.[192]

The marriage did not help to keep the ties between king Henry and the two counts, as Matthew's claim on the county of Mortain through his wife made him seek an alliance with king Louis. If king Henry had in fact orchestrated Matthew's marriage, he must have felt that Matthew should be content with the county of Boulogne. Matthew probably disagreed and either his honour, his greed, or both, made him hostile to king Henry. Count Philip must have been more motivated by a fear of survival, with so much of France already under king Henry's control, none of his neighbours could have felt very safe. The prospect of receiving substantial lands in England, and a weakened Angevin Empire under the Young King helped as well to take king Louis' side in 1173.

The motivations here were also mostly economic and territorial in its nature. The county of Kent, which the Young King granted to count Philip for his support, had been held by another Fleming, the mercenary captain William of Ypres, who had been a strong supporter of king Stephen during the civil war. It was the same land that Philip was promised in 1173, suggesting that he felt he had some claim to them. In the case of king William there was a question of honour and of earlier disputes with king Henry, but in Philip's case, there were none, except for when king Henry forced through the marriage of the heiress to Boulogne and Philip's brother Matthew, which caused a hostile reaction from count Philip and his father. Although it provided their family control over the neighbouring county of Boulogne, it was a sure signal that king Henry would not hesitate to intervene in neighbouring counties to ensure that a ruler to his liking would be installed. This was of course something that was not

[191] Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders*, 71.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 754.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 55.;Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World, 1066-1216*, 35.
[192] S. P. Thompson, "Mary [Mary of Blois], Suo Jure Countess of Boulogne (D. 1182), Princess and Abbess of Romsey," (Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004).

uncommon. King Henry I had intervened in Flanders in 1127 when they were in the process of electing a new ruler, which was something king Louis VI of France had also done, but the count was probably sensitive to the high-handed treatment of king Henry, and how little there was Philip could do about it due to king Henry's military and economic superiority.[193]

4.1.3 Count Theobald of Blois

Count Theobald had almost as long of a history with king Henry as king Louis had. The counts of Blois and Anjou had long been rivals, but when count Geoffrey of Anjou conquered Normandy the relationship somewhat changed. Even though the then count of Blois, Theobald IV, was the elder brother of king Stephen of England, it did not prevent Theobald from attempting to stay on good terms with Geoffrey when he became the new duke of Normandy, as Theobald did not oppose the conquest.[194] Theobald IV's successor, his son, Theobald V, faced a bigger challenge with Geoffrey's son Henry II, who quickly acquired England and Aquitaine in addition to Normandy and Anjou. It put count Theobald in a very threatened position as he now shared a far larger border with the immensely powerful king Henry. Theobald appears however to have been firmly placed in king Henry's camp in the early parts of his reign. Torigny wrote that in December 1158, king Henry and count Theobald came to an agreement, probably concerning tensions along their border. Count Theobald was in any case required to give up the castles of Amboise and Fréteval, and in the same agreement king Henry traded two more border-castles from the neighbouring count of Perche, in exchange for the castle of Belléme.[195]

Theobald was still in alliance with king Henry in 1159, when he made some attacks on the lands of king Louis and his brother, the count of Dreux during the Toulouse campaign. But the peace settlement after the Toulouse campaign marks the shift in Theobalds allegiance. The marriage of his sister Adela to king Louis ensured an alliance between Blois and king Louis, which is evident when Theobald and Louis both contribute to the fortification of the castle of Chaumont, which belonged to Theobald. King Henry performed a quick attack on the castle, forcing Theobald and Louis to flee, and Henry taking the castle, which he gave to one of

[193] Oksanen, *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World, 1066-1216*, 26-29.; Crouch, *The Normans*, 196-97.
[194] Kathleen Thompson, *Power and Border Lordship in Medieval France : The County of the Perche, 1000-1226*, Studies in History New Series (2002), 91-92.; Heather J. Tanner, *Families, Friends, and Allies : Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, C. 879-1160*, The Northern World (2004), 218-26.
[195] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 747.

Theobalds enemies, who he was sure would not surrender the castle.[196] Another incident in 1169 renewed hostilities between count Theobald and king Henry, when a baron on the border between Blois and Maine died and Theobald wanted to secure control over the deceased baron's castles. The baron in control of these castles realised that his only chance of survival was to receive the protection of king Henry. He then sold his castles to Henry, effectively drawing him into the conflict with count Theobald.[197]

Count Theobald's support for the Young King can clearly be attributed to border tensions between him and king Henry. Henry's involvement in Theobald's internal conflicts probably served as a clear reminder towards Theobald of king Henry's active policy of retrieving castles on his borders. While from the point of view of king Henry it was probably necessary due to his constant conflicts with the king of France and the barons in Brittany and Aquitaine, but for count Theobald the loss of these castles further compromised the integrity of his territories and weakened his control over his county. Theobald's gravitation towards king Louis in the same period probably came as a reaction towards this, and there is no surprise that Theobald answered king Louis' summons to Paris in 1173, to prepare for the invasion of Normandy. Theobald was there promised the castle of Amboise, together with an annual payment from the revenues of Anjou, and a restoration of his influence in the Touraine, which had been in the possession of the counts of Anjou since the previous century.[198]

The pattern from all of these rulers are a clear alienation from king Henry, due in most part to his consolidation of his borders, and sometimes ruthless intervention in their internal politics, as in the case with Flanders and Blois. Their motivations for entering the conflict were surely dictated by their need to ascertain their own authority in their principality, and their security were to a great extent threatened by the existence of the Angevin "Empire". Allying with king Louis against king Henry II were as much a consequence of king Henry's own policies towards his frontier and his neighbours as it was their own desires for a redress of personal grievances or territorial and economic ambitions.

[196] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 754-55.
[197] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 772-74.
[198] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 367-68.

4.2 King Louis and his motivations

When the Young King fled from his father at Chinon in 1173, it was at his father-in-law, king Louis VII of France, that he sought refuge and help. The relationship between king Henry and his son had broken down at the conference at Limoges earlier in the year, where the Young King had lost his temper and demanded possession of either Normandy, England or Anjou. Roger of Howden claims that this was not entirely the Young King's own idea, and that Louis had been working to widen the rift between them. The Young King was sent by his father to meet with king Louis, under the pretext that Louis wished to see his daughter Margaret. Of the meeting Howden wrote: "From this circumstance great injury resulted to the kingdom of England, and to the kingdom of France as well. For Louis, king of France, who always held the king of England in hatred, counselled the new king of England, as soon as he should arrive in Normandy, to request the king, his father, to give him either the whole of England, or the whole of Normandy, where he himself might reside with his daughter."[199]

Howden's accusations warrant a look at what motives king Louis had, or could possibly have, for manipulating his son-in-law to make such great demands of his father, king Henry. King Louis VII, was king of the French, and of the house Capet, the lords of Ile-de-France, with its capital Paris. As the king of the French, Louis claimed overlordship over all of the French-speaking territories, which translates roughly to modern-day France, including the outlaying principalities of Flanders, Champagne, Burgundy, Toulouse and Gascony. After the breakup of the Carolingian Empire, France had broken up into a mass of principalities, some larger than others, with the rulers of the largest duchies and counties constantly fighting against each other. The Capetians in Paris styled themselves kings of France, but their base of power was limited to Ile-de-France. The Capetian laid thus claim to overlordship over all of France, but lacked the power to continually enforce their overlordship, and the most powerful dukes and counts were only loosely committed to their lord, sometimes an ally of the king, and other times at war with him.

4.2.1 A king with half a kingdom

William the conquerors elevation to king of England in 1066 altered the balance of power in northern-France by vastly improving the duke of Normandy's economic and military power,

[199] *Chronica*, 1, 362.

at least in theory, but not always in practice, due to the Conqueror's children and their internal rivalry. Count Geoffrey of Anjou's conquest of Normandy in the 1140's and his son, Henry's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine, and him inheriting the kingdom of England, the duchy of Normandy and the greater county of Anjou ensured that king Louis was facing a powerful conglomeration of French territories under the control of one of his vassals. King Louis thus saw himself eclipsed by one of his vassals, both in terms of riches and military power. King Louis demesne bordered with king Henry's own lands in Normandy and in Aquitaine, with large areas where their authorities clashed, with both laying claims to overlordship over the castles, towns and barons in these areas. From the point of view of king Louis, this authority was essential to uphold, lest his opponent, king Henry, in time would establish overlordship and further encroach on king Louis' lands. Long term, this would mean the destruction of the Capetians ability to act as kings of France. It was therefore imperative for king Louis to prevent the eldest son of king Henry from inheriting an intact empire, cementing the king of England's claim to control over so much of France. A breakup of king Henry's dominions must therefore have been one of king Louis' greatest motivations from 1154 and onwards.

King Louis attempting to turn the Young King against his father resonates well with king Louis wanting to break up king Henry's control over his dominions. King Henry giving up one of his principalities would reduce his power, all depending on which territory he would give up, create possible problems of cooperation between father and son and thus creating a possible new ally for king Louis. If king Henry refused, as he did, it would most likely put the Young King firmly against his father. The Young King's status as co-king and heir to most of the Angevin lands, would create dilemmas of loyalty for king Henry's vassals, further destabilizing king Henry's lands and weakening him. This line of thought suggests calculated planning, and Louis does not necessarily appear as a calculated person.

Newburgh describes king Louis as being motivated by his private hatred towards king Henry, suggesting that emotions played a part in king Louis' decisions in 1173.[200] That there was animosity between the two kings is most likely. Over 20 years full of conflicts between the two kings could hardly have improved the relationship between them. Newburgh also provides us with king Louis' justification for the war against king Henry. When king Henry's messengers reached king Louis' court and demanded that the Young King return to

[200] Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 121.

Normandy, Louis asked the messengers who sent them, and they answered that they were sent by the king of England. Louis then replied that the only king of England he knows, is the one beside him, referring to the Young King.[201] He then claimed that when the Young King was crowned king of England in 1170, king Henry had effectively given up his own title as king, thus justifying the Young King's demands. This was a bald claim, and one that was wrong. Louis himself was familiar with the practice of crowning the heir in his father's lifetime. Usually the barons of the count, duke or king would give homage to the heir in order to secure a peaceful transition of power when the ruler died. This did not always have the desired effect, as the civil war between Stephen and Matilda can testify to. The practice of crowning the heir was established by the Capetians themselves, when the first Capetian king had his son crowned to prevent the barons from electing a king from their own ranks, and it was a practice applied frequently by the Capetians. Although it was a rare occurrence for the king of England to have his son crowned, the practice was well known, and a practice which Louis knew intimately.[202]

4.2.2 Policy of expansion of royal authority

Drawing on what has already been discussed concerning the conquest of England in 1066 and how this altered the "balance of power" in Northern-France, and even more so with the unification of Aquitaine, Brittany, Normandy and England under the counts of Anjou after 1154, it is worth noting that this happened at the same time as the French Kings were attempting to revive their own royal authority, which had seen a sharp decline during the previous century, with the emergence of the principalities such as Normandy and Anjou, where the rulers homage to the French King was more theoretical than anything else. The historian Jean Dunbabin explains how the policy of consolidating royal powers had begun during the reign of Louis VII's predecessor, Louis VI and continued by Louis VII.[203]

This policy is most visible in the reign of Philip II, Louis VII's son, who were far more aggressive, yet drew on the same methods as his father and grandfather. Louis VII's policy of consolidating and expanding royal power were clearly limited by the relative weakness of the French King compared to his vassals, who were overshadowing him in the case of king Henry

[201] *Historia*, Book 2, 117-18.
[202] Andrew W. Lewis, "Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France," *The American Historical Review* 83, no. 4 (1978).
[203] Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1180* (1985), 267.

II, and in the case of the counts of Flanders and Blois, they were not far behind king Louis in terms of income and military power.[204] In comparison, king Henry's policy of expanding ducal authority in Aquitaine caused him continuous troubles, and yet he only faced local lords with little power outside their castles. King Louis was thus forced to push hard only where resistance was weak to avoid starting conflicts he could not win. And yet this policy clearly helps to explain his involvement in 1173-74. King Henry's growing problems with his son, and the rising number of dissatisfied barons offered opportunities for a breakup of Angevin power.

4.3 The relationship between king Louis VII and king Henry II

The conflict of 1173-74 followed a common recipe used by the French Kings, namely to use an already existing conflict between the English King and a family member as a starting point for an invasion of Normandy. In the case of 1173-74, the Anglo-Norman chroniclers accuse Louis of more than this. Roger of Howden goes as far as giving king Louis the blame for the troubles between the Young King and king Henry.

"For Louis, king of France, who always held the king of England in hatred, counselled the new king of England, as soon as he should arrive in Normandy, to request the king, his father, to give him either the whole of England, or the whole of Normandy, where he [the Young King] himself might reside with his daughter."[205]

Howden was of course writing from the perspective of king Henry II, but the meeting between the Young King, his wife and king Louis did take place however, as Robert de Torigny also mentions it, although he makes no accusations, and only writes that king Louis received them most joyfully, "as he would his children."[206] The Young King proceeded to ask his father for a principality of his own, which of course, king Henry refused. The similarities between the Young King's demand, and the demand Robert Curthose made to his father, could point to the fact that Howden borrowed the idea from the writers of that period, or that the Young King got the inspiration from Curthose. It is of course impossible to tell what really happened at the meeting, but the fact of the matter is that after his flight from Chinon,

[204] For an explanation on how the Capetian kings were able to maintain a certain sway over vassals who were their equals in territory and wealth, see Robert Fawtier, *The Capetian Kings of France : Monarchy & Nation (987-1328)*, trans. Lionel Butler and R.J. Adams, vol. 35, Les Capetiens Et La France (1960), 60-65.
[205] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 362.
[206] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 779.

the Young King quickly arrived at St. Denis outside Paris, where king Louis called together a great council of his barons.[207]

The Young King's external supporters divided themselves into two large armies, with king Louis invading Normandy from the south, while the count of Flanders and Boulogne, accompanied by the Young King, invaded Normandy from the east. Forgoing the short, but heavily defended route through the Vexin, king Louis attacked Verneuil, not far from Robert of Leicester's castle of Breteuil. King Louis' siege of Verneuil was similar to what he had done the last time king Louis involved himself in one of king Henry's conflicts with his family. In 1152, king Louis invaded Normandy, allied with king Henry's brother Geoffrey, and other counts along the Norman border, as well as king Stephen and his son, count Eustace.[208] King Louis was given free movement through the lands of the count of Meulan, and marched on Normandy, but when he heard that Henry was quickly marching to meet him, king Louis opted for more caution and did not it seem, invade until Henry went to Anjou to deal with his brother. King Louis then proceeded to burn the town of Tilliéres and a village close to Verneuil. The conflict ended after Henry's brother surrendered, as king Louis and Henry then negotiated a peace agreement.[209]

King Louis showed less caution when attacking Normandy in 1173, as he spent quite some time besieging Verneuil without success. Either he was confident that the dual invasion would prevent king Henry from arriving to defend Verneuil, or he was willing to take more risks than in previous conflicts. Either way, the invasion of eastern Normandy came to a halt after count Philip of Flanders' brother, the count of Boulogne, died. King Henry was then free to march against king Louis. King Henry quickly took Robert of Leicester's castle of Breteuil, and from there he could send a challenge to king Louis, saying he intended to march on Verneuil and lift the siege. Torigny reports that king Louis then took the advice of his council and retreated, while Newburgh comments that king Louis fled like a frightened hare. Howden is more elaborate about the siege, writing that king Louis managed to burn part of the town by breaking a truce he had made with the inhabitants, before fleeing at king Henry's approach.[210]

---

[207] Fantosme, *Chronicle*, 2-7.

[208] For a discussion on the conflict between Henry and his brother, see Warren, *Henry II*, 46-47. and for an argument against Warren view, see Keefe, "Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession."

[209] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 731-32.; Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 252-53.; Warren, *Henry II*, 46-48.

[210] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 781.; Newburgh, *Historia*, Book 2, 125.; Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 371.

The Anglo-Norman chroniclers certainly paints a bad picture of king Louis here, but all it really tells is that king Louis was not willing to risk losing the war through a pitched battle.

This conflict appears similar to 1173 in several aspects. King Louis is allied with a member of king Henry's nuclear family, this time king Henry's brother, who is feeling cheated of his inheritance, namely the county of Anjou. Geoffrey here is around the same age as the Young King was in 1173, and as with the Young King, Geoffrey's main obstacle to gaining the title and honour he felt he had the right to, was king Henry. Warren discusses the possibility that Geoffrey at this time was convinced by the barons of Anjou to rebel, giving them a chance to increase the autonomy they had lost during the countship of king Henry's father. He does not seem to take into account Geoffrey's failed attempt to kidnap and marry Eleanor of Aquitaine, only to see her married to Henry, and Henry thus receiving the large duchy of Aquitaine.[211]

Another significant similarity is that king Louis is also allied with Henry's rival for the English throne. In 1152 however, king Henry was challenging king Stephen for the English throne, while in 1173, it was the Young King who was attempting to remove king Henry from power. Other allies of king Louis are familiar as well. The count of Boulogne, in 1153 this was Eustace, king Stephen's son, the count of Champagne, Stephen's nephew and the count of Meulan.

The two conflicts appear to have the same goal as well, in king Louis' case at least. Henry had already built up a significant conglomerate of land, the counties of Anjou, Maine and Touraine, and the duchies of Aquitaine and Normandy. In 1173, Henry's lands also included Brittany and England. Louis attempted in 1153 to remove king Henry from Normandy, preferring to have it controlled by Stephen, who must have appeared to king Louis as the weaker opponent of the two. Much like in 1173, where king Louis obviously preferred to have the Young King controlling England and Normandy in a weakened state and by a person he commanded a greater control over.

From a military point of view the conflicts share even more similarities. In 1152, Geoffrey attempted to destabilize king Henry's lands from the inside by using his castles in Anjou to raid the surrounding lands belonging to king Henry and his vassals. Stephen attacked Henry's strongholds in England, and Louis stood for the outside invasion of Normandy. This is where

[211] Warren, *Henry II*.: 46-47

the similarities end however. Geoffrey was soon brought back to obedience with Henry quickly marching into Anjou and attacking his castles. King Louis makes raids into Normandy, but fails to capture any castles, and after Geoffrey's surrender, Louis agrees to a truce with king Henry. Henry is then free to travel to England, and curiously enough he leaves Geoffrey in charge of the defense of Normandy in his absence.[212]

Although king Louis, here as in 1173 had constructed a large assembly of allies against king Henry, he still was not able to conduct a successful campaign into Normandy. He even had the advantage that king Henry was reluctant to attack Louis directly, as he was still his lord, and thus there was little to prevent king Louis to besiege the Norman border castles. Shortly after Geoffrey's capitulation in 1152, king Louis agrees to a truce, while king Stephen and count Eustace were still very much invested in the conflict with Henry. In 1173, king Louis breaks off peace negotiations having suffered much the same setbacks, with the capture of earl Hugh of Chester and Ralph de Fougères at Dol, showing more determination than in 1152, and continued the conflict with a new attack on Normandy in 1174, this time throwing all caution into the wind and going straight for the capital, Rouen.

The conflicts between king Louis and king Henry up until 1173 were quite numerous, but it was not always king Louis who was attempting to disrupt king Henry's rule. In 1159, king Henry decided to make good on queen Eleanor's claim on the county of Toulouse, which was ruled by count Raymond de St. Giles. Count Raymond had married the sister of king Louis not long after king Henry and queen Eleanor had married. For king Louis it had been a way to retain influence in southern France, and at the same time to have better assurances of keeping Toulouse out of king Henry's control. Count Raymond appealed to his brother-in-law, king Louis, for help. This created a dilemma for both kings. By helping his ally, Louis risked being defeated and humiliated by his own vassal, but by refusing to aid his ally and brother-in-law, he risked being seen as a coward, giving king Henry the impression that he could do what he wanted. Louis most likely didn't relish the thought of even further Angevin expansion in Southern-France. Louis chose the risk of being defeated in battle, and he arrived in person to help defend the city of Toulouse. Louis' presence in the city created problems of its own for king Henry. If he continued to attack the city, he could end up with his own liege as his captive. In 1151, he had sworn allegiance to king Louis, and the king had given him no good

[212] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*.: 252-253

reasons for him to break that oath. King Henry was in this case the aggressor, and would be seen as the one attacking his own lord. Louis had come to the defense of his brother by marriage, and was merely protecting his own family. Despite having an overwhelming military advantage, Henry decided to break the siege and attack further north, where he did not risk the possibility of capturing his liege. That this was a sensitive issue for Henry is clear because he chose to end an ambitious military campaign with only very minor territorial gains, rather than having to face Louis in battle.[213]

The contrast to both 1173 and the conflict in 1152 are clear. King Henry is here the attacker in a very rare and spectacular military campaign. The king of Scotland, which at that time was king Malcolm IV took part in the campaign as a member of king Henry's company. Count Theobald of Blois was also fighting for king Henry, and when the conflict moves from Toulouse to Normandy, count Theobald makes diversionary attacks on king Louis, though with little success. The Toulouse campaign serves as a good example of the shape and nature of the conflicts between king Henry and king Louis. This time king Henry was in the role we usually see king Louis in. He had created a network of allies, and although he does not attack king Louis, he must have calculated that king Louis would most likely come to the aid of his brother-in-law, or face the ridicule of being seen as a weak king who could not defend his own family. It is also curious to observe that king Henry was still reluctant to directly attack king Louis, which was not the case in 1173 at Verneuil, or in 1174 at the siege of Rouen. It does help to signify the relative danger the conflict of 1173-74 posed to king Henry compared to the other conflicts between king Henry and king Louis.

4.4 The Young King's marriage and king Louis as father-in-law

King Louis' defense of his brother-in-law in the Toulouse campaign in 1159 does have a connection to the conflict of 1173-74, as king Louis was the Young King's father-in-law. The betrothal between the Young King, and king Louis' daughter Margaret was arranged in an attempt to establish a more lasting peace between the two kings. Tying the two families closer

[213] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 750-51.; Richard Benjamin, "A Forty Years War: Toulouse and the Plantagenets, 1156–96," *Historical Research* 61, no. 146 (1988).; For a discussion on the significance of Henry's homage to Louis see C. Warren Hollister, "Normandy, France and the Anglo-Norman Regnum," *Speculum* 51, no. 2 (1976). and John Gillingham, "Doing Homage to the King of France," in *Henry II : New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (2007).

together would hopefully defuse tensions and provide longer periods of peace. For king Henry there were other motives involved. As a dowry for Margaret, king Louis provided the castles he controlled on the Norman Vexin, which he had acquired as the price for acknowledging Geoffrey of Anjou's conquest of Normandy. King Henry saw these castles as vital to the defense of Normandy, and he was eager to claim them.[214] The agreement was that the children should be betrothed for three years, with the castles in question would be occupied by the Templars. The betrothal had already been negotiated before the Toulouse campaign, and so Margaret was already in king Henry's custody by the time the betrothal was reconfirmed in 1160.

The proposed marriage between the two royal families had only happened once before since the conquest, when king Stephen's son Eustace married king Louis VII's sister, Constance, who later married count Raymond St. Giles. The marriage between Eustace and Constance served to cement the alliance between Stephen and Louis against the Angevins who were fighting king Stephen in England and Normandy. For king Stephen, who was the son of a count, it served to better legitimize his own dynasty as kings, by marrying another royal house, who had been kings of France for a few centuries already.[215] King Henry's motives must have been much the same. King Henry's father had also only been a count, and for the Young King to marry a princess, it would bring further prestige to himself and the Angevin house.

The betrothal between the Young King and Margaret did not serve to promote peace between the two kings however, as king Henry moved quickly to have them married so he could retrieve control of the Norman Vexin. There were some complications due to the close kinship between the two children, so king Henry took advantage of the conflict over the papacy, where the election in 1159 had produced a pope, Alexander III, and an anti-pope, Octavian. In return for promising support to pope Alexander, king Henry received a papal dispensation for the marriage.[216] Henry did not use the dispensation immediately, but when king Louis's wife died, he quickly remarried in the hopes of finally getting a son. Louis' choice of wife was the sister of the counts of Blois and Champagne. The counts of Blois and

[214] For a more detailed discussion around Henry's motives for the betrothal and subsequent marriage, see Diggelmann, "Marriage as Tactical Response: Henry II and the Royal Wedding of 1160," *The English Historical Review* 119, no. 483 (2004).
[215] Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154*, 133-34.
[216] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 29.; Frank Barlow, "The English, Norman, and French Councils Called to Deal with the Papal Schism of 1159," *The English Historical Review* 51, no. 202 (1936).

Champagne had already tied themselves to king Louis by both marrying his daughters. With the prospects of the children of Louis and Adela of Blois further strengthening the bonds between the two houses. The counts of Blois and Champagne were also king Stephen's cousins, and so had claims to the English throne, which king Henry probably was very aware of, in addition to the military threat a Blois-Capetian alliance posed to Normandy.

King Henry reacted to this prospect of a strong alliance against him between his neighbours by having the Young King and Margaret married ten days before king Louis' own marriage was to take place. The Templars being witness to the marriage, then handed the castles over to king Henry, who quickly had them fortified and strengthened. King Louis was outraged by this, but there was little he could do to have the marriage annulled because of the close kinship between the Young King and Margaret, as he himself was equally related to his new bride.[217] This caused both king Louis and his allies the counts of Blois and Champagne to reinforce the castle of Chaumont, with the intention of attacking the city of Tours, which king Henry held. King Henry quickly marched on the castle, forcing king Louis and his allies to flee or face him in battle.

Besides the failed military reaction, there was little king Louis and his allies could do about the marriage. Luckily for king Louis, he himself finally got a son in 1165, who was quickly proclaimed his heir, preventing the prospect of having any eventual children of the Young King and Margaret succeeding to the French throne. The Young King's marriage to Margaret did have more positive effects for king Louis however. As the father-in-law he naturally gravitated closer towards the Angevins, which is evident as the frequency between king Henry and king Louis greatly increased.[218] Not only did the frequency of the meetings between king Henry and king Louis increase, but suddenly king Louis had a better reason to intervene in family conflicts in the Angevin family as well. The interests and status of the Young King and his wife was suddenly his concern as well, being concerned for the well fare of his daughter especially. For king Louis it would be just as important to see his daughter crowned queen, just as much as it would be to see the Young King rule as king of England. When the Young King was crowned at Westminster in 1170 without Margaret, king Louis

[217] Howden, *Chronica*, 1, 257-58.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 30-33.
[218] John Gillingham, "The Meetings of the Kings of France and England, 1066-1204," in *Normandy and Its Neighbours, 900-1250 : Essays for David Bates*, ed. David Crouch, Kathleen Thompson, and David Bates (2011), 19-25.

responded by raiding across the Norman border in response. The issue was only settled when the Young King was crowned a second time, this time together with Margaret.[219]

4.5 King Louis as overlord of France

In the second chapter, the barons of king Henry were discussed, and just as the marriage in 1160 created a strong possibility of king Louis intervening in the family affairs of king Henry; king Louis' title as king of the French also gave him the possibility of intervening in conflicts between king Henry and his own barons on the continent. The rivalry between them made it appealing to attempt to place the other in a bad light, and this was something they on many occasions attempted to do. While Louis gave Henry very few opportunities to embarrass him, the more complex nature of Henry's conflicts with his vassals served to give Louis many opportunities to place Henry in a bad light. This particular game of politics and propaganda was meant to both create conflicts for the other, and encourage already existing conflicts and blow them out of proportion.[220]

The conflict of 1173 has so far in this chapter been discussed as a major conflict between king Henry and king Louis, and either as a large-scale military campaign, like the one king Henry had against Toulouse in 1159, or as king Louis intervening in a family conflict, like the one in 1152 between king Henry and his brother Geoffrey. A third possible way to look at the conflict of 1173 is to view it as the Young King, as a vassal of king Henry, appealing to king Louis, his lord, for help. The Young King having done homage to king Louis for Normandy, Anjou and Brittany, making him a vassal of king Louis just as much as he was the vassal of his father.

In a major conflict between the two kings, that started in 1167, it was the barons of Henry and Louis that were the main motivating factors for starting the conflict, and keeping it going when the kings were at the point of negotiating a peace agreement. When the young count of Auvergne was dispossessed by his uncle, the uncle had sworn in the presence of king Henry that he would abide by justice in respect of his nephew. The uncle failed to do this however, and when the king Henry began to punish him by devastating his lands, he went to the French

[219] Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 92.
[220] Jean Dunbabin, "Henry II and Louis VII," in *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent (2007), 57-59.

King's court, and according to Torigny; "sowed discord between them."[221] This incident coincided with an ongoing dispute between the two kings concerning money both of them had collected to the aid of the crusaders in Jerusalem. King Henry wanted to ship the money through his own lands with the help of his own men because the money had been raised within his own district. The money had been deposited at Tours, and king Louis claimed that the money should be sent to Jerusalem by his men, because the city of Tours belonged to him. The result of the argument was that the city of Tours was burned. The question of how the money was to be sent to The Holy Land must have been a question of prestige between the two. The two incidents were probably intertwined. Henry's attempt to ascertain his authority in Auvergne, a county on the Aquitanian border in the east, where the influence of the duke of Aquitaine intertwined with the king of France, can't have created any enthusiasm at the French court. King Louis attempted to divert king Henry's attention away from Auvergne by raiding the Vexin.[222]

The two kings met to discuss a truce, but the negotiations broke down. Torigny blames king Louis' barons for this when he mentions the meeting, saying that: "the kings of England and France had a conference in the Vexin to discuss peace; but no good resulted from it, for the lenity of king Louis was negative by the asperity of his nobility."[223] What Torigny says here is that while king Louis may have been prepared to make peace, the attitude of his nobles must have made him afraid of being seen as weak by his own men, and in turn he refused to discuss a truce. A truce was nevertheless agreed in August, two months after the meeting in the Vexin. By this time both parties had destroyed villages and castles in the borderlands. Henry must have been the most eager one for peace, as he was dealing with rebels in Brittany and Aquitaine at the same time.[224]

Henry's conflicts with the barons in Brittany and Aquitaine has already been discussed in the previous chapter, but Louis did his best to take advantage of Henry's troubles in 1168, and when they were to meet at Easter in 1168, Henry was faced with barons from Brittany and Aquitaine in Louis' entourage, as well as representatives from Welsh princes and the King of Scotland. Henry refused to discuss peace with king Louis while he was cooperating with

[221] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 765.
[222] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 765-66.; Warren, *Henry II*, 105-06.; Dunbabin, "Henry II and Louis VII," 57.
[223] Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 766.
[224] "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 766-67.; Warren, *Henry II*, 106-08.

rebels, and the barons begged Louis not to make peace without them. It required several more raids from both sides until a new conference was held. This time Louis readily abandoned his allies, although attempts were made by him to reconcile Henry with his rebellious barons.

The peace agreed upon at Montmirail in January 1169 was an attempt to defuse the tensions between the two kings, and between Henry and the barons of Brittany and Aquitaine in Louis' company. At Montmirail, king Henry made it clear how he intended to divide up his lands between his sons when he died. His son Henry were to inherit Anjou, Normandy and England, while the third son Geoffrey were to become duke of Brittany and hold it as a fief of his brother Henry. The second son, Richard, were to inherit Aquitaine and hold it directly of the French King, independent of his brother. As a further concession, Henry agreed to a betrothal between Richard and Louis' daughter, Alice. It's reasonable to assume that this did much to ease Louis' worries. Louis had, in 1165, finally gotten a son by his third wife, which, in theory at least, secured the future of his dynasty as Kings of France. After 1165, his focus must have been on giving his son the best possible prospects, and the prospect of all of Henry's lands being inherited by his eldest son must have been a dreadful prospect for king Louis' son. Therefore, Richard holding Aquitaine directly from the French King, and closely tied to the King by marriage must have been a more appealing prospect to Louis.[225] The appearance of Eleanor and Richard as supporters of the Young King suggests, although it is not confirmed by any treaty made in 1173, that Aquitaine would remain free of the King of England if they succeeded in replacing king Henry with the Young King. Thus, the conference at Limoges, and the homage of the count of Toulouse to king Henry was quite significant in the breach in the royal family, and even more so in king Louis' own determination to place the Young King on the English throne.

4.6 Chapter Summary: The Young King's rebellion or King Louis' war?

When the Young King arrived in Paris in 1173, he could count on king Louis' support against king Henry. The long history of conflicts between Henry and Louis had only seemed to intensify in the last decade, with the latest far flung conflict happening in 1167 involving barons in Brittany and Aquitaine. In that conflict some of king Henry's barons had appealed

[225] *Henry II*, 108-10.; Strickland, *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183*, 70-72.; Torigni, "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte," 771.

to him and it was on this pretext that king Louis intervened on the barons' side. King Henry's treatment with his other neighbours had ensured that king Louis was in no lack of potential allies when the Young King appealed to him for support. King Louis had also actively been seeking out potential allies and tying them to him by marriage alliances. King Henry's apparent lack of caution in intervening in his neighbours' internal politics were also a good reason for the formation of a wide coalition against him. The immense wealth and the large geographical extent of the Angevin "Empire" also served as a constant threat to them, and to prevent king Henry from steamrolling them in negotiations their only option was to seek allies.

The conflict of 1173-74 appears then almost as just another of the many conflicts between the two kings, except that unlike the previous conflicts between the two, like the conflict in 1152 with king Henry's brother, and the one in 1167-68 with the barons of Brittany and Aquitaine, the conflict of 1173-74 contained strong elements of baronial rebellion and a family conflict, which increasingly helps to confuse how the conflict is seen. But the way the chroniclers present it, the conflict was one between king Henry and king Louis, where king Louis took advantage of the growing discontent of the Young King due to his lack of responsibilities and land appropriate for the elevated status his crowning and marriage to a princess had given him. The barons supporting king Henry were most of all interested in pursuing their own goals, whether they be territorial and economic, or tied to king Henry's own policies of expanding royal authority.

King Louis was equally concerned with the expansion of royal authority over near autonomous vassals, including king Henry who was vastly superior in terms of wealth and military power, and who controlled nearly half of what was considered the kingdom of France. The pattern of conflicts between king Louis and king Henry shows a clear tendency of king Louis exploiting tensions within the English royal family in attempts to destabilize his rival's authority in his dominions. King Louis also began to use his role as overlord over king Henry's continental lands as a way of intervening in king Henry's internal conflicts with the same motives of further destabilizing king Henry and expanding his own authority. This was not something extraordinary to the reigns of king Henry and king Louis, but rather something that had established itself as a pattern with the duke of Normandy's conquest of England in 1066, and which was further intensified with king Henry's acquisition of Brittany and Aquitaine, and thus further stressing the King of England's dominance over the King of

France. The external forces in the conflict of 1173-74 are too much involved and dictates too much of the events for the conflict to be considered a revolt, whether it was the Young King's revolt or king Henry's barons.

5 Conclusion

The objective of this thesis was to take a deep look at the conflict of 1173-74 that covered so much of king Henry II's Angevin "Empire". The intention was to determine the character of the conflict by examining the major actors fighting against king Henry, and by comparing it to some of king Henry's other conflicts, and other similar conflicts. The thesis was divided into three main chapters, the family, the barons and a last chapter concerning the French and the Scottish kings. The idea behind this division was to begin with the apparent core and cause of the conflict. The contemporary authors Jordan Fantosme and Roger of Howden pointed towards king Henry's eldest son, heir and co-king, Henry the Young King. Beginning with a study of the nuclear family and the young king in particular, provided the opportunity to start with a fairly narrow view of what this conflict was really about and gradually broadening this view, from the core family, to the prominent barons involved and seeing the conflict as a domestic conflict between two factions, and finally seeing how all this connected with the involvement of the French king, Louis VII, and the Scottish king, William the Lion.

5.1 Family conflict

King Henry II's nuclear family consisted of his wife, Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine, and their four sons, Henry the Young King, Richard, Geoffrey and John. Out of these five, only John did not take part in the conflict, due to his young age. The conflict in the family was in large part between Henry II and his eldest son, the Young King. The relationship between the Young King and his father reached its breaking point at a conference in Limoges, when the Young King demanded that he be given control of one of his father's principalities. This was a reaction to king Henry granting the youngest of his children, John, three important castles in Anjou, as part of a betrothal arrangement with the count of Maurienne.

The Young King's demand of being given one of his father's principalities to rule was not unprecedented. Robert Curthose had in 1078 demanded the same from his father, king William I of England. William I had reacted just like king Henry and rejected the demands, and Curthose had in turn rebelled against his father. The most unusual about the Young King's demand was perhaps that he felt he was in a situation where he had to make them. There was more of a tradition of the ruler sharing some of his responsibilities with his heir, as a way of training for the heir, and perhaps more importantly, retaining unity within the family.

An idle and bored son was a sure way of creating conflicts within the household in a medieval family, and especially among the ruling class. Two recent examples of an heir being given partial or total control over the principality was Philip, the count of Flanders, and king Henry himself. The count of Flanders had been given control when his father left for crusade, and Henry had been given control of Normandy, while his father retained control of Anjou. William I's and Henry II's failure to successfully share the rulership with their heirs might be a consequence of themselves assuming rulership from an early age. William had been the eldest surviving son of the previous duke of Normandy, and had thus assumed the rule when his minority ended. Henry had similarly been given the rule of Normandy by his father. They themselves had not been in the frustrating situation their sons were in, and failed or refused to understand their son's frustration and discontent.

The Young King's situation in 1173 was very similar to that of Robert Curthose's in 1078. The Young King had been crowned king of England in 1170, making him co-ruler alongside his father. He had been married at a very young age to Margaret, the daughter of king Louis VII of France, and he had done homage to king Louis for the county of Anjou, and the duchies of Normandy and Brittany, a ceremony which cemented his position as heir to these principalities. The Young King's reality was that he was still living in his father's castles, surrounded by his own followers, but also by advisors picked and removed on his father's orders. He did own any lands, so all his income was provided by his father as well. These were all signs that the Young King was still considered a minor, despite the fact that he had passed his eighteenth birthday. The dower that had come with his wife, Margaret, was still in king Henry's control. Margaret's dower was a sensitive subject, as part of it was three castles in the Vexin, with major strategic significance to the defence of Normandy and its capital, Rouen.

The Young King's situation was strikingly similar to that of Robert Curthose's in 1078, with Robert holding the title Count of Maine, and being designated regent of Normandy when his father was in England. But like the Young King, he held no real power. That they both ended up demanding more responsibilities in the form of their own principality suggests that they were frustrated and unhappy with their situation. Pressure from their own household also served as a reminder and probably helped to fuel their frustration, with young nobles eager for their lord to acquire land and responsibilities which provided them with opportunities to elevate their own status in their lord's service.

The Young King was supported by other family members in the conflict. His mother, Queen Eleanor was a strong supporter of his cause, sending two of his brothers to him in Paris, while she encouraged several Aquitainian nobles to give him support. Queen Eleanor's role was unprecedented in the extent of support for her son against her husband. It was not unusual for the mother to provide some sort of support for her son in a conflict with his father. Robert Curthose had received financial support from his mother, Queen Matilda, but her support remained passive however, and this allowed her to serve as a mediator between them. Queen Eleanor took an active part and placed herself firmly against her husband, which was very unusual. When she was captured by king Henry's soldiers, she was placed in house arrest and was not released until her son Richard succeeded Henry as king.

The Young King was as already mentioned supported by his brothers. Their relatively young age, Richard was sixteen and Geoffrey fourteen, suggests that they were motivated by their mother's encouragement more than anything else. The Young King and Richard would some years later develop a sibling rivalry that developed into armed conflicts. This is a clear difference from the 1078 conflict, where Robert Curthose did not have the support of his brothers. Robert was in 1078 some years older than the Young King was in 1173, and Robert was without the same assurance of his inheritance as the Young King was, which created a great sense of uncertainty for Robert, as his brothers were in a position to threaten his chance of inheriting Normandy and England.

The clearest difference between the conflict of 1173-74 and Robert Curthose's conflict in 1078 is shown in the form of domestic and foreign support. Curthose enjoyed some support among barons in Normandy, but the fighting was limited to Normandy's southern border. Robert himself tried to capture Rouen, but was forced to flee Normandy. He failed to receive any firm support from the count of Flanders, but was given a castle by the French king, Philip I, close to the Norman border, which he used as a base to raid the surrounding areas. That was the extent of the French support however, and Philip soon came to an agreement with king William, and participated in a siege against Robert. The Young King's support was much more substantial. Some part of this was clearly because king Henry's dominions was much larger than that of Curthose's father, king William, who only held England, Normandy and Maine. But the Young King had support from king Louis, king of France, William, king of Scotland, the counts of Flanders, Boulogne and Blois, and barons from Normandy, England, Brittany, Anjou, Maine and Aquitaine.

5.2 The barons

The Young King's support in 1173 was massive compared to Robert Curthose's conflict, despite their situation being much the same, and their motivations for going against their father's as well. Robert's conflict was very much a family conflict, and it appears to have remained very much a conflict between Robert and his father, a family conflict. The Young King support, in comparison to Roberts, was massive. Although the Young King may have essentially seen this as a conflict between himself and his father, king Henry, the barons supporting him had their own reasons for doing so, and few, if none, were out of loyalty to Henry the Young King. Their motivations either stemmed from personal grievances with king Henry, or through personal ambitions.

The Young King, as a close family member of the King, and as an anointed king, albeit with severely limited authority, represented an opportunity for those barons excluded from king Henry's inner circle of advisors and friends. Influence at the king's court could give great benefits, either through a lucrative marriage, forgiveness of debt, grants of land, or having the king's support in a dispute over land. Influence with the king was important for a baron with ambitions, and if one was excluded from it, there were less ways to advance one's fortunes, and there was always a risk that one of your rivals who had the king's ear could make gains at your expense. The possible solutions to this was either to spend time at the king's court, and attempt to ingratiate oneself with the king, which was easier said than done with a king like Henry II, who, as he became older, only listened to a small group of friends and family members, making it increasingly difficult for barons on the outside to gain any influence with the king. The other possibility was to support a rival to the throne, in the hope of being rewarded for this support. A major supporter would naturally have influence with the new king. The Young King represented a possibility for change, and some barons were eager for it. With the acceptance of their support, the entire nature of the conflict thus changed from one where the Young King was simply protesting his father's decision and trying to change his mind, to one where a faction inside the kingdom was attempting to replace the king with someone more to their liking. The conflict thus evolved from one that was mostly concerned with the royal family, to one that concerned the Angevin domains as a whole.

King Henry's policy of recovering royal demesne lost during the reign of his predecessor had ensured that many of the barons, especially in Normandy and its marches, were wavering in

their support for him. Henry's seizure of lands and especially castles created a sense of uncertainty among the barons regarding their lands. Those barons who had received grants of land from either king Stephen, or king Henry before 1154 were vulnerable, and the king used every excuse. Henry's policy towards the most powerful of his barons in England, the earls, was to curb their power, and preventing them from achieving the same level of autonomy rights as those of the French counts, with Henry, as the count of Anjou, knowing full well what these rights included, and how the count could exploit them.

Some of the resistance towards king Henry, in England especially, came from the highest echelon of the barons, the earls. The earls in England, unlike their counterparts on the continent, the counts, did not enjoy the same rights in their earldoms, and the king appears to have had a policy of further limiting their rights. At least two of the earls supporting the Young King had been hindered in one way or another from expanding their rights. Before 1154, king Henry had promised Ranulf, earl of Chester, the 'totus comitatus' of Staffordshire, in exchange for his support. Ranulf however, died before he could make good on the promise, and king Henry denied his son, Hugh, this possession. Earl Robert of Leicester also made attempts to prevent the third penny in Leicester from becoming a nominal rent. King Henry, in his dealing with the captured earl after 1173-74, made sure that the third penny became nominal, and that earl Robert would not be able to enforce the right to a third of all the profit of pleas in Leicester.

The barons' appetite for land were only in part motivated by the economic side of it. The acquisition of new land provided the baron with a basis for attracting new followers. But for a follower to remain loyal, they usually expected that the lord made provisions for them, in the form of land. The size of a magnates following affected his prestige and his honour. More importantly, the seizure of lands negatively affected a baron's standing, and severely hindered his ability to attract followers.

Henry's demesne policy does not alone explain why a large portion of the barons decided to support the Young King. Several of the barons who remained loyal, or at least neutral, had suffered seizure of castles. By looking at Normandy and England, a pattern appears clear however. In Normandy, the baronial support for the Young King was mostly located in the borderlands, where king Henry's quest for control of castles had been heaviest, but also where the ducal control traditionally had been weakest. Among the English earls, both the earl of Chester held a large amount of land close to the Norman border to Brittany, while earl Robert

of Leicester held the honours of Pacy and Breteuil, in south eastern-Normandy. In the south-east, Normandy bordered on the county of Blois and the lands of the Capetian kings of France. The count of Blois changed his loyalty from king Henry to king Louis of France gradually in the 1160's, following the same trend as the count of Meulan. Henry's policy, combined with the hostility of Blois, Capet and Flanders/Boulogne could very well explain the rapid fall of Eu, Aumale and Evreux. The Young king offered an opportunity for change, and the promise of rewards for loyalty. It also helped that the Young King had the backing of king Louis of France.

5.3 King Louis and his allies

The French king, Louis VII Capet, had a long history of conflicts with king Henry, yet these were usually smaller raids, followed by a peace conference and some form of settlement. Usually the raids were caused by a disagreement between the two kings, or by involvement from one part in a conflict between the king and his vassal. Henry's vassals in his French dominions had the advantage that they could appeal to king Louis, as he, as king of France, was king Henry's overlord. As king Louis acted as a focus point for all of king Henry's enemies, king Louis had contact with both Welsh princes and the Scottish king.

The relationship between the king of France and the duke of Normandy had been drastically altered after the duke of Normandy's conquest of England in 1066. Under king William I, and Henry I, the English kings had been in control of both England and Normandy, and in terms of money and military power were easily stronger than the French king. The French kings were still able to match them by allying the neighbouring counties. The alliance between Anjou and the French kings were especially important for maintaining some sort of balance between the powers. When Henry first became duke of Normandy, then inheriting the county of Anjou from his father, he had already become a dangerously strong vassal of the French king. When he then married Eleanor of Aquitaine, thus taking control of the largest duchy in western Europe, and in 1154 becoming king of England, he had completely altered the balance of power in Western-Europe.

King Henry's large assembly of land in France ensured that the borders between the two kings were extended beyond the traditional borderlands in Normandy, and there was a greater amount of conflicts between the two kings. Some conflicts were due to conflicting claims

over land and castles in the borderlands, while the larger and more serious conflicts were sparked by the French king's desire to break up king Henry's control over his domains. It was imperative for king Louis to prevent the establishment of an English hereditary overlordship over Anjou, Aquitaine and Brittany in the same way as Normandy. As king Louis would experience throughout his reign after 1154, he was completely eclipsed by king Henry when it came to money and manpower.

If the English kings were allowed to remain control over such a large part of France, the French kings would in time no doubt lose their significance, and their right to overlordship over all of France. This had no doubt been the cause of king Louis alliance with king Stephen of England while Henry was still only duke of Normandy, as an attempt to prevent Henry of being victorious in the English civil war. King Louis had later allied king Henry's brother Geoffrey, and other neighbouring counts, and launched an invasion against Normandy, as Geoffrey attempted to take control of Anjou, as he claimed was his by right of inheritance. King Louis also allied rebellious Breton and Aquitanian vassals in the late 1160's, no doubt to weaken king Henry's control in the two duchies. The conflict of 1173-74 easily fits into this pattern of conflicts aimed at disrupting the unity of king Henry's dominions.

The involvement of king William of Scotland reminds us that the conflict of 1173-74 was just as much a conflict about territorial ambitions as it was a conflict over the rulership of the Angevin dominion. The great Scotto-Northumbrian kingdom that king David I of Scotland had created during king Stephen of England's reign had been quickly demolished by king Henry in 1157, when Henry forced king William's predecessor to relinquish control of all lands in what was then considered England. When the Young King offered to king William the restoration of the lands he had lost, king William found it hard to resist. Unlike his grandfather, king David I, who had made his territorial gains under the pretext of supporting his niece Matilda, who was the rival of king Stephen during the civil war, king William had no other pretext than the conquest of land he held claim on. This is underlined by Jordan Fantosme's chronicle, where king William first offers his services to king Henry in exchange for what the Young King was offering. Only after king Henry's refusal does king William accept the Young King's offer and begin his invasion of northern England.

5.4 Modern day theories on the conflict of 1173-74

Robert Bartlett, in his large work on England from 1075-1225, differs between three types of baronial rebellion. The first type being when a lord rebels as a protest against infringements or threat of infringements from the royal government. The second type of rebellion, where he places the conflict of 1173-74, is when a group or "general movement" among the aristocracy supports a rival ruler, usually a member of the ruling family. Both Curthose's rebellion in 1088, and the conflict of 1173-74 is placed in this category by Bartlett. A case could be argued that Bartlett is right in placing the conflict of 1173-74 in this category, as the baronial support for the Young King was substantial, and at least the English earls and Norman barons such as the count of Meulan, who had suffered for siding with the French king in earlier conflicts, were eager for a change in rulership. The barons in Brittany and Aquitaine, and earl Hugh Bigod for that matter, had other motives. Earl Hugh Bigod's old age and exploitation of earl Robert of Leicester's army heavily suggests that he was more interested in geopolitical gains, i.e. the control of Norwich castle, than a change in rulership, which neither he nor his family would reap much benefits from. His eldest son was fighting on king Henry's side in the conflict.

The strongest argument against viewing this conflict as a type of baronial rebellion is the active involvement of king Louis of France and king William of Scotland. In the civil war, king Louis only involved himself as late as 1150, but he had within the same year made peace with Henry and his father, due to an illness preventing him from attacking Normandy. The contrast to 1173-74 is sharp. In this conflict, Louis is implied to have been involved from the beginning, suggesting that this was just as much king Louis conflict as it was the Young King's. Also, in 1173, he creates a large coalition, and at Verneuil, he sacrifices his own reputation by attacking the town during a truce he had agreed on. Despite the death of count William of Boulogne and the withdrawal of count Philip of Flanders, and king Henry's capture of Ralph de Fougères and the earl of Chester, king Louis breaks up a peace conference in late 1173, preferring to continue the fight against king Henry. This was also in contrast to earlier conflicts, like the one in 1169, where he negotiated a peace agreement with king Henry that effectually left his Breton and Aquitainian allies to their fate. It was only after a daring attempt to capture the Norman capital, and the collapse of the Young King's support in England, that king Louis fled Normandy and negotiated a peace.

The conflict of 1173 may have been started by the Young King's public argument with his father at Limoges, and his subsequent flight to Paris, but this was arguably only the boulder that started the avalanche. The Young King's conflict with his father offered his barons an opportunity to support a rival to king Henry's authority, and who offered them a chance to achieve their immediate ambitions, whether it was the reclamation of land or lost rights. But paradoxically, some of the Young King's supporters were at war with the same entity that the Young King so desperately wanted to inherit. The French King, the barons of Aquitaine and the count of Flanders all hoped for the total or partial dismemberment of king Henry's dominions. This could also be claimed was the motivating factor in Queen Eleanor's active involvement in the conflict as well. W.L Warren in his book on Henry II calls the conflict of 1173-74 for the great war. In a sense he is right. The barons support of the Young King makes the conflict clearly something more than a family conflict, but it is not enough to take the next logical leap and call it a baronial rebellion, as Bartlett does, mostly because the conflict contained too strong of an external element for it to be considered a rebellion, which is a term that implies that the conflict was mostly an internal one. The French king and his non-Norman allies thus attributes to the conflict being more of a war than a rebellion or family conflict.

The conflict of 1173-74 was something out of the ordinary, but not in the sense that the participants in the conflict was acting outside the norm of the time. The motives for the participants was normal for the time, but it was rather the fact that all these different aspects of medieval conflict all came together in this conflict. The Young King followed in the footsteps of Robert Curthose in making for on his father in a wish to get an early inheritance. The barons followed an all too familiar pattern in supporting a member of the royal family in order to remove a king that did not suit them. The Scottish king too followed an established pattern of invading England in a moment of weakness for the English king. King Louis of France was merely continuing his efforts of weakening king Henry's control over his domains. What made this conflict extraordinary for its time was that all this happened in the same conflict. This was in no small part due to the extensive lands that king Henry controlled, with all the problems that the barons in Aquitaine and Brittany brought with them, and the dominating figure that king Henry's "empire" posed to its neighbours ensured that when the Young King's quarrel with his father became public, many were willing to capitalise on this apparent weakness of king Henry. And thus evolved a family conflict that was appeared to be a symptom of a primogeniture inheritance system, into a full-fledged war between the richest

and most powerful king in European Christendom and the coalition of his weak neighbours, led by a French king eager to reclaim authority over his kingdom.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Fantosme, Jordan. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle.* Translated by R. C. Johnston. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Howden, Roger of. *The Annals of Roger De Hoveden: Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D 732 to A.D 1201.* Translated by Henry Thomas Riley. Vol. 1, London: H.G. Bohn, 1853.

Newburgh, William of. *The History of English Affairs : Book 2.* Translated by P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy. Aris & Phillips Classical Texts. Vol. Book 2, Warminster, Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips, 2007.

Torigni, Robert de. "The Chronicles of Robert De Monte." Translated by Joseph Stevenson. In *The Church Historians of England Vol. 4 Part Ii., Containing the History of William of Newburgh, the Chronicles of Robert De Monte; Translated from the Original Latin*, edited by Joseph Stevenson. Fleet Street, London: Seeleys, 1858.

Secondary Sources

Aird, William M. *Robert Curthose: Duke of Normandy C. 1050-1134.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008.

Amt, Emilie. *The Accession of Henry Ii in England : Royal Government Restored, 1149-1159.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993.

Aurell, Martin. *The Plantagenet Empire : 1154-1224.* Translated by David Crouch. L'empire Des Plantagenêt, 1154-1224. Halow: Longman, 2007.

———. *The Plantagenet Empire: 1154-1224.* Translated by David Crouch. Halow: Longman, 2007.

———. "Political Culture and Medieval Historiography: The Revolt against King Henry Ii, 1173–1174." *History* 102, no. 353 (2017): 752-71.

Bachrach, Bernard S. "The Angevin Strategy of Castle Building in the Reign of Fulk Nerra, 987-1040." *The American Historical Review* 88, no. 3 (1983): 533-60.

Barlow, Frank. "The English, Norman, and French Councils Called to Deal with the Papal Schism of 1159." *The English Historical Review* 51, no. 202 (1936): 264-68.

———. "Roger of Howden." *The English Historical Review* 65, no. 256 (1950): 352-60.

Barrow, G. W. S. *The Kingdom of the Scots : Government, Church and Society from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century.* London1973.

———. *Kingship and Unity : Scotland 1000-1306.* The New History of Scotland. 2nd ed. ed. Vol. 2, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

Bartlett, Robert. *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Bates, David. *The Prosopographical Study of Anglo-Norman Royal Charters.* Family Trees and the Roots of Politics : The Prosopography of Britain and France from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century. Edited by K. S. B. Keats-Rohan. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1997.

———. *William the Conqueror.* London: George Philip 1989.

Beeler, John H. "Castles and Strategy in Norman and Early Angevin England." *Speculum* 31, no. 4 (1956): 581-601.

Benjamin, Richard. "A Forty Years War: Toulouse and the Plantagenets, 1156–96." *Historical Research* 61, no. 146 (1988): 270-85.

Boorman, Julia. "The Sheriffs of Henry Ii and the Significance of 1170." In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, edited by George Garnett, John Hudson and J. C. Holt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Boussard, Jacques. "Le Gouvernement D'henri Ii Plantegenet." Paillart, 1956.
Bradbury, Jim. *The Capetians : Kings of France, 987-1328.* London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007.
Brown, R. Allen. "Royal Castle-Building in England, 1154-1216." *The English Historical Review* 70, no. 276 (1955): 353-98.
Carpenter, David. *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain, 1066-1284.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
Crouch, David. *The Beaumont Twins : The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century.* Cambridge: Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1986. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511897139.
———. *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300* Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2005.
———. *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300.* London: Routledge, 1992.
———. *The Normans: The History of a Dynasty.* London: Hambledon Continuum, 2002.
———. *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154.* Harlow: Longman, 2000.
David, Charles Wendell. *Robert Curthouse: Duke of Normandy.* London: Harvard University Press, 1920.
Davis, R. H. C. "William of Jumièges, Robert Curthose and the Norman Succession." *The English Historical Review* 95, no. 376 (1980): 597-606.
Diggelmann. "Marriage as Tactical Response: Henry Ii and the Royal Wedding of 1160." *The English Historical Review* 119, no. 483 (2004): 954-64.
Duby, Georges. *Medieval Marriage : Two Models from Twelfth-Century France.* The Johns Hopkins Symposia in Comparative History. Vol. 11, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
Dunbabin, Jean. *France in the Making 843-1180.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
———. "Henry Ii and Louis Vii." In *Henry Ii: New Interpretations*, edited by Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.
Dunn, Diana E. S. *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
Everard, Judith. *Brittany and the Angevins : Province and Empire, 1158-1203.* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. 4th Series. Vol. 48, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Eyton, Robert William. *Court, Household, and Itinerary of King Henry Ii: Instancing Also the Chief Agents and Adversaries of the King in His Government, Diplomacy, and Strategy.* London: Printed and sold by Taylor, 1878.
Fawtier, Robert. *The Capetian Kings of France : Monarchy & Nation (987-1328).* Translated by Lionel Butler and R.J. Adams. Les Capetiens Et La France. Vol. 35, London: Macmillan, 1960.
Flori, Jean. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
Foreville, Raymonde. *L'eglise Et La Royaute En Angleterre Sous Henri Ii Plantagenet : (1154-1189).* Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1943.
Garnett, George. "Ducal Succession in Early Normandy." Chap. 4 In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, edited by George Garnett, John Hudson and J. C. Holt, 80-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Gillingham, John. "Doing Homage to the King of France." In *Henry Ii : New Interpretations*, edited by Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.
———. *The English in the Twelfth Century : Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values.* Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2000.
———. "The Meetings of the Kings of France and England, 1066-1204." In *Normandy and Its Neighbours, 900-1250 : Essays for David Bates*, edited by David Crouch, Kathleen Thompson and David Bates. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.
———. *Richard Coeur De Lion : Kingship, Chivalry, and War in the Twelfth Century.* London: Hambledon Press, 1994.
———. *Richard I.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
———. "Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh." In *The Haskins Society Journal 12*, edited by Stephen Morillo. 2002. Studies in Medieval History, 15-38. Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2003.
Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England : 1 : C. 550 to C. 1307.* Vol. 1, Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1974.
Green, Judith A. *The Aristocracy of Norman England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
———. "Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier." In *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Daniel Williams. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990.
———. "Lords of the Norman Vexin." In *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich*, edited by John Gillingham and J. C. Holt. Cambridge: Boydell Press, 1984.
Hollister, C. Warren. "Normandy, France and the Anglo-Norman Regnum." *Speculum* 51, no. 2 (1976): 202-42.
Holt, J. C. "Presidential Address: Feudal Society and the Family in Early Medieval England: Iv. The Heiress and the Alien." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 35 (1985): 1-28.
Hosler, John D. "The "Golden Age of Historiography": Records and Writers in the Reign of Henry Ii." *History Compass* 12, no. 5 (2014): 13.
———. *Henry Ii : A Medieval Soldier at War, 1147-1189.* History of Warfare. Vol. 44, Leiden: Brill, 2007.
Joliffe, John Edward Austin. *Angevin Kingship.* London: Black, 1955.
Jones, Thomas M. "The Generation Gap of 1173-74: The War between the Two Henrys." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 5, no. 1 (1973): 24-40.
Jumièges, Guillaume de, Ordericus Vitalis, Robert de Torigni, and Elisabeth M. C. Van Houts. *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni : Vol. 1 : Introduction and Books I-Iv.* Vol. Vol. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
———. *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni : Vol. 2 : Books V-Viii.* Vol. Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
Keefe, Thomas K. "Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 6, no. 3 (1974): 266-74.
Kerr, Margaret H. "Angevin Reform of the Appeal of Felony." *Law and History Review* 13, no. 2 (1995): 351-91.
King, Edmund. *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
Kjeldstadli, Knut. *Fortida Er Ikke Hva Den En Gang Var.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1992.
Lally, J.E. "Secular Patronage at the Court of King Henry Ii." *Historical Research* 49, no. 120 (1976): 159-84.

Le Patourel, John. *Feudal Empires : Norman and Plantagenet.* History Series. Vol. 18, London: Hambledon Press, 1984.
———. "Henri Ii Plantagenêt Et La Bretagne." Chap. X In *Feudal Empires : Norman and Plantagenet*, edited by John Le Patourel. History Series, 99-116. London: Hambledon Press, 1984.
———. "The Norman Succession, 996-1135." *The English Historical Review* 86, no. 339 (1971): 225-50.
———. "The Plantagenet Dominions." *History* 50, no. 170 (1965): 289-308.
Lewis, Andrew W. "Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France." *The American Historical Review* 83, no. 4 (1978): 906-27.
———. "Anticipatory Association of the Heir in Early Capetian France." *American Historical Review* 83 (1978): 906.
———. *Royal Succession in Capetian France : Studies on Familial Order and the State.* Harvard Historical Studies. Vol. 100, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1981.
Lodge, Anthony. "Literature and History in the Chronicle of Jordan Fantosme." *French Studies* 44, no. 3 (1990): 257-70.
Martindale, Jane. "Eleanor of Aquitaine." In *Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries*, edited by Jane Martindale. Collected Studies Series. Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1997.
———. *Status, Authority and Regional Power : Aquitaine and France, 9th-12th Centuries.* Collected Studies Series. Vol. CS488, Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1997.
Mayer, Hans Eberhard. "Henry Ii of England and the Holy Land." *The English Historical Review* 97, no. 385 (1982): 721-39.
Milsom, S.F.C. "The Origin of Prerogative Wardship." In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy : Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, edited by George Garnett, John Hudson and J. C. Holt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Nicholas, David. *Medieval Flanders.* London: Longman, 1992.
Norgate, Kate. *England under the Angevin Kings.* London: Macmillan and co. ; New York: Macmillan and co., 1887.
Oksanen, Eljas. *Flanders and the Anglo-Norman World, 1066-1216.* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Painter, Sidney. "Castellans of the Plain of Poitou in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Speculum* 31, no. 2 (1956): 243-57.
———. "English Castles in the Early Middle Ages: Their Number, Location, and Legal Position." *Speculum* 10, no. 3 (1935): 321-32.
———. "The Houses of Lusignan and Chatellerault 1150-1250." *Speculum* 30, no. 3 (1955): 374-84.
———. "The Lords of Lusignan in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Speculum* 32, no. 1 (1957): 27-47.
Power, Daniel. *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries.* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. 4th Series. Vol. 62, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Ramsay, James H. *The Angevin Empire: Or the Three Reigns of Henry Ii, Richard I, and John (A.D. 1154-1216).* London: S. Sonnenschein & co., ltd ; New York: S. Sonnenschein & co., ltd, 1903.
Rosenthal, Joel T. "The King's "Wicked Advisers" and Medieval Baronial Rebellions." *Political Science Quarterly* 82, no. 4 (1967): 24.
Round, J. H. "King Stephen and the Earl of Chester." *The English Historical Review* 10, no. 37 (1895): 87-91.

Stenton, Doris M. "Roger of Howden and Benedict." *The English Historical Review* 68, no. 269 (1953): 574-82.
Strickland, Matthew. "Against the Lord's Anointed: Aspects of Warfare and Baronial Rebellion in England and Normandy 1075 - 1265." Chap. 3 In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, edited by George Garnett and John Hudson, 56-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
———. *Henry the Young King, 1155-1183.* Yale: Yale University Press, 2016.
———. *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217.* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
Stubbs, William. *The Constitutional History of England : In Its Origin and Development.* Clarendon Press Series. Oxford: Clarendon, 1874.
———. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages : 49 1 : Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis : The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry Ii and Richard I A.D. 1169-1192 ; Known Commonly under the Name of Benedict of Peterborough.* Vol. 49 1, London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867.
Tanner, Heather J. *Families, Friends, and Allies : Boulogne and Politics in Northern France and England, C. 879-1160.* The Northern World. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Thompson, Kathleen. *Power and Border Lordship in Medieval France : The County of the Perche, 1000-1226.* Studies in History New Series. Woodbridge: The Royal Historical Society, 2002.
Turner, Ralph V. *Men Raised from the Dust: Administrative Service and Upward Mobility in Angevin England.* Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
———. "The Problem of Survival for the Avengin 'Empire': Henry Ii's and His Sons' Vision Versus Late Twelfth-Century Realities." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 1 (1995): 78.
Valente, Claire. *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
Vincent, Nicholas. "The Court of Henry Ii." In *Henry Ii: New Interpretations*, edited by Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007.
———. "Did Henry Ii Have a Policy Towards the Earls?". In *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, C. 1150-1500*, edited by Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle and Len Scales. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008.
———. "Introduction: Henry Ii and the Historians." In *Henry Ii: New Interpretations*, edited by Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007.
Warren, W. L. *Henry Ii.* London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.
Weiler, Björn. "Kings and Sons: Princely Rebellions and the Structures of Revolt in Western Europe, C. 1170-C. 1280." *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (2009): 23.
White, Graeme. "King Stephen, Duke Henry and Ranulf De Gernons, Earl of Chester." *The English Historical Review* 91, no. 360 (1976): 555-65.

Online Sources

Crouch, David. "Breteuil, Robert De [Robert Ès Blanchmains, Robert the Whitehanded, Robert De Beaumont], Third Earl of Leicester (C. 1130–1190), Magnate." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004,

http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1883.
———. "Reginald, Earl of Cornwall (D. 1175), Magnate." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23319.
Dalton, Paul. "William Le Gros, Count of Aumale and Earl of York (C. 1110–1179), Magnate." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-47237.
Gillingham, John. "Richard I [Called Richard Coeur De Lion, Richard the Lionheart] (1157–1199), King of England, Duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23498.
Jones, Michael. "Geoffrey, Duke of Brittany (1158–1186), Prince." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-10533.
King, Edmund. "Peverel, William (B. C. 1090, D. After 1155), Baron." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22076.
Martindale, Jane. "Eleanor [Eleanor of Aquitaine], Suo Jure Duchess of Aquitaine (C. 1122–1204), Queen of France, Consort of Louis Vii, and Queen of England, Consort of Henry Ii." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2006, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8618.
Thompson, S. P. "Mary [Mary of Blois], Suo Jure Countess of Boulogne (D. 1182), Princess and Abbess of Romsey." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-54455.