Henry II’s Heir: the Acta and Seal of Henry the Young King, 1170–83

Henry, son of Henry II, crowned king on 14 June 1170 and re-crowned together with his queen in 1172, is the sole associate king in English post-Conquest history. Though also titular duke of Normandy and count of Anjou, his coronation in his father’s lifetime is the most dramatic sign of Henry II’s concern for the succession to the Angevin lands. However, Henry II’s innovation in the customs pertaining to the English succession redounded to his own disadvantage, for the Young King, discontented with his powers as associate king, rebelled in 1173 and again in 1183. Furthermore, as will be argued below, the character of his reign ensured that at his death the question of the succession to the Angevin lands was reopened in intractable circumstances. The ensuing disputes between Henry II and the future Richard I culminated in Richard’s alliance with Philip Augustus and in their successful campaign against Henry II in 1189. Although the Young King never ruled, his reign formed a crucial chapter in the quarrels within the dynasty over the succession to the Angevin lands, disputes that had brought strife in 1152 and 1156 between Henry II and his brother Geoffrey for the inheritance of Anjou and were to bring war between John and Arthur of Brittany over the succession to Richard I. The Young King’s charters and seal have their own interest as the record of a unique reign, but their study also helps to explain the failure of Henry II’s policy for the succession to the Angevin lands, a failure that debilitated the Angevin ‘empire’ and aided the Capetians.

At least thirty-two texts of the Young King’s charters, ten of them originals, plus two synopses and a paraphrase of one of his letters, still survive. But as Delisie remarked, many of the Young Henry’s grants are homologues, each repeating a charter of Henry II with only the necessary grammatical variations, while others repeat substantial passages from his father’s charters and some are confirmations of charters.

*I am grateful to Sir James Holt, under whose guidance the bulk of the ensuing material was collected many years ago, and to my colleague, Dr Nicholas Vincent, who encouraged me to write this piece and who provided further material; I am indebted to him for Appendix nos. 15, 22 and 33, and for the full text of 19 and 20. However, I alone am responsible for what follows.

1. See infra, Appendix nos. 2, 9, 10, 14, 19, 24, 26, 29, 30 and 32 are originals; no. 23 was destroyed in 1944.
2. Infra nos. 21, 34 and 35 plus the suspect no. 36.
3. L. Delisle, Recueil des Actes de Henri II Introduction, (Paris, 1909), pp. 251–2 [hereafter cited as Delisle, Introduction]. Appendix nos. 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 23, 25 and 32 are either homologues, or contain substantial passages from his father’s charters. We are told that on occasion Henry II ordered the Young King to confirm his instruments ‘per similes suas’, see Master David of London’s letter in Z. N. Brooke, The Register of Master David of London, and the Part he played in the Becket Crisis, in Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole, ed. H. W. C. Davis (Oxford, 1927), p. 240.
of Henry II, carefully limited by the terms of his father's instruments. Thus, they have an importance for the study of Angevin diplomatic, where the very circumscription of their contents is advantageous, for they form a series of texts, for the most part modelled on those of Henry II, but in the main passing at different places and having discrete witness-lists, which we may compare with the charters of the elder king. They offer us a binocular vision of a period in Henrician diplomatic.

Three phases can be distinguished within the Young King's reign: that from his first coronation on 14 June 1170 to the commencement of his first rebellion in mid-Lent 1173, the period of the rebellion of 1173–74 itself, and a final phase from the end of that revolt to the Young King's death, during his second insurrection, on 11 June 1183. As far as the history of his acta is concerned, the renewal of his homage on 1 April 1175 rather than his submission to his father the previous September is the effective beginning of the last period, for it is unlikely that an instrument of his issued in the interim would have had any standing. If the Young King's acta can be assigned to the appropriate phases of the reign, then their date limits can be narrowly set, and their changing nuances caught.

The administrative writs issued in the Young King's name as regent in England for Henry II must fall within the first phase of his reign. The Young King was left nominally in charge in England, but in practice under the control of Henry II's ministers, when the elder king left for the continent about 24 June 1170, and was thereafter regent in England during Henry II's absences in France and Ireland until late 1172. During this period the Young King paid several visits to Normandy, notably that from May 1172 to his return to England about 24 August 1172, prior to his second coronation on 27 August 1172. His subsequent reluctant crossing to Normandy at his father's summons in November 1172 marks the end of his regency, for his authority in England was superseded by that of the justiciar late in 1172. He did not return to England until May 1175 and was never again regent in England. His administrative writs, all issued in England, must therefore date from between late June 1170 and November 1172. Some corroboration of this dating is given by Richard of Ilchester's and Geoffrey Ridel's witnessing between them three of the Young King's writs as archdeacons (nos. 7, 15

1. *Infra* nos. 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19, 24 and 32.
2. *Infra* nos. 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 22, 26, 28 and 33.
4. *Gesta*, i. 31 and 34.
and 28), for they became the elects of Winchester and Ely in April and May 1173.¹

In addition to the writs proper, the Young King's instruments for St Augustine's, Bristol, concerning Bedminster and Ashleworth (nos. 4 and 5) probably come from this first period of the reign, for although they confirm grants in perpetuity they have much of the character of a writ, while his Horfield charter for St Augustine's (no. 3) and his charter for Montebourg (no. 23) are clearly from this time.² These writs and charters from this first period of the reign have a particular character: their witnesses are exclusively Henry II's men and in the Montebourg charter are, with one exception, the very men who attest the parallel grant of the elder king.³ Yet the administrative writs from the regency form the only substantial fraction of the Young King's acta, save for those that passed during the 1173-74 rebellion, that is not paralleled in surviving instruments of the elder king.

The Young King was taken by his father to Montferrand in the Auvergne before 2 February 1173 and, in returning, fled from Chinon to France in mid-Lent at the beginning of his first rebellion.⁴ The rebellion of 1173-74 marks a clear break in the history of the Young King's acta. On its outbreak 'his' servants, including his chancellor, Richard Barre, returned to Henry II, taking his seal with them. King Louis provided the Young Henry with a new seal,⁵ but we only have two texts which clearly come from this second period of the Young King's reign: a letter to Prior Odo and the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, and another to Pope Alexander III (nos. 1 and 11). Neither text, as we now have it, includes witnesses, and the second is sometimes thought suspect. Moreover, one of the terms of the peace at the end of the rebellion was that the Young King's engagements to his associates should be void, and Henry II later forced the surrender of at least some of the grants his son had made during the revolt.⁶ Grants made by the Young King during the 1173-74 rebellion are therefore unlikely to survive.

By contrast, a number of the Young King's charters can be firmly assigned to the last phase in the history of his acta: that to Roger Caperun, the two charters to Walter of Coutances, the two charters for Christ Church, Canterbury, the two for Fontevraud, and that for the

¹ E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy, Handbook of British Chronology 3rd edn. (London: Royal Historical Society, 1986), pp. 244 and 276. William de St John, one of Henry II's most prominent Norman officials, is the most frequent witness to the Young King's surviving writs (nos. 2, 8, 16, 17, 22, 26 and 33) and, with nine attestations, to the Young King's acta in general.
² See the notes to the acta when the dating of a particular charter is not discussed in the text.
³ In the Montebourg charter the last witness of the elder king's grant, Henry de Bernevalle, is replaced in the Young King's charter by William de St John.
⁵ Gesta, i. 43.
⁶ Gesta, i. 77, 83 and 286.
canons of Waltham (nos. 12, 13, 14, 9, 10, 19, 20 and 32 respectively). The witness-lists of these eight texts are very different in character from those of the earlier *acta*: whereas in the first phase of the reign only Henry II's men attest, in the later period the Young King's own household and followers are prominent. The proportion of the witness-list occupied by the Young King's men varies. The Waltham charter (no. 32), aside from William Marshal and William the chaplain, is witnessed solely by Henry II's servants and by bishops, while the two Fontevraud charters were witnessed only by the Young King's supporters. However, no charter having a witness list that clearly comes from the last phase of the reign is without an attestation by at least one of the Young King's men, save that to Roger Caperun (no. 12), where the witness-list is incomplete.

There is, however, room for debate as to whether some of the witnesses to the Young King's post-1175 charters were primarily his men. Among the administrators, Thomas 'de Sigillo' is associated with Henry II's minister, Geoffrey Ridel, and Osbert 'de Camera' was Henry II's servant. More seriously, Peter fitz Guy, who attested as 'dapifer' similarly witnessed at least one charter of Henry II and was his man, as was John de Soligny. The knightly figures who attested more than one of the Young King's charters were: Adam d'Yquebeuf (eight attestations), William Marshal (seven), Gerard Talebot (five), Robert de Tresgoz (five), William de Tintiniac (five), Simon Marsh (four), William de Dive (four), Peter fitz Guy (four), Peter de Adeville (three), Geoffrey fitz Hamo (two, the two Canterbury charters), Thomas de Coulonces (two, the two Fontevraud charters), Juhel de Mayenne (two, the two Fontevraud grants), John des Prêaux (two, the two Fontevraud charters) and John de Soligny (two, the two Canterbury charters). While neither Peter fitz Guy nor John de Soligny is listed among the rebels of 1173, Juhel de Mayenne was captured in rebellion at Dol in that year, and the rest are named as the Young King's partisans in that revolt. Apart perhaps from Peter fitz Guy and John de Soligny, these men therefore seem to have been the Young Henry's long-term supporters and household men. The Young King's two charters for Canterbury (nos. 9 and 10) suggest that the core of the group was already in existence during his 1175–76 visit to England, despite that being a time when he was kept in close attendance on his father.

The presence of the Young King's military and clerical household in these charters, and their absence earlier, joined to the circumstance that texts of grants made by the Young King during the 1173–74 rebellion are unlikely to have survived may, tentatively, suggest that all those of his extant charters that were witnessed by members of his household

2. Delisle, Introduction, pp. 399, 413; Recueil, nos. 199, 391, 401, 412, 466, 468, 474 and 481.
3. Gesta, i. 45-6; Howden, ii. 52.
post-date the end of that rebellion. Some support for this rule of thumb is offered by the glimpse of his court that we are given in a charter of Earl William de Mandeville: none of the Young King's knightly followers there appears. Although we know that the Young King had household men before the rebellion, for we are told that Henry II's removal of Hasculf de St Hilaire and other malcontents from his son's household was a cause of the Young King's revolt, there is no sign of them, nor of William Marshal, who joined the household in 1170, in either the Young King's earlier charters or in de Mandeville's list, a circumstance that reinforces the impression of tight control of his acta by his father's ministers during the regency. Nor is there a subscription from Richard Barre, who we know was the Young King's chancellor prior to Lent 1173. The presence of the household is a particularly firm indicator of late date in the case of charters issued in England where there is no possibility of their having been issued during the rebellion itself. The charters for Montjoux and Le Valasse can therefore be assigned to the last phase of the reign as, with a shade less confidence, can that for Salomon the Serjeant (nos. 24, 31 and 30 respectively).

But in his final years the Young King was rarely in England. He crossed to France shortly after Easter 1176, returning only for the weeks from early March to late May 1179, and from late March to before 20 April 1180. His known itinerary in France is fragmentary, but in his last year he was with Henry II at Le Mans in January 1183 and a little later at Mirabeau. All subsequent references to him in life refer to Poitou and Aquitaine.

The substance of the Young King's acta is consonant with the subordination implicit in the near-identity of his charters with those of Henry II. Although grants to monastic houses with which the dynasty had close links, and to his own household, form the greater part of the Young King's acta there is little sign in his charters that he enjoyed independent possession of land. The omnipresence of the household in the witness-lists after 1175 clearly indicates changed circumstances, reflecting his advancing manhood, the substantial establishment given him under the terms of the 1174 peace and subsequently added to, and his career on the tourney fields of France after he left his father's court in 1176. However, his dependence, albeit gilded, continued. It is notable that not only are his charters to monasteries all confirmations, but the


5. Gesta, i. 201–2; Diceto, ii, 18–9.

6. Gesta, i. 77–9, 290–1; L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, lines 2461–5044.
more elaborate of them – Canterbury, Fontevraud, Waltham – occurred when Henry II himself was contemporaneously involved. Indeed, the primary importance of the Young King’s *acta* lies in their demonstration of the restricted nature of associate kingship; they illustrate the frustrations that provoked his rebellions and in some measure substantiate the Young King’s complaints of the inanity of his own regal title.¹

When we turn from the dating of the Young King’s charters to their diplomatic we find that those of his *acta* which can be shown to post-date April 1175 invariably use the style *Dei gratia rex*, while those that can be proved to pre-date the rebellion of 1173–74 as invariably omit it. Thus the Young King’s *acta* provide separate confirmation of the chancery’s adoption of that style in the interim.

In the years since Delisle definitively formulated his claim that the chancery adopted the style of king ‘by the grace of God’ in the year from May 1172, his hypothesis has been largely accepted by scholars and valued as giving a fixed point in the diplomatic of a reign where royal charters normally bear only a place and not a date of issue.² But the width of Delisle’s date-limits, his acceptance of a period of variation before the new style became the norm, and his recognition of two potential causes for the change – the composition which Henry II made with the Church at Avranches in 1172 and the change in the control of the chancery from Geoffrey Ridel to Ralph de Wanneville in May 1173 – left the motive for the adoption of the new royal style unclear.³ Since Delisle wrote, Richardson’s widening of the period within which the change took place by dating a charter to Wroxall Abbey in the *Dei gratia* style at least as early as May 1172 has rendered the ascription of motive yet more doubtful.⁴ The contribution that the Young King’s *acta* can make towards narrowing the limits within which the change was introduced is regrettably slight. The sequence of his charters resumes after the rebellion too late to affect the terminus *ad quem* of the change, while the evidence from his writs before the autumn of 1172 has a fatal lacuna, for the title clauses of his two writs to Ely (nos. 16 and 17), which can be dated to the late summer and autumn of 1172, and which might, given the closeness with which the Young King’s *acta* follow his father’s charters, have given an indication of chancery practice after Avranches,


³ Delisle, *Introduction*, p. 32.

are missing from the surviving texts. All that can be said is that there is no
sign of the change of style in those of the Young King’s acta that predate
November 1172. However, in both of his letters from the period of the
rebellion he calls himself Dei gratia rex, while omitting the title by grace
from his references to Henry II in the letter to Alexander. Neither text is
an original, and neither can be evidence for chancery practice, though
the Young King’s style there might have given Henry II cause to place on
his charters, or to maintain there, his own claim to rule by God’s grace.1
These letters appear to show that the Young King adopted the title king
‘by the grace of God’ by May or early June 1173, which is just within the
time limits of Delisle’s hypothesis. The Young King may have adopted
this new style in imitation of the practice of his Capetian hosts, or
through the use of a French scribe, but the presence of the title king ‘by
the grace of God’ on his instruments early in the rebellion inevitably
directs attention to the evidence for the use of Dei gratia by Henry II by
the early months of 1173. The Young King’s charter to Fontevraud (no.
19), issued in or after September 1182, itself confirms Henry II’s grant of
the mint at Saumur to Fontevraud, which was Delisle’s key text for the
presence of the style by grace in the charters of the elder king early in 1173
and which he dated ‘vers le fin du février 1173?’.2 But, aside from
confirming that gift, the Young King’s charter consists solely of
confirmations of later grants of Henry II to the house, suggesting that
Henry II’s Saumur charter may be later than Delisle thought: indeed, it
now appears that Henry II’s charter dates from the later 1170s.3 The case
for the introduction of Dei gratia in 1172–73 is still supported by the
Wroxtall charter, and may be reinforced by such other early examples of
the style by grace as are discovered in the work for the forthcoming
edition of all of Henry II’s charters. However, the fewer they prove to be,
the greater will be the significance of the Young King’s change of style,
not perhaps for the dating of the first introduction of the style into
English chancery practice, but for the motivation and chronology of its
routine adoption.

For the purpose of dating the Young King’s charters the appearance of
the style by grace in his letters during the 1173–4 rebellion prevents us
from automatically regarding all his charters in that style as subsequent
to the rebellion. Nevertheless that does appear to be the inference for the
Montjoux charter (no. 24), an original, since it passed in England – apud
Stocam – and has household witnesses. The charters to Salomon (no. 30),
and St Katherine’s, Rouen, (no. 29) cannot be dated as confidently to the
last phase of the reign, although the character of the witness-list together
with the presence of Dei gratia suggests strongly that the charter for

1. See H. Prentout, De L’Origine de la Formule “Dei gratia” dans les Chartes d’Henri II (Caen,
2. Recueil, no. 457
3. Information supplied by Nicholas Vincent.
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Salomon does so date. However, the absence of Dei gratia may imply that the charters to the burgesses of Eu (no. 18) and to Odo the butler (no. 25), assuming that the texts have been accurately transmitted, pre-date the 1173–74 rebellion. Yet the Eu charter is problematic, for some aspects of it suggest that it dates from the summer of 1173.1 If that were indeed the case, then either the Young King’s style during the rebellion varied, or his letters to Prior Odo and Pope Alexander have been miscopied.

When we turn to the seals of the elder and junior kings we find that in contrast to their charters, their seals are strikingly different. Two impressions and a fragment of the Young King’s seal survive. The best, that attached to the Barkesore charter (no. 10) is intact,2 while the seal belonging to the Montjoux charter (no. 24) has had its inscription chipped away,3 and only the legs remain on the fragment attached to the charter for Salomon (no. 30).4 In addition, there is a cast of uncertain provenance in the British Library5 and a drawing by Gagnières6 of the seal that was once attached to the Fontevraud charter for Leighton and Radnage (no. 20), plus a drawing of a seal by Francis Sandford.7 Neither surviving impression is a model of completeness and clarity, and some details are sufficiently faint to have been differently described by different authorities, but the two impressions and the fragment seem to come from the same matrix, and the cast in the British Library shares their character, as do the drawings. The two surviving impressions and the Fontevraud drawing originate from charters that assuredly passed after the rebellion of 1173–74 and, as has been argued above, this is almost certainly true of the fragment. All come from charters in the Dei gratia style. It appears, however, probable that the same seal was also in use during the years 1170–73, for the Gesta says that when the Young King’s chancellor returned it to Henry II in 1173 ‘the King receiving it, commanded that it be well kept’, in contrast to the Young King’s harness, which the elder King returned to his son.8 It therefore seems that the seal was preserved for future use; we have no knowledge of the replacement seal that Louis VII commissioned in Paris for the Young King.

1. See infra the notes to Appendix no. 18.
2. A reproduction of the Young King’s seal is given in A. B. & B. Wyon, The Great Seals of England from the earliest Period to the Present Time (London, 1887), no. 34.
6. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 5480 (Gagnières’ transcripts), part 1, p. 270. (I am indebted to Nicholas Vincent for the use of his copies of Gagnières’ transcripts.)
8. Gesta, i. 43.
The Young King's seal was single-sided, bearing the legend HENRICVS REX ANGLO' ET DUX NORMANNOR' ET COMES ANDEGAVOR', whereas Henry II's seals, which have counter-seals, read DEI GRATIA from as early as 1154.1 The omission of Dei gratia from an English royal seal after its introduction by William II is unique.2 Moreover, while Henry II's seal shows the king bearing a sword and holding an orb supporting a dove, neither sword nor dove, the latter a symbol which came to be associated with the Confessor, saint and antecessor, features on the Young King's seal. The Young King appears to hold, as Sandford shows, a small globe surmounted by a long cross in his right hand, though others have seen a small sceptre.3 His left hand holds a long rod terminating in a foliated top within the area of the legend. The style of the two seals also differs. The majesty sides of English royal seals of the period show the monarch with arms extended away from the body, with his palms and their contents facing the viewer, whereas the Young King's seal shows his left arm bent inwards towards his body and the rod or sceptre proceeds from a closed fist held against his left hip or thigh.

As only known seal of an associate English king the Young King's seal is unique, but an obvious comparison now, and an obvious model then, is the practice of the Capetians, among whom association of the heir was common. While no seal explicitly that of an associate Capetian appears to survive, we know that Philippe Augustus, who was associate King at the end of the reign of Louis VII, used his regal seal – legend PHILIPPVS D(E)I GR(AC!)A FRANCORVM REX – before his father's death.4 It is true that the circumstances were unusual, but it may be that it was then thought unnecessary to include a statement of associate status on the seal of an associate Capetian. Similarly, the Young King's seal itself carries no express statement that he was but associate King. A comparison of the Young King's seal with that of Louis VII5 is therefore not inappropriate, and shows that the two seals are alike in the details of the thrones, the posture of the figures, the absence of swords, and the dispositions of the regalia.6

The character of the Young King's seal may, therefore, have been derived from a French model. Nonetheless, since the majesty face of

---

1. I am grateful to Mrs Caroline Dalton, the archivist at New College, and to Mr Culverhouse, the Administrator at Burghley, for confirming that the Young King's seals in those collections have no counter-seal.
2. On the absence of Dei gratia see Wyon, The Great Seals, p. 18.
3. For a different identification of the regalia see Stenton, Facsimiles from Northamptonshire Collections, p. 28.
5. Dalas, Les sceaux, pp. 146–7 and no. 67.
6. For the stylistic similarity with French seals see W. de Gray Birch 'On the Seals of King Henry the Second, and of his son the so-called Henry the Third', Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, xi, Part II n.s., 1876, at 37.
every English royal seal from William II to the second seal of Henry III displays a sword, its absence from the seal of the Young King is still significant, particularly as Henry II is known to have controlled the making of his son's seal. However, since the sword was the symbol of knighthood, it is also tempting to relate the absence of a sword from the Young King's seal to the story in L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal that the Young King had to be hastily dubbed a knight by William Marshal on the outbreak of the 1173–74 rebellion, although other sources say that he was knighted by Henry II before the 1170 coronation. If the former account is true, it is another sign of the dependence in which the Young King was kept during the first stage of his reign, and the absence of a sword from his seal might then be putatively ascribed to his lack of knighthood. However, that explanation of the seal appears incompatible with his use of a swordless seal long after 1173, by which time, on any account, he had been knighted. The absence of a sword from the Young King's seal therefore appears not to be connected with knighthood, and it is difficult to read it as other than a sign of subordination, particularly as recent scholars have identified an increasing emphasis in the Angevin period on the sword as a symbol of royal authority.

The lack of a counter-seal in a king who was also duke of Normandy is in some ways even more remarkable than the signs of subordination on the seal itself. For in this period, when the claim to the realm and the duchy ran together, one side of the royal seal symbolized England and the other Normandy; the legend on the equestrian counter-seal from the time of Henry I's so-called 'fourth seal' reading 'Dei gratia Dux Normannorum'. Further, it has been argued apropos German history, and more recently French, that a sword was, or came to be, a symbol of secular power held under a king. Certainly, Howden wrote 'accinctus est gladio ducatus Normanniae' to express Richard I's installation as duke in

1. Gesta, i. 6.
4. Wyon, The Great Seals, nos. 24, 26, 28, 31 and 33. In the latter two, Henry II's, 'et Aquitanorum et Comes Andegavorum' is added to the counter seal and Dei gratia is confined to the seal.
Moreover a sword had appeared on the equestrian face of Henry I's 'fourth seal', issued after he had formally claimed Normandy, and reappeared on that of Henry II's seal, where he is shown as Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine and Count of Anjou. More apposite still, Capetian royal seals were swordless until Louis VII, as Duke of Aquitaine, adopted an equestrian counter-seal, complete with sword, upon his marriage to Eleanor, the heiress to the duchy.

The singularity of Young King's seal is the greater because it contrasts in this respect not only with those of his father but also with the seals of those his brothers - Richard and Geoffrey - who held French duchies or counties. Richard's seals as Count of Poitou were single-sided equestrian seals showing a figure bearing sword and shield, following the pattern normal on the seals of the counts of Poitou from the time of William IX. Geoffrey as Duke of Brittany and Count of Richmond had a double-sided equestrian seal, the Breton face showing him with a sword, the Richmond face with a lance.

What, then, have the Young King's acta and seal and those of his brothers to tell us of the Young King's position as Duke of Normandy and Count of Anjou in comparison with those of Richard as Count of Poitou and Geoffrey as Duke of Brittany? In one sense Young Henry was clearly associate Duke and Count: he had the title. On the other hand the Gesta in describing his powers in 1170 was very geographically specific: Henry II sent into England the new King his son, to whom he conceded that he might make in England all rights and judgements by his new seal . . .³ (my italics), which may imply that his powers in Normandy differed from those he then exercised in England. Certainly, we do not have a chain of Norman writs corresponding to the English sequence, although it is true that writs of Henry II himself addressed to recipients in France survive far more rarely than do their English counterparts, and there is little reason to think that the Young King exercised viceregal power in Normandy in 1170-72. Moreover, such references as we have in his acta to him exercising judgement in Normandy are slight, and may concern his own household. The writ-charter for Le Valasse (no. 31) is to a degree an exception, but even

1. Howden, iii. 3.
3. Wyon, The Great Seals, nos. 31 and 33.
5. F. Eygun, Sigillographie du Poitou jusqu'en 1515 (Poitiers, 1938), p. 159a, nos. 1 and 2 and p. 160a-160b, no. 6 and Plate LIII, 6 (drawing); Gagnières' transcripts, BN MS Latin, 5480 Part i, pp. 161 and 145.
7. Gesta, i. 6.
that in part concerns English rights. Aside from these references and this writ we have only occasional mention of him acting in Normandy in conjunction with his father. Moreover, the Young King's surviving confirmations of land to monasteries in Normandy and Anjou are curiously limited. The Montebourg confirmation (no. 23) concerns English land, while that to Montjoux (no. 24) is a general confirmation and protection. Since the latter was both issued in England and remained in England its importance also was presumably for the English lands of the house. One of his two Fontevraud charters (no. 20) again concerned land in England. There remains only the confirmation of Pont de Cé and other liberties to Fontevraud (no. 19) to indicate that he exercised any authority in Anjou, or that his confirmation of French rights and lands was valued by monastic houses.

Further, it is surely significant that we look in vain to the Norman chronicler of the reign, Robert of Torigni, for a specific reference to an act of association. Nor does Torigni call the Young Henry duke of Normandy but simply 'Henry, the King's son' until the 1170 coronation, after which he refers to him as 'rex junio'. Torigni reports the homage of the Norman barons to the Young Henry, his homages to Louis VII in 1160 and 1169, and by implication alludes to the future division of his lands between his sons that Henry II made in the latter year, while Howden in both his Gesta and Chronica, but not Torigni, notices Henry II's distribution of his lands between his sons at Mont-a-Ger in 1170, when he probably expected to die. None of these is specifically called an association, and none of them made the Young King more than designated heir, or, 1170 apart, put him in a position notably superior to that of Henry I's heir, William Audelin, in 1119–20. At Mont-a-Ger the Gesta says that Henry II 'concessit . . . Henrico filio suo majori regnum Angliae et ducatum Normanniae et comitatem Andegaviae et Cenomanniae . . . ' but the revision of the same incident in Howden's Chronica reads 'Henrico regi filio suo dedit Normanniam, et omnes terras quas fuerunt patris sui Gaufredi'; the omission of England suggesting that the 1170 coronation made any specific mention of it redundant. But the same argument would imply that in 1170 the Young Henry was not associate duke or count. If he was subsequently made associate duke that might explain both Torigni's vocabulary and Howden's treatment of Mont-a-Ger. A possible moment


3. Torigni, pp. 208, 216, 240.
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for such an association is the council at Argentan in 1171, prior to Henry II's Irish expedition; the Montebourg charter would fit an association at that moment, but we have no testimony to any such event. Moreover, too much should not be made of the incident at Mont-a-Ger in 1170, since such emergency actions were revocable. There is a Capetian parallel from 1135 when Louis VI, thinking he was dying, invested his son Louis, already associate king, with the realm, but recovered and took back the government. In the absence of any positive evidence we must assume either that one of the above-recorded acts served to associate the Young King in the Norman duchy, or that the consequences of association were so slight that Torigni forbore to notice it.

Where Torigni is silent, the Angevin tradition is ambiguous. An argument from the Angevin chronicles is vulnerable, given the decline in history writing in Anjou after the death of Prior Thomas of Loches in 1168. Yet if the successors to the Chroniques des Comtes d'Anjou were cribbed at length from Anglo-Norman writing, by the same token they demonstrate the lack of memory of the Young King in Anjou. The Annals of St Aubin of Angers, sub anno 1169, say 'Hainricus rex, regnum suum tribus filiis suis dividens, statuit Hainricum regem Anglie et ducem Normannie, Richardum ducem Aquitanie et Gaufridum ducem Britannie', omitting all reference to Anjou itself. Similarly, the Historia Comitum Andegavensium, echoing Diceto and speaking of the marriage of Henry II and Eleanor, omits both Normandy and Anjou from its list of the titles that came to their sons, though mentioning John's Irish principality, saying 'Henricus, horum quatuor primogenitus, in regem Angliæ consecratus est; Ricardus comes Pictavensis est assignatus a patre; Gaufridus totius Britanniae nactus est principatum'. Nevertheless, the Historia elsewhere alludes to the Young King's homage to Louis VII for Normandy, and records his 1169 homage for Anjou and Brittany and the grant to him of the seneschalship of France, 'quod pertinet ad feudum Andegavense'. On this occasion the Angevin account echoes Torigni. For its part the Catalogus Comitum Andegavensium mentions the Young King in a list of the Counts of Anjou that also includes 'Arthur of Brittany, but says 'Henricus rex juvenis, filius Henrici, non tenuit comitatum'. It appears that neither these later Angevin writers, nor their Anglo-Norman sources were entirely clear or categorical as to the Young

King’s position in Anjou. Such uncertainty either argues against any formal ceremony of association, or suggests that the Young King’s powers as associate duke and count were nugatory.

In Poitou such uncertainties vanish. Geoffrey of Vigeois, under the head ‘De Rege Anglorum Henrico et Richardo Duce Aquitaniae’ tells how in 1172 Richard was enthroned ‘iuxta consuetudinem’ and invested with lance and banner at Poitiers, and subsequently received at Limoges the ring of St Valerie, when ‘novusque Dux ab omnibus proclamatur’.† Further, Geoffrey says ‘tempore illo rex Henricus senior filio suo Richardo ex voluntate matris Aquitanorum tradidit Ducatum’. Prior Geoffrey’s words are close to those used by the annalist of St Aubin of Angers in his account of Geoffrey Plantagenet’s transfer to the future Henry II of Henry’s maternal inheritance of Normandy: ‘Gaufridus comes ducatum totius Normanniae Hainrico filio suo tradid’.‡

Vigeois’ testimony suggests that in Aquitaine Richard received more than recognition of status and of eventual succession. The parallel between Richard’s position as Eleanor’s heir in Aquitaine and that of Duke Henry earlier as Matilda’s heir in Normandy is striking. Indeed, Le Patourel suggested that in granting Normandy to his son, Geoffrey Plantagenet modified Angevin practice and created a novel form of association: ‘association with possession’, a term that seems applicable Richard’s position in Poitou. However, exactly how close the two bequests were in intention is hidden from us by the premature death of Geoffrey Plantagenet, and especially by Eleanor’s years as a prisoner following her complicity in the 1173–74 rebellion, for if Richard was anyone’s associate heir in Poitou he was Eleanor’s. It was Eleanor to whom Richard in 1185 temporarily surrendered Aquitaine.⁴ Nevertheless, Richard certainly acquired authority and initiative in Poitou far in excess of any held by the Young King in the lands where he was associate ruler. Although in 1175 Henry II dispatched Richard into Poitou, the campaigns that followed established Richard’s power as duke and in them Richard had freedom to employ the Poitevin levies as he would. Richard may have acquired more authority after his capture of Taillebourg in 1179 than before, for the Pipe Roll calls him count of Poitou from that time. He certainly had control of the Poitevin castles by 1184–5 at the very latest, and according to Bertrand de Born was earlier able to erect a fortress even on territory within Poitou technically held by

4. Gesta, i. 337–8.
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SEAL OF HENRY THE YOUNG KING, 1170–83

the counts of Anjou. It is true that Henry II continued to intervene in Poitou, or to authorize the Young King to do so. Moreover, very occasional grants of Poitevin rights by Henry II with Richard’s consent are known, but Richard’s charters as duke and count, as far as can be judged in the absence of a definitive edition, though they sometimes have the phrase ‘filius regis Angliae’ and include a number of confirmations of earlier grants by Eleanor, some made in conjunction with Henry II, show no sign, unlike the Young King’s, of being the echo of his father’s voice. In them Richard appears freely to dispose of the revenues of Poitou. By contrast the Young King always appears to act as his father’s agent: as in 1176 when he was sent to Richard’s aid in Poitou; in 1177 when he was sent to secure the wardship of the heiress of Ralph of Dèols; when he and his father combined to bring some stability to the early months of Philippe Augustus’s reign, and when he was dispatched to Poitou to bring Richard to heel early in 1183. It is unlikely that such roles were a consequence of his status as associate ruler, for the sequence begins before 1170. The Young Henry, aged seven, acted formally as his father’s deputy at Becket’s election and received Becket’s surrender of the possessions he held of the Crown. He was also party to the treaty with Flanders of 1163, and seems to have been envisaged as potentially acting judicially before his coronation. While we cannot know how the Young King’s position would have developed had he not rebelled in 1173–74, the terms used for Richard’s installation, and his subsequent power, may suggest that it was intended from the beginning that Richard’s situation in Aquitaine, a region not part of Henry II’s ancestral lands, was to be more akin to Henry II’s position as Matilda’s heir in Normandy than to the Young King’s role as Henry II’s associate.

2. Recueil, no. 655.
4. Gesta, i. 115, 132, 245, 284; Diceto, ii. 18–19.
5. E. Grimm, Thomas Saga Erkibyskups, ed. and trans. S. Magnusson (2 vols. Rolls Ser., 1875–81), i. 60–1, 66–7, 82–3; Becket Materials, iii. 185; T. Rymer, Foedera (London, 1704–35, repr. London, 1816), i. i. 22–3; Henry II’s promise to Nun Cotham that the community should not be impailed save before himself, his justiciar or ‘filio meo Henrico’ seems from its wording to pre-date June 1170, see Calendar of Charter Rolls, ii. 469.
In the case of Geoffrey of Brittany, it is clear that after his marriage to the heiress Constance in 1181 he was no one's associate heir: Henry II had never claimed to be duke of Brittany. Before his marriage Geoffrey is recorded as being sent by Henry II to impose Angevin authority upon Brittany¹, much as Richard was sent to Poitou, or the Young King to Berry; but after 1181² his charters show Geoffrey ruling as duke in his wife's right, as Louis VII had in Aquitaine by the right of his wife, Eleanor, and like Louis as duke, Geoffrey had in life no male heir from the heiress of the old line, whose claims might come to seem superior to his own. His charters carry no overt reference to Henry II, save in his title, but instead we notice the consent of his wife to his grants; and there is even, on occasion, a parallel charter from Constance.³

Contemporaries were well aware that the Young King lacked the territorial rule that Richard and Geoffrey came to enjoy.⁴ Association alone was merely the formal anticipation of succession; the Young King was the king, and the duke, of tomorrow. The explanation for the exceptional character of his seal seems to lie in this circumstance; if the sword on the royal seal and on the ducal seal were the symbols of active authority, then the Young King's swordless seal was the sign of an heir in waiting. The contrast between the powers of the Young King and those of Richard and Geoffrey magnified the strains inherent in Henry II's ambitious scheme to divide his lands among his sons. Scholarly opinion is divided both as to whether at this period Angevin custom encouraged rulers to direct their acquisitions away from their heirs, and whether William of Newburgh's report that Geoffrey Plantagenet had intended that his and Matilda's inheritances should ultimately go to different sons is credible.⁵ However, there appears to be no exact precedent for an Angevin cadet formally installed in his mother's inheritance during his

1. Gesta, i. 83, 239; Torigni, pp. 274–5.
3. See The Charters of Duchess Constance, nos. Ge2, Ge4, Ge7, Ge10, Ge15, Ge20, Ge25, C1, C2, C4, C5 and C8.
4. See Bertran de Born's gibe: 'Pois n'Aenrics terra no te ni manda / Sia reis dels malvatz', Poésies Complètes, i. IV, 17, lines 7–8.
father's active life. The Young King may therefore have had grounds to resent Richard's advancement. Moreover, Newburgh's story, if true, shows Henry II setting aside his father's dying wishes; Angevin heirs had a short way with fraternal claims to divide the inheritance. Yet, since Henry II was unable or unwilling to cede power to the Young King in the Norman and Angevin lands, Richard's establishment had the effect, as a comparison between the seals and charters of Richard and the Young King shows, of placing the second son in some respects and albeit temporarily in a more favourable position than the first-born. Richard's emerging power in Poitou exposed the emptiness of the Young Henry's associate kingship, nor did Henry II require Richard to do homage to his brother until late in 1182. Further, in these circumstances attention could not but have been drawn to Geoffrey Plantagenet's grant of Normandy to the future Henry II, which had set a precedent for an Angevin heir in control of a major fief during his father's lifetime. The Young King's first demand for the rule of England or Normandy, made prior to his 1173 rebellion, was in effect a demand that his father follow Geoffrey Plantagenet's example; when repeated late in his reign it also represented a desire that to his position as associate king should be added the advantages that Richard enjoyed in Poitou. The Young King, twice denied effective power, and seeing Richard rivet his authority on Aquitaine, perhaps to his own ultimate danger, turned again to rebellion.

The Young King's death in the course of that rebellion destroyed Henry II's proposals for the succession to the Angevin lands, yet no adequate replacement succeeded to the lost design, in part because Henry remained trapped by the consequences of the earlier provisions. His attempts at a redivision of his lands were frustrated by his inability to deny Richard the inheritance of the duchy in which he had been installed, while the study of Richard's and the Young King's charters and seals shows that Richard had good reason not to relinquish Aquitaine, even could he have obtained recognition as his father's heir in the Norman and Plantagenet inheritances. Such recognition Henry II was unwilling to give. The impasse was only resolved when Richard in 1189

1. Geoffrey Martel's division of his lands between his two nephews in 1060, a possible case of parage, occurred shortly before his death, see O. Guillot, Le Comte d'Anjou et son entourage au Xe siècle, (Paris, 1972) i. 102-3 and H. Legohérel, 'Le Parage en Touraine-Anjou au Moyen Âge', Revue historique de droit français et étranger (4e série, 43 (1965) 222-46 at 230. Parage preserved a measure of unity, but does seem to have been envisaged in Richard's case, for he had done homage to Louis VII in 1169, Gesta i. 240. Geoffrey Plantagenet's brother Hélie's demand for Maine, Chronica de Gesti Consulum Andegavorum and Historia Gaufredi Duci Normannorum et Comitis Andegavorum in Chroniques des Comtes d'Anjou, ed. L. Halphen and R. Poupardin, pp. 71 and 207, which may have been a second son's claim to the maternal inheritance - his mother was Aremburgis, daughter and heiress of Hélie of La Flèche, Count of Maine - occurred after his father's death, as Geoffrey Plantagenet the Younger's claim to Anjou followed his father's death.

2. Gesta i. 292. The homage was declined because of the Young King's engagements to Richard's vassals.

3. Gesta. i. 41, 289.
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made common cause with Philip Augustus, imposed his will upon his father, and emulated Henry II by monopolising the inheritance of both of his parents. Henry II's failure to provide effectively for the succession to the lands he had so effectively amassed had brought him to an ignominious end. That failure was rooted in the flawed provisions made in the late 1160s and early 1170s for the transmission of Henry II's and Eleanor's inheritances. In 1189 the old Angevin practice of a single heir was reasserted. Nevertheless, in estimating the cohesiveness of the Angevin 'empire' we should not overlook the fact that for a run of years Henry II had prepared a different future for Aquitaine, that of a feudal dependency of Anjou in the hands of a junior branch of the dynasty. Nor had the distinction between Aquitaine and the Angevin and Norman lands been solely prospective. Rather, as this study has endeavoured to demonstrate, it had been manifest in the differing powers of their respective heirs.

Canterbury Christ Church University College
R. J. SMITH

APPENDIX

The Acta of Henry the Young King

Incidental chronicle references to grants of the Young King are not included here. The Young King's usual style was *H(enricus) rex Angl(orum) et dux Norm(annorum) et comes And(egavorum) H(enrici) reg(is) fil(ius)*, or later *H(enricus) Dei gratia rex Angl(orum) et dux Norm(annorum) et comes And(egavorum) H(enrici) reg(is) fil(ius)*. But since on occasion even some of the originals have the extended form *Anglie*, rather than the then more usual *Anglorum*, I have indicated where *Anglie* occurs in the texts I have used.

1. Alexander III, Pope
Letter of Henry the Young King as *Dei gratia rex* to Pope Alexander explaining his rebellion, complaining that the abuses which Becket opposed still flourished in England and including as evidence a writ of his father (without the phrase *Dei gratia*), and, as Henricus III *Dei gratia rex*, promising ecclesiastical liberties. No witnesses. [1173, after mid-Lent.]. Printed in *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. L. Delisle, (24 vols., Paris, 1869–1904), xvi. 643–8, from Paris, BN. MS. Latin 14876 fos. 116r–121r.
Date: After the Young King's flight to France and occasioned by elections to English sees at a council in London in April/May 1173.¹

2. Biddlesden Abbey
Writ of Henry the Young King to Roger Foliot ordering him to warrant the land of Whitfield to the monks of Biddlesden. "(este) Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne apud Windesh'. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Original, BL, MS Harley Charter 84, c.6. Printed in Delisle, Introduction, p. 270.

3. Bristol, St Augustine’s Abbey
Charter of the Young King granting Horfield to St Augustine’s. ‘Testibus Gaufrido archidiacono Cantuariensi, Ricardo Pictavensi archidiacono, Thoma archidiacono Wellensi, comite Willelmo de Mandevilla, Ricardo de Luci, Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne, Hugone de Gundovilla, Radulpho filio Stephani, Willelmo filio Aldelini, Ricardo vicecomite de Wiltesira apud Wintoniam’. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172, probably June 1170 x the autumn of 1171 or Aug. x Nov. 1172.] Printed in Calendar of Charter Rolls, iii. 1300–26, p. 378 and in The Cartulary of St Augustine’s Abbey, Bristol, ed. D. Walker (The Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society, 1998) pp. 11–2 no. 17 from the St Augustine’s cartulary in the Berkeley Castle Muniments, which lacks the witness-list. Repeats, with a minor variation, Henry II’s grant of Horfield in the St Augustine’s cartulary, which lacks both witness-list and place-date, printed in Walker ibid. p. 5 no 7.

Date: since the Young King’s charter is witnessed by Geoffrey Ridel as archdeacon, it must date from before the Young Henry’s crossing to Normandy in Nov. 1172. William fitz Audelin was sent to Ireland ahead of Henry II’s arrival there on 17 Oct. 1171, and he and Hugh de Gundeville remained in Ireland as governors of Wexford and Waterford respectively when Henry II left Ireland in April 1172, although de Gundeville at least had returned by the late summer of 1172. This charter therefore presumably passed either between June 1170 and the very early autumn of 1171, or during the Young King’s visit to England between late August and November 1172. The Young King’s second coronation at Winchester in August 1172 is a possible occasion for its issue.

The suspicion of forgery hangs over the texts from St Augustine’s, but the only suspicious feature of this particular text, its identity with Henry II’s grant, is paralleled by the Montebourg charter and is consonant with the character of the Young King’s acta.

1. Roger Foliot held Whitfield of the Earl of Leicester. His grant, made before 1168, BR[itarish] LI-brary, MS Harley Ch. 86 C. 31, passed in the Earl’s presence and the Earl’s notification of his consent to the grant is in the Biddlesden cartulary, BL, MS Harley 4714 fo. 17v.
2. Gest. ii. 25; Howden, ii. 29–30; Gerald of Wales, Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, ed. J. F. Dimock et al. (8 vols, Rolls Series, 1861–91), v. 186 and infra Appendix no. 16.
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4. Bristol, St Augustine's Abbey
Writ-charter of Henry the Young King to the justices, sheriff and all his faithful barons and men of Somerset granting a mill in Bedminster to St Augustine's as his father's charter confirms and ordering that the monks shall peacefully hold it, etc. No witnesses. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Printed in The Cartulary of St Augustine's, ed. Walker, p. 12 no. 18.

5. Bristol, St Augustine's Abbey
Writ-charter of Henry the Young King to the Bishop of Worcester and to his justices, sheriff, ministers and faithful men of Gloucester confirming the church of Ashleworth by Gloucester to the monks of St Augustine's as his father gave it, and ordering that they may hold it peacefully, etc. No witnesses. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Printed in The Cartulary of St Augustine's, ed. Walker, p. 11 no. 16.

Repeats, with minimal additions, Henry II's charter printed ibid p. 7 no. 10.

6. Bristol, St Augustine's Abbey
General charter of confirmation of Henry the Young King to St Augustine's granting and confirming inter alia Ashleworth by Gloucester, Almonsbury, Abbot's Leigh, Fifehead and Wapley to St Augustine's, as his father's charter and the charters of the donors attest. No witnesses. [Probably 14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Printed in The Cartulary of St Augustine's, ed. Walker, pp. 12-3 no. 19. Contains wording common to Henry II's charter to St Augustine's printed in Calendar of Charter Rolls, iii. 377–8.

Although the Young King's charter itself does not contain suspicious features, Henry II's charter as Dei gratia rex has a witness-list that places it very early in his reign, and may therefore be thought suspect. There are seventeen cases where the two kings issued similar instruments to the same recipients: in thirteen cases the style of the elder and junior king was the same in both texts, in three others, nos. 20, 24 and 31 the elder king's charter is demonstrably early and his son's late.

7. Bury St Edmund's, Abbey of
Writ of Henry the Young King to the men of the sakes of Brockford and Palgrave, ordering them to fulfil their services to the Abbey. 'Teste G. archidiacono apud Newebir.' [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Printed by D. C. Douglas, Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds (Oxford, British Academy Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales viii, 1932), pp. 100–1 no. 93 from Cambridge University Library, MS Ff 2.33 (Bury cartulary) f. 29r.

1. For the identity of Ashleworth see The Cartulary of St Augustine's, ed. Walker nos. 1, 3, 10, 15 and 67 and Add. Doc. 14, and the Domesday entry for Berkeley, Glos., DB. i. 163a.
2. Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum, iii, no. 128.
3. The cartulary text crediting the Young King with the title of duke of Aquitaine as well as of Normandy is presumably a copyist's error.
8. Bury St Edmunds, Abbey of
Writ of Henry the Young King to Hamo Pecco requiring him to pay twenty-five shillings rent in 'Schelfang' [Shelfanger, Norfolk] to the Abbey. 'Teste Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne apud Winton.' [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Cambridge University Library, MS Additional 4220 (Bury cartulary) fo. 384 r.

9. Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Priory

Date: Gervase says that when Henry II placed his charter on Becket's tomb on 21 April 1177 the Young King granted a charter 'in eadem forma'. But Henry II's charter must have been issued between the consecration of one of its witnesses, Adam, Bishop of St Asaph, on 12 October 1175 and the election of a second, John, Dean of Salisbury, to Norwich on 26 November 1175.¹ The Young King left England shortly after Easter 1176 and did not return for three years²; his charter was therefore issued after 12 October 1175, certainly before his final crossing from England in April 1180 and probably before his 1176 departure. Master Adam of Gloucester, who witnessed this and the following charter, is likely to have been the Young King's vice-chancellor, Adam of Churchdown, for Churchdown is adjacent to Gloucester; if so, the charters could not have passed at a later date since Adam was caught spying for Henry II at Poitiers in the summer of 1176 and expelled from the Young King's household.³ Moreover, Archdeacon Seffrid was probably Dean of Chichester by Dec. 1178.⁴

¹ Gervase of Canterbury, i. 361-2; Handbook of British Chronology, pp. 295, 261. We have, however, confirmation of Henry II's presence at Canterbury on 21 April 1177, Gesta, i. 158.
² Gesta, i. 144-5; Dictio, i. 428.
³ Gesta, i. 122-3; Howden, ii. 94.
10. Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Priory
Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex granting rents in Barksore, ‘Hokes’ [Hook Farm], ‘Aisse’2, Rushenden and Leysdown. ‘T(estibus) Ric(arдо) thesaur(ario), Walt(ero) de Constant, magistro Ad(a) de Gloec, Iohanne de Solineio, Petro filio Guid(onis) dapi(isero), Willelmo de Tintinachо, Willelmo de Divа, Gauf(ido) filio Ham(onis), Ad(a) de Ikebof, Petro de Adeuilla apud Wodestokam’. [May 1175 x 20 Apr. 1180, probably 12 Oct. 1175 x shortly after Easter 1176]. Original, Canterbury Cathedral Archive, MS Chartae Antiquae B336. Repeats Henry II’s charter to Canterbury, Canterbury Cathedral Archive, MS Chartae Antiquae B337.

Date: the Young King’s grant cannot precede Henry II’s charter, since both texts say the property was to be held as freely as Henry II had held it; Henry II’s, witnessed by Richard of Ilchester as elect of Winchester and Robert, elect of Hereford, must date between late April 1173 and October 1174.3 The most probable date for Henry II’s award is 12–13 July 1174, when Henry performed penance at Canterbury for his part in Becket’s death. The Pipe Roll records payment of rents to the sum involved from the manor of Milton, to which the places concerned belonged, in two instalments in 1173 and 1174, the latter tranche on the occasion of the King’s visit to Canterbury tempore werre.4 Henry II’s grants, particularly that in 1173, may, however, have given effect to gifts made by the Young King at Canterbury in Michaelmas-tide 1172.5 The Young King’s own charter must post-date his return to England on 9 May 1175 and precede 20 April 1180; the similarity of the witness-list with that of the preceding charter suggests both passed together.

11. Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral Priory
Letter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex to Odo the Prior and the convent of Canterbury forbidding the consecration of bishops without his assent and giving notice of an appeal to Rome, notified to cardinals Albert and Theodin. No witnesses. [Late Apr. 1173 x before 10 June 1173]. Printed by W. Stubbs, The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, i. 245.

1. The Canterbury original specifically gives the Young King’s title as rex Anglie [sic] et dux Norm. et comes And.
2. The obvious translation – Ash – seems doubtful, all the other places mentioned lying in the manor of Milton, and all save Barksore being on Sheppey.
5. Becket Materials, iv. 179. There is a hint of this in the manuscript. By a scribal error the passage on the Young King’s offerings was repeated in the manuscript, and in the case of the first entry- but only then- in the phrase ‘mutia donaria obutili et mutia plura promisit’ a pen has been drawn through ‘obutili et mutia plura’ thus making the Young King’s alms entirely prospective, see ibid footnote to p. 179.
Date: after the Council in London in April/May 1173 where the bishops were elected and before 10 June 1173, when the consecrations, forestalled by this letter, were to have been held.  

12. Caperun, Roger  
Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex granting half of Berton to his chamberlain Roger Caperun which his uncle William [Longéspee, brother of Henry II] had given to his butler Walter de Ventadour, as the charter of the King his father attests. ‘Testibus Ricardii Winton’ et Gaufri de Eliensi episcopis, comite Willelmo de Mann, Ranulphi de Glanuilla et ceteris’. [1 Apr. 1175 x 11 June 1183]. Printed by D. C. Douglas, Feudal Documents, p. 104 no. 99 from Cambridge UL, MS. Gg 4, 4 fo. 77v (citing fo.112v in the alternative, medieval, foliation) & P[ublic]R[ecord]O[ffice], Duchy of Lancaster, Misc. Bks. 5 (Bury cartulary) fo. 29r. Repeats Henry II’s charter printed by Douglas, Feudal Documents, p. 103 no. 98.  
Date: after the consecrations of the two bishops on 6 October 1174 and the Young King’s renewal of his homage on 1 April 1175.  

13. Coutances, Walter of  
Date: after the consecrations of the bishops in Oct. 1174 and the Young King’s return to England on 9 May 1175, and before the Young King’s final departure from England in April 1180.  

14. Coutances, Walter of  
Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex confirming Walter in a house on the Grand Pont at Rouen which he had bought in the presence of Henry II’s justices and of the commune of Rouen, and which Henry II had confirmed to him. ‘T(estibus) Ricard(o) Wint’ et Gauf(rido) Eliens’ episcopis, Willelmo de Hum’, Rogero le Bigot, Rann(ufo) de Glanuill’, Willelmo Marescall’, Gerard(o) Talebot’, Roberto de Tregozi, Adam de Ikebo, Simone de Marisco apud Westmonast[eri]um’. [9 May 1175 x before 20 Apr. 1180, perhaps Mar./May 1179]. Transcribed in Materials for a Supplement and Continuation of Rymers Foedera collected since 1831, PRO, 31/8/140A no. 201, from the original, Rouen, A[archives].  

1. See supra p. 314, n. 1 Gervase of Canterbury i. 245.  
2. Handbook of British Chronology, pp. 244 and 276.

Date: after the consecration of the bishops and the Young King’s return to England in May 1175 and before both his final departure in April 1180 and the appointment of William de Hommet as constable of Normandy; the Pipe Roll calls him ‘constable’ from 1179–80.¹ The first four witnesses are among the first five of Henry II’s parallel charter, but there William de Hommet attests as ‘constabulario’. Delisle therefore suggested 1180 as the date for both charters and thought that Henry II’s was slightly the earlier. However, this renders de Hommet’s simple attestation of the Young King’s charter anomalous and is insecure, since Henry II’s charter only survives as a cartulary copy. Moreover, the Pipe Roll records the presence in England of the fifth witness to Henry II’s charter, Stephen of Tours, seneschal of Anjou, in 1178–79 and not 1179–80.²

15. Elstow Abbey
Writ of the Young King to the reeves and burgesses of Bedford ordering them not to molest men coming to the monks’ fair or to infringe the liberties granted by his father and Henry I. ‘T(este) Ricard(iae)ono Pia’ apud Winton’. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. PRO, C56/37 (Confirmation Roll 2 Henry VIII) m.11 no. 8 (an inspeximus of 20 May 1510).

16. Ely, Priory of
Writ of the Young King ordering the election of six monks to go to France to treat with Henry II concerning the Church of Ely. ‘Testibus Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne et Hugone de Gundevilla apud Westmonasterium’. [Late Aug. 1172 x Oct. 1172]. Oxford, Bodleian MS., Laud Misc. 647 fo. 108r; BL, MS Cotton Titus A.I. fo. 54 v (no. 174).³ (Both copies of the Historia Eliensis). Printed in Memoranda Roll 1 John, ed. Richardson, p.lxx from BL, MS Cotton Titus A.I.

Date: subsequent to the Young King’s crossing to England on 24 August and prior to no. 17.

17. Ely, Priory of
Writ of the Young King ordering that the six monks chosen to cross to France to treat with Henry II be at Winchester on the Thursday after the Feast of St Andrew. ‘Teste Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne apud Westmonasterium’. [Oct./Nov. 1172]. Bodleian MS, Laud Misc. 647 fo. 108v-v; BL, MS Cotton Titus A.I. fo. 54 v (no. 175). Printed in Memoranda Roll 1 John, p.lxx from BL, MS Cotton Titus A.I.

Date: subsequent to No. 16, and before the Young King’s return to Normandy in November, 1172.

¹ Pipe Roll 26 Henry II, 46 and 149.
³ The Cottonian text omits a phrase; the Bodleian text replaces Hugh de Gundeville by ‘et aliis’.
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Notification by the Young King that at Driencourt [Neufchâtel-en-Bray], at the request of Henry, Count of Eu, he has confirmed and personally guaranteed the commune conceded by John, Count of Eu, father of Count Henry, and Henry, Count of Eu. ‘Hujus pactionis testes fuerunt Guillelmus camerarius de Tancarvilla, Guillelmus de Sancta Maura, Robertus de Sancto Petro, Gaufridus de Sancto Martino, Robertus de Davidvilla, Johannes [de] Evemeio.’ [Probably 1170 x 1174, perhaps 1173]. Printed by Delisle, Introduction, p. 255–6 from Eu, Bibliothèque Municipale, Cartulary of the Comté d’Eu fo. 1 v. Calendared in Round, Calendar, no. 1418. This charter makes promises similar to those made earlier by Henry II.¹

Date: The absence of Dei gratia suggests a date before the early summer of 1173; however, Henry, Count of Eu, William of Tancarville and William de St Maure were all rebels in 1173, while the Young King was present at the siege of Driencourt that July.² As a personal pledge and not a grant to a fellow-rebel, such a document might well survive after 1174, even if issued during the rebellion. These factors suggest, though do not prove, that this piece was issued in 1173. No witness to this charter attests any other charter of the Young King, perhaps a further indication of exceptional circumstances. If the royal style is accurately copied it suggests a date before April 1175, since no charter of the Young King clearly dating from after the rebellion lacks the style by grace. However, the arguments are all inconclusive.

Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex granting and confirming Pont de Cé and other liberties to Fontevraud as Henry II gave them and as his charters show. ‘T(testibus) Thoma de Colunces, Gerard(o) Talebot, Roberto de Tregoz, Iohanne de Praeis, Adam de Ikebo, Wille/mo de Tianniac, Iuel(o) de Maene apud Chinonum’. [23 Sept. 1182 x early 1183]. Original, Paris, A[rchives] N[ationales] L1018 no.3. Partially printed by Delisle, Introduction, pp. 262–3. This is a mosaic of passages from Henry II’s charters see, in order, Recueil, nos. 503, 413, 351, 330, 573, 361, 348, 618, 457, but the final passages, including an exemption from toll, do not seem to follow any text in the Recueil.

Date: subsequent to the agreement, which it confirms, made in the presence of Henry II on 23 September 1182 between Fontevraud and Gilbert de Montsoreau³ and before the Young King’s departure for Aquitaine early in 1183.

---

¹ Recueil, no. 170.
² Gesta, l. 45, 47, 49.
³ Recueil, no. 618.
20. Fontevraud, Abbey of
Date: issued in the same place and with an identical witness-list, this charter must have passed at the same time as the preceding text.

21. Henry II
Paraphrase, by Geoffrey of Vigeois, of a letter dictated by the Young King on his death-bed at Martel, June 1183, asking his father to treat his mother indulgently and to provide for his widow, to make peace with his allies, and to make restitution to the churches he had plundered, especially St Martial, and asking that his eyes, brain and intestines should be placed before the shrine of St Martial (‘ante Apostolum proiici’) and that he be buried in the Church of St Mary at Rouen. No greetings clause and no witnesses. [On or shortly before 11 June 1183]. Chronica Gaufredi, printed in Novae Bibliothecae Manuscriptorum, ed. Labbe, ii. 339.

22. Monks Horton, Priory of
Writ of the Young King ordering William de Velud not to trouble the monks over the land of Huntbourne [in High Halden, Kent]. 'Test(e) Willelmo de Sanct(o) Iohanne apud Wint.' [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. BL, MS Stowe 935 (Monks Horton cartulary) fo. 35r.

23. Montebourg, Abbey of
Charter of the Young King confirming the gift to Montebourg of the manor of Uveley [Woolley, Berks.] by Aelicia de Riveriis. 'Testibus Gaufrido archidiacono Cantuariensi, Ricardo archidiacono Pictavensi, Reginaldo archidiacono Saresberiensii, Johanne decano Saresberiensii, Ricardo de Canvilla, Reginaldo de Curtenai, Willelmo de Lanvaleio, Hugone de Creissi, Willelmo de Sancto Iohanne apud Burum.' [14 June 1170 x Jan. 1173]. The original, St Lô AD Manche H12772, was destroyed in 1944. Transcribed in PRO 31/8/140B pp. 180–81, no. 100 and calendared in Round, Calendar no 887 from the transcript. Printed by Delisle Introduction, p. 254 from the Montebourg cartulary, Paris BN

1. The text reads rex Anglie.
24. Montjoux Hospital
Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex confirming his father's gifts to the house and placing the brothers and their goods under his protection as they were under his father's. 'His t(estibus) Petro filio Guidonis, Willelmo de Tinteniaco, Godefrid de Aubigni, Henrico de Longocampo, Willelmo de Diau, Adam de Ikebo, Simone de Marisco apud Stocam.' [9 May 1175 x before 20 Apr. 1180]. Original, Oxford, New College, New College MS Archive no. 10679 (formerly Hornchurch charter no. 13). Printed, with facsimile, in H. E. Salter, Facsimiles of Early Charters in Oxford Muniment Rooms, no. 37 and by Delisie, Introduction, pp. 259–60.
Date: the presence of Dei gratia, the witnesses from the Young King's household, and the English place of issue suggest a date after the Young King's return to England in 1175 and before his final crossing to France.

25. Odo the Butler
Charter of the Young King3 confirming to Odo the Butler and his heirs the grant, in return for service, of land at 'Escalleclif', once given to William de Escalleclif by Henry II, according to the terms of an agreement entered into in the Young King's court before himself and his barons. No witnesses. [Probably 14 June 1170 x Jan. 1173]. Paris, BN MS nouv. acq. Latin 2035 fo. 127v, copy by Delisie of a seventeenth-century transcript destroyed in the AD. St Lô.
Date: the absence of Dei gratia suggests a date before the 1173–74 rebellion.

26. Oxford, Priory of St Frideswide
Writ of the Young King to Henry the Forester ordering him to make good a ditch in Holywell meadow lest harm come to a free tenement and weir of the monks of St Frideswide. 'T(estis) Willelmo de Sancto Ioannes apud Oxen.' [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. Original, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Oxford Charters no. 57. Printed by S. R. Wigram in Cartulary of the Monastery of St Frideswide, (Oxford Hist. Soc. xxviii, xxxi, 1895–6), i. 260, no. 338.

1. The transcript omits 'archidiacono' after 'Reginaldo Sarresbury[sic]' and 'Saresberiens' after 'decano'. Delisle's Montebourg texts include both.
2. Torigni, p.253; Delisle Introduction p. 22; Gesta, i. 31, 34–5
3. The text as copied by Delisle reads 'rex Anglie et dux Normannie et comes Andegavensis'.
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27. Préaux Abbey
   Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex confirming Préaux in Robert count of Meulan’s grant of freedom from toll. ‘Testibus) Gaufrido com(ite) Britanniæ, Roberto de Montefort, Willelmō capellano, Thoma de Sigillo, Willelmō Marescallo, Seherio de Quince juniores, Adam de Ikebue, Gisleberio de Albaemaria, Petro de Adeuilla, Roberto de Mara.’ [1 Apr. 1175 x 1178]. Printed by Delisle, Introduction, p. 261 from Préaux Cartulary, Evreux AD H711 fo. 31r no. 64. Calendared in Round, Calendar, no. 349. Repeats Henry II’s charter printed by Delisle, Introduction, p. 261 and Recueil no. 486.
   Date: presumably contemporary with, or subsequent to, Henry II’s identical charter which dates from between the dispatch of one of its witnesses, the Legate Cardinal Peter, to France in April 1174 and the election of another, John, dean of Salisbury, to Norwich in November 1175, and before the death of Robert de Montfort in 1178.1

28. Ramsey Abbey

29. Rouen, St Katherine de Monte
   Letter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex notifying that John de Mara had given the church of Nointot to the leper house of Rouen ‘ad preces me’. ‘Testibus) Roberto comite Mellenti et Willelmo Maresc’ apud Chiuilliac.’ [Probably 1173 x early 1183]. Printed by Delisle, Introduction, p. 257 from the original, Rouen AD Seine-Maritime 25HP7.
   Date: the presence of Dei gratia suggests a date in or after 1173, though the text is related to a charter of Henry II3 which since it speaks of the Young Henry as merely ‘Henry, my son’ probably pre-dates 14 June 1170. However, there is no reason why this particular instrument should either have been close in time to Henry II’s charter or affected by the terms of the peace of 1174, while Robert, Count of Meulan, was one of the Young King’s supporters in that rebellion. If, as is probable, ‘Chiuiliac[um]’ is Quevilly near Rouen, this letter cannot be later than very early 1183.

30. Salomon the Serjeant
   Charter of the Young King as Dei gratia rex confirming to Salomon and his heirs North Luffenham, the gift of his uncle William

1. Recueil, no. 486; Handbook of British Chronology, pp. 261; Torigni, p. 279.
2. The Rolls Series text reads ‘rex Anglie et dux Normannie et comes Andegavie; the addition of ‘[et Aquitaniae]’ appears an editorial misapprehension.
31. Valasse, Abbey of Le
Writ-Charter of Henry the Young King as Dei gratia rex addressed to the justices, sheriffs and all his ministers and especially to the keepers of the ports throughout England and Normandy, granting the monks of Le Valasse freedom from prisage of wine and other tolls throughout his dominions and forbidding that they should be unjustly disturbed. 'Testibus A. Lexouiensi episcopo, G. cancellario, Willelmo capellano, Petro filio Guidonis dapifero, Fulcone de Alaco, Godardo de Sancto Valeriis, Willelmo de Curceio senescallo, Willelmo Marescallo, Roberto de Tresgos apud Argentomum.' [14 June 1170 x 1176, probably 1 Apr. 1175 x 1176]. Printed by Delisle, Introduction, p. 260 from Rouen, AD Seine-Maritime 18HP28, (Le Valasse cartulary), i, fo.16. The text and witness-list are related to Recueil, nos. 183,481. Date: the presence of Dei gratia and of members from the household suggests a date in or after 1173, while the charter must pre-date the death of William de Curci in 1176 and, if 'G. cancellario' stands for Geoffrey of Beverley the Young King's chancellor, his drowning on 27 September 1177.¹

32. Waltham, Abbey of

¹ Gesta, i, 125, 195; Torigni, p. 271.
and the final anathema of Henry II's charters printed in *Cartae Antiquae*, ii. 38-42, nos. 357, 358.

Date: after the institution of canons-regular at Waltham in 1177 and, issued in Normandy, not later than the early weeks of 1183; it most probably passed in Sept. 1180.1

33. Warwick, Godwin of
Writ of the Young King to Peter of Studley ordering him to keep the agreement made between himself and Godwin of Warwick concerning the land of 'Aneborne' [Enborne, Berks]; if he does not the sheriff of Berkshire is to act. 'T(este) Willelmo de Sancto Johanne apud Oxen'. [14 June 1170 x Nov. 1172]. PRO, E 164/22 (Warwick cartulary) fo. 39 r.

34. Marmion, Robert
Notification by King Henry III that he has inspected and ratified a charter of King Henry his uncle granting Robert Marmion free warren in all his lands in Lindsey. [14 June 1170 x 11 June 1183]. *Calendar of Charter Rolls*, i. 338 (24 Jan. 1249).

35. Wykeham, Priory of St Michael als. St Mary of
Confirmation by King John (1 Feb. 1201) of a grant of one hundred and three acres in the same vill and of the site of a mill in 'Raddak' described as 'the grant of King Henry our brother'. [14 June 1170 x 11 June 1183]. Printed in *Rotuli Chartarum in turri Londinensi asservati*, Accurante Thoma Du./fus Hardy (Record Comm., 1837) i. 85b.

This charter appears to indicate possession of land by the Young King. However, King John also alluded to a charter of Henry II, which might well disprove the Young King's ownership. In the case of Acta no. 20, for example, the charters of both kings speak of 'manerium meum de Lectona'.

36. Nun Monkton, Priory of (suspect text)
Confirmation by King John to the nuns of Monkton of freedom from toll and from the king's buying and selling and of the churches and land given by William de Arches, as his charters and those of Elias de Hou testify and as Roger Mowbray confirmed, with all liberties and free customs, saving the liberty of the city of London, as the charter of King Henry the King's brother attested. [14 June 1170 x 11 June 1183]. Printed in *Rot. Chart i*, 41b-42a (28 Mar. 1200). Calendared in *Early Yorkshire Charters* i, 415, footnote.

Since no separate charter of Henry II is mentioned it is likely that 'fratris' is an error for 'patris'.

2. Peter of Studley held 10 fees of the Earl of Warwick in 1166; in 1086 his forbear William de Corbucion held land both in Studley (Warwick) and in Enbourne, see *The Red Book of the Exchequer* ed. H. Hall (3 parts, Rolls Series. 1896), i. 325 and DB, i. 61b and 243b.