

1088 – WILLIAM II AND THE REBELS*

Richard Sharpe

William Rufus celebrated Christmas for the first time as king at London.¹ No diploma from that occasion has preserved the names of the great men who attended, though Henry of Huntingdon mentions the names of the bishops present.² His most probable source may have been a diploma for Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, now lost but accessible to Henry at Lincoln. Last of those named (apart from Remigius himself, who would not have witnessed such a diploma but must be counted as Henry's addition) was Odo, bishop of Bayeux. William Rufus had restored him to his earldom of Kent, and he is addressed as earl in one surviving writ, appointing Wido as abbot of St Augustine's abbey, Canterbury, in the closing months of 1087.³ A source from Canterbury tells us that Odo was present in Canterbury when Abbot Wido was installed by Archbishop Lanfranc.⁴ If the much later writer William Thorne has correctly given the date as 21 December, they may have travelled from there to London together for the king's Christmas court.⁵ After his coronation William of Malmesbury tells us that 'for the rest of the winter' King William 'enjoyed peace and popularity',⁶ though none of the national chroniclers mentions that in January or February the king, 'surrounded by a great multitude of the great men of the palace', travelled north to York, something that must be gathered from Stephen of Whitby's account of the founding of St Mary's abbey. Stephen names Archbishop Thomas of York, Bishop Odo, Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances, Bishop William of Durham, Count Alan of Richmond and Count Odo of Champagne (both

* I am grateful to colleagues working with me on the project to collect and edit the charters of Henry I for their reading drafts of this paper: Nicholas Karn, Hugh Doherty, and Mark Hagger.

¹ ASC, 166.

² *Huntingdon*, 408. Those present were Archbishops Lanfranc and Thomas, Bishops Maurice of London, Walkelin of Winchester, 'Galfridus' (an error for Osbern, presumably guessed expansion from a misread initial) of Exeter, 'Wlnod' (for Wulfstan) of Worcester, William of Thetford, Robert of Chester, William of Durham, Odo of Bayeux, and Remigius of Lincoln.

³ *Regesta* i, no. 304.

⁴ *Acta Lanfranci*, ed. J. Earle and C. Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, Oxford 1892–9, i, 290; translated in *EHD*, 679.

⁵ William Thorne, *Chronica*, ed. R. Twysden, *Historiae Anglicanae scriptores X*, London 1652, col. 1793, dates the blessing of Abbot Wido to the feast of St Thomas the Apostle, 21 December (which was a Tuesday). The *Acta Lanfranci*, without this precise date but linking the blessing to the consecration at Canterbury of Bishop Godfrey of Chichester and Bishop John of Wells (elsewhere dated to July 1088), says that on the next day Odo was present when Lanfranc installed Abbot Wido at St Augustine's. F. Barlow, *William Rufus*, London 1983, 67 and n. 66, inferred that the installation took place on 22 December, but the *Acta* goes on to describe the monks' rebellion and Lanfranc's actions, after which 'Lanfranc returned home'. One must wonder how much of this could have happened on the eve of Christmas with the king. Wido was certainly installed before July, because he was sent as an envoy from the king to Bishop William in Durham (*De iniusta uexatione Willelmi episcopi*, ed. H. S. Offler, Camden Society 5th ser. 10, 1997, 76; *English Lawsuits*, 92).

⁶ *Gesta Regum* i, 544.

with large territorial interests in Yorkshire), William de Warenne, and Henry de Beaumont.⁷ Trouble began in the early spring of 1088. By then Bishop Odo was plotting rebellion against the king, and Bishop Geoffrey and Bishop William were in on the plot. From Easter or earlier Odo of Bayeux was at the centre of a widely distributed rising by many of the leading nobility, even perhaps receiving oaths of fealty from some of them on behalf of the king's brother, Duke Robert,⁸ who was to have invaded England and added the kingdom to the duchy he had inherited. There is reason to regret that Stephen did not give a more complete list of the laymen present.

The principal primary source for our knowledge of the events of the spring and summer of 1088 is the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle kept at that time at St Augustine's abbey in Canterbury. William of Malmesbury, John of Worcester, and Henry of Huntingdon provide accounts, which elaborate in different ways on what the Chronicle says; John's contains the most detail about some parts of the campaign, but it leaves King William besieging his uncles Odo and Robert at Pevensey and never completes the story. While broadly following the Chronicle's account, Orderic Vitalis stands a little apart from these sources, adding further information as well as his usual vivid drama; he begins with a clear discrepancy, indicating that the plot was hatched in Normandy between Bishop Odo, Eustace of Boulogne, Robert of Bellesme, and many others, and suggesting that these magnates crossed to England after Christmas.⁹ Since Henry of Huntingdon's more circumstantial statement has Odo in London with the king at Christmas, we can probably infer that Orderic was resorting to conjecture for the obscure early stages of the conspiracy. When so many of the leading magnates were involved, we might assume that the planning required a good deal of communication – unless it was done while many of them were at court for Christmas or in the course of the king's northern journey. The events have been much discussed, most recently by Frank Barlow, and what remains at issue is questions of detail.¹⁰ It will suit our purposes here to quote the Canterbury chronicler's spare account in modern English:¹¹

⁷ The form of words includes comital titles for the last two: 'Interfuerunt etiam fundationi nostre ecclesie multi ex primoribus palatii quorum ista sunt nomina Thomas archiepiscopus, Odo Baiocensis episcopus ipsius regis patruus, Gosfridus Constantiensis episcopus qui eo quoque tempore Northahimbrorum consulatum regebat, Willelmus Dunelmensis episcopus, comes Alanus, Odo comes de Campania, Willelmus comes de Warena, Henricus comes de Bello Monte, et multi alii nobiles quos hic inserere longum est'; it is likely that this is a minor anachronism on the part of the writer. Stephen's text was printed in *Monasticon* iii, 544–6, from an inferior copy, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 39; an improved text based on the twelfth-century copy, BL, MS Add. 38816, has been prepared by Dr N. E. Karn, to whom I am grateful for letting me use it. The king's visit to York was first noted by E. C. Norton, 'The Buildings of St Mary's Abbey, York, and their Destruction', *Antiquaries Journal* 74, 1994, 256–88 (at pp. 280–1), and again by J. E. Burton, *The Monastic Order in Yorkshire*, Cambridge 1999, 40–1.

⁸ This is Barlow's inference, *William Rufus*, 71 and n. 82, from *De iniusta uexatione*; he cites pp. 174, 189, in Arnold's edition (below, n. 28). In the first passage, Bishop William protests that 'nulli fiduciam uel sacramentum feci uel ab aliquo recepi', and in the second, 'nulli fiduciam feci uel ab aliquo recepi' (ed. Offler, 76, 91); one must take a guess as to what promise or oath he felt accused of giving or taking, and a conspiratorial commitment is the likely interpretation. Douglas's translation obscures the evidence ('I have neither made nor received any pledge', 'nor have I ever associated myself with any scheme', *EHD*, 655, 664); Van Caenegem is clearer ('I have made or received no promise or oath to the detriment of your body, lands, or honour', 'I have given or received no surety thereon to anyone', *English Lawsuits*, 93, 101).

⁹ *Orderic* iv, 120–34; for their crossing to England 'post natale Domini', p. 124. Orderic would himself treat these three as the main losers from the plot (*Orderic* v, 208), and hindsight may be at work.

¹⁰ E. A. Freeman, *The Reign of William Rufus*, Oxford 1882, i, 22–89, and ii, 465–83; J. H. Ramsay, *The Foundations of England*, London 1898, ii, 157–62; C. W. David, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy*, Cambridge, MA, 1920, 44–52; Barlow, *William Rufus*, 69–93.

¹¹ ASC, 166–8.

In this year this country was very much disturbed and filled with great treachery, so that the most powerful Frenchmen who were in this country intended to betray their lord the king and to have as king his brother Robert, who was count of Normandy. At the head of this plot was Bishop Odo, with Bishop Geoffrey, and Bishop William of Durham. The king treated the bishop so well that all England went by his counsel and did exactly as he wished; and he thought to treat him just as Judas Iscariot did our Lord; . . .

The identity of the bishop in this sentence is unclear. Usage in the rest of the annal makes one suppose that the bishop of Bayeux was intended, and that is how Henry of Huntingdon takes it, though there is no other evidence for Odo's prominence in the king's counsels.¹² Word-order points to the bishop of Durham, who played a greater role in guiding the king but even so deserted him. Certainly William of Malmesbury interpreted it as referring to Bishop William, adding that 'Odo saw that he was no longer as in former times to have everything in the country all his own way, the conduct of public business having been entrusted to William, bishop of Durham; and in his jealousy he himself deserted the king and infected many others by the same insinuations'.¹³ John of Worcester too identifies the bishop as William, 'At this time the king (who knew him well) relied on Bishop William's wisdom as a true counsellor, and the affairs of all England were managed by his advice.'¹⁴ The Canterbury writer goes on:

. . . and Earl Roger was also in this conspiracy, and a very great number of people with them, all Frenchmen, and this conspiracy was plotted during Lent. As soon as Easter was reached, they marched and ravaged and burned and laid waste the king's demesnes, and they ruined the lands of all those men who were in allegiance to the king. And each of them went to his castle and manned it and provisioned it as best he could. Bishop Geoffrey and Robert de Mowbray went to Bristol and ravaged it and carried the plunder to the castle, and then went out of the castle and ravaged Bath and all the surrounding area, and laid waste all the district of Berkeley. Those who were the chief men of Hereford and all the shire with them and the men of Shropshire with a large force from Wales came and ravaged and burned Worcestershire until they came to Worcester itself, and intended to burn the town and plunder the monastery and get the king's castle by force into their hands. Seeing these things the reverend Bishop Wulfstan was much distressed in mind because the castle had been committed to him to hold; nevertheless, the members of his household marched out with a few men from the castle and, through God's mercy and the bishop's merits, killed and captured five hundred men and routed all the rest. The bishop of Durham did whatever damage he could everywhere in the north. One of them was called Roger, who threw himself into the castle of Norwich and did always the worst of all throughout the country. There was also one Hugh who did not mend matters at all, neither in Leicestershire nor Northampton. Bishop Odo, with whom all these affairs originated, went to Kent to his earldom and injured it severely, and

¹² The modern translators of the Chronicle thought it worth adding a note to the effect that Odo is meant. This was the sense put on the sentence by *Huntingdon*, 412–13, 'Odo, bishop of Bayeux, the chief man and governor of England'; discussed by Barlow, *William Rufus*, 61 n. 35.

¹³ *Gesta Regum* i, 544.

¹⁴ *John of Worcester* iii, 48.

they utterly laid waste the king's land and the archbishop's, and he carried all the goods into his castle at Rochester.

When the king understood all these matters and what treachery they were committing against him, he grew much disturbed in mind. Then he sent for Englishmen and explained his need to them and asked for their help, and promised them the best law that there had ever been in this country, and forbade every unjust tax, and granted the people their woods and hunting rights – but it did not last any time. But nevertheless the Englishmen came to the help of their liege lord the king. They marched towards Rochester and intended to capture Bishop Odo – they thought that if they had the one who had been the head of the plot they could the better get hold of all the rest. Then they came to the castle at Tonbridge. Odo's soldiers were then in the castle and many others who meant to support him against the king. But the Englishmen proceeded to storm the castle, and the men in it made truce with the king. The king with his army marched towards Rochester, and they thought the bishop was there, but it became known to the king that the bishop had gone to the castle at Pevensey. And the king went in pursuit with his army and besieged the castle with a very large army for a full six weeks. Meanwhile the count of Normandy, Robert, the king's brother, collected a very large force and thought to conquer England with the help of the men who were opposed to the king in this country. And he sent some of his men to this country and meant to follow himself, but the English who guarded the sea captured some of his men and killed and drowned more than anyone could count. Afterwards their food failed in the castle; then they asked for a truce and rendered it up to the king, and the bishop swore he would go out of England and never more come into this country unless the king sent for him and that he would render up the castle at Rochester. Just as the bishop went and was to render up the castle, and as the king sent his men with them, the men who were in the castle rose up and seized the bishop and the king's men and put them in prison. In the castle were very good knights – the young Eustace and Earl Roger's three sons and all the highest born men in this country or Normandy. When the king understood these matters, he followed with the army that he had there, and sent over all England and ordered that everyone who was not a scoundrel should come to him, French and English, from town and country. Then a great company came to him and went to Rochester and besieged the castle until those inside made a truce and rendered up the castle. Bishop Odo with the men who were in the castle went overseas, and the bishop thus relinquished the dignity that he had in this country.

Then the king sent an army to Durham and had seige laid to the castle; and the bishop made a truce and rendered up the castle and relinquished his bishopric and went to Normandy. Also many Frenchmen relinquished their lands and went overseas, and the king gave their lands to the men who were loyal to him.

Taking a little gloss on the names from the Latin historians, we have here a clear indication of the personnel of the rebellion.¹⁵ Odo, bishop of Bayeux and earl of Kent, was the ring-leader in England, Robert Curthose the intended beneficiary in Normandy. John of Worcester adds the name of Odo's brother, Robert, count of

¹⁵ The versions will be found in *John of Worcester* iii, 48–57; *Gesta Regum* i, 544–9; *Huntingdon*, 412–15. The account in the *Durham Historia regum*, in *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols, ed. T. Arnold, RS 1882–5, ii, 214–17, is similar; it is in part copied from John of Worcester, but it includes information from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle omitted by John.

Mortain. Roger de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, was privy to the conspiracy, but it is only from John of Worcester that we learn that he was in his castle at Arundel, waiting for Duke Robert to cross the channel. Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances and his nephew Robert de Mowbray were active in Gloucestershire and Somerset. John of Worcester says that Robert failed to capture Gloucester itself, and he adds the name of William of Eu as attacking Berkeley. And only John mentions that Bernard de Neufmarché, Roger de Lassy, Ralf de Mortemer, together with men of Earl Roger of Shrewsbury, led the attack on the towns of Hereford and Worcester. One manuscript of the Worcester version adds that Robert fitz Baldwin rebelled in Exeter.¹⁶ William of Saint-Calais, bishop of Durham, was not with King William when rebellion broke out but he was present when the king began to take steps to deal with the situation. At that point he deserted the king who had trusted him. Roger Bigod in East Anglia had been a constant courtier of William I; his rebellion now is further attested by a source from Bury St Edmunds.¹⁷ The active part taken by Hugh of Grandmesnil in Leicestershire is less clear. In Kent itself, apart from Odo, there was Gilbert of Tonbridge at Tonbridge castle, whose name enters John of Worcester's and Henry of Huntingdon's accounts; John adds that Gilbert was wounded and yielded himself and his castle after a siege of only two days. And further south at Pevensey John of Worcester adds the name of Robert, count of Mortain, Odo's brother; his name is corrupted to 'Rogerum consulem' by Henry of Huntingdon. In the final conflict at Rochester, the town was defended by Eustace III, count of Boulogne, and three sons of Roger of Montgomery, usually identified as Robert de Bellesme (he at least is named by John of Worcester), Hugh de Montgomery, and (it has been both presumed and denied) Roger of Poitou.

The spin is clear. The great men from Normandy were all disloyal, the English stood by the new king. Of those leading figures who did not desert William, only Bishop Wulfstan is mentioned. Orderic is the one source to name several other loyal magnates:¹⁸ Hugh of Avranches, earl of Chester, William de Warenne, and, more surprisingly, Robert de Mowbray, whom the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and John of Worcester named among the rebels. Orderic also mentions Robert fitz Haimo, son of the sheriff of Kent, as a loyal courtier, while John of Worcester is the only chronicler to mention that Archbishop Lanfranc and the most of the *optimates* of Kent stood by the king. These are hardly the Englishmen of the Chronicler's slanted perspective, and historians can take a more detached view of how the Anglo-Norman aristocracy took sides in this crisis over their allegiances to two princes. A comparison with Domesday Book shows that six of the ten wealthiest magnates in England favoured rebellion and the cause of Duke Robert: Bishop Odo, Count Robert of Mortain, Roger de Montgomery, Gilbert fitz Richard of Tonbridge, Bishop Geoffrey, and Count Eustace of Boulogne. Three stood by the king: William de Warenne, Count Alan of Richmond, and Earl Hugh of Chester.¹⁹ The missing name from the top ten is Geoffrey de Mandeville, whose position is not clear. Some other prominent figures remained invisible in Normandy, among them Roger de Beaumont and his elder son

¹⁶ *John of Worcester* iii, 313.

¹⁷ 'Hermannus archidiaconus' (identified by A. Gransden as Bertram the Archdeacon), *Miracula S. Eadmundi*, ed. F. Liebermann, *Anglo-Normannische Geschichtsquellen*, Strassburg 1879, 202–81 (at pp. 268–9); ed. T. Arnold, *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, RS 1890–96, i, 26–92 (§ 39, pp. 79–80).

¹⁸ *Orderic* iv, 128.

¹⁹ C. W. Hollister, 'Magnates and *curiales* in Early Norman England', *Viator* 4, 1973, reprinted in his *Monarchy, Magnates, and Institutions in the Anglo-Norman World*, London 1986, 97–115 (at pp. 99–100). Hollister overlooked the evidence for Count Alan's loyalty in *De iniusta uexatione*.

Robert of Meulan.²⁰ For an overview of the court of William I that had been divided in 1087, one can hardly improve on the picture presented by the list of witnesses to the second dedication charter of St Stephen's at Caen from the 1080s.²¹

There are three figures whose roles appear ambiguous in this bald summary. First, it is not apparent why Orderic alone thought that Robert de Mowbray, earl of Northumbria, adhered to the king when other sources depict him as in rebellion with his uncle Bishop Geoffrey. This is probably Orderic's mistake. Orderic also mentions that Robert of Rhuddlan was fighting alongside his uncle Hugh de Grandmesnil in the midlands, but Robert's lord was Earl Hugh of Chester, and Orderic may have made a bad guess; elsewhere he suggests that Robert had actually taken part in the siege at Rochester.²² Second, and more interestingly, Roger de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, was at Arundel in Sussex when the rebellion broke out after Easter, according to John of Worcester; his men took part in the fighting in Worcestershire, and, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle puts it, he was 'in this conspiracy'. William of Malmesbury has him and his men fighting at Worcester, but a few lines later he contradicts himself, saying that Roger had not made public his complicity in the conspiracy but was still attending on the king, in circumstances where William was able to talk him over to the royal cause.²³ It looks as if Roger's personal involvement at Worcester was a careless assumption on the part of William of Malmesbury. If Earl Roger was keeping a low profile at Arundel, he could hardly have avoided attending on the king as he rode south from Tonbridge to Pevensey; William of Malmesbury implies that he was with the king even earlier. It is possible that he had joined the king already when the siege of Pevensey began, or that he came over during the six weeks of the siege. In Orderic's narrative, he was with the king's forces at Rochester, where his sons were besieged, and even secretly tried to help the defenders.²⁴ Of the besieged sons who had arrived from Normandy with Count Eustace of Boulogne, only Robert de Bellesme is named, though the Chronicle says 'three sons'. It has been assumed since Freeman's work that the others were Hugh de Montgomery and Roger of Poitou.²⁵ Our third ambiguous figure is this Roger of Poitou, who was

²⁰ Robert's whereabouts in 1088 are unknown, but the prominence of his younger brother Henry de Beaumont on the king's side would surely have attracted the attention of chroniclers to Robert if he too had been in England. Orderic iv, 204, refers to his arrival in Normandy from England, apparently in 1090, and S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan*, Berkeley, CA, 1987, 98–9, infers from this that he was in England in 1088, but the lapse of time is too great for this to be decisive.

²¹ Bates, *Regesta*, 258–63 (no. 54). An anomaly compromises the exact validity of this list, since it was a renewal; Bishop Hugh of Lisieux was already dead, and others may have been, though none of the following, whose names appear in the discussion here: Duke Robert and King William as the king's sons, Archbishop Lanfranc, Bishop Odo, Bishop Geoffrey, Roger de Montgomery, Robert of Mortain, Roger de Beaumont and his sons Robert of Meulan and Henry de Beaumont, Walter Giffard, Earl Hugh of Chester, Robert de Bellesme, Hugh de Montfort, Hugh de Grandmesnil, Bishop William of Durham, Count Alan, William de Warenne, and Henry de Ferrers.

²² Orderic iv, 124; Barlow, *William Rufus*, 81 and n. 140, draws attention to the fact that a few pages later, iv, 136, Orderic refers to Robert of Rhuddlan, 'de obsidione Rofensi rediens', as if he had taken part in the siege.

²³ *Gesta Regum*, § 306. 4 (Roger attacks Worcester), § 306. 5–6 (riding with the king, he is talked round).

²⁴ Orderic iv, 126–8.

²⁵ Freeman, *William Rufus* i, 57 n. 3, 93. J. F. A. Mason, 'Roger de Montgomery and his sons (1067–1102)', *TRHS* 5th ser. 13, 1963, 1–28 (at p. 16) warns against this, but, as Freeman himself observed, of the younger sons from his first marriage (Orderic iii, 138) Philip had no English interests and Arnulf is not known to have taken any active role until 1093. Ramsay, *Foundations* ii, 158, says evasively that Roger 'kept pretty loyal', and Barlow, *William Rufus*, 77, hedges his bets behind opaque punctuation, 'and three sons of Roger de Montgomery – Robert of Bellême, and two of the younger sons, Hugh of Montgomery, Roger of Poitou – and Arnulf', though *ibid.*, 91, he more persuasively explains Roger's wobbly allegiance and his recovery of his English estates.

certainly acting on behalf of the king in September 1088, when he was sent north with Count Alan of Brittany and Count Odo of Champagne to bring the bishop of Durham to the king.²⁶ There is no precise evidence for his having taken any part in the rebellion with his brothers, but he was certainly in England earlier in the summer, since we shall see that he witnessed more than one royal diploma. It is perhaps more plausible that he joined the king and his father after the siege of Rochester was over than that he was with the king all summer.²⁷

Apart from the Chronicle and its translators, there is one other near-contemporary account, which provides an important side-light on the main narrative, the *Libellus de iniusta uexatione Willelmi episcopi*.²⁸ This allows an insight into the bishop of Durham's role, which was rather more complicated than appears from the Chronicle, and adds the names of others loyal to the king, Count Alan who held the honour of Richmond and Count Odo, kinsman of the count of Champagne.

In spite of the detail available from these sources, it is not possible to establish a definite timetable of events. 'An exact timetable', as Barlow observed, 'cannot be constructed from *De iniusta uexatione*.'²⁹ There is one key problem, which makes it impossible to harmonize this text with the chroniclers: the crucial charge against the bishop, put by an eye-witness, 'H. de Bellomonte', presumably Henry de Beaumont, was that, when rebellion broke out, and the king began to organize himself to fight Bishop Odo and Earl Roger de Montgomery, the bishop of Durham left his court and deserted him.³⁰ If the rebellion did not get underway until Easter, 16 April 1088, it is impossible to square this with the explicit date in the *libellus* for the king's ordering the disseisin of Bishop William, 12 March. The bishop's claims to have defended Dover, Hastings, and London for the king before he left the court appear to push the outbreak of hostilities to a date so early as to conflict with all other evidence.³¹ The manuscript tradition has a tendency to make mistakes at crucial points; if we boldly emend *quarto Idus Martii* (Sunday, 12 March) to *quarto Idus Maii* (Friday, 12 May),

²⁶ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 79–80; *English Lawsuits*, 95. Roger acted *uice regis* 'on the king's behalf' in receiving the oath of seven of the bishop's men.

²⁷ C. P. Lewis, 'The King and Eye: a Study in Anglo-Norman Politics', *EHR* 104, 1989, 569–89, at pp. 572–3, 575–6, reads back from Roger's part in escorting Bishop William from Durham to guessing that he may have been in the party escorting the captured Bishop Odo from Pevensey to Rochester when Odo was rescued and his escort taken prisoner at Rochester. He goes against the evidence that the king turned rebels into followers by assuming that 'one of the Rochester rebels would not have been given such a commission so soon afterwards' (p. 575).

²⁸ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 49–104; translated (from *Symeonis Opera*, ed. Arnold, i, 170–95) in *EHD*, 652–69 (no. 84), and in *English Lawsuits*, 90–106 (no. 134).

²⁹ Some of the difficulty is encapsulated in his dating the fall of Rochester to the end of May in one discussion and July in another: quotation from *William Rufus*, 83n, where he favoured July; compare Barlow, *The English Church 1066–1154*, London 1979, 282, 'at the end of May Pevensey and Rochester surrendered'.

³⁰ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 83–4; *English Lawsuits*, 97. The name of the accuser is five times given as Hugo de Bellomonte or just Hugo; Barlow, *William Rufus*, 77 n. 111, proposed that this was an error for Henry, a suggestion I find persuasive. Offler, 84 n. 45, denied the possibility of five-fold error, adding that Henry would have been accorded his recent comital title, and proposed instead Hugo de Bellocampo. In favour of Barlow's conjecture is the clear evidence that the writer (as in so many royal acts) used initials for baptismal names, some of which remain unexpanded ('G. Constantiensis episcopus', 'T. Eboracensis archiepiscopus', 'W. de Merlaio', pp. 84–5, 93), while others were incorrectly expanded ('Rogerum Paganellum' for Ralf Paynell, p. 82 and n. 37; 'Radulfus Piperellus' for Ranulf Peverell, p. 89 and n. 63; 'Reginaldus Paganellus' for Ralf Paynell, p. 93 and n. 75; 'Rogerio de Molbraio' for Robert, pp. 95–6 and n. 91). The copyist of the archetype of our extant witnesses did not make five mistakes but consistently took H. for Hugo.

³¹ Barlow, *William Rufus*, 74–6, implausibly links this with a miracle story from Fécamp as evidence for 'an early outbreak of hostilities'.

the difficulties vanish, and we are spared the smaller problem that the disseisin would have been ordered on a Sunday.

We can now propose a timetable of events that keeps the sources in harmony. The chroniclers indicate that the rebellion broke out at Easter, when the rebels, instead of attending the king's court, defended their castles and commenced attacks on the royal demesne. We do not have evidence for where the king spent Easter, but a depleted court may have been his first inkling of the outbreak.³² At that date Bishop William appears to have been at London and communicated with the king, who was very likely at Winchester where it was usual to observe Easter. He later claimed to have helped preserve for the king the castles of Dover and Hastings in the troubled counties of Kent and Sussex, and to have imposed loyalty on Londoners by taking twelve leading citizens as hostages.³³ We should probably allow two weeks or more for the attacks to take place in various parts of the country. The assembly summoned in London thereafter,³⁴ the king's arrival, the promise of good laws, and the raising of forces to defend the realm may have taken place around the end of April or the beginning of May, and it was at this moment of crisis that the bishop of Durham declined to fight and left the king's court without leave. His disseisin was ordered on 12 May, by which date he was well on his way northwards; he was able to reach Durham, though behind him in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire the king's order took effect. Meanwhile the king went into Kent and captured Tonbridge. The six-week siege of Bishop Odo and Count Robert in Pevensey castle must have lasted through the rest of May and much of June. Whitsuntide fell on 4 June, but the king can hardly have held court. During the siege William de Warenne, recently made earl of Surrey for his loyalty to the king, was injured; he was taken to his foundation at Lewes priory, where he died on 24 June 1088.³⁵ It must have been the middle of June at the earliest when Odo was snatched from his captors outside Rochester and the king began his second siege. Since early May, more than seven weeks had passed in the exchange of letters between Bishop William and the king until, in early July, the king, still in Kent, sent Abbot Wido from Canterbury to Durham to bring the bishop to face charges.³⁶ It must have been late July when the bishop at last went south to the king – we do not know where – but failed to engage in discussion, because Archbishop Thomas and the other bishops present were unwilling to deal with him against the king's instructions. The *libellus* here points towards a summer court, for which we shall see other evidence in royal diplomas. The bishop did not stay long at court but went back to Durham, and in August the king sent three counts, Alan of Richmond, Odo of Champagne, and Roger of Poitou to fetch him. They promised him safe conduct on 8 September, but the bishop and his escort remained in the north until Michaelmas, and his trial at Salisbury did not commence until November. There

³² *John of Worcester* iii, 48.

³³ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 91; *English Lawsuits*, 101.

³⁴ Henry writes, 'rex autem congregato Anglorum populo reddidit uenatus et nemora legesque promisit exoptabiles' (*Huntingdon*, 414); John writes, 'mittit legatos, uocat quos sibi credit fidos, uadit Londoniam', where 'statuens leges, promittens fautoribus omnia bona', he prepared to march on Rochester. The assembly at London to whom good laws were promised may have been essentially military in character.

³⁵ *Chronicle of Hyde Abbey*, ed. E. Edwards, RS 1866, 298–9; the exact date derives from the Lewes cartulary but is accepted as reflecting his obit by Clay, *EYC* viii, 4; *Complete Peerage* xii.1, p. 494. *Orderic* iv, 128, names William de Warenne among the loyal magnates but places his being created earl and his death rather later, iv, 180.

³⁶ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 75; *English Lawsuits*, 92.

Henry de Beaumont appears to have been the principal accuser, but two former rebels took part in the debate, Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances and Roger Bigod.³⁷

The role of Henry de Beaumont is important, since like William de Warenne, he seems to have been created earl in the course of the year 1088, taking Warwickshire where he already held his father's estates.³⁸ It is assumed that this was a reward for his service to the king during the rebellion. It would appear that William was made earl sooner than Henry, for in a charter for Lewes datable after William de Warenne's death he witnessed as Henry de Beaumont.³⁹ In documents to be discussed below, datable to the summer of 1088, he witnessed as Henry, earl of Warwick, or as Henry of Warwick.⁴⁰ One is tempted to guess that William de Warenne was made earl in the context of the siege of Pevensey, and that a distinguished role at the later siege of Rochester, without fatal consequences, earned a similar reward for Henry de Beaumont. If so, it is a curious insight into the reasons that induced King William to create earldoms: it begins to look more like a rank of precedence and less like a responsibility in the shires of Surrey and Warwickshire; the tenurial consequences, if any, are a matter of guesswork.

Duke Robert's intentions are altogether less well attested. Much importance has been attached to an act of Duke Robert, dated 7 July 1088. As Barlow puts it, 'On 8 July he granted a charter to the abbey of Fécamp on the Norman coast and added to the dating clause, "on the day when I should have crossed to England".'⁴¹ He cites C. W. David's study of Duke Robert, who tells us that 'a charter by Duke Robert in favor of La Trinité of Fécamp is dated 7 July 1088, *quando in Angliam transire debui*'.⁴² If it were correct that a contemporary dating-clause invoked an unfulfilled intention, then already by 7 July Robert had abandoned the plan to invade. David in his turn cites Haskins, where we find that this is a fusion of two texts: first, a charter dated Friday, 7 July 1088, by which Duke Robert granted certain lands to Fécamp, with an annexe of further grants, and then the *narratio* of a third charter refers back to the Duke's grant, 'et quod ego eam quando in Angliam transire debui cum aliis terris ecclesie reddiderim'.⁴³ At this stage, not before 1089, Duke Robert came to Fécamp and delivered seisin of the lands in question. His original grant on 7 July 1088 was not on the day when Robert was due to cross but did not, but rather was around the time when he intended to cross. It seems strange to recall that failed plan a year or more later: perhaps it was meant only to signal the circumstances in which he had then been at Fécamp, if he was indeed there – the act of 7 July does not actually indicate where the duke was. The only layman to witness alongside Duke Robert on that date was his brother Count Henry, who, we learn from Orderic (see below, 150), did cross to England soon afterwards.

The last sentence of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle's narrative is translated by Henry

³⁷ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 83–4; *English Lawsuits*, 97.

³⁸ D. B. Crouch, *The Beaumont Twins*, Cambridge 1986, 10.

³⁹ *Regesta* i, no. 325.

⁴⁰ The argument is made in *Complete Peerage*, xii.2, Appendix A, that Henry was made earl of Warwick after 24 June 1088 and before he witnessed *Regesta* i, no. 302 for Rochester (see below), 'unlikely to be very long after the surrender of Rochester, the date of which cannot be closely determined but which was probably some time in July or a little later'.

⁴¹ Barlow, *William Rufus*, 81 and n. 139.

⁴² David, *Robert Curthose*, 51–2 n. 52.

⁴³ C. H. Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, Cambridge, MA, 1918, 287–9; Haskins makes the fusion in his heading, '7 July 1088, Robert, when about to cross to England, restores to Fécamp and frees from all secular dues the land of William of Bec' [&c.]. This rendering is picked up by Chibnall, *Orderic* iv, 134 n. 1, and is explicitly amended by Barlow as quoted.

of Huntingdon, but William of Malmesbury reports a different conclusion to the rebellion: 'Odo, taken prisoner for a second time, forswore England in perpetuity; the bishop of Durham voluntarily went overseas, being allowed to leave the realm unharmed out of respect for their former friendship.' *Ceteri omnes in fidem recepti* 'all the rest were admitted to take the oath of allegiance'.⁴⁴ Orderic says a little more:⁴⁵

He [the king] bided his time and waited for the right moment to take vengeance. He punished some of the rebels with severe penalties and deliberately turned a blind eye to the guilt of others. He shrewdly spared the older barons, although the conspiracy had temporarily weakened their allegiance to him, out of love for his father whom they had served long and faithfully, and through respect for their grey hairs. In any case he knew that disease and speedy death would soon put a term to their activities. Consequently some of those who had gone furthest in their treachery obeyed him with all the more devotion in the years that followed and endeavoured to appease him with gifts and services and flattery.

To test these contrasting views of how King William treated the rebels, we may consider a small group of charters. Their witness-lists tend to support William of Malmesbury's view that the king was lenient toward the rebels. The three documents of most interest are two for Rochester cathedral priory and one for the abbey of Le Bec, for which I shall argue a date in July or perhaps August 1088. The act for Lewes priory, already cited, would seem to have been issued earlier, at the end of June or beginning of July. The usefulness of these documents for the present argument is that they all contain substantial witness-lists. In form they are all diplomas rather than writ-charters, and while this provides us with longer lists of witnesses, it deprives us of place-dates; it also raises anxieties, since in this category of act forgery is more readily suspected and less easily proven. There is also the imponderable question why we should have a cluster of diplomas rather than writ-charters from around July 1088. Without an answer to that, it is not possible to know how far these witness-lists reflect an official perception of the attestation as the few select witnesses to a writ-charter would.

I take first a short diploma confirming King William's gift of St Mary's church, Lambeth, to the church of Rochester in compensation for loss caused during the attack on Rochester Castle.⁴⁶ There are six named witnesses:

presentibus testibus et assentientibus de baronibus meis Thoma archiepiscopo Eboracensi, Rogero comite Scropesbyriensi, Henrico comite VVaruucensi, Henrico de Ferrariis, Rogero Bigoto, Iuone Taillebosc, Willelmo Peurell, et aliis pluribus.

It is only formally datable after Henry de Beaumont was made earl of Warwick, apparently around July 1088, and before the death of Roger de Montgomery, earl of Shrewbury, on 27 July 1093.⁴⁷ The reference to making amends for damage caused

⁴⁴ *Gesta Regum* i, 548.

⁴⁵ *Orderic* iv, 134.

⁴⁶ *Regesta* i, no. 302. The principal source is *Textus Roffensis* (Maidstone, Kent Record Office, MS DRc/R1), fol. 211r-v (no. 202), published in facsimile, ed. P. H. Sawyer, Copenhagen 1957-62; the text was printed by T. Hearne, *Textus Roffensis*, Oxford 1720, 213-14; again by J. Thorpe, *Registrum Roffense*, London 1769, 459 [from BL, MS Cotton Domitian X (s. xiii), fols 107v-108r, now fols 109v-110r (no. xviii)]; and in *Monasticon* i, 173 (no. xliii).

⁴⁷ This last date has been muddled in the twentieth century. His death is reported by Orderic as happening on 27 July (*Orderic* iv, 302); the year is unspecified but Orderic says that he died six years after King

during the siege of Rochester surely points to a date soon after the siege ended, for which we might plausibly guess July 1088. Roger de Montgomery had been complicit in the rebellion earlier in the year, but here, in what may be one of the king's first acts after the rebellion was finally quelled, he witnesses alongside the king. Roger Bigod, another witness here, had held Norwich castle for the rebels and raided around East Anglia, and there is no clear evidence as to how or when he was brought back into the king's friendship. Alongside them, loyal Henry de Beaumont is given his new title but not allowed precedence over the more senior earl of Shrewsbury. Ivo Taillebois had been with Henry de Beaumont in Normandy after William I had died;⁴⁸ both must have come to England soon after, and William Peverell was presumably also a loyal courtier.⁴⁹

Also from the *Textus Roffensis* we have another act in diploma form confirming to the church of Rochester the manor of Haddenham (Bucks) which Archbishop Lanfranc had bought from William I. This act comes with an imposing list of twenty-two witnesses. Its text, which is arguably authentic, was not differentiated in *Regesta* from a much later inflation of it, though the definitely spurious version abbreviated the witness-list and so reduced the most persuasive means of authenticating the act.⁵⁰ The *Textus Roffensis* also includes a narrative of how Archbishop Lanfranc and Bishop Gundulf secured this royal confirmation by a process of negotiation with Henry de Beaumont, earl of Warwick, and Robert fitz Haimo, a loyal friend of the king's and son of the sheriff of Kent.⁵¹ The king had demanded a fine of £100 in return for approving this transfer of a valuable manor, which the archbishop held as part of his lay fee, into the ownership of the church of Rochester. The figure is not an unusually high one, and it happens to be the same amount of money as the church of Rochester received in the distribution of William I's charitable bequests in 1087. Lanfranc and Gundulf are represented as unwilling to pay so much, and at the suggestion of the king's negotiators, the fine was commuted: instead Bishop Gundulf, an experienced builder, would raise up the castle at Rochester in stone to

William I (*Orderic* iii, 148). The *DNB* therefore favoured 1093. G. H. White in the *Complete Peerage* xi, 687n, thought this statement was not inconsistent with his dying in 1094; he dated Earl Roger's death to July 1094, which has generally found favour. White was, however, misled by what is no more than a demonstrably mistaken guess by H. H. E. Craster: in 1930 when Craster first published *Regesta*, no. 338a (*Regesta* ii, p. 401), he saw a long witness list and the place-date Gloucester, when William II for the first time kept his Christmas court there (*ASC*, 171). He guessed, therefore, at a Christmas date, which was in conflict with the date of Earl Roger's death; he accordingly redated the latter to 1094. The earlier date for Earl Roger's death draws strong support from John of Worcester (iii, 64–6 and n), who quite explicitly places the earl's death in the same year and context as those of Wido, abbot of St Augustine's, who died on 9 August 1093, and Paul of Caen, abbot of St Albans, who died on 11 November 1093. Craster overlooked the fact that in 1093 the king was at Gloucester throughout Lent; he also overlooked *Regesta* i, no. 338 for St Mary's abbey, York, dated at Christmas, datable to 1093, and witnessed by Hugh de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury.

⁴⁸ They witnessed together alongside Duke Robert; Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, 285.

⁴⁹ Presumably William Peverell the elder of Dover, whose earliest certain attestation is in a royal confirmation for Bermondsey priory, dated at Windsor, Whitsuntide 1095 (*Regesta* i, no. 362). The first explicit attestation by William Peverell the elder of Nottingham is in a writ-charter for Peterborough, c.1094x1098 (*Regesta* i, no. 409).

⁵⁰ *Regesta* i, no. 301 failed to distinguish this document, *Textus Roffensis*, fols 212r–213r (nos 205, 206), from the inflated version, BL, Campbell Charter vii.1; M. Brett, 'Forgery at Rochester', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter, MGH Schriften* 33, 1988, iv, 397–412, describes this pseudo-original as 'a conflation and adaptation of two apparently genuine charters of William II' [those discussed here concerning Lambeth and Haddenham] 'clearly written later than c. 1150' (p. 403).

⁵¹ *Textus Roffensis*, fols 173r–174v (no. 88). The less controversial writer of the *Vita Gundulfi episcopi*, § 27, ed. R. M. Thomson, Toronto 1977, 50, mentions the king's gift of Lambeth and his grant of the transfer of Haddenham without alluding to such negotiation.

replace William I's wooden structure. We may be tempted to conjecture that the circumstances in which this was something the king wanted would most likely be the aftermath of the siege. The witness-list provides evidence in support of this conjecture:

- + Signum Willelmi regis Anglorum
- + Signum Lanfranci Cantuariensis archiepiscopi
- + Signum Thome Eboracensis archiepiscopi
- + Signum Remigii Lincolniensis episcopi
- + Signum Walcelini Wentoniensis episcopi
- + Signum Mauricii Lundoniensis episcopi
- + Signum Osmundi Serberiensis episcopi
- + Signum Rodberti Herefordensis episcopi
- + Signum Baldeuini abbatis sancti Eadmundi
- + Signum Henrici fratris regis
- + Signum Philippi filii Rodberti comitis Flandrie
- + Signum Alani comitis
- + Signum Hugonis comitis
- + Signum Heinrici comitis
- + Signum Willelmi comitis
- + Signum Eudonis dapiferi
- + Signum Rogerii Bigotis
- + Signum Gosfridi de Magnauilla
- + Signum Rodberti filii Haimonis
- + Signum Hugonis de Monte forti
- + Signum Gisleberti de Tonebrigge
- + Signum Hugonis de Bello campo +

The list of bishops is considerable, suggesting that the king had called what amounted to a council, though where the act was completed is unknown. The key evidence for the date is the presence of Henry, the king's brother, who was scarcely ever in England during William II's reign. We do know, however, that he came to England in the summer of 1088. On 7 July he was still in Normandy, when he witnessed alongside Duke Robert, as already mentioned. From Orderic we learn that,⁵²

when positive news of the surrender of Rochester was heard in Normandy, Prince Henry, count of the Cotentin, crossed to England and asked his brother for his mother's lands. King William received him kindly as a brother should and fraternally granted his petition. In the autumn, after completing the business that had brought him, he said good-bye to the king and began preparations for returning to Normandy with Robert de Bellesme, who had already been reconciled to the king through the intercession of powerful friends.

Orderic goes on to explain how Duke Robert arrested Count Henry on his return to Normandy, along with Robert de Bellesme, and that when news of this reached England, Robert's father Roger de Montgomery left England for Normandy to protect his castles against the duke. If Henry was in England only from July to September, then this act must have been issued during that period. As with the act granting St Mary's Lambeth to Rochester, so here we have a mixture of King

⁵² *Orderic* iv, 148.

William's allies and rebels among the witnesses. The most senior laymen of the realm are his allies Count Alan of Richmond, Earl Hugh of Chester, Earl Henry of Warwick, Earl William de Warenne of Surrey – and this, it seems, must be William II de Warenne, already styled earl. Eudo Dapifer and Robert fitz Haimo come lower down the order, and between them are the former rebel, Roger Bigod, and Geoffrey de Mandeville, who has been mentioned as a rebel, though that is no more than a historian's conjecture.⁵³ Later in the list is Gilbert of Tonbridge, whose estates in Suffolk were greater than Roger Bigod's, who had more land in Surrey than William de Warenne, and who took part in the rebellion in Kent; he had been wounded during the short siege of Tonbridge at the start of the king's campaign in Kent, and he had remained under guard there when the king's forces moved on to Pevensey.⁵⁴

These diplomas appear to bear out the story that King William treated the rebels with clemency and received them back into his service. The same implication runs through another document, which must be dated to very much the same period. This is a royal confirmation in Norman style of a gift to the abbey of Le Bec by Walter Giffard; it survives as an original diploma with the *signa* of the witnesses and the royal seal, and also as a sealed exemplification.⁵⁵ The act is unusual in form for William II, though it would not have been at all unusual for his father; its seals are authentic and the witness-list unimpeachable. William II's seal was reproduced from this act.⁵⁶ The business of the transaction is relatively minor. Walter Giffard had given the manor of Blakenham (Suffolk) to the abbey of Le Bec, a transaction attested by four of his men; this was then confirmed by the king and attested with seventeen *signa* in rows below the text:

+ Henricus de Guaruuic
 + Signum regis
 + Rogerus de Monte gomerici
 + archiepiscopus de Ebroic
 + Rogerius Pictauensis
 + Eudo dapifer
 + Gislebertus filius Ricardi
 + episcopus de sancto Laudo
 + episcopus de Lincholensi
 + episcopus de Herefort
 + comes Alanus
 + comes Hugo de Cestre
 + Rogerius Bigot
 + Guillelmus de Perceio
 + Hugo de Montfort

⁵³ No source attributes any role to him at this date. Barlow, however, has brought together the claim made by Bishop William of Durham that there had been outbreaks of rebellion at Dover, Hastings, and London, and the assumption that Geoffrey de Mandeville had custody of the Tower of London (*William Rufus*, 76).

⁵⁴ *John of Worcester* iii, 52.

⁵⁵ *Regesta* i, no. 320. H. J. Ellis dated this act to the vacancy 1089x1093 (*Complete Peerage* ii, 387n), on the strange assumption that the absence of Lanfranc's name implies that he was dead; this assumption seems to have lingered. The editors of *Regesta* give the date c.1091, following the terms set out in a note on the facsimile published by the New Palaeographical Society (pl. 45a), that William Rufus was not reconciled with Walter Giffard until 1090 nor with his brother Henry until February 1091, and that Henry was in England briefly that year.

⁵⁶ T. A. M. Bishop and P. Chaplais, *Facsimiles of English Royal Writs*, Oxford 1959, pl. xxx; Barlow, *William Rufus*, pl. 1b. These give the date-range August 1091 x May 1092; the first term is unexplained, the second is the death of Remigius, bishop of Lincoln.

+ Henricus filius regis
+ episcopus de Wincestre

There is again no indication of where this transaction took place, but it is a weighty witness-list. Next to the king, we have Henry de Beaumont, already styled 'of Warwick'; Roger de Montgomery, sometime rebel who went over to the king early in the rebellion; Archbishop Thomas of York (*Ebroic* in Norman French); Roger of Poitou, a possible rebel; Eudo dapifer, one of William's father's loyal *curiales*; the bishop of Saint-Lô is none other than Geoffrey, bishop of Coutances, who had rebelled at Bristol in the spring; the bishops of Lincoln and of Hereford; Count Alan of Richmond and Earl Hugh of Chester, both loyal throughout; Roger Bigod who rebelled in East Anglia, the only disloyal sheriff; William de Percy, patron of Whitby abbey;⁵⁷ Hugh de Montfort, a royal official from William I's court who witnessed only these two acts for Rochester in William II's time;⁵⁸ Henry the king's son; and finally Walkelin, bishop of Winchester. The irregular sequence reflects the haphazard placing of the *signa* and not the order of signing. Apart from the king himself, twelve names are shared by this act and the confirmation of Lanfranc's gift to Rochester of Haddenham, a high proportion. These are (following the more orderly precedence of the Rochester diploma): Archbishop Thomas of York, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, Bishop Walkelin of Winchester, Bishop Robert of Hereford (a very rare witness), Henry the king's brother (surely to be equated with the otherwise uninterpretable Henry the king's son in the act for Le Bec), Count Alan of Richmond, Earl Hugh of Chester, Earl Henry of Warwick, Eudo dapifer, Roger Bigod, Hugh de Montfort, and Gilbert fitz Richard of Tonbridge. Among these names, again we have two former rebels, Roger Bigod and Gilbert of Tonbridge.

There is a *prima facie* case for thinking that these two acts may have been drawn up on the same occasion, and the number of bishops present suggests a significant occasion. The presence of Henry the king's brother provides the main route to a dating during July–September 1088.⁵⁹ Taken in conjunction with the narrative of *De iniusta uexatione* we can further reduce the possible data-range. By 8 September Count Alan of Brittany, who witnessed both acts, and one possible converted rebel, Roger of Poitou, who witnessed for Le Bec, had reached Durham and made arrangements to bring Bishop William south to meet the king. They appear to have remained in the north for at least three weeks, since it was Michaelmas before the bishop began his journey south.⁶⁰ It would appear likely that they had set out for the north before the end of August, so that both acts must be dated to the months of July or August 1088. Within this time-frame we know that Bishop William had briefly visited the

⁵⁷ There is a grant of liberties to Whitby (*Regesta* i, no. 228, though the sheriff Ralf Paynell argues for William II's time), whose substance is suspicious, but whose address to Archbishop Thomas, Count Alan, and Ralf Paynell, and attestation by Archbishop Lanfranc and Bishop Osmund and William de Percy at York, are not incompatible with a date around late January or early February 1088. They may have been taken from an authentic act.

⁵⁸ William de Percy and Hugh de Montfort are both among the many witnesses to an impressive forgery from Lincoln, dated 1090 (*Regesta* i, no. 328). Stenton thought it derived from authentic documents, since the rarer names included could not be 'mere inventions' (in C. W. Foster, *The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln*, vol. i, Lincolnshire Record Society 27, 1930, 10–11). The inclusion of Robert, count of Mortain, there, and also Bishop Robert of Hereford makes it plausible that another act from the summer of 1088 was among the sources used. There are, however, sufficient anomalies among the bishops to rule out the possibility that the witness-list was taken over as a unity from a single source.

⁵⁹ This was recognized by C. W. Hollister, *Henry I*, New Haven, CT, 2001, 61 n. 149.

⁶⁰ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 79–80.

king, whose company at the time included Archbishop Thomas and several other bishops.

A fourth act, not as it stands authentic, has a witness-list that contributes to the same picture. The beneficiary in this case was St Peter's abbey in Gent, in Flanders, and King William confirmed to it the lands it held in Kent. The witness list is not so long, but there are again some notable similarities:

Signum Willelmi regis.
 S(ignum) Gosfridi episcopi de sancto Laudo.
 S(ignum) comitis Roberti de Moritonio.
 S(ignum) Odonis comitis de Campania.
 S(ignum) Philippi comitis Roberti Flandrensis filii.
 S(ignum) Eudonis dapiferi regis.
 S(ignum) Ostonis Flandrensis.
 S(ignum) Raingoti de Aldenarda.

Here we have the rebel Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances, who witnessed the act for Le Bec, and Philip, son of Count Robert of Flanders, who witnessed the act for Rochester. Neither was habitually in England. Another peculiar similarity is the form of Bishop Geoffrey's witness; in William I's time he frequently attested with the title bishop of Coutances, but only in these two acts does he use the title bishop of Saint-Lô, a larger town in his diocese about halfway between Coutances and Bayeux. Eudo dapifer, one of the king's steadfast courtiers, appears in all three lists. Two other names, however, further demonstrate the swiftness of the king's leniency: Count Odo of Champagne had been loyal, but he went to Durham with Count Alan of Richmond and Roger of Poitou, so this act again seems likely to fall into the same narrow range of dates (July–August 1088); another witness, Robert, count of Mortain, the king's uncle, brother of Bishop Odo, took part in the rebellion and was besieged at Pevensey. He attests very rarely in William II's reign and is only known to have been in England during 1088.⁶¹ The two names at the end of the list were presumably members of the Flemish contingent in England, accompanying the son of Count Robert of Flanders, among whose party may also have been the representatives of St Peter's abbey who sought the confirmation. In spite of the doubts attaching to the tenor of this act, the witness-list would appear to have followed one that could well have been authentic from England in the summer of 1088. It is hardly possible to suppose that forgers at Rochester at the time when the *Textus Roffensis* was drawn up and forgers at Gent later in the twelfth century had been able to collude and had information available to them drawn from an unusual act such as the diploma for Le Bec.

Two versions of a forged confirmation from St Mary's abbey at York present different versions of a single witness list which, if any confidence could be placed in it, would also have to date from the summer of 1088.⁶² The presence of Bishop

⁶¹ The four acts with his name among the witnesses are this one for St Peter's, Gent; the conflated witness-list of a Lincoln forgery (*Regesta* i no. 328; see above, n. 58); a very dubious confirmation for Rochester (*Regesta* i, no. 451); and a writ for Abbot Herbert of Ramsey, datable 1087 x May 1089.

⁶² Neither of these texts has been printed, but a further version is *Regesta* i, no. 313 (with only two witnesses). From a twelfth-century York manuscript, BL MS Add. 38816, fols 21r–22r, the list contains eleven names: Archbishops Lanfranc and Thomas, Bishops William of Durham and Hildebert (recte Hoel) of Le Mans, Cardinal Albert, Abbot Anselm of Le Bec, Abbots Paul of St Albans and Serlo of Gloucester, Count Alan of Richmond, Earl Henry of Warwick, Earl William II de Warenne, and many others. Roger Dodsworth has preserved a longer version, Bodl. MS Dodsworth 10, fols 110r–111v, with twenty-three names: Archbishops Lanfranc and Thomas, Count Alan, Bishops Geoffrey of Coutances, Remigius of Lincoln, Godfrey of Chichester, Gundulf of Rochester, and William of Durham, Earl Henry of Warwick,

Godfrey of Chichester, who died on 25 September 1088, a few months after his consecration, is particularly distinctive. The attestation of Anselm of Le Bec is also remarkable: he is not known to have been in England in 1088, though the confirmation of Walter Giffard's gift to the abbey suggests that there was a deputation in England. The witness of an otherwise unknown Cardinal Albert, however, diminishes confidence here. If more reliance could be placed on these two copies, we should have to date them to the summer council at which Bishop William of Durham briefly attended on the king and his fellow bishops. It would be his first datable attestation since he was with the king in York in January or February of 1088.

At this point I should like to go back and consider the Lewes diploma in more detail.⁶³ If the absence of Henry de Beaumont's comital title can be trusted, this must predate the two acts for Rochester cathedral priory that deal with issues arising from the siege there. It can hardly be later than July 1088, and yet already in among the witnesses here, we find signs that rebels are being drawn back into the king's circle. It is attested by the king and eighteen other witnesses, and, unusually for any witness-list of that length, there are only two clerks included:

Signum + Willelmi regis
 Signum + Gunnulfi episcopi
 Signum + Willelmi Teforensis episcopi
 Signum + Rogerii comitis
 Signum + Roberti comitis
 Signum + Walteri Gyphardi
 Signum + Henrici de Ferrariis
 Signum + Henrici de Bellomonte
 Signum + comitis Alani
 Signum + comitis Hugonis de Cestria
 Signum + Reotgerii de Busliaco
 Signum + Bernardi de Nouo Mercato
 Signum + Walterii de Aincurte
 Signum + Ricoardi
 Signum + Radulfi de Caisneto
 Signum + Ricardi
 Signum + Hugonis filii Golde
 Signum + Godefridi de Petraponte
 Signum + Hugonis de Wanciaco

The *terminus post* is secured by the reference in the text of the document to the day when William de Warenne was *uiuus et mortuus*, 24 June 1088. The absence of Henry de Beaumont's title as earl of Warwick argues for a date before the siege of Rochester was concluded. We may therefore have a glimpse of those with the king as he travelled from Pevensey to Rochester or even as Rochester was besieged. The presence of Bishop Gundulf in these circumstances is not surprising; he was never disloyal, but during the siege he was able to move to and fro between the two sides.⁶⁴

Earl William de Warenne, Count Roger, the chancellor Gerard, Abbot Anselm of Le Bec, Abbots William of Cerne, Ingulf of Crowland, Ranulf of Saint-Vincent at Le Mans, Serlo of Gloucester, and Paul of St Albans, Cardinal Albert, Milo Crispin from Le Bec, Henry de Ferrers, Bishop Hildebert (recte Hoel) of Le Mans, and Ernulf de Hesdin.

⁶³ *Regesta* i, no. 325.

⁶⁴ *Vita Gundulfi episcopi*, § 28, 'uirum Dei tamen et licenter exire et licenter cum uolebat urbem permittebat intrare' (ed. Thomson, 50–1).

Bishop William of Thetford's presence is unexpected; we have not met him in the king's company since Christmas in London at the beginning of the year, and this is his only attestation. Earl Roger de Montgomery of Shrewsbury and Earl Robert de Mowbray of Northumberland are former rebels. (If we accept Count Roger of Poitou's involvement, he was presumably still defending Rochester and raiding in Kent at this date.) Walter Giffard had witnessed frequently for the king's father, and he would witness Henry I's coronation charter, but this is his only attestation in William II's time outside a definite forgery from Tewkesbury. The document for Le Bec, however, which we have already considered, confirmed his gift, so we may infer that he was in England around this time. Henry de Ferrers was another courtier of William I who in William II's time witnesses only here and in the diploma soon afterwards that granted the church of Lambeth to Rochester. Henry de Beaumont we have already discussed; Count Alan and Earl Hugh of Chester were fighting with the king. Roger de Builli otherwise witnesses only William II's diploma granting Bath abbey to John of Tours, bishop of Wells, in January 1091.⁶⁵ Bernard de Neufmarché had rebelled in the Welsh borders in the spring, and yet here he appears at the king's side around the end of June or beginning of July; this is his only attestation during William II's reign. Walter d'Aincourt also attests only here, but he must have been loyal; later in the summer of 1088 he acted in the king's name, giving instructions to the bishop of Durham, whose men ('homines episcopi qui in castello suo sunt') had stolen from the king's custody two hundred cattle belonging to Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances.⁶⁶

It would appear that before the siege of Rochester was over, several of those who had broken their faith to King William had gone to join him, to make their peace, and presumably to renew their oath of fealty. Something of the circumstances of Roger de Montgomery's return we may accept from the story told by William of Malmesbury. His son Roger of Poitou seems to have returned to the fold as the siege of Rochester drew to a close, while Gilbert of Tonbridge was under guard in Kent and could have been brought to the king in July 1088. Robert, count of Mortain, would surely have been a bigger prize, captured with his brother Odo at Pevensey; the only sign of his witnessing is among the names attached to the Gent forgery. None of the sources explains how the rebellion in East Anglia was suppressed, but Roger Bigod also appears here among the king's courtiers. How Bishop Geoffrey was brought to heel, we do not know, but he too is here in attendance on the king. Bernard de Neufmarché was thwarted at Worcester by Bishop Wulfstan, but there is no word as to whether he and the other leaders in the border shires were captured and brought to the king. Did such men decide that their rebellion had failed – perhaps as soon as it was clear that resolute action in Kent and Sussex was working – and come of their own accord to the king in the hope of favourable terms? That cannot be known, but evidence shows that soon after the rebellion in Kent was defeated, the king was allowing as witnesses to his diplomas men who had committed acts of violence in his realm and in support of a rival claim to the throne.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ *Regesta* i, nos 314, 474; see also nn. 46, 55.

⁶⁶ *De iniusta uexatione*, ed. Offler, 93–4; *English Lawsuits*, 103. This episode was mentioned at the end of Bishop William's trial by one W. de Merlaio, possibly William, steward of Bishop Geoffrey (as Offler notes).

⁶⁷ Where Barlow, *William Rufus*, 94–5, presents a round-up of names from witness-lists of 1088–9, no distinction is drawn between those who had been loyal or disloyal; 'steadfastness' is attributed even to Roger de Montgomery, Robert of Mortain, Roger of Poitou, Roger Bigod, and Bernard de Neufmarché.

The evidence for his leniency is clear. It includes the seniors who, as Orderic expressed it, would soon be dead: these must include Robert, count of Mortain, and Roger de Montgomery. His son Roger of Poitou was of the younger generation, and he was able to secure his position in William II's time. Old Bishop Geoffrey and his nephew Robert de Mowbray were allowed to retain their estates. Gilbert of Tonbridge granted the church of Rotherfield to the church of Rochester, a gift confirmed by King William in an act witnessed at Winchester by Roger Bigod. And Roger himself granted the church of Felixstowe, in Suffolk, to the church of Rochester, a gift again confirmed by King William at Winchester in an act witnessed by Eudo dapifer.⁶⁸ It is not surprising that Gilbert should be a benefactor of the cathedral priory so near to Tonbridge, but Roger's interests were not in Kent. Were they perhaps both making some condign gesture of regret – a gift to a charity of the king's choosing – within a few weeks of the siege of Rochester? We should probably also reflect on how much money was paid to the king to secure this lenient treatment.⁶⁹ Roger Bigod, although also a trusted official in the king's father's time, seems certainly to have belonged to Orderic's category of those who, forgiven for their disloyalty, became more faithful than ever.

Punishment is not much in evidence here. The Chronicle's notion that the lands of the disloyal were made over to those who helped the king is certainly not generally borne out. The nearest to it, one might think, is that Queen Matilda's English lands, which the king's brother Henry had hoped to inherit, were given to the landless Robert fitz Haimo.⁷⁰ Odo was exiled, and so were the leading defenders of Rochester, Eustace of Boulogne and Robert de Bellesme, but their lands remained in the king's possession. Bishop William, we know, was punished in a very public way, tried at Salisbury before being sent into exile, but even he, who betrayed the king's trust and deserted him in his hour of need at the very start of the campaign against the rebels, had climbed back into the king's favour by 1091 and been restored to his position. And if Bernard de Neufmarché was already being reconciled to the king before the siege of Rochester was concluded, then it can hardly be said, in Orderic's phrase, that the king 'bided his time and waited for the right moment to take vengeance'.⁷¹ I wondered whether Orderic was here thinking ahead to 1095, when William of Eu, a rebel for a second time, was mutilated and died as a result, but the response is in Orderic's own text. Years later, he returns to report on the fortunes of some of the rebels of 1088, when Urban II preached the crusade in 1098, and Duke Robert pledged his duchy to King William. Bishop Odo had lost his earldom and withdrawn to Normandy to live out his last years as bishop of Bayeux. 'So great was the enmity between him and the king as a result of a past strife' (*pro transactis simultatibus*), writes Orderic, 'that it was impossible for any mediators to bring about a reconciliation.' Odo had persuaded his brother Count Robert of Mortain to join the rebellion, but 'when besieged by the king his nephew', Robert had made peace and 'been restored to his friendship after surrendering the castle'. Gilbert of Tonbridge and his brother Roger had fortified Tonbridge castle against the king, but it fell at the first assault; there is no word of their reconciliation here, but Gilbert certainly was forgiven. Those who held out against the king's two siege-towers at Rochester,

⁶⁸ *Regesta* i, nos 450, 452, both from *Textus Roffensis*; both have defective address clauses, which might be attributed to the twelfth-century compiler, but I remain a little suspicious about them.

⁶⁹ In 1095 Hugh de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, paid £3,000 to buy his way back into King William's favour (*Orderic* iv, 284).

⁷⁰ *Orderic* iv, 220.

⁷¹ *Orderic* iv, 134; quoted above, 148.

Eustace of Boulogne and Robert of Bellesme were disinherited by William, whose final triumph, in Orderic's tale, was his taking control of Normandy from Duke Robert. Bishop Odo now found it preferable to join the duke on the crusade and died at Palermo in February 1099.⁷²

It was William of Malmesbury who took the gentlest view of William's treatment of the rebels. Apart from Odo and Bishop William, he said, in 1088, 'all the rest were admitted to take the oath of allegiance'.⁷³ We have not been able to establish exactly when or where, but the evidence of an unusual series of diplomas from different archives has illustrated how several of the rebels were quickly restored to the king's favour. The process began before hostilities had even really ended. Two new earls had been made in the context of sieges, and some rebels – Bernard de Neufmarché is the first of those who had actually attacked the king's towns – were already restored to good standing. He and Gilbert of Tonbridge were never active as courtiers, nor were Robert of Mortain or Bishop Geoffrey, so that their attestation in 1088 is all the more conspicuous. More rebels were perhaps rehabilitated at Rochester, but sometime in late July or August, before Count Alan and Count Odo and Count Roger went north to deal with the bishop of Durham, it appears that there was a large public occasion, attended by both archbishops, several other English bishops, and many of the nobility, when business might be done to deal with the consequences of the war in Kent and to bring back some sense of unity again to the court. If one could rely on the writ-charters that confirmed two gifts from former rebels to the church of Rochester, one might hazard that this happened at Winchester. If there is a trade-off between writ-charters with place-dates and diplomas with long witness-lists, we have not done too badly from the odd documents surviving from the summer of 1088. They cannot tell us where the court was held to restore some kind of normality, but they confirm William of Malmesbury's understanding of the king's conciliatory approach in 1088. William Rufus had neutralized the major problem of separating England from Normandy; the rebels who had caused him most difficulty were excluded from England, and he secured their English lands for himself without having to distribute them to buy others' loyalty. He had shown enough strength in this, and in his military successes at Pevensey and Rochester, that other rebels were thankful enough to have been forgiven their temporary disloyalty. Normal government in England was quickly restored.

⁷² *Orderic* v, 208–10.

⁷³ *Gesta Regum* i, 548–9.

