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Introduction

Traditional assessments of Richard the Lionheart’s first years as king, between 1189 and 1191 look most often like the following. Richard became king of England at age thirty-two on September 3 1189. His one goal upon his accession was to drain his realm of men and money for his upcoming crusade. He remained in England only long enough to receive the crown, to make impetuous and ill-planned decisions for the governance of England in his absence, and to suck the country dry of every penny. His father, Henry II, had built up a highly efficient system of government, which Richard promptly began to tear down. He dismissed his father’s chief justiciar, Ranulf Glanvill, ousted his father’s sheriffs. Richard was unmarried and about to depart on crusade, from which he might not have returned. Richard did not designate a successor in the event of his death. He gave his brother John unreasonably vast grants of land including six whole counties, and nominated a bastard brother Geoffrey, who it was rumored had designs at the throne, to the archbishopric of York. In the words of J.T. Appleby, “Richard thus heaped up the materials for an explosion…and subjected the governmental system, painfully restored by his father…to the most severe strain.”

However, for the four centuries after his death in 1199, Richard the Lionheart remained the model king that he had been in life. Richard was a model for Edward I and Edward II, and compared to Alexander the Great, and Charlemagne. Richard stood for contemporaries, like Roger of Howden, Richard of Devizes and Ambroise, as a model crusader king. The anonymous author of the Itinerarium explained, “King Richard had the valour of Hector, the heroism of Achilles; he was not inferior to Alexander, nor less

valiant than Roland.”² Until the seventeenth century, Richard retained this reputation. John Speed in *The History of Great Britain* (1611) said that Richard’s love and care of the English nation were of justice itself, and his death brought a black cloud over a “triumphal and bright shining star of chivalry.”³ This was not a king who heaped up an explosion to bring down what his father had established.

Assessments of Richard would shortly change drastically. Just seven years after Speed’s assessment, Samuel Daniel in *The Collection of the History of England* (1618) trounced the model king narrative. He explained that Richard consumed more of the English kingdom than all his predecessors since the Norman conquest, and deserved his exactions less than any, having never lived on the isle, nor left behind any monument, or showed any love or care to the nation. Daniel first posed what became a traditional assessment of Richard as an ineffective and exploitative king. Criticizing the ignorant bliss of the chroniclers, David Hume in his *History of England* (1762) explained that Richard’s positive early reputation was attributed to the romantic spirit of the age. Richard ceased to be the model king. By the nineteenth century, Bishop William Stubbs wrote that Richard was indeed not a model king but rather an “unscrupulous and impetuous soldier,” whose “love of warfare kept him from paying proper attention to the administration of his inheritance from his father.”⁴ Stubbs’ impression of Richard still haunts scholars, as some of his editions of the Latin chroniclers remain the standard.

Since the 1960s and 1970s, revisionists and apologists have begun to rehabilitate Richard, seeking to place him back in his proper twelfth century, contemporary context.

---

However, by returning to Richard’s context and restoring credibility to contemporary chroniclers, revisionists continue to emphasize Richard’s militarism as much as Stubbs had before them. Richard continued as a king predominantly interest in combat. Scholars credited Richard’s non-military successes, if they saw any, to his administrators. Richard’s reign often remains a “mere hiccup of chivalric combat” or even more severely an “interregnum.” Crusade historian Steven Runciman, adjusting Stubbs’ assessment (“bad son, a bad husband, a selfish ruler and a vicious man”) called Richard “a bad son, a bad husband and a bad king, but a gallant and splendid soldier.” Jonathan Riley-Smith deemed Richard one of the finest crusade leaders who nonetheless was “vain…devious and self-centered.” Michael Markowski called Richard a leader who prolonged warfare, avoided peace and was “no hero, but a man who merely wanted to fight hand-to-hand forever.” Richard, in a reemphasized twelfth century context, still loved warfare and was an incompetent king.

As J.A. Brundage and John Gillingham have pointed out, “The great problem of interpreting Richard’s career…is the question of what standards one should apply to his history.” Certainly perceptions of Richard shift if he is judged as crusader, or king of England, or count of Poitou, or son. The greater problem, though, is that Richard’s reign truly was consumed by combat. Of his ten year reign, around nine of those years were

---

largely concerned with combat. Richard was forced to focus on combat and success in that combat, whether on crusade or against the Capetians. It was a necessary aspect of his kingship, especially as a crusader. However, even this should not limit assessments of Richard’s abilities as king. That is, as John Gillingham noted, “whether we like it or not, leadership in war was a vital aspect of kingship, and successful leadership required many qualities besides those of brute courage and physical strength.”

The present inquiry reassesses Richard I’s kingship. It seeks to understand how those “many qualities” appeared in the context of the first two years after his father’s death. From July 6 1189 (Henry II’s death) to May 12 1191 (Richard’s marriage to Berengaria) Richard prepared the Angevin domain for crusade. Modern scholars have argued that Richard’s reign needs to be assessed in light of the effectiveness of his government in England, and in his military successes between 1194 and 1199. However, by sidestepping or ignoring Richard’s first years, considering them those in which he simply exploited his domains and sucked his dominions dry to raise money for crusade, historians ignore the single period of Richard’s reign when Richard was able to act, and was not forced to react. Richard’s first years as king provide the clearest image of the many qualities that Richard had besides brute courage and physical strength.

My examination, with a focus on 1189-1191, reveals Richard’s vision for his reign. His father had left him an expansive dominion. The solution for its defense was left to Richard. In response, Richard least of all wanted to fight hand-to-hand forever. He sought, also, to distinguish himself from his father’s reign and his father’s policies. Part

---

of this break with his father was the shift from the father’s expansion, to the son’s defense of the realm.

This thesis also seeks to understand the relationship that crusading had with the functions of kingship. Richard’s reign was shaped by crusade. He spent July 1189 to May 1191 preparing for crusade. He spent June 1191 to December 1192 on crusade. From December 1192 to March 1194, he was held captive, having been captured by duke Leopold of Austria on his return home from crusade. Owing to his captivity and consequent absence, Philip II was able to capture some of Richard’s continental lands. So Richard spent March 1194 to his death in April 1199 working for the return of his family’s continental holdings. Crusade characterized Richard’s as one certainly obsessed with combat, and prolonging it. He appears, as Stubbs put it, impetuous and does not seem to be paying the proper attention to his inheritance.

However, Richard’s contemporaries did not always view Richard as impetuous and unwise. The current project focuses on the chronicle evidence to determine how Richard’s contemporaries viewed his successes and failures. Roger of Howden, Richard of Devizes, Ralph Diceto, Gervase of Canterbury, Gerald of Wales and Ambroise figure largely in this reassessment. The focus on these late twelfth century authors encourages a reading that emphasizes contemporary analyses and opinions. Of these, Roger of Howden takes precedence. In the 1170s and 1180s Howden had been in attendance to Henry II as a royal clerk. He held public office, and was by 1189 justice of the forests in Northumberland, Cumberland and Yorkshire.\footnote{Frank Barlow, “Roger of Howden,” \textit{The English Historical Review} 65 (1950), 356-357.} He compiled the \textit{Gesta}, went on crusade
with Richard I, came back and wrote his *Chronica*.\(^{12}\) His *Chronica* stretches from 732 to 1201. Roger borrows the greater part of his chronicle from various authorities, leaving only the 1180s to 1201 from his own pen. He has been praised for his objectivity and criticized for it. That is, for someone who had such occasion for contact with leading men, Richard I included, scholars lament the lack of personal revelation. “This dour Yorkshire parson, who knew so much about the affairs of government and recorded what he knew with immense elaboration” did so “without a spark of warmth for either of the masters whom he had served.”\(^ {13}\) Historians praise Howden more as a preserver of legal documents. Recently, however, historians have begun to offer glimpses of a politicized Howden.\(^ {14}\) This thesis emphasizes and relies on Howden’s objectivity as “the best historian of the English Crown in the twelfth century,” but also where he reveals his politicized opinion.\(^ {15}\)

Other chroniclers employed in this research have a tendency to more outwardly display their loyalties and interests. Ralph Diceto and Gervase of Canterbury, both contemporaries to Henry II and Richard I, displayed similar preoccupations with government as Howden did, but with more obvious displays of loyalty and interest. Howden had begun his history in 1170. Diceto began his around 1180. Gervase began his around 1185. Diceto had been archdeacon of Middlesex and was dean of St. Paul’s London from 1180 until his death around 1202. Gervase is primarily remembered as an ecclesiastical historian, important to the history of Canterbury. He played a significant

---

12 Gillingham, *Richard Coeur du Lion*, 143.
15 Southern, *Medieval Humanism*, 150. This opinion will be covered below in regards to Howden’s comparison of Henry II and Richard.
part in the disputes between the monks at Canterbury in Archbishop Baldwin, which take a prominent place in his history. Gervase grounded his work in the *Gesta Regis Henrici*, but for matters of his own time wrote from his own recollections. For these years, like the rest of Richard I’s contemporaries used in this thesis, Gervase’s “own recollections” are invaluable to understanding contemporary opinion of, for this thesis, Richard’s first years as king.

The chroniclers’ opinions are not without inherent problems. In the words of William Stubbs, “Like so many of the other writers of the time, [Gervase] regarded the younger Henry as a possible Trajan, and the young Richard as an actual Nero.” Richard’s reign was a moral message according to his contemporaries, none more prominently than Gerald of Wales who dubbed Henry II’s offspring the devil’s brood. Gerald of Wales perhaps more than any contemporary was given to “wear his heart on his sleeve.” Ambroise, an eyewitness to Richard’s crusade, similarly wear his heart on his sleeve, but as a crusader himself, who praised Richard as a model crusader. His chronicle of the Third Crusade, with its heavy bias towards Richard Lionheart, is valuable not only as an eyewitness account but to understanding how Richard operated as a model king, to understanding why chroniclers might be biased in praise of Richard. It is however these opinions, and these moments where the chroniclers do wear their hearts on their sleeves that present assessments of Richard’s first years, more than their objectivity.

It is for that same reason, in part, that Richard of Devizes’ account is valuable to this thesis. Devizes was in “an ideal place for gathering information” as a monk of St.

---

17 Ibid., xlvii.
18 Gillingham, *Richard Coeur du Lion*, 152.
Swithun’s at Winchester. He wrote his chronicle only about the time between Richard’s coronation in September 1189 and his preparations to leave the Holy Land in October 1192. Devizes was not a clerk to the royal chapel. He was a simple monk who “had nothing to gain from a king who would in all probability never hear of him or his writings.” Furthermore, Richard’s chronicle is wholly original. It shows no borrowings from other sources, though Devizes was fond of classical quotations. Yet, he displays stout loyalty to Richard, and as a good Englishman hates the French. Devizes gives the reader an interesting picture of what the average opinion of Richard I was during the king’s life first years. Devizes’ importance lies here. He is unique as an apparently completely detached and individual chronicler. In assessing contemporary opinions of Richard I, Devizes is an important piece amongst other chroniclers. A reexamination of these chroniclers with a focus on those who wrote about Richard’s first years as king from their own recollections creates a different picture than the traditional narrative.

Richard’s first years should not be stumbled over as those where he sought only to drain his realm of men and money for his crusade. Crusade was doubtless important to the new king, but it was not his goal to drain the realm of men and money. More problematic, Richard does appear disinterested with the whole of his inheritance. He spent little time in England. After his coronation, Richard spent only six months in England, four in 1189 for his first coronation and to prepare for crusade, and two in 1194 for his second coronation. He was not, however, overly interested in combat or disinterested in his inheritance. External factors, a call to crusade and more specifically

19 Devizes, *Chronicon*, xi.
Philip II, forced Richard’s interest in combat upon him. That interest in combat was for the interest of Richard’s inheritance. He was hardly impetuous. He was calculating, and forced to be so expediently for sake of his imminent crusade departure. His plans for establishing the security of his domain were, after all, because he knew he would soon take up the crusade journey.

Taking the Cross: A Personal and Political Statement

Before his father and Philip II of France, Richard took the cross. Richard’s motivations to take the cross before his father or before Philip, then his ally, are unclear. Richard’s motivation for crusade, according to the chroniclers, followed similar crusader motivations. He took up the cross apparently first and foremost because of his responsibility to protect the patrimony of Christ. Ambroise, a Norman chronicler and eyewitness to Richard’s crusade, explains, “Richard, the valiant Count of Poitiers, did not wish to fail God at the time of His need and His call, so he took the Cross for love of Him.” As Jonathan Riley-Smith explains, taking up the cross was an act of love, and that act of love was for Christ, a feudal lord, a king who had lost his patrimonium. Furthermore, for the chroniclers, Christ rewarded Richard for his devotion. After the crusade had launched, the Itinerarium Peregrinorum relates that, “when all the other princes had either died or retreated, He retained him as executor of His affairs.” God had chosen Richard. Richard’s reputation as a pious crusader king began immediately at

24 Nicholson, Chronicle of the Third Crusade, 47.
his taking the cross. The chroniclers are all keen to note that Richard “was the first of all princes this side of the Alps to be signed with the Cross…”

Certainly the promised spiritual rewards of crusade and the religious obligations to crusade by the end of the twelfth century cannot be ignored as motivations for Richard. However, not all chroniclers emphasize the spiritual motivation. Neither Ralph Diceto, Roger of Howden, Gervase of Canterbury nor Gerald of Wales emphasize or at all mention Richard’s religious motivation to crusade. They simply mention that he took the cross. For a chronicler like Howden, praised for his dispassionate narrative and official tone, this is unsurprising. For chroniclers like Gerald of Wales, Ralph Diceto and Gervase of Canterbury who were considerably more passionate about their Angevin subjects, it is peculiar that there is no mention of motive, even a spiritual one.

These chroniclers do, however, emphasize that Richard took the cross first, before his father and before Philip. For the Itinerarium, Richard “disregarded his father’s white hairs, and the kingdom … and the difficulties of so great a journey, and used no pretext to avoid the undertaking.” For Howden, Richard took the cross months earlier than did Henry II, forcing Henry II and Philip II to follow his example. For Ralph Diceto, Richard took the cross “not having waited nor wishing for the counsel of his father.” For Gerald of Wales, Richard was the first and again Henry and Philip followed his example. The chroniclers tend to portray Richard’s crusade vow as an impetuous and inconsiderate

---

27 Nicholson, Chronicle of the Third Crusade, 47.
28 Ralph de Diceto, Opera Historica, ed. William Stubbs II (Kraus Reprint, 1965), 50. “…non expectato patris sui consilio nec voluntate.”
29 Gerald of Wales, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, 98.
move. It seems, also, that Henry II would have agreed with them. According to Gervase of Canterbury, when Henry heard that Richard had taken up the cross with many troops, he was troubled.\textsuperscript{30} Likely, Henry was more than troubled. He had reason to be frustrated that his son acted without his consent or even counsel.

Henry’s frustration illustrates the significance of Richard’s crusade vow. By taking up the cross before his father, or in the words of the chroniclers “before any king this side of the Alps,” Richard not only made a spiritual statement, but also a personal and political one. Richard was not the only Angevin who had good reason to crusade. The Angevins had family ties to Outremer through the Lusignans. Richard’s connection and obligation to the Lusignans was the same as his father’s. The family connection cannot alone explain why Richard preempted his father in assuming the cross. Nor is it enough to say that Henry II was more distracted than Richard in 1187. Henry was as occupied with rebellion as Richard was in rebelling. In fact, Henry II had greater cause to take up crusade early, or at least before his son ignored his white hairs and counsel and did so. Henry, in fact, had refused the throne of Jerusalem in 1185 despite great pressure to go, at least on crusade, in part to atone still for the death of Thomas Becket.\textsuperscript{31} Regardless, Richard took the cross before him.

The crusade vow did not assure Richard’s inheritance of the throne. It played a crucial role in separating Richard out from his father, Henry II. His assumption of the crusade vow also took place in the years when Richard seemed most concerned about succession, but Richard did not take the cross in order to take the crown. When Richard

\textsuperscript{30} Gervase of Canterbury, \textit{Opera Historica}, 389. “…unde rex pater ipsius specie tenus adeo turbatus est.”

swore the crusade vow he took an action not unlike that which William Jordan discusses in regards to Louis IX. For Jordan, Louis IX’s assumption of the cross affirmed his break from the regency of his mother, Blanche of Castille.32 Both Louis and Richard were thirty years old when they took the cross, and established enough in their careers to understand the impact of a crusade reputation. Like Louis IX would do a half-century later, Richard sought to break from a dominating parent and emphasize his individual ability. Taking the cross before his father was politically and, perhaps more importantly, personally expedient for Richard.

Richard’s concern to distinguish himself stemmed from family conflict in general, but also derived from his concerns about inheritance. Henry had displayed little love for Richard in the latter half of the 1180s. Richard had allied with Philip II, and fought against his father for family lands. His succession to the throne was not at all assured. Though it was not uncommon for medieval kings to neglect to name an heir, Henry II had once before officially declared an heir, young Henry. Richard sought the same recognition.

Richard’s efforts between 1183 and 1189 appear strictly tied to ensuring his succession to the throne. Richard had had plenty of conflict with Young Henry after Henry II had named Young Henry heir to the throne. Richard refused to do homage to his older brother, and the resultant quarrel in January 1183 saw Henry II and young Henry invading Poitou.33 Young Henry’s death in June 1183 brought Richard some peace of mind, but did not quell Henry II’s concerns regarding an uncooperative son. Richard’s

33 *Gesta Regis Henrici*, ed. William Stubbs (Kraus Reprint, 1965), 292-293.
troublemaking only increased with the death of his remaining elder brother Geoffrey in August 1186. As the eldest son, Richard had every reason to expect the throne, and to request that Henry II name him his heir.

Richard was not, however, the only remaining legitimate son. While Richard was Eleanor’s favorite, John was Henry’s. Richard’s actions reflect his awareness of the favoritism. In February 1184, despite his father’s command, Richard refused to give up Aquitaine to John. 34 Henry II consequently allowed John to invade Poitou, and though the invasion came to nothing militarily, Richard was eventually forced to return all of Poitou to Eleanor, presumably so that the lands might eventually go to John. 35 These events took place between Young Henry’s death in 1183 and Richard’s second older brother Geoffrey in 1186. After 1186, Richard desperately sought to be named heir, and persisted in his stubbornness toward his brother. In that same time, Richard took the cross. Geoffrey’s death did not alone spur Richard’s decision to take the cross. Certainly the news of the Battle of Hattin influenced his action. However, Richard’s assumption of the crusade vow took place in the same window from 1186 to 1189 when he sought assurances that he would inherit the throne.

The chroniclers convey some sense of Richard’s desperation in regards to inheritance. In November 1188, at a conference at Bonsmoulins, Richard demanded that Henry II name him heir. 36 Henry refused. In response, Richard threw his lot in with Philip II. 37 And though Philip II and Henry II came to a truce at a conference in January 1189,

34 Ibid., 311.
35 Ibid., 338.
36 Gervase of Canterbury, Opera Historica I, 435.
37 Ibid., 436.
Richard refused to submit to his father, largely because he had yet to be named legitimate heir. Richard continued as the stubborn son of an apparently equally stubborn father. For as long as Henry II refused to appoint Richard as his heir, Richard continued to refuse to submit to his authority. At the conference at Le Mans in June 1189, a month before Henry II’s death, Richard and Philip made further demands. First they demanded that Alice be given to Richard from the Henry II’s custody. Next, Richard demanded that he be appointed heir. Third, Richard requested that his brother John be made to go on crusade with him. Henry refused all demands. Despite Henry’s refusal, Richard was clearly concerned with acquiring the Angevin inheritance. Fortunate for Richard’s initial plans, his father around June 29 1189 was forced to submit to all demands. Ultimately Richard was not assured his succession because he took the cross before his father, but because of the combined force of himself and Philip II.

Richard’s vow to crusade reveals, and highlights an element of his kingship more important than a simple explanation for his succession. Outlining the difficulties Richard faced before Henry’s death, and reading Richard’s crusade vow in this context, illustrates an apparent vision Richard had for his kingship. The difficulties he faced color the character of his kingship and in a sense predict the course of his kingship. Richard cannot have assumed that his taking the cross first would ensure his accession. It served instead as a mark distinguishing him from his father. It served subsequently to shape the course of his kingship. Yet initially for Richard, taking the cross before his father was a political assertion heavy with spiritual value. It placed him before his father in the eyes of the

---

38 Ibid., 439.
39 Ibid., 448.
chroniclers. It placed him before his father in the eyes of the church. Richard was not an impious king prone to the murder of church officials like his father, but a devout crusader who Christ would take on as executor of affairs. Though distance from the Becket affair had done much to rehabilitate Henry’s reputation, Richard, in taking up crusade, gained a position as an improvement on, and significant change from his father.

The chroniclers emphasize this shift from father to son. As Roger of Howden explained, “Sol pater, et radius filius ejus erat,” the father had been the sun, and the son the ray. For Bishop William Stubbs, this meant Richard was an improvement on his father. The metaphor’s meaning is not so simple, however. It should be read in the context of Richard’s vision for his kingship. He sought to distinguish himself from his father, to break away from his father’s form of kingship. Howden emphasizes part of this break immediately after he calls Richard the ray. Richard restored the rights of those whom his father disinherited, he recalled those whom his father banished, released those confined, and forgave those whom his father punished. He released his mother from her sixteen-year captivity. He turned out Henrician sheriffs and appointed his own new ones. Though the ray traditionally is an extension of the sun, the ray, Richard, for Howden broke away from the sun. Richard made a conscious choice to distinguish himself from his father, to break from his practices as king, and the chroniclers (significantly one as close to Henry and Richard as Howden) saw that in his kingship.

---

40 Roger of Howden, The Annals of Roger of Howden, trans. Henry T. Riley (Facsimile reprint, Llanerch Publishers: Felinfach, 1997), 114. “The father was the sun, the son was his ray.” Gesta Regis Henrici II, 76.
41 Roger of Howden, The Annals, 76-77.
Alongside his break from his father sat Richard’s concern for the safety and health of his family’s domains, what some have called the Angevin ‘empire.’ Richard would face both internal and external threats to Angevin lands. His greatest concern was Philip II and the threats the Capetian king posed to the Angevin continental lands. Richard also faced the internal threats of rebellious barons, and a rebellious younger brother. Furthermore, Richard had to concern himself with these defenses, because he was preparing for crusade.

Richard’s actions were, in fact, not unlike that of any typical crusader from the first crusade to the last. Affairs had to be set in order for all crusaders, from farmer to king. Richard sought peace and allies. He sought protection. “A Christian world at peace was always an ideal, but the crusade gave the need for peace a critical immediacy.” Richard had to seek peace and allies, and do so immediately. Richard no doubt understood the privileges and protections set out for a crusignatus. However, as evidenced by the papal reaction to Richard’s captivity, the protections and privileges assigned to a crusader king were not convincingly enforced. Though admittedly the privileges and protections were frequently abused on a lower level as well.

When Philip II began his conquest of Richard’s lands in his absence, it was not unlike any other crusader’s lands coming under siege in their absence. Christopher

---

43 For a detailed discussion of the ‘character’ of the Angevin Empire see, Turner and Heiser, Richard Lionheart, 17-40.
44 Jordan, Louis IX, 14.
46 Eleanor’s letters specifically reveal her understanding that Richard was under crusade protection when he was captured, as a returning crusader; Epistolae, “Eleanor of Aquitaine,” http://epistolae.cnml.columbia.edu/letter/141.html (accessed January 13, 2010). However, Richard received no help from the papacy until Innocent III attempted some recompense in 1198-1199.
Tyerman offers up a number of these cases in his work on England and the crusades. One John of Wroxham had his lands ravaged by a neighbor, despite having left a custos in place to guard his interests.\(^{47}\) In this sense, Richard looks like a typical crusader preparing his inheritance for his absence while on crusade. The insecurities he faced are the same of any crusader taking up the cross. While the crusader might set his affairs in order to the best of his abilities, they could ultimately assure nothing. The difference for Richard, of course, was the scope.

Richard inherited a domain much larger than that which Henry II had at the start of his reign, thanks to Henry’s expansion. Richard spent his first year and a half from Henry’s death in July 1189 to winter 1190 much like any crusader would before beginning the crusade journey. He dealt with the priorities, problems and preoccupations inherited from his father, and those of his own creation. Richard had to deal with these problems and find peace and allies swiftly. The Angevin domain stretched from Scotland to the Pyrenees. Richard inherited a new and increasingly more powerful enemy and neighbor, Philip II, who in the week before Henry II’s death had been Richard’s friend and ally. Richard’s younger brother, John, had been made promises of a larger inheritance and due to past experience had reason to doubt the affection of his older brother. In short, Richard inherited a mass of problems that, because of his imminent crusade departure, had to be dealt with immediately and effectively.

*Richard’s Itinerary, 1189-1190: Visiting an Inheritance*

Part of Richard’s crusade preparations was a thorough trip around his family’s domain. He appears to have had a clear course of action in his first year as king. Between

Henry’s death in July 1189, and his arrival in Genoa in August 1190, Richard traveled some 4,571 miles, almost equivalent to his crusade journey there and back (see Table 1, Appendix). His course spanned the breadth of the Angevin domain, from the Pyrenees to the Scottish border. His actions include holding council at Pipewell Abbey, meeting with Philip and his agents to confirm peace and crusade plans, a trip into the Pyrenees where he possibly met with Sancho VI of Navarre to discuss marriage to his future wife Berengaria, a litany of charters, and a solution to the debates at Canterbury. The itinerary itself, and the speed at which Richard’s court was able to travel, illustrate Richard’s general ability to act promptly. The looming crusade, and constant pressures from Philip II to begin their crusade, clearly spurred Richard’s actions. Richard had one year to set the defense of his family’s vast domain in order, something neither his father Henry II nor his younger brother John I ever had to attempt.

Richard’s itinerary that year took him from Fontevrault to as far north as Geddington where he held council at Pipewell Abbey, making some of his first major clerical appointments. From his coronation on September 3 1189, to December 6 1189 when he crossed from Dover to Calais, he toured around England making further clerical appointments, and dealing with the debates at Canterbury, where he had contact with Gervase of Canterbury. He made preparations for crusade, including the sale of estates to finance the crusade. In the words of Richard of Devizes, “the king most obligingly unburdened all those whose money was a burden to them.” Apparently Richard joked
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that he would have sold London itself if only he could have found a buyer. Devizes, a contemporary and monk at St. Swithun’s house at Winchester, likely encountered the king when from October 17 1189 to October 26 1189, Richard I was at Winchester. Other chroniclers, like Ralph Diceto dean of St. Paul’s, doubtless encountered their new king in this first year tour as well.

In a sense, Richard’s first year operated as a medieval media tour. Richard’s rebellion against his father had won him no great reputation in English or Norman eyes, and he had already had to deal with rebellious barons in Poitou. His mother, Eleanor, in fact was charged on her release to smooth over Richard’s coronation in England. Richard had good reason to make an appearance, and good first impression, throughout his inheritance. He appears to have seen the importance in traveling across the entirety of his domain, personally visiting major cites in both England and the continent. He spent the better part of his first month as king at either Westminster or Geddington, settling justiciar appointments, family affairs and clerical appointments. Beyond his tour around England, Richard cut across his continental holdings around four times from December 6 1189 to July 1 1190. He traveled from Calais to Nonancourt to La Réole along the Pyrenees, back to Gisors, and then back to the Pyrenees (see Figure 1, Appendix). Richard sought not only to be seen, but also to see. While he was more familiar with the continental holdings than the English ones, having spent the majority of his young life in Poitou, Richard’s itinerary illustrates a king interested in traveling through the entirety of his inheritance.

---
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Certainly, crusade would distract him from the administration of his inheritance while he was away on crusade, but Richard’s itinerary illustrates quite the opposite point Bishop Stubbs and others made in regards to Richard’s priorities. Richard was interested in the administration of his inheritance from his father. The itinerary serves as one minor example of this interest. In his first year, Richard visited important Angevin cities, all the while making significant preparations for crusade and provisions for the defense of his inheritance. He had, like any crusader, to acquire peace for his lands and allies in case there was need for protection.

_Eleanor, Geoffrey and John: Dealing with Family_

Richard found one ally in his family. He also found threats. His treatment of his mother Eleanor, and his two brothers John and Geoffrey, followed the same pattern of defense and maintenance of his inheritance. His concern for defense and the actions he took to ensure it, reveal a king who, in light of the imminent crusade and threat from the Capetians, had a plan for his reign and enacted the start of that plan swiftly, immediately in fact. While he sought to break from the policies of his father, and to distinguish himself from him, Richard often used Henry’s plans to serve his own purposes. Richard’s treatment of and dealings with his mother Eleanor, however, were a distinct and whole break from Henry II’s policy.

Immediately following Henry II’s death, Richard freed his mother. It was clear from the moment she was freed, that Eleanor would play a pivotal role in Richard’s reign. Henry II had imprisoned Eleanor in England for her role in her sons’ 1173-1174 revolt. Richard not only freed her, but also empowered her to hold England until his arrival there. Eleanor, in response, worked immediately to prepare for that arrival. By Richard’s
order, she traveled around the kingdom and dispatched royal representatives to release captives imprisoned for offenses against forest law, and those held by the king’s will and not the law of the realm.\textsuperscript{52} Eleanor doubtless recalled her own imprisonment, and her recently acquired freedom, while charged with the task. She restored estates that had been confiscated under Henry II. She also smoothed Richard’s accession, sending agents to acquire oaths of fidelity to Richard.\textsuperscript{53} These efforts made Richard’s arrival in Portsmouth on August 13, 1189 one greeted by lined streets.

Eleanor continued to work staunchly on Richard’s behalf for the entirety of his reign. She enforced directives, controlled the movements of papal legate John de Anagni, attested royal charters, and effected peace between Richard and John. When in 1192 John was planning a trip to Paris to meet Philip II and to marry Alice, Eleanor stopped him.\textsuperscript{54} Richard had been her favorite, and he did everything he could to maintain that. Richard gave her further lands and money. Richard gave Eleanor the dower of Matilda, queen of Henry I, that of Alice, wife of Stephen, and the whole of Henry II’s dower.\textsuperscript{55} Eleanor continued to be as important to the maintenance of Angevin lands as she had been upon her marriage to Henry II. She worried about an heir to the throne, and according to the chroniclers was critical of Richard’s marriage with Berengaria. In fact, Eleanor would take precedence over queen Berengaria, enjoying a queen-regnant’s perquisites.\textsuperscript{56} Eleanor remained an important support to Richard’s rule throughout his reign. When in captivity,
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Eleanor was instrumental to gathering Richard’s ransom, but also to the defenses of the kingdom. When in 1194, she sensed the possibility of a French invasion to aid John against Richard, she ordered that the coasts facing Flanders be strongly fortified.\textsuperscript{57}

Indeed, according to Gervase of Canterbury, Eleanor ruled England while Richard was held captive.\textsuperscript{58} Eleanor clearly was essential to the administration, maintenance and defense of Richard’s inheritance. By freeing and empowering his mother, Richard gained an important and powerful ally.

Beyond her role in defending against Philip and John, and gathering the ransom for Richard’s return, Eleanor wrote frequently to Pope Celestine III begging that the pope take action against Richard’s captors. In this, Eleanor displayed not only her love for Richard, but also her understanding of the importance of his personal presence to the safety of the kingdom. Writing in 1193 to Celestine, Eleanor witnessed the problems caused by John, and the threat posed by Philip. “My guts are torn from me, my family is carried off and removed from me…King Richard is held in chains. His brother, John, … seeks to usurp the kingdom of the exile by cruel tyranny … If I go, deserting my son’s kingdom, that is laid waste on all sides with grave hostility, it will be deprived of all counsel and comfort.”\textsuperscript{59} At this point Eleanor had already stopped John from his trip to Paris. Eleanor understood the urgency of the situation. She appreciated her own role in the defense of the kingdom, but understood the importance of Richard’s presence. Richard had to return in order to right the kingdom. The other defenses Richard had established before his departure were apparently not enough to secure against his major

\textsuperscript{57} Turner, “Role of Eleanor,” 84.
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internal and external threats represented by John and Philip. Eleanor’s urgent tone in this
and other letters to Celestine illustrate the need for Richard’s return. He had to deal with
the problems personally. Eleanor’s support was deserved and well sought and it
ultimately served to strengthen the defense of the Angevin domains from the very start of
Richard’s reign. His brothers’ affection and support was more difficult to buy.

Richard gave the archbishopric of York to his half-brother Geoffrey. Geoffrey
was the only son with Henry II when he died at Chinon, and as he lay dying Henry
apparently expressed a wish that Geoffrey, the only son who had remained faithful to
him, should either become Archbishop of York or Bishop of Winchester.60 Richard
fulfilled the promise.61 It is the first of two significant promises Henry made that Richard
followed. On one hand, Geoffrey’s clerical appointment served Richard’s purposes. By
appointing Geoffrey to the archbishopric, Richard precluded any secular claims Geoffrey
might have had. Fortunately also for Richard, Geoffrey’s appointment was not a short or
simple process. Eleanor and others, including officials at York, opposed Geoffrey’s
appointment.62 Though Richard had appointed Geoffrey in 1189, he was not consecrated
until August 1191.63 According to Gerald of Wales, part of the delay had to do with
rumors that Geoffrey actually was aiming at the throne.64 Geoffrey stood as a potential
heir to the throne, and Eleanor also seemed wary of that possibility.65 Richard in response
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confiscated Geoffrey’s English and continental estates and prevented the retrieval of Geoffrey’s pallium. Geoffrey had to pay £2,000 toward the crusade to restore Richard’s favor. For Richard then, Geoffrey was a potential threat to the throne, and despite initially preventing his election; it neutralized any secular threat Geoffrey might have posed. So while Richard may have followed Henry’s wish, it served his own defensive purposes.

Richard made one further provision against Geoffrey, in this case particularly for England. In March 1190 at Bonsmoulins, Richard made both Geoffrey and John swear not to enter England within the next three years. John was immediately released from the oath, but Geoffrey had to wait until summer 1191 when he paid Richard for his release. It seems Richard worried about possible clerical threats, or perhaps the relative benefits of appointing Geoffrey to York. Whatever the concern, the clerical appointment combined with the oath, and the threat it symbolized, sufficiently neutralized any problems Geoffrey might have posed. Richard had used the wishes of his father to serve his own purposes, and he would do so again with his younger, legitimate brother. Richard sought to avoid the problems his father faced, by empowering and investing family with authority and grants, instead of disinheriting them. Richard’s treatment of John illustrates this plan.

Richard had reason to fear his brother John, the same reason that would eventually include John in the oath at Bonsmoulins prohibiting entry to England. Richard at least feared the claims that his brother John held to the throne, those legitimate claims

---
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and those fed by rumor. John, as Richard’s sole surviving legitimate brother, was therefore one of Richard’s two legitimate heirs. The other was Arthur of Brittany, the posthumously born child of Richard and John’s older brother Geoffrey, age three at the time of Richard’s coronation. As part of his crusade preparations, Richard sought to placate John, to either win his favor in much the same way he had assured Eleanor’s or to occupy him as he did with Geoffrey. Initially, Richard sought to occupy John, and to keep him outside Angevin lands. Richard’s demand that John go on crusade, though not carried out, illustrate one possible solution.

Richard sought other solutions for John. The first was to follow his father’s plan and bestow upon John great grants and honors in both England and France (See Figure 2, Appendix). As Richard of Devizes explains, Richard gave to his brother John “such rich and far-flung lands in England that many people said, both in private and in public, that the king did not intend to return to his realm, and that if he did not restrain his brother’s lifelong habits, his brother, already no less powerful than he and eager to rule, would defeat him and drive him out of the kingdom.”68 Devizes’ explanation and assessment of Richard’s grants to John illustrate a few key points. First, Richard’s grants to John were seen as ill advised, and poorly thought out. Second, John needed to be restrained by Richard. Third, John was on an equal playing field with Richard. Though obviously John was not king, he was seen as equally powerful, and equally able, or at least eager to rule. Devizes establishes clearly, and in a few lines, the problem John posed and the difficulty Richard faced in attempting to deal with his younger brother.

---

The “lifelong habits” that Richard of Devizes discusses are those same lifelong habits of not only John, but all of Henry II’s sons. In fact, this family hostility was, in the words of B.S. Bachrach, a kind of Angevin family tradition.69 These same lifelong habits proved that fraternal affection was not a means of alliance that Richard could passively rely on. It would take much more than the love of John to assure protection against him, and it would take much more to win John’s favor than it had to win Eleanor’s. Richard’s lifelong habits themselves help to reveal why he could not rely on fraternal affection. The Gesta Regis Henrici provides particularly revealing examples. In January 1183, Richard had refused to do homage to his older brother Henry.70 Henry II forced Richard to do homage and Richard agreed, but apparently by the time Richard was prepared to do homage, Young Henry no longer had interest in accepting his younger sibling. The contentions between the Angevin sons, and those between sons and father, are clear in the chronicles, and would have been equally obvious to Richard. While Richard had enough experience to know he could rely on physical force to defend against John, Richard was about to depart for crusade, and John was to remain home.

At a conference between himself, Philip and Henry at La Ferté in May 1189, Richard had tried to convince his father to force John to join his crusade.71 Henry refused. Richard’s concern with John was in part due to the rumors spreading that Henry sought to invest John with the crown before Richard. It was not the only time Richard gave himself over to rumor. Henry submitted to this demand, and others, in late June 1189.72 Despite
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this, it appears that, after his father’s death, Richard quit his efforts to force John onto crusade, and focused instead on making sure Philip II would go. Scholars have suggested that Richard let go the matter of John’s crusade because he feared for the possible extinction of the Angevins. He needed an heir. John Gillingham suggests that Richard was not able to rely on an infant Arthur to maintain the stability of Angevin lands.73 R.V. Turner suggests that this was not Richard’s main motivation, and that he could in fact have relied on Arthur. Instead, for Turner, Richard left John because he had “so little respect” for him.74

The evidence that Richard thought he could rely on Arthur is minimal and rests heavily on the Treaty at Messina where Richard named Arthur his heir, should he have died on crusade. Instead the evidence for the first years of Richard’s reign suggests that Richard was not worried at all about an heir, and in fact was not worried about dying on crusade. The March 1191 treaty with Philip made provisions for anticipated heirs.75 Suggesting that Richard was concerned about an heir in 1189 or 1190 ignores the March 1191 treaty in which, after being released from his engagement with Alice and therefore free to marry Berengaria, Richard appears relatively unconcerned with succession matters. His reasons for leaving John at home must therefore have had little to do with concerns for possible Angevin extinction.

At their inception, though, Richard’s attempts to force John to crusade can be read as tied to his own fears for his own succession, not concerns for an heir. It was during his requests to be named heir from 1186 to 1189 that Richard requested that John crusade.
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These petitions were made before Henry’s death. Forcing John to go on crusade would have kept him from being alone with Henry II, should Henry have died while Richard was on crusade. If John and Richard were both on crusade, Richard would not have been at as considerable of a disadvantage. But after Henry II’s death and Richard’s accession, since both happened before the crusade journey began, Richard’s priorities changed. He no longer had to worry about gaining the crown; he now had to worry about keeping it. For Richard to leave John at home must have meant Richard saw an easier solution to the John problem.

Eleanor, as shown above, was part of the solution. Richard knew early on what benefit and support his mother was able to provide. Indeed, as Eleanor’s biographer Régine Pernoud wrote, she had accumulated great stores of energy during her imprisonment that she would use throughout the reigns of Richard and John, and to the benefit of both.76 Eleanor would demonstrate this control over John in 1192 when she stopped him from traveling to Paris to meet with Philip, where he would have married Alice and been recognized by Philip as Richard’s replacement for Angevin possessions in France.77 She would do so again in 1193 when John rushed to England declaring Richard dead, not just captured, and demanded the crown. Eleanor refused him and rallied the government to support the captive king Richard.78 Eleanor, however, was not enough of a solution for Richard. The rest of Richard’s strategy with John worked like his strategy with Geoffrey. He once again carried out his father’s plans, but in such a way as to serve his own purposes.
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Henry II invested John with Ireland in 1177, and though it was not wholly under John’s authority, he retained the title *dominus Hiberniae*. Henry II had made clear later in life that, beyond Ireland, he wanted John to be married to an English heiress and be given both English and Norman territories. Richard’s generosity towards John begins here. Before crossing from Barfleur to Portsmouth in July 1189 en route to his September coronation, Richard granted John the sword of the county of Mortain.\(^79\) A month later, in August 1189, Richard saw to it that John was married to Isabelle of Gloucester despite the protestations of Archbishop Baldwin on grounds of consanguinity.\(^80\) Thus, Richard followed Henry’s desire that John be married to an heiress. Isabelle brought John the earldom of Gloucester. There remained the matter of both English and Norman grants to John.

Shortly after the marriage, Richard gave to John what many scholars and chroniclers have seen as an “unprecedented block of territories,” including the counties of Somerset, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Cornwall, Devon and Dorset and the honors of Lancaster and Wallingford.\(^81\) With these grants, Richard filled the last of Henry’s goals for John, both English and Norman territories. Fulfilling his father’s plans for both John and Geoffrey alike served to placate them. They would have been equally aware of the plans set out for them by Henry II. In part, Richard had to fulfill his father’s plans or run the risk of open rebellion. Like with Geoffrey, Henry’s plans had the ability to serve Richard’s purposes. Unfortunately for Richard, though the grants sought to placate John, they were not enough to avoid John’s troublemaking.
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Historians and chroniclers alike criticize Richard’s judiciousness with regard to John’s grants. Like the public opinion explained in Devizes’s account, many see problems inherent in these grants. Bishop William Stubbs in the *Historical Introduction to the Rolls Series* called the move “lavish improvidence.”82 Stubbs explains Richard’s move to fulfill his father’s goals as spurred on by remorse for his conduct against his father. The grants to John were a kind of penance for past sins, and part of what Stubbs called Richard’s “shortsightedness,” and “exaggerated confidence.”83 Kate Norgate explained that Richard’s grants to John were “most imprudent and dangerous.”84 Norgate states further that the grants were “beyond the limits of worldly wisdom and sound policy.”85 Revisionists like Ralph Turner have defended Richard’s grants to John, explaining that as grants to keep John pacified, the move was not unwise, and that Richard “may have been attempting to avoid the disastrous results following from his father’s stinginess toward his eldest son.”86 In this sense Richard’s grants to John, at the same time that they follow the wishes of Henry II, act as a break from his father's policies. By granting these lands Richard sought to avoid the very reasons his older brother Henry had ever rebelled against their father.87 The grants were not lavish improvidence, or shortsighted.

Further, Angevin family tradition held that something would be provided for every male heir on the father’s death. That model of inheritance, *parage*, granted the
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patrimony to the first son, but allowed the father to distribute the rest of his acquisitions to other sons.\textsuperscript{88} If Richard had withheld lands from John or Geoffrey, he would not only have broken his father’s promises, but also broken with Angevin inheritance practice. Granting John great and valuable honors was a smarter maneuver than not doing so. However Richard was still clearly not convinced that the grants alone would preclude problems with John.

Richard sought further assurance at the council at Bonsmoulins, where both John and Geoffrey swore an oath not to enter England within the next three years.\textsuperscript{89} Eleanor, however, convinced Richard to release John from the oath immediately. No doubt Eleanor saw the problems inherent in the oath. To honor John with grand grants, but then to bar him from England was equivalent to tearing away his rights from birth. Barring John from England was apparently not a valid option. However, the attempt to bar John from England reveals Richard’s concern with the provisions made against John. At the same time that Richard displayed great generosity toward John, he also displayed his great distrust of John and an apparent lack of confidence in his own plans.

In fact, in even attempting to solve the problem of John, Richard created one. By granting John such lands, Richard made his brother unequalled among the English lords. John did not equal Richard in his power, but upon Richard’s departure for crusade, John stood well in front of all other Anglo-Norman barons. And when in late 1190, Richard would formally announce Arthur of Brittany as his heir, should he die without offspring, John took that power granted by his brother and began making trouble, the trouble that
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Eleanor became especially concerned with on Richard’s capture. Richard’s grants to John gave John the power to contend with Richard’s chancellor, William Longchamp. Richard’s dealings with John illustrate the hopelessness of relying on fraternal affection to ensure allegiance. John’s case also provides evidence for the importance of Richard’s personal presence. No matter what appointments to justiciar or chancellor, no matter how well governed the Anglo-Norman realm might have been, Richard’s personal presence was instrumental in avoiding conflict. John was clearly aware of this as well. His troublemaking did not start until Richard was on crusade. Only then did “wrath cut furrows across his forehead,” and “his burning eyes shot sparks,” and “rage darkened the ruddy color of his face.”90 And though Eleanor put a damper on some of John’s efforts, his troublemaking only truly ceased when Richard returned from captivity to England.

Despite their limited success, Richard’s grants and provisions for his family illustrate an emphasis in his rule on granting promises Henry II made late in life, but breaking from policy Henry followed for the better part of his reign. Richard learned from his father’s experiences, and with his family, particularly John, Richard sought to avoid providing those reasons to rebel that Henry II had provided for his wife and children. Richard’s refusal to name John heir should be seen in a similar light. Though he named Arthur his heir at Messina, Richard would tacitly accept John as his heir in 1196 after Arthur went to the Capetian court. By not naming John heir, Richard likely sought to avoid one of the major reasons young Henry rebelled against Henry II in 1183. As Björn Weiler explained in a recent study of rebellious sons, young Henry felt he had been
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shamed and dishonored by his father. Henry II had officially crowned young Henry in 1170, but had prevented him from fulfilling his royal duties. Richard grew up amidst this rebellion, took part in it, and witnessed the problems faced by his older brother. Admittedly, this is also perhaps why Henry II never officially named an heir. But for Richard, by not naming John heir, and by not ever crowning an heir apparent, he again appears to have learned from his father’s mistakes, and to have consciously broken from his father’s policy in the interest of defense. Richard’s dealings with external threats emphasize his same vision for defense.

Three Brides: Marriage Diplomacy and the Angevin Border

Philip II of France was Richard’s greatest concern in regards to the defense of Angevin lands. Of Richard’s strategies in the interest of his kingdom’s defense against Philip II, specifically in the first year of Richard’s reign, marriage diplomacy served as an important option for defense. Marriage diplomacy was nothing new for medieval kings, and certainly nothing new for Norman and Angevin kings. Norman settlement meant that those who held in chief of the king not only owed the king military service and counsel but also that the king had right of guardianship over heirs if they were minors, giving the king control of marriage. These rights of wardship gave Richard another important tool with which he sought to strengthen his defenses against the Capetians.

On July 20, 1189, at Rouen, as duke of Normandy but not yet king of England, Richard married his niece Matilda of Saxony to Geoffrey of Perche, son of count Rotroud. Matilda’s marriage was the first in a series of significant marriage alliances

---

Richard made in his first year as duke of Normandy and king of England. He married two other heiresses to close friends before he left for crusade. These marriages tied important borderlands to Richard through both close friends and relatives. They were marriage arrangements on which Richard thought he could rely. That he began so soon after his father’s death to arrange these marriages illustrates the significance they played in Richard’s defense plan. Richard’s strategy illustrates the purpose marriage diplomacy might have served a medieval king as a means of acquiring allies. These allies would ideally serve defensive purposes. Through these marriages, Richard sought to strengthen defenses against the Capetians.

Before Richard, Angevin kings saw the advantages of these marriages for reward and for financial gain, and seem to have placed emphasis on this aspect. Richard’s father had in fact comprised a royal inquiry into ladies and wards in the king’s gift, including the names and ages of widows and the value of their lands. Richard used the marriages for both of these purposes, as well as for his defense plan. The case of Perche illustrates the first example of what Richard hoped for from these marriages, and how they functioned. First the marriage between Matilda and Geoffrey, specifically that it happened so shortly after his becoming duke, displays Richard’s reliance and interest in solidifying defenses through marriage. Second the marriage displays the problems and limitations of reliance on marriage as a defense. Though Richard sought to win the counts of Perche further to his side with the marriage of Matilda and Geoffrey, the counts continued to vacillate between Angevin and Capetian lord. Though Richard had to

---

prepare defenses like any crusader, his plan was not without flaws. No defense could have been guaranteed.

As John Gillingham explained, the problem for these border lords was that “as marcher lords they held estates on both sides of the border and could rarely afford to be unambiguously loyal to one lord only. They were always walking a political tightrope…” 95 Only when the counts of Perche felt Richard’s presence did they return to his side, and continue there. The marriages of Andrew de Chauvigny, and the three suitors for Hawise of Aumâle follow a similar pattern and further emphasize the reliance on Richard. His kingship, and the maintenance of his regnum, especially the borders concerned here, relied on his real presence.

Henry II’s tendency toward snatching up the custodies of rich heirs took on a different flavor with his son Richard. 96 Like his father and great-grandfather before him, Richard saw these marriages as part of a reward system. However, the marriages served not just as reward, but also as a means to further ingratiate knights or barons into his charge, and the Angevin domain. Those who fought alongside him against his father, who fought with him in Poitou, certainly reaped the rewards, but also were clearly Richard’s best choices if he sought to ensure defense as well. The two marriages after Matilda’s concerned major invasion points along the Angevin-Capetian border. In this case, Richard rewarded his friends with wealthy heiresses, and sought to reap his own benefits, defense, from this form of patronage. What follows is a discussion of why Richard made

95 Gillingham, Richard the Lionheart, 232.
these matches, how and when they were carried out, and their efficacy as part of his defense plan.

Henry II died on July 6, 1189. He was buried July 8, 1189. On July 13, Richard’s sister Matilda of Saxony died. A week later, Richard had arrived at Rouen, and was girded with the sword of the duchy of Normandy. While still at Rouen, as newly appointed duke of Normandy, Richard gave Matilda to Geoffrey, the son of Rotroud count of Perche. Richard sought to shift Perche, a county closely aligned to both Angevins and Capetians and important to border defense, closer to the Angevins. The county of Perche lies on the southeast side of Normandy, abutting the Capetian royal domain (See Figure 1, Appendix). On its border lies Nonancourt, Tillières, and Veneuil, all sites that regularly featured as favored spots for treaties, peace agreements and truces between Angevin and Capetian kings. The counts of Perche also balanced Angevin and Capetian lords. Geoffrey’s father Rotroud in particular displayed this when he led a delegation to Richard on behalf of Philip II, in November 1189, to relay Philip’s crusade departure plans, and to convince Richard to agree to a departure date. Geoffrey, his son and Matilda’s new husband, would stand with Richard at Messina, and witness the gifts Richard granted to his queen Berengaria at Cyprus. The marriage of his niece Matilda to Geoffrey, son of and future count of Perche, established a possible defense point at Perche for Richard.

---
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The effectiveness of pairing Matilda and Geoffrey is questionable though, as it ultimately assured no security. The county of Perche tended to side with whoever happened at the time to display greater force, usually by means of an army inside Perche’s borders. In 1193, Perche lowered its gates for the invading Philip Augustus. In 1197, Geoffrey returned to alliance with Richard.\textsuperscript{101} Regardless, in 1189 Richard saw the marriage of his niece to the future count of Perche as an assurance that he needed to attempt. He sought to bind himself to a border lord who had ties to both the Capetians and Angevins, in order to sway that influence.

Before his coronation, Richard implemented another significant marriage. Andrew de Chauvigny had been a knight in Richard’s military household during Richard’s rule in Aquitaine. In fact, Andrew had in the past year been captured and imprisoned amidst the 1188-1189 rebellion. Freed upon Henry’s death, Andrew was one amongst the few Poitevins who made the move from ducal service to royal service. Andrew was worthy of the reward, in this case the heiress that Richard gave to him. He had proven himself against Henry II, and as \textit{L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal} describes Andrew, he was “a knight of the count of Poitiers’ son, renowned for his noble prowess.”\textsuperscript{102} This was someone Richard had reason to rely on, did rely on, and would continue to rely on. It is not surprising then that Andrew received Richard’s wealthiest ward, Denise de Déols.

Denise came into Angevin custody in 1177. When her father Ralph of Déols died, dubbed in the \textit{Gesta} the richest lord in Berry, his close relations refused to give up his
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daughter, Denise, to Henry II’s custody.\textsuperscript{103} Shortly after their refusal, Henry II ordered his sons to seize Ralph’s estates and to seize Denise as well.\textsuperscript{104} Richard understood the value of Denise’s lands, specifically Déols and Châteauroux, and therefore understood the honor marriage to Denise brought Andrew. Richard was aware of another and more important purpose served by the marriage, though. Beyond its economic value, Berry covered a key invasion route for Capetians into Angevin lands (see Figure 1, Appendix). Thus, marrying a friend and furthermore one of the Poitevins in his court to Denise provided a strong bond between Angevins and the house of Déols. The witnesses present at Andrew and Denise’s wedding display the importance of this union. On August 21, 1189 Gilbert de Glanville at Salisbury in the presence of Queen Eleanor, Bishop Hugh du Puiset – Richard’s future chief justiciar, married Andrew and Denise the bishops of Evreux and Worcester, “and in the presence of many counts and barons.”\textsuperscript{105}

The wedding held particular significance for conflict between Angevins and Capetians. Berry had previously been split between Angevin and Capetian in 1101. The Capetians held the north, while the Angevins held the south, with Châteauroux, its leading lordship held by Denise’s family. Berry became even more important to Richard’s insurance plan. It not only lay on the border of the Angevin and royal domains, but also within itself contained a border between Angevin and Capetian. Apparently, with Andrew de Chauvigny, Berry was in “safe hands.”\textsuperscript{106} However, the marriage of Andrew and Denise gained Richard little actual effective defense in Berry. After the close of

\textsuperscript{103} Gesta Regis Henrici I, 127.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 132.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., II, 76: et in praesentia multorum comitum et baronum.
\textsuperscript{106} Gillingham, Richard the Lionheart, 128.
crusade, and Richard’s return from captivity, Berry’s defense fell to Richard personally. That Philip Augustus was resisted in Berry at all was due to Richard personally.\(^{107}\) However, much like Perche, Richard in 1189 understood the importance of trying to tie an important house like that of Berry to the Angevins, and attempted to do so with a close friend.\(^{108}\) While Richard knew he might have to rely on personal rule, as much as he had to in Poitou, he sought in these marriages to perhaps avoid over-reliance on his own abilities.

Richard put in place one more significant marriage before his crusade departure, that between William de Forz and Hawise countess of Aumâle – in northeast Normandy – and lady of Holderness – in east Yorkshire (see Figures 1 and 2, Appendix). Before Hawise returned to Richard’s custody, and was married to William de Forz, she had been married to another William. In 1180, Hawise had been married to one of Henry II’s best friends, William de Mandeville, third earl of Essex. Richard would in 1189 appoint William de Mandeville, then earl of Essex and count of Aumâle, one of his first co-justiciars with Hugh du Puiset.\(^{109}\) According to Ralph Diceto, William had been so fond of Hawise, or at least of the title, that he fashioned himself count of Aumâle rather than earl of Essex.\(^{110}\) Affection however likely had little to do with it. Aumâle was simply more significant than Essex. It was this significance that Richard saw as well. Though Richard did not enact the marriage, part of William’s appointment as justiciar was tied to


\(^{108}\) Andrew would accompany Richard on the Third Crusade, and gain such a reputation that he was included in a fourteenth century romance called *Saladin*; Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, 208.

\(^{109}\) Diceto, *Opera Historica*, 3.

\(^{110}\) Ibid.
the importance of Aumâle. 111 Aumâle, like Berry, served as a key invasion point on the northeastern border of Normandy. Philip II’s acquisition of Amiens in 1185 served to expand the Capetian royal domain, making Aumâle even more important to Angevin defenses. By appointing William de Mandeville justiciar, Richard kept Aumâle close. William de Mandeville however died in Rouen in November 1189, before Richard left England.

Like Denise and Matilda before her, Hawise was kept close to Richard through marriage. Shortly after de Mandeville’s death, in early 1190, Hawise was married to another of Richard’s few Poitevin knights who came to the royal court with him, William de Forz. William was member of a family that had long served as prévôts to the counts of Poitou. 112 Likely, he and Richard had met as early as Christmas 1181 when William witnessed one of Richard’s comital charters. 113 He quickly became one of Richard’s military associates, of the same caliber as Andrew de Chauvigny, and would also accompany Richard on crusade. Though benefited from this marriage, rising to the upper ranks of English barons, for Richard the marriage served to maintain control over the county of Aumâle. However, once again, despite Richard’s attempts to assure defense in Aumâle as a wall against Capetian invasion, the marriage apparently assured nothing.

Indeed, William de Forz was not the last man to whom Hawise was married. Hawise was widowed again in 1195, and Richard promptly married her to Baldwin de

111 Turner and Heiser, Richard Lionheart, 79 say that Richard married William to Hawise. However, I have not been able to confirm this point in any of the primary sources. If it were able to be confirmed, it would mean that in his reign, Richard I married Hawise not just twice but three times.
113 Ibid., 221.
Béthune. Baldwin was another among Richard’s crusading cohort, and as a companion in Richard’s captivity had served as a hostage for Richard. Henry II had originally promised Denise de Déols to Baldwin, but Richard gave Denise instead to Andrew de Chauvigny. Richard promised Baldwin equivalent compensation, which manifested itself four years later as marriage to Hawise of Aumâle. So despite the deaths of William de Mandeville and William de Forz, Richard kept Hawise closely tied to Angevin interests, by giving her again to a close friend. Interestingly, during John’s reign, after Baldwin died in 1212, Hawise offered 5,000 marks for her inheritance and dowers so that she might not be compelled again to marry. \(^{114}\) Hawise in this regard illustrates Richard’s reliance on marriage as an instrument of kingship, and reveals the possible exploitative nature of that instrument.

Though Hawise was married three times to men closely tied to the Angevin court, she could not guarantee the defense of the northeastern Angevin-Capetian border. Philip regained Aumâle in the 1194 Truce of Tilières. \(^{115}\) The terms of an August 1195 discussion, concerning the final clarifications on the release of Alice from Angevin custody, held that Philip renounced Aumâle and other lands to Richard. However, in late June 1196 when Philip broke the peace of Louviers, he besieged Aumâle and won. When Richard died in 1199, he had not won Aumâle back to Angevin hands. The loss of Aumâle would eventually make Philip’s invasion of Normandy simpler.

While the marriages themselves clearly did not ensure the security of the counties or castles concerned, Richard’s marriage diplomacy helps highlight his vision for the

\(^{114}\) See note, Devizes, *Chronicon*, 10.  
defense of his domains. He sought not only to honor those men close to him, but also to tie critical border territories to the Angevins. Richard sought to shore up a great piece of the Angevin-Capetian border with the marriages of Geoffrey of Perche, Andrew de Chauvigny, and the suitors for Hawise countess of Aumâle. Though they lacked any real effectiveness for defense, Richard in 1189 and 1190 saw these marriages as crucial to his preparation for crusade, and to avoiding contest between himself and Philip II. Yet these were not the only border marriages Richard was concerned with immediately following his father’s death.

Alice or Berengaria: Choosing a Bride

His own marriage concerned two critical points on the Angevin border. Richard not only used marriage diplomacy, but was also himself a part of its use. Henry II and Louis VII had initially proposed the marriage between Alice and Richard in the interest of Angevin and Capetian peace, much like the marriage between Richard’s older brother, young Henry and Alice’s older sister, Margaret. Philip II, after his father’s death in 1180 began to use the engagement as an attempt to strengthen ties between himself and Richard against Henry II. Despite its importance to Angevin and Capetian kings alike, the marriage was constantly delayed. Alice was betrothed to Richard in 1169, and in Henry’s custody since then. As early as 1177 though, popes were sending legates to confirm the actual wedding.116 At a conference in Gisors, in March 1186, between Henry and Philip, the wedding was agreed upon but did not take place. At Barfleur in January 1188, Philip insisted again.117 He insisted again in November 1188 near Bonsmoulins, and again in

116 *Gesta Regis Henrici I*, 181, 190.
May 1189 at La Ferté Bernard.\textsuperscript{118} Henry apparently did not want to rush the marriage, or confirm the marriage at all.

The delays in part had to do with the rebellion of Henry’s sons, of Richard in particular and the contentions over succession. It at least appeared that way. The simple historical explanation for the long protracted engagement becomes less certain with Henry II’s death. Richard continued to delay the marriage after his father’s death. It was not just Henry II who delayed the marriage. The complications, and the delays, appear to stem from some debate over which bride would be the better choice, which marriage would serve Richard’s purposes better: Alice or Berengaria of Navarre. As the analysis here seeks to illustrate, Richard’s decision to marry Berengaria apparently fit his defense plans but appears tied more to Richard’s attempts to break from his father’s policies. After all, Henry II had initially embraced Richard’s marriage to Alice.

Much speculation surrounds the early contact between Richard and Berengaria, and therefore contact between Richard and Berengaria’s father, Sancho VI king of Navarre. Some scholars have suggested that Richard and Sancho and Berengaria had contact as early as 1172 and 1173.\textsuperscript{119} In searching for the first contact between England and Navarre, the hope for historians is to find an explanation for why they married, or at least when the marriage was first discussed. For the chroniclers though, the earliest mention of Berengaria is in 1191 when she crossed the Alps with Eleanor, en route to meet Richard. A few of these references in the chronicles have led historians to search for the earlier contact of Richard and Berengaria. The anonymous author of the \textit{Itinerarium}\textsuperscript{118} 

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 50, 66.
\textsuperscript{119} Ann Trindade, \textit{Berengaria: In Search of Richard Lionheart’s Queen} (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1999), 69.
Regis Ricardi explains, after Berengaria’s arrival, that Richard “had desired her very much for a long time – since he was first count of Poitou.”\(^{120}\) Ambroise, who accompanied the crusading army, states in *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* that Richard “did love her and revere/since he was count of Poitiers.”\(^{121}\) On the basis of these references, it has been suggested that Richard had previous personal contact with Navarre and that these marriage negotiations were not a secret from him or the public.\(^{122}\) However, though both accounts are from eyewitnesses, it is possible that these chroniclers were merely justifying *post facto* Richard’s marriage to Berengaria. Both Ambroise and the author of the *Itinerarium* would have been aware of the marriage as eyewitnesses.

There is then no justifiable reason to use these limited references as proof that Richard’s negotiations happened at all before 1189, or if they did that they were open to the public. That is, even if prior meetings between Richard and Sancho VI, or between Eleanor and Sancho VI could be confirmed, the evidence points to covert negotiations. One charter entry greatly substantiates this conclusion. In seeking earlier contact, and evidence for marriage negotiations, R.V. Turner looks to Richard’s expedition to La Réole in February 1190.\(^{123}\) Richard’s most distinguished subjects were present, and as Turner points out, the charter suggests that Richard had called a council, where Richard’s marriage to Berengaria would likely have been discussed.\(^{124}\) If marriage was discussed, its mention has not survived in the sources, or was never included. This could suggest that, had the discussion of a marriage between Berengaria and Richard taken place,

---

\(^{120}\) Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade*, 173.
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Richard sought to keep his plans secret. That the chroniclers do not mention Berengaria before the 1191 trip with Eleanor suggests that same air of secrecy.

There is further evidence that the kings of England and Navarre sought to keep the engagement secret. If Richard were not concerned with keeping it from public view, or at least Capetian view, he would not have stressed that the marriage take place while on his way to the Holy Land. John Gillingham explains, “in a Cypriot town a queen of England was crowned by a bishop of a Norman see;” it was a unique situation.125 Far from her father, far from England, and far from France, Richard married Berengaria. From the evidence, it appears no one was aware of the marriage until Berengaria was already en route to meet Richard. As Richard of Devizes writes, Richard himself was surprised. Because of suspicions concerning his father’s custody of Alice, Richard “therefore considered marrying the maiden whom his mother had brought.”126 Richard’s agency is completely removed in Devizes’ account, and Eleanor takes full responsibility for even presenting Richard the option of Berengaria. This evidence suggests that if Richard had any part in the marriage talks, he wanted the marriage negotiations with Navarre to be kept secret, and only after Berengaria’s appearance in the chronicles is there any mention to previous contact.

Richard had good reason to keep secret his possible marriage to Berengaria. A longstanding proposal to Alice, and regular assurances and promises to fulfill that proposal would have forced Richard to keep any alternative marriage plans secret. A break with the proposal to Alice would be a great insult not only to Alice, but also to her

125 Gillingham, Richard the Lionheart, 166.
126 Devizes, Chronicon, 26.
brother Philip. An insult of this degree meant that Philip had cause for conflict. Richard would have known that to trounce Alice’s and Capetian honor would be met with a demand for territorial compensation, and the threat of war. Philip’s demands for territorial compensation came from the grants made to Richard on account of his proposal to Alice. The Norman Vexin was initially part of the dowry presented to Young Henry with his marriage to Margaret, Philip and Alice’s sister. This marriage alliance, just like the eventual marriage between Richard and Alice, sought peace between Henry II and Louis VII, the royal Angevin and Capetian households. But when Young Henry died in 1183, the widowed Margaret’s dowry passed to Alice who had been betrothed to Richard in 1169. So, lordship over Gisors and the Norman Vexin, eventually one of the two major theaters of war between Richard and Philip and thus a large part of Richard’s border defense (see Figure 3, Appendix), depended on Richard’s marriage to Alice. The threat of war was enough cause for secrecy.

Richard’s solution apparently was to keep the marriage secret until both he and Philip were en route to the Holy Land. Essential to Richard’s defense plan was to ensure that Philip went on crusade as well. At the same meeting in July 1189 in the Norman Vexin where Philip ceased his claim to Gisors on the promise that Richard would marry Alice, Richard received Philip’s promise that he would take up the crusade with him. Ensuring that Philip took up the crusade journey meant in part that Richard could be assured of Philip’s absence from France in time with Richard’s own absence. To repudiate Alice while he and Philip made the crusade journey together, would have

128 Gesta Regis Henrici II, 74-75; Landon, Itinerary, 2.
seemed a much more judicious decision than repudiating Alice with Philip left in France far from Richard’s influence. Richard was successful in this.

Some, however, have read the peculiar occasion of Richard and Berengaria’s marriage en route to crusade as more directly influenced by Sancho VI’s concerns. Scholars have seen Berengaria’s trip to Richard en route as evidence that Sancho VI, Berengaria’s father, required a swift marriage rather than one that might regularly be postponed.\(^{129}\) Certainly, Sancho VI had reason to worry about postponement, considering the knowledge of Richard’s very long engagement to Alice. However, if marriage talks had taken place before 1189, as is likely, it is more unlikely that Sancho would have suggested his daughter travel across the Alps into Sicily with Eleanor as a companion. If Sancho had wanted a swift marriage, he could easily have requested that it happen before Richard’s departure from England or France. It is more likely then that Richard required this course of action. It is after all extraordinary that Richard left and traveled on crusade still betrothed to Alice, awaited Berengaria’s arrival, broke the betrothal to Alice and married Berengaria all before his arrival in Acre. Richard knew the consequences of his action, and made the most judicious choice in how he carried out that action. He broke the betrothal to Alice and married Berengaria within what would have seemed the safe confines of crusade. Philip was already too far along, and too prepared, to turn back from crusade.

Richard’s decision to marry Berengaria en route displays Richard’s own awareness of the importance of his personal presence at home. He ensured that Philip took up crusade with him certainly for the benefit of crusade, but also as a benefit for the

defenses of Angevin lands. Richard must have known he would ultimately have to rely on his own abilities to protect his domains. Knowing that Philip was away on crusade meant that Richard would not have to worry about the defense of his kingdom until he and Philip returned. Likely Richard thought he and Philip would return at the same time. He cannot have known Philip would leave early. Nor could Richard have known he would be captured and held for ransom, giving Philip relative free reign over Angevin continental holdings.

That said Richard must also have understood the consequences of his marriage to Berengaria. Marrying Berengaria first meant Richard would not marry Alice. With marriage to Alice came the Norman Vexin and Gisors, and an alliance with Capetian France and Philip. With Berengaria came an alliance with Navarre, and potential help against a well-established thorn in Richard’s side, Raymond V of Toulouse. There was apparently “no threat so serious as that posed by the count of Toulouse.”130 The motivation to marry Berengaria stemmed from these relative benefits and drawbacks. Richard seems to have chosen Berengaria over Alice for three main reasons: first, for an alliance with Navarre; second, as an alternative to Alice; and third, to produce an heir.131 An examination of these three motivations serves to illustrate aspects of Richard’s kingship that were tied more to personal reasons than to political ones.

First, apparently Richard decided an alliance with Navarre would better serve his defenses than preserving a peace between himself and Philip through marriage to Alice. Gillingham and others have argued that the Spanish match served Richard’s purposes

---

well. The match secured Richard’s southern frontier and provided his Aquitainian seneschals a potential ally against potential rebellion. This was all potential. Raymond V had proven himself a problem for Richard, but nothing guaranteed further rebellion in the future, or while on crusade. Raymond would cause trouble and Sancho VI would provide help, but only twice in Aquitaine following Richard’s marriage to Berengaria. In 1192, he helped against Raymond V, and in 1194 Sancho’s army joined Richard’s forces against Philip II, deep into Angevin territory on Loches. The alliance, however, began to lose its usefulness after 1194. Raymond V of Toulouse died and Richard made an alliance with the new count, Raymond VI. Richard decided to attempt peace between the Angevins and the counts of Toulouse. He restored lands to Raymond VI, and in yet another example of marriage diplomacy, Richard gave his sister Joan, widow of the king of Sicily, as bride to Raymond. While this solved the problems with Toulouse, it did not, however, solve the problem of Philip II. The Navarrese alliance gave Richard some support, but Richard cannot have thought that alliance would better serve his purposes than a marriage alliance with the Capetians. Alice was the best and truly simplest solution to Richard’s problems with Philip, but Richard did not go through with it. Defense cannot have been the only reason Richard chose Berengaria.

As Richard’s second motive, historians have seen Berengaria as simply an alternative to Alice. This theory is grounded largely in one element. Since Alice had been in Henry II’s custody, rumors began to surface considering relations between Alice and Henry II. In 1191, Richard told Philip that he could prove that Alice had had a son by

---
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Henry II, and that this was reason enough to break off the marriage proposal.\textsuperscript{135} Certainly, breaking the proposal would dishonor Alice and the Capetians, but marrying Alice would have been a breach of Richard’s own honor. The reality of Henry II’s seduction of Alice is unclear, but it is at least clear that the rumor circulated widely. It clearly influenced Richard’s decision. However, seeking an alternative to Alice served a further purpose. An alternative to Alice was a break from Henry II’s influence. Indeed the marriage to Berengaria should be seen as another of Richard’s breaks from Henry II. This is break is emphasized by Eleanor’s apparent involvement in the marriage of Berengaria and Richard. According to most of the chroniclers, Eleanor brought Berengaria to Richard, and suggested the marriage. The level of Eleanor’s involvement in the actual marriage negotiations is unclear, but she does certainly stand as illustrative of the break with Henry II. This was a marriage suggested not by Henry II, but by the wife he had imprisoned for sixteen years. Richard certainly had cause to seek an alternative to Alice, not only because of rumor but also as a break from his father’s influence, from his father’s policies.

Lastly, Richard was without an heir. He would ultimately remain childless. Nonetheless, the third and perhaps most significant motivation for his marriage to Berengaria instead of Alice had to do with the question of an heir. It is not a question of whether Alice could have produced an heir, especially since rumor had it that she had already proven herself able. The difference between Alice and Berengaria rested in the nature of the offspring. A child of Berengaria would simply have been less encumbered than a child of Alice. The child of an Angevin and Capetian union could have stood to

\textsuperscript{135} Howden, \textit{The Annals}, 195.
inherit France and England, and doubtless would have been used by either Richard or Philip to attain exactly that. Though Henry II and Louis VII displayed no concern for this when Margaret and Young Henry were wed, Richard would at least have been aware of the problems inherent in the possible children of Alice and himself.

Ultimately, Richard married Berengaria. According to Devizes, through the mediation of the count of Flanders, cousin of Richard and uncle to Philip’s first wife, Philip released Richard from his oath, and granted him undisturbed and perpetual possession of the Norman Vexin and Gisors, in return for 10,000 pounds of silver. The possession would neither be undisturbed or perpetual. The results of the broken proposal and the marriage to Berengaria have been dealt with in great detail, as it played its part in Philip’s departure from crusade and his conquest of Richard’s lands. For the moment though, Richard’s marriage to Berengaria reemphasizes the same three elements that have run the course of the current analysis. Richard had the ability to make swift and judicious decisions, based in a clear and substantial assessment of good or bad consequences. These provisions and decisions set in large part for the defense of his kingdom but also often as part of a break from his father. They were, however, clearly not enough on their own to preclude conflict. John took up his betrayal. Philip II took up his war. The defenses against internal and external threat were ultimately left to Richard’s personal presence and abilities.

Conclusion

The above actions were not the only measures Richard took before his arrival in the Holy Land. He made clerical and judicial appointments, praised often by

136 Devizes, Chronicon, 26.
administrative and bureaucratic historians. Also in that first year, Richard had to contend with the threats posed by Wales and Scotland. For Scotland in particular, Richard again broke with his father’s policy. In November 1189, Richard met with William king of Scots, and his brother David. The three negotiated a treaty that J.T. Appleby called the “wisest and most statesmanlike” of Richard’s acts before setting out for crusade.\textsuperscript{137} In exchange for 10000 marks Richard granted William the castles of Roxburgh and Berwick, and restored to him those lands that Henry II had extorted from him when William was taken prisoner in 1173.\textsuperscript{138} Richard also released William, his earls and his bishops from their allegiance to the king of England. Later, in 1190, Richard granted the earldom of Huntingdon to William’s brother David.\textsuperscript{139} The treaty bought Scottish support. William later refused to join John’s attempt to seize the English throne, and refused to allow him to recruit Scottish mercenaries. After Richard’s release from captivity, William held one of the three swords carried at Richard’s second coronation.\textsuperscript{140} He and Richard also talked at one point of marrying William’s daughter to Richard’s nephew Otto.\textsuperscript{141} With the Scottish, Richard once again revealed a vision for kingship that did not include armed conflict.

The crusade shaped Richard’s first years as much as it shaped the rest of his reign. The imminent crusade journey forced Richard to set his affairs in order as immediately as he possibly could. The ground covered by Richard, as seen in the itinerary, displays one sense of the hurried nature of his first years (see Table 1). Despite this though, Richard
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was able to make sounds decisions like those concerning William king of Scots. Though the provisions and preparations were not all as successful as those for the Scottish, Richard’s decisions were both wise and swiftly enacted. That they came to little success was due to circumstances Richard cannot possibly have predicted. He did not plan for Philip’s early departure from crusade any more than he planned to be captured on his own return.

As much as crusade shaped Richard’s kingship, it is certainly clear that kingship was able to shape crusade. Richard left the Holy Land in order to return home to deal with the problems he faced from John and Philip II. Despite successful negotiations with Saladin and his brother Safadin, Richard left crusade in October 1192. Five months later, in March 1193, Saladin died, and so did Muslim unity. If Richard seems to have spent his years on crusade distracted he had good reason to be. This distraction from crusade, and his rush to return to France and England also further confirm Richard’s concern for the administration and security of his inheritance. He sought to maintain and retain the whole of the inheritance from Henry II. Further, he made clear he would do so of his own accord, and break with his father’s policies.

When he arrived in England in August 1189, Richard brought along one of his father’s most unpopular ministers, Stephen of Tours. In what John Gillingham called “a contrived piece of theater,” Richard loaded Stephen down with chains, where according to Richard of Devizes, “he was made a spectacle to angels and to men.”142 It was a piece of theater and spectacle that implied, in this case, the fate of those powerful men who headed Henry II’s administration. Richard’s provisions and preparations provide further

142 Gillingham, Richard the Lion Heart, 129; Devizes, Chronicon, 5.
examples of those messages. Richard displayed how a son might both follow the policies of his father, and break away from those policies. The provisions and preparations discussed in this examination, whether they were ultimately successful or not, display a different form of Richard than historians have described. He does not appear tempestuous, or distracted from the administration and security of his inheritance. If anything, Richard was singularly concerned with the security and administration of his inheritance. In preparing for crusade, Richard had to secure his inheritance, and made clear and judicious attempts to do so.

This characterization of Richard still assuredly retains the military abilities that Gillingham and others have espoused. Indeed, as illustrated by the failures of provisions for John and of marriage diplomacy, the defense of the Angevin domains fell to Richard’s same military abilities. Richard still relied heavily on personal rule. However, it is clear that in order to fully understand the character of Richard’s reign, and his abilities as king. It is not enough, as M.T. Clanchy recently explained, to simply focus on the effectiveness of Richard’s government in England and of his successes in France between 1194 and 1199. Richard’s actions before the Third Crusade must be more fully assessed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Distance (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fontevrault, Jul 7</td>
<td>Saumur, Jul 9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saumur</td>
<td>Rouen, Jul 20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td>Barfleur, Aug 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfleur</td>
<td>Portsmouth, Aug 13</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Winchester, Aug 14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Salisbury, Aug 21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Marlborough, Aug 29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Windsor, Aug 30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>London, Sept 1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Westminster, Sept 3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>St. Alban’s, Sept 7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Alban’s</td>
<td>Silverstone, Sept 9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstone</td>
<td>Northampton, Sept 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Geddington, Sept 11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geddington</td>
<td>Pipewell, Sept 15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geddington</td>
<td>Dodford, Sept 18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodford</td>
<td>Warwick, Sept 19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>Feckenham, Sept 22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feckenham</td>
<td>“Browd”, Sept 27</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feckenham</td>
<td>Warwick, Sept 28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>Woodstock, Sept 30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Westminster, Oct 6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Guildford, Oct 12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Arundel, Oct 14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td>Winchester, Oct 17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Freemantle, Oct 30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemantle</td>
<td>Winchester, Nov 7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>London, Nov 12</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Canterbury, Nov 25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Dover, Dec 6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Calais, Dec 12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calais</td>
<td>Rihoult, Dec 17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rihoult</td>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt, Dec 25</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt</td>
<td>Nonancourt, Dec 30</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonancourt</td>
<td>Verneuil, Jan 2, 1190</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verneuil</td>
<td>Angers, Jan 13</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angers</td>
<td>La Réole, Feb 2</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Réole</td>
<td>Poitiers, Feb 18</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>Londigny, Feb 21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londigny</td>
<td>Chinon, Feb 24</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinon</td>
<td>Mayet, Mar 8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Distance (miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayet</td>
<td>Bonsmoulins, Mar. 12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonsmoulins</td>
<td>Nonancourt, Mar. 14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonancourt</td>
<td>Dreux, Mar. 16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreux</td>
<td>Rouen, Mar. 18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt, Mar. 27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt</td>
<td>Gisors, Mar. 28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisors</td>
<td>Guerny, Mar. 31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerny</td>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt, Apr. 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons-la-Forêt</td>
<td>Gisors, Apr. 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisors</td>
<td>Argentan, Apr. 6</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentan</td>
<td>Domfront, Apr. 7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domfront</td>
<td>Mortain, Apr. 11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortain</td>
<td>Gorron, Apr. 12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorron</td>
<td>Evron, Apr. 15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evron</td>
<td>Chinon, Apr. 17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinon</td>
<td>Saumur, Apr. 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saumur</td>
<td>Chalonnes, Apr. 22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalonnes</td>
<td>Chinon, May 1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinon</td>
<td>Lucon, May 5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucon</td>
<td>Fontenay, May 6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay</td>
<td>St Jean d’Angely, May 7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jean d’Angely</td>
<td>Cognac, May 8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognac</td>
<td>Bayonne, June 6</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayonne</td>
<td>Bordeaux, June 9</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>Pons, June 12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pons</td>
<td>Parthenay, June 17</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenay</td>
<td>Chinon, June 18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinon</td>
<td>Tours, June 24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>Montrichard, June 27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrichard</td>
<td>Donzy, July 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donzy</td>
<td>Vezelay, July 2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vezelay</td>
<td>Corbigny, July 4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbigny</td>
<td>Moulins-Engilbert, July 5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins-Engilbert</td>
<td>Lyon, July 10</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Valence, July 16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>Marseille, July 31</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>Genoa, Aug. 13</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Distance:**
c. 4321 miles