

THE GIFFARDS.

PART II.

To continue an account of the descendants of Walter Giffard, the hero of Senlac, is attended with much difficulty. The companion of the Conqueror was, as we have seen, a man who distinguished himself, not only for his conspicuous valour during William's eventful wars, but also by his personal devotion to his leader. The Chroniclers and Rhymers admired the bravery and devotion of the aged Knight, and have left on record the striking incidents of his career for the benefit of succeeding centuries. But though the names of Giffard's son and grandson are here and there mentioned as taking their part in the conspicuous events of the reigns of William Rufus and Henry I., they did not present the picturesque figure of the old Knight, they were not among the chief actors on that momentous day when Harold's fate was sealed, and the old order in England was changed. They were powerful Knights, powerful both in Normandy and England, yet their names only occur incidentally in the works of Ordericus Vitalis, the recognised historian of the times. There is not, therefore, much material for a history of these descendants of Walter Giffard. Notwithstanding this, it must be borne in mind that no attempt has been before made to give a connected account of the three Giffards who were the foremost figures in Buckinghamshire in the period succeeding the Conquest. Whatever, therefore, is handed down to us of the first Walter Giffard it has been of some importance to record, and whatever can be learnt of the son and grandson will be of interest, as they both bore the title of Earl of Buckingham, the creation of that Earldom being attributed by Bishop Stubbs probably to William Rufus, as previously referred to. If the Red King created the Earldom there can be little doubt it was conferred on Walter Giffard, the son, as the elder Giffard must have died in the lifetime of the Conqueror.

We have seen that the son was at Senlac, and that on the authority of Guy of Amiens, who gives their names, he was amongst those of unenviable notoriety who, after the battle, mutilated the body of Harold. He was young at the time, but he must have been cruel. It will be charitable to suggest that the foundation by him of a religious house at Longueville, and the grant of lands in Buckinghamshire to that house years after, may have been as an expiation for a wanton and shameful act towards a brave but fallen foe.

The first time the name of the second Giffard occurs in the reign of William Rufus was on the occasion of the Gemot at Winchester, which Freeman considers to have been the Easter Gemot in the third year of the King's reign. At that assembly the King, as Ordericus says, "opened his mind" to the gathered Witan. He reminded them that they were aware of the faithlessness of his brother Robert, and of the trouble he had occasioned him—of his having incited the King's liegemen to rebellion, and of the conspiracy to deprive the King of his crown and his life. He depicts the lamentable state of Holy Church and of Normandy itself through his brother's misgovernment. And he rallies the assembly with these words—"We ought not," he says, "to suffer dens of robbers to exist in Normandy, and harass the faithful and ruin the abbeys which our forefathers founded with so much zeal. The whole country is a prey to robbery and murder." The King then invites the assembly to consult together, and if they approve he proposes to send over an army to Normandy and make reprisals for the mischief occasioned.* The Witan readily fall in with the King's projects of invasion, and Ordericus gives us the names of the great nobles, the possessors of castles in Normandy, who gave in their adherence to the King. The first was Stephen d'Aumale, a nephew of the Conqueror, the lord of the Castle on the borders of Normandy, rising above the river Bresle, a fortress so important as to have been strengthened at the royal expense, and garrisoned by the King. The names of the other nobles recorded by Ordericus are Gerard de Gournai, who, it is

* Ord. Vit., B. viii., ch. ix.

said, put into the King's hands his Castle, called La Ferte-en-Brai-Gallefontaine, and all his other fortresses. The other nobles who gave in their adhesion were Robert Count d'Eu, Walter Giffard, and Ralph de Mortemer. With these "almost all," Ordericus adds, "who lived in the country beyond the Seine as far as the sea leagued themselves with the English, and were supplied by the King with large sums of money to enable them to fortify their residences and arm their Vassals."

Here it must be borne in mind that the nobles Ordericus names had a double purpose in making common cause with the Red King. They had to consider the security of their possessions both in Normandy and England. This was clearly the case with Walter Giffard. He was Count of Longueville and also Earl of Buckingham. His English possessions were vast, and it would have been in him the height of impolicy not to have espoused the King's cause.

But at this point we have to consider who the Walter Giffard was to whom Ordericus refers. Freeman falls into an error in assuming it was the "old Walter Giffard"—"the aged warrior of Arques and Senlac."* It is going over ground already occupied in again alluding to the death of the first Walter Giffard. His son, as is mentioned in the previous paper, on the authority of Doyle, appears to have succeeded him before 1084. That the father died within twenty years of Senlac is more than a mere conjecture. He was, as we have seen, an aged warrior at that battle, too feeble to bear the consecrated standard. Everything points to the improbability of his joining in the King's plans for the invasion of Normandy twenty-three years after the Conquest of England. The confusion in the identity of the Giffards has arisen from the mistake often made of assuming that there were two instead of three Walter Giffards in succession.

The second time Giffard is alluded to in the reign of William Rufus was, on the authority of Freeman, on the occasion of the vacancy of the abbey of Bath by the death of its abbot, Ælfsige. Bishop John of Somerset, whose seat was at Wells, obtained the vacant

* "The reign of William Rufus," by E. A. Freeman, Vol. i. p. 231.

office to himself and his successors for the benefit of the bishopric of Somerset. The grant was made at Winchester, and was afterwards confirmed at an assembly at Dover, according to the same authority, in January, 1091, the fourth year of the reign of Rufus. A long list of names is appended to the grant, and amongst the Earls and Counts the name of *Walter* occurs. "Earl Walter," says Freeman, "must be Walter Giffard, created Earl of Buckingham by Rufus." (he refers to Stubbs' Const. Hist. I., 361). It does not appear that Giffard actually signed, or rather made his cross to the grant, but the document is important, as it is, we believe, the first evidence forthcoming of the creation of the Earldom of Buckingham.*

We have to wade through much of the history of the reign of Rufus, totally disconnected with Buckinghamshire, if we are to throw any light on the lives of the Giffards. It must ever be remembered that they were Normans, and that where we may expect to find them, the country where their interests will naturally be centred, would be in Normandy. It will be on the occasion of the Red King's second Norman campaign, in 1094, that the name of the second Giffard occurs again in history.

In consequence of a challenge from Robert, Duke of Normandy, an assembly was held at Gloucester, and a second invasion of Normandy was determined. The King and his Court, with his army, repaired to Hastings in February, 1094, from whence it was intended that the fleet should sail. They waited there for some time for the north wind to blow, and on the 19th of March, 1094, the King landed in Normandy. Attempts were made at a meeting between the King and the Duke to settle their disputes, but in vain, and the brothers, as Freeman says, "parted in greater anger than ever." Freeman gives an account of the King's strategy, and particularly of the Castles of which he had gained possession and garrisoned in different parts of Normandy, far away from one another, proving his powerful grasp over the dukedom. We do not follow out the course of the invasion, but merely refer to its

* See Freeman's "Reign of William Rufus," Vol. I, p. 137. and Appendix F.

termination. Philip of France joined his forces with those of Robert; the combined army extended its march to Longueville, the stronghold of the Giffards. There Rufus sent his emissaries, and by a large bribe induced Philip to break up the army and to return to France. Freeman gives the names of the Red King's Norman supporters in this invasion, with some accounts of each of these nobles. In this account he says:—"Nor do we wonder to find in the same list—for he was Earl of Buckingham as well as Lord of Longueville—the name of Walter Giffard, him who appeared as an aged man forty years before." And in concluding his description of the notable adherents of the King, he thus writes:—"These men all left the world in the year with which we are now dealing (1094), and left the hoary Earl of Buckingham to be for eight years longer the representative of an earlier day. The hands which, eight-and-twenty years before, had been too feeble to bear the banner of the apostle, were still, it would seem, ready to do whatever was still found for them to do in the service of the Red King." In the expression "it would seem" one cannot but realise that Freeman writes with evident incredulity that the elder Giffard was one of the actors in this Normandy invasion—that he could have lived on for thirty-six years after the battle of Senlac is an impossible proposition; but the difficulty with Freeman was that he was only dealing with two Giffards—father and son, that the last of the Giffards was, according to Orderic, as it will be remembered, a child at the death of his father, who died in 1102, and that he had therefore to prolong the life of the father to account for the Giffard who figures as one of the supporters of Rufus on the occasion of the second invasion of Normandy. He fell into the error, common to many learned authorities, of recognizing only two instead of three generations of Giffards.*

Our aim will be to bring to light any incidents in the period to which our attention is directed that may be associated with the descendants of the first Giffard, for these will indirectly be of interest in the history of our county. And there is one, in

* For the full account of this second invasion of Normandy, see Freeman's "Reign of William Rufus," Vol. i., p. 434, *et seq.*

which the second Giffard figures, at a festival in the King's new hall at Westminster. This hall had been erected by Rufus to his own glory, as a memento of his reign, to form a part of his royal palace, not as we now see it, with its marvellous timber roof and wide expanse, for the original building had two rows of pillars down the centre. We can imagine from the space it occupied, however, that it was a noble building, as the Norman builder left it, stern and impressive in design.

On this new hall it must be remembered that large sums spent on its erection and on the Tower of London were exacted from an oppressed nation. Fabyan says: "The King filled the spiritualitie and temporalitie with unreasonable taskys and tributys, the which he spent upon the Towre of London and the makynge of Westminster Hall." On his return from Normandy at the end of the French War, "when he saw the Hall of Westminster y^t he had caused to be buylded he was therewith discontented, y^t it was so lytle. Wherefore, as it is rehersed of some wryters, he entended, if he had lyved, to have made a larger and y^t to have served for a chamber."* This is Matthew Paris's account:—"In the same year King William, on returning from Normandy into England, held for the first time his Court in the new hall at Westminster. Having entered to inspect it with a large military retinue, some persons remarked that 'it was too large, and larger than it should have been.' The King replied that 'it was not half so large as it should have been, and that it was only a bed-chamber in comparison with the building which he intended to make.'"†

The new hall was completed in time for the Whitsuntide feast on the 19th May, 1099, and there the King held his banquet to celebrate its erection. The King first went to the Minster to pay his devotions, and from thence he came to the banquet at the New Hall, wearing the crown that had been placed on his head at the Minister. Geffrei Gaimar, in his "*Lestorie des Engles*,"

* "The History of the ancient Palace and the Houses of Parliament at Westminster," by E. W. Bradley and John Britton, pp. 17 and 18, quoting Fabyan's *Chronicles*, p. 252, edit. 1811.

† Matt. Paris, p. 51, edit. 1589.

gives a graphic description of the feast. He refers to it as taking place after the second War of Maine, but in reality it was before that second war, the date of which was in June, 1099. William kept Whitsuntide in Westminster Hall both in 1099 and 1100. The former was, as already mentioned, the feast to celebrate the completion of the building of this hall. The Anglo-Norman Rhymer speaks of the feast as held in the new hall. Freeman gives an account of the banquet as held the month before the second War of Maine.†

Probably this was the occasion of all others in his reign when the Red King felt his royal power, and displayed it in the eyes of his subjects. Freeman refers to the presence of King Eadgar of Scotland as bearing the sword of State before his superior Lord, though he admits the statement is of doubtful authority. Gaimar does not refer to the Scotch King, but he says the Kings of Wales and many Earls and Dukes were there. In describing the splendour of the entertainment, he speaks of three hundred ushers richly attired as conducting the Barons to their seats.

It was a strange function, for with all the pomp and circumstance, there seems to have been a conspicuous lack of dignity on the part both of king and guests, and this absence of self-respect and self-restraint on the part of Rufus, though such as we might have anticipated, is forcibly pictured to us. Many a nobleman the King knighted, and with them Giffard, who in the illegitimate line was his kinsman. We are following Gaimar. Amongst those knighted were thirty youths, who, adopting the effeminate fashion of the reign, had been accustomed to wear long hair. Giffard cut their locks. He had his own locks shorn. All presented themselves at the feast with their hair cut. It would seem that these young men were Giffard's retainers, who had been waiting about the Court to no purpose, for Gaimar says:—

“All had their hair cut,
For their lord was wroth,
Because he tarried there a month
Before the King gave them arms.”

This was the first occasion that the young men of the Court appeared with their locks shorn. The King at

† See “Reign of William Rufus,” Vol. ii., pp. 264-265.

first laughed at their appearance, and these young knights were evidently victims of his mocking jokes. But when he made it understood that he commended the fashion—"took it as a courtesy"—there was, Gaimar continues, *indeed* a cropping. More than three hundred courtiers had their locks shorn, and they never appeared at Court again with long hair. In the narration Giffard is specially singled out as a prominent character. Gaimar goes out of his way to mention—"The second month that Giffard came the King held the feast." It was a feast never to be forgotten, the first held in the New Hall, memorable for the many of his guests the King knighted. The splendour of the royal entertainment was such that it must have infected the populace. Thus the account of it concludes—

"So richly he knighted them
That for ever it will be spoken of,
For these and others he did so much
That all London shone.
What shall I say of this feast?
So rich was this feast it could not be more so."

It appears without doubt from the account of the banquet handed down to us that Giffard took a prominent, though, to our modern notions, a ridiculous part on this memorable occasion.*

It was not long after the revels at the New Hall that the King had to reign, for at the close of the month of July, 1100, Rufus died in the New Forest, the actual occasion of whose death has been and ever will be in our English History a theme for conjecture. But there is one incident before the King's death which needs recording. Maine had been especially the scene of the wars of Rufus. It is not our purpose to follow the account of the varied struggles and fortunes of these wars, but it will be sufficient to say that in the June of 1099 Le Mans was in the hands of the King's troops. The King was far away in England, and Helias, the Count of Maine, considered it an opportune time to

* "Laisson dico, del rei parlom.
La feste tint com baron,
Mais nai laisir de tut retraire
La grant richesse kil fist faire,
Ne les grant dous kil donast.
Maint gentil hom i adubat.
Od sul Giffard le Peiteuin,

recover Le Mans. He came to it with a great force. Gaimar says: "On all sides round they sat down." Helias was successful; Le Mans was re-taken, though the King's garrison were not driven out, but secured themselves in the fortresses of the city. A messenger was sent with all speed to the King to tell of the disaster. Gaimar says he found him at Brockenhurst, at the head of the New Forest, where he sat at his dinner; whilst Ordericus describes him at the time as riding with his attendant. We follow Gaimar. When the King rose from his meat the messenger came before him. The King asked him, How goes it? How fare my knights whom I left in Le Mans the other day? "Sir," said he, "they are besieged. The siege extends as far as the bridge. On all sides of the city are the Angevins quartered. More than a thousand tents are spread. Never was such pride seen. Each day they set up his complete belief in his knights, his reverence for

Ki de Barbastre ert son cosin,
 Adubat il trente vallez,
 Trenche aueit lur tupez.
 'I restuz ourent les tops trenchez,
 Car lur seignur fu corucez
 Pur sul vn mais kil demorat,
 Ke li reis armes ne lur donat.
 Lui e sa gent fist estuper,
 Les tups trenchez a curt aler.
 Co furent les primers vallez
 Ki firent trencher lur tupez.
 Li reis sen rist. si sen gabat,
 A curteisie le tur turnat,
 E quant li reis en bien le tint
 De ses vallez desi ka vint
 Se tuperent tut ensement.
 Ore fu encurt lestaucement,
 Plus de treis cent sen estaucerent
 Vnc puis en curt ne la leisserent.
 El secund mais ke Giffart vint
 Li reis icele feste tint,
 Si richement les aduba
 Ke tuz iorz parle enserra.
 Dices e daltres taut en fist
 Ke totes Londres en resplendist.
 Ke dirraie diceste feste?
 Si riche fu, plus ne pout estre."

"Lestorie des Engles solum la Translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar," edited by Sir T. Duffus Hardy and C. T. Martin, 6077 to 6110.

gallows whereon to hang knights and soldiers and townsmen." The messenger then hands a letter to the King, the purport of which was to send succour to the city. The King, stirred with grief, without a moment's delay, Gaimar continues, leapt on his horse and rode straight to Southampton, ordered his soldiers to be mustered and to follow him. With a select few the King came to the sea, and though the wind was against him, he was not deterred. The steersman asked him if he would risk his life on the sea with a contrary wind. "Brother," said the King, "hold your peace. You never saw a King drowned. Nor shall I be now the first. Set your ships afloat;" and so they sailed, and arrived at Barfleur.* On the authority of Orderic, the King lands at Touques, and rides on to the Castle of Bonneville. William of Malsbury gives a short account of the messenger bringing tidings to the King of the siege of Le Mans, and of the King's promptitude in reaching the sea; and he significantly tells of the King's reliance on his followers. "If," says he, "I know the temper of the young men of my kingdom, they will even brave shipwreck to come to me."† And here our interest centres in one of those followers of the King, who readily gave his help to rescue Le Mans from the victorious Helias.

Gaimar speaks of the King's knights as rich and well-equipped. Among them was no poverty. Of his soldiers he had more than enough, kept at the King's expense for his royal pleasure, and then Gaimar describes his Barons, and singles out some for special praise. He continues:

"To the King there came to give aid
Walter Giffard and the Earl of Eu,
Their Knights were no wise few.
Earl William, he of Evereux,
He and Eustace of Dreux
Came to the King with many men,
At Barfleur they waited for his host."‡

The King seems to have had the power of attracting the soldier to his cause, for with all his faults the redeeming feature of his character was his chivalry,

* "*Lestorie des Engles la Translacion*," 5792 to 5840.

† "William of Malsbury, B. iv., c. i.

knightly honour. Numbers flocked from beyond the sea to join his army, but the news of the King's collecting his forces for the march on Maine struck terror among the followers of Helias, and, as Gaimar quaintly says:—

“When the Angevins knew it,
And the people of Maine, one morning early
They went off, they did a very wise thing.”

In the story of the siege of Le Mans it is a curious incident to be noted that Gaimar does not style Giffard as an Earl. This omission adds to the perplexity of establishing with certainty the date of the creation of the earldom.

The reign of Rufus has now closed, and we can follow the career of the second Walter Giffard for a very short time during the reign of Henry I. The only rift in the cloud that discloses something of the character of our hero is the occasion of the great feast at the New Hall of Westminster. Giffard seems to have taken, according to Gaimar, as we have seen, a leading part at the function. His cropping the hair of the young gallants of the Court would suggest that he was a leader of fashion, by royal favour; that he could not have attempted such a change in the appearance of those who were to be the King's guests unless he were assured of a certain influence with his royal master. Gaimar leads us to believe, from his account of the Whitsun feast, and from another incident already noticed, that Giffard was a prominent courtier in the time of Rufus, a character with some rough humour about him, and therefore one who, we can readily understand, would be among the welcome companions of the Red King.

There was a great change for the better in the government of England when Henry I. succeeded to the throne. He succeeded to it with the hearty will of the English people, but with a divided allegiance

‡ “Al rei en vout pur fere aie
Walter Giffard e li quens d'ov,
Lur cheualers ne furent mie pov.
Li quens Willam cil d'Erriwes
Il e Eustace de Driwes
Vindrent al rei od mult grant gent,
A Barbeffet son ost atent.”

“Lestorie des Engles la Translacion,” 5898 to 5904.

among the Norman nobles. They dreaded a return to order and the reversal of the misrule of Rufus. The English hailed the crowning of Henry at Westminster. He was a king born on English soil, and who could speak the language of his people. On the eve of his coronation, and immediately after the choice of the Witan, he appointed, as the chroniclers tell us, William Giffard to the See of Winchester, which had been kept in the hands of William since 1098. Orderic says he had been the chancellor of the dead king.* It is generally believed that this William Giffard was of the family of the Giffards, Lords of Longueville and Earls of Buckingham. The Bishop built a palace, which belonged to the See of Winchester, known as Winchester House, in Southwark; its situation was on the banks of the Thames, "near the west end of St. Mary Overie's Church," long since demolished, and the site converted into streets. He also founded the Church of St. Mary, Southwark, for Canons Regular, in the year 1106. Differences between Anselm, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry delayed Giffard's consecration till 1107. He then held his See for twenty-one years, and, dying in 1128, was buried in his own Cathedral.† The important act which inaugurated Henry's reign was the framing and signing his famous Charter. The alteration effected in the tenure of land by that Charter was of the utmost consequence in those times. This is not the occasion to explain the reason for the framing of the Charter, but a few words of explanation may be of interest. Freeman refers to the secret of the misrule of Rufus. It is to be found in the Peterborough Chronicle. The King, the chronicler says, would be, according to a system of rules he had established, the heir of every man, so that, in the words of Freeman, "The estate of the minor heir was to be made a prey; he was himself to be begged and granted and sold like an ox or an ass. The heiress, maid or widow, was in

* "*Guillelmo cognomento Gifardo, qui defuncti regis cancellarius fuerat, Guentanæ urbis cathedram commisit.*" (See Ordericus Vitalis, translated by Thomas Forester, B. x., ch. xv.)

† See "History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Winchester," begun by Henry, Earl of Clarendon, and continued by Samuel Gale 1715, pp. 35-97.

the like sort to be begged and granted, sold into unwilling wedlock, or else forced to pay the price which a chivalrous tenure demanded for the right either to remain unmarried or to marry according to her own will. The bishopric or the abbey was to be left without a pastor, and its lands were to be let to farm for the King's profit, because the King would be the heir of the priest as well as of the layman."* It was the object of Henry's Charter to make provisions for the reform of the abuses of the last reign as to the tenure of land, and its other provisions, with the exception of the one by which the King kept the forests in his own hands, manifest an enlightened desire to deal in a liberal spirit with his new subjects, and to put an end to the oppressive rule of the last reign. We have lingered on the subject of the famous Charter chiefly for the sake of the mention of the witnesses to the document, which was sealed by the King on the day of his coronation. The witnesses were Maurice, Bishop of London; Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester; William Giffard, Bishop Elect of Winchester; Henry, Earl of Warwick; Simon, Earl of Northampton; Walter Giffard; Robert of Montfort; Roger Bigod; and Henry of Port. The fewness of the names, it is suggested by Freeman, is to be accounted for by the suddenness of the death of Rufus, followed by the immediate coronation of Henry. (The names are to be found in the *Select Charters*, 98.)

Rapin tells us that several copies of this Charter were transcribed and deposited in the principal Monasteries for the purpose of reference, and that there were as many copies transcribed as there were counties, the copies being sent to Abbies in each county, and yet, although *Magna Carta* was founded on the Charter of Henry, it seems to have been very difficult to find a copy of the latter in the reign of John. Matthew Paris gives a transcript of the copy sent into Herefordshire.† Walter Giffard, it is true, witnessed to Henry's Charter, but he was one among the great Norman nobles who had their misgivings as to the

* See Freeman's "*Reign of William Rufus*," Vol. i., pp. 335-336, and quotation from *Chron. Petrib.* 1100.

† See Rapin's "*History of England*," Vol. i., Book vi., p. 191.

results of good government, and how it would affect their personal interests. They may have had vast estates in England, but so they had in Normandy. Would not the misrule of Robert be more likely to promote their objects of personal aggrandizement than a reign of law, so clearly foreshadowed in Henry's Charter ?

A plot was contriving to place the Duke of the Normans on the throne of England, and the great nobles had all the facilities for carrying out their intrigues, since their opportunities were rendered easy for passing from England to Normandy on the plea that their estates required their presence. Robert invaded England in 1101, at the instigation of these nobles, some of whose names Orderic† has handed down to us. The invitation was to collect a fleet and cross over to England. The names we have are Robert de Belesme, and his two brothers, Roger and Arnulph ; William de Warren, Earl of Surrey ; Ivo of Grantmesnil, Robert Fitz-Ilbert, and Walter Gicard. In reproducing the names of disaffected nobles, Freeman concludes the list of those who were in direct communication with the Duke by remarking—"And we are somewhat surprised to find on the same list, now at the end of his long life, the aged Walter Giffard, Lord of Longueville, and Earl of Buckingham."[‡] We can quite realise that in contemplating the longevity of the first Walter Giffard, the eminent historian must have been perplexed. Anselm the Primate and all the Bishops were, with the English people, united against a Norman invasion. Orderic gives a particular account of Robert's coming into England, and contrasts it with his father's invasion, the latter landed by his own strength, whilst the former by the subtle help of traitors. We do not follow the fruitless results of Robert's invasion, which are a matter of history. All we are now interested in is the action of the nobles, whose purposes were completely thwarted, the advent of Robert having been the occasion for securely establishing Henry on the throne of England.

† "Ordericus Vitalis," B. x. ch. xviii.

‡ Freeman's "Reign of William Rufus," Vol. ii., p. 395.

The next reference chronologically to a Giffard is that in the fleet of Magnus, King of Norway, in his last invasion of Ireland, one who bore the great name of Giffard was with the King. The expedition, according to Orderic, was designed against Ireland, but the *Manx Chronicle* informs us that Magnus plundered Ireland on his way to Man, and that Man and the other islands connected with it were the object of the conquest. Now it appears that this expedition took place in the year 1102, and it was in that year, as we shall see, the second Giffard died. There is nothing beyond the name to connect him with the invasion of Magnus. We may therefore, we think, safely dismiss the idea that in naming a Giffard the Earl of Buckingham is intended by the chronicler in this account of the expedition of the Norwegian King.

In the previous article on the Giffards some account has been given of the marriage of the second Walter Giffard to Agnes, who was apparently the daughter of Gerard Fleitell, and sister of William Bishop of Evreux, in which it is mentioned that the third Walter Giffard, one of the issue of this marriage, was not born till fifteen years after the nuptials. That Agnes appeared to be a woman of considerable force of character, the early death of her husband giving her, on the authority of Orderic, the charge of her son, whose education she undertook with great solicitude, and that she managed his vast estates with singular prudence. Mention has also been made, derived from the same authority, of the influence she exercised over Robert Duke of Normandy.

We should now turn to the better side of the character of the second Giffard. An act which made his memory to be gratefully remembered after his death was the foundation, in the year 1084, of the Priory of Clugniac monks at Longueville, near Dieppe, of which town he was the Earl. The Priory was dedicated to St. Faith. Orderic says the monks after his death paid great honours to his memory, and commended his soul to God by incessant prayers, mindful of the benefits they richly enjoyed through his foundation at Longueville.* We find that he and Agnes, his wife, bestowed the

* "Ordericus Vitalis," B. xi., ch. iv.

Manor of Newton or Newington and other lands in Buckinghamshire on the Priory at Longueville, but the Priory was to be more richly endowed by his son and Ermengard his wife, as their Confirmation Charter discloses. By the original donors Newton Longueville became a cell to the Norman Priory, and this explains one of the names which the parish still bears.* Ducarel says: The founder also gave to this Priory (Longueville) many churches, besides lands and castles in England. Among these latter was that of Newington Longueville in the County of Buckingham, where subsequently was established a Priory resembling that in Normandy.† We propose to refer more in detail to the Confirmation Charter in specially alluding to the third Walter Giffard. Orderic gives a precise account of the death of the second Walter, the date of which seems to have been July 15, 1102. He makes it clear that he died in England, bearing at the time of his death the title of Earl of Buckingham; that his body was, by his own direction, brought over to Normandy, and buried at the entrance of the Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Longueville, the church of his own foundation. There, too, were buried his wife Agnes and his son, the third Walter. Orderic has preserved the epitaph to his tomb, which he mentions was inscribed on the wall, adorned with frescos. It is as follows:—

“Signa Gifardorum Gualterus ingenuorum,
Quæ meruit vivens busta, sepultus habet.
Templi fundator præsentis et ædificator.
Hoc velut in proprio conditus est tumulo.
Qui se magnificum Patriæque probavit amicum,
Dux virtute ponens, et pietate nitens,
Religiosorum sed præcipue Monachorum
Cultor multimode profuit Ecclesiæ. Amen.”

The writer of “The Alien Priories” says: “Their monument,” namely, of the father, mother and son, “with their effigies in stone, is still (1779) to be seen in the nave near the great door on the left-hand as you enter.”‡ Since this was written the religious house

* See Tanner’s “Notitia,” p. 25, “*Newinton Longavilla*,” in the Confirmation Charter to the Priory of Longueville. Lyson gives the names *Newenton* or *Newton Longueville*.

† Ducarel, “Anglo Normandes,” p. 10.

‡ “Some account of the Alien Priories,” Vol. i., p. 17.

has been dissolved, and the conventual buildings are now only traceable in the ruins standing at the present time.

The annual income of the Priory at Longueville the same writer gives at the date of his work at 12,000 livres. The Prior was nominated by the Prior of la Charité sur Loire, and presented to the Church of Longueville, and to twenty other churches.

The second Walter Giffard not only left a son, but "divers daughters," one of whom, Rohais, married Richard Fitz Gilbert, and from this marriage sprang the great family of Clare.*

If the historical references to Walter Giffard, the son, are infrequent, those relating to the third Walter are still more scanty. He was an infant, as we know, at the death of his father, and it was not till the year 1119 that his name is mentioned by Orderic. The historian classes him among those consistently loyal to Henry. The first instance of this loyalty is through the selection the King made of those who should have the custody of his fortresses in Normandy at a time when the duchy was harassed through the conflicting claims arising between the King, and those who were still the adherents of Duke Robert, long a captive in England, and of his son William. Orderic selects from among the loyal nobles the following names:—Richard Earl of Chester, Ranulph de Bricasard, Ralph de Conches, William de Warrenne, William de Roumare, William de Tankerville, Ralph de Saint Victor, Walter Giffard, Nigel d'Aubigni, and his brother William. But it was at the battle of Brémule or Brenville, between Louis of France and Henry of England, that the third Giffard seems to have specially distinguished himself. It would occupy many pages to recount the quarrels between the Kings of England and France which led up to the all but bloodless battle, yet in which there were incidents of singular interest, a battle which resulted in a decisive victory for Henry. Orderic gives a precise account of this struggle. He tells us that the King heard Mass at Noyon on the 20th of August. He is recording the occurrences of the year 1119. The King descended from Mount Verclive to the open plain

* See Dugdale's Baron: Tom. i., p. 60.

called Brémule. This plain is in the commune of Gallard-bois, through which the road from Rouen to Paris passes. Duchesne's text calls the place Breuneville, but it seems that Bremula is the name given in the original MS. The King was accompanied by five hundred horsemen. He had with him, says Orderic, his two sons, illustrious knights, and three Counts,† Henry d'Eu, William de Warren, and Walter Giffard. The historian refers to others as supporting the King, and to heighten the estimation of those whom he thus singles out, he compares them to such distinguished Romans as Scipio, Marius, and Cato. Then we have the account of Louis meeting his opponents with four hundred knights, of the first charge being made by the French with great gallantry, but through their lack of order in the advance of their being overpowered and put to flight; of the struggle which followed, and the French prisoners taken, and of the hasty retreat of Louis, after displaying great courage. It is said that the horse of Louis was killed under him, and that he fled on foot with a crowd of fugitives. The King of England's bravery is recorded, and his narrow escape from the charge of a deadly enemy, William Crispin, who struck the King with two blows on the head, the violence of the shock forcing the blood from his nostrils, but that the strength of the helmet resisted the edge of the battle-axe. Orderic concludes his picturesque account of the battle by mentioning that nearly nine hundred knights were in the encounter; that he had ascertained only three were slain. This he attributes to the complete suits of armour worn and to a spirit of fraternity among the combatants, whose aim was rather to take prisoners than to sacrifice life. The King of England captured the standard of France, and the day after the battle, as became a King, returned to King Louis his charger, with the trappings. Orderic speaks of the knightly valour of Giffard and his companions, and Dugdale refers to the former as giving most high testimonies of his individual bravery at this battle, and this reference is repeated by subsequent

† Whatever difficulties there may be as to the creation of the Earldom of Buckingham, it will be noticed that Orderic refers to Walter Giffard as an earl at the battle of Brenville.

writers. The only authority quoted by Dugdale is Orderic, who does not appear to single out Giffard, but, for bravery, to associate him with the few specially chosen by the King as his most trusted knights. We may therefore conclude that the spirit of the hero of Senlac survived in the grandson, who undoubtedly took a conspicuous part at the battle of Brenville.** He is mentioned as some time chief marshal of the King's Court.¶ We once again hear of the third Giffard after the death of Henry I. It is but a passing allusion, though it affords evidence of his continuing to take a prominent part in public affairs. The Norman Chronicle speaks of him as an adherent of Stephen at the commencement of his reign, but that he subsequently made his peace with Geoffrey of Anjou, the husband of the Empress Maud.§ We know little about his marriage, and have no intimation, so far as we have been able to discover, of the parentage of his wife. Her name, Ermengard,* we are able to trace from the Confirmation Charter to the Monks of Longueville, and the foundation Charter of Notley Abbey.

Nothing seems to be recorded of the third Giffard in the reign of Henry II. except that in the twelfth year of the King's reign, upon assessing of the aid for marrying the King's daughter, he certified that he had ninety-four knights' fees and a half *De Veteri feoffemento* and one-and-a-half *de Novo*.† Robert du Mont, in his *History of France*,‡ gives the date of his death as occurring in the year 1164. He was buried, according to some, with his father and mother at the Priory Church of Longueville;|| by others in the Abbey which he had founded at Notley. Dying without issue, his vast estates were dispersed, and the Earldom of Buckingham as a title became extinct. The benefactions to the

** See "Ordericus Vitalis," B. xii., c. xviii. (translated by Forester). For another account of the battle see Lingard's "History of England, Vol. i., p. 505, quoting Orderic, Chron. Sax. 821; Hunt: 217; Malm. 90. See also Dug. Bar., p. 60.

¶ See Cockayne's "Complete Peerage of England," Vol. ii., p. 62. Chron. Norm., 980 B.

* By Dugdale called *Ermetrude*, Baron: Tom. i., p. 60.

† Ib. quoting Lib. Rub. Scac. c. Buck.

‡ His. de France, Tom. xiii., p. 309.

|| "Some account of the Alien Priors, Vol. i., p. 37.

church by this last of the Earls of Buckingham and his wife, Ermengarde, will next deserve some attention. It is through these benefactions that his name is specially handed down, and the memorials of his pious gifts are still preserved to us in that which remains of the 12th century work in the Church of Newton Longueville and in the ruined Abbey of Notley, though these ruins unhappily have for many years been gradually disappearing.

It seems a fitting opportunity here to pause and to take another occasion, as it may be offered, to consider the Giffard Charters. Notley Abbey has been frequently referred to by the archæologist, but the Church of Newton Longueville has not received the attention it deserves. It would, therefore, be of much interest to examine its architectural features, tracing them from its foundation in the 12th to the considerable alterations made by New College, Oxford, in the 15th century.

JOHN PARKER.
