



Raoul (i) de Tosny.

915-955

Father: Hugues de Calvacamp (c.890-c.980)

Mother: Haldruc de Therouanne

Spouse: unknown.

Children:

1. Raoul (I) (ii) de Tosny c.970-1024

A great deal of confusion has resulted from the work of students and writers down the ages in that a variety of 'numbering systems' have been employed to differentiate between succeeding generations of Raouls, Ralphs and Rogers. Having worked with these for some time it would appear to me that there is what one might call the English system, and another system which is used in the Norman-French sources. The Norman-French system seems to use Raoul (i), the archbishop's brother as the starting point, which is logical; the English seems to adopt numbers which commence with the first of the family who was known to the English writers; the two being, consequently, one generation out-of-step with each other. Consequently, in this paper, I have used a 'compound' system where the two are amalgamated. This, Raoul (i) is the father of Raoul (I) (ii) – 'upper-case' letters signifying the English system and 'lower-case' the Norman-French.

To exacerbate our difficulties, there has been a habit of suggesting that Roger (I) de Tosny (990-1040) was the son of Raoul (i) de Tosny (the archbishop's brother). This idea would require Raoul (i) to have lived for upwards of 100 years – very unlikely for a man who spent his entire life in military adventures! Modern scholarship, such as Moore (2017),¹ proposes a solution by suggesting that there were, in this era, two individuals known as Raoul de Tosny –

1. Raoul (i) de Tosny (c.915-c.955), 1st Seigneur de Tosny (the archbishop's brother).

¹ Moore, James, (2017), *The Norman Aristocracy in the Long Eleventh Century: Three Case Studies*, unpublished DPhil thesis presented to the University of Oxford, (2017), 63. When reading Moore's thesis, his Ralph II is the same as Raoul (I) (ii), in this paper – the archbishop's nephew.

[https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:8982f540-1890-4469-ae16-3c78c1ecac1e/download_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=ThesisFinal9%252C%2B30.4.18.pdf&type_of_work=Thesis] (accessed 5/4/2020)

2. Raoul (I) (ii) de Tosny (before.970-1024), son of the above.

An inspection of the dates reveals that this is plausible if we accept that Raoul (i) died perhaps ten years later, and that Raoul (I) (ii) was born some ten years earlier, both of which suggestions are within the bounds of possibility.² Indeed, in a letter from Pope John XV describing the formal reconciliation arranged by his envoy, Leo of Trevi, between Æthelred II, king of the West Saxons, and Richard I, Duke of Normandy, following a dispute between the two caused by the Normans supporting Viking raids against Æthelred,³ we find the following “*nobis relatum est a compluribus de inimicitia Æthelredi Saxonum Occidentalium regis necnon et Ricardi marchionis*”.⁴ Æthelred called his wise men (*witan*) together after the visit of the papal envoy and they agreed to make peace. The king sent ambassadors to Richard who received them and he also agreed to make peace. Oaths were sworn on both sides: for the Saxons by Ethelsinus,⁵ Bishop of the holy church of Sherborne, Leofstan son of Alwoldi, Athelnothus son of Wistani {both thegns}; and, on behalf of Richard and the Norman side, we have Rogerus episcopus, Rodulfus Hugonis filius, Turstenc filius Turgis. This was enacted in Rouen on 1 March 991.⁶ The Norman oath-takers are of particular interest to us. They are:

✠ Rogerus episcopus – [?]Roger, bishop of Lisieux (985/9 – c.1022).⁷

² I have chosen to retain the Norman-French name ‘Raoul’ rather than the English ‘Ralph’ since the family is of Norman-French origin, not English.

³ Sir Frank Stenton wrote, that towards the end of the long reign of Duke Richard I of Normandy, “It was no longer possible for Scandinavian adventurers to found new families in Normandy. But the Norman aristocracy, still conscious of its Scandinavian origin, was well disposed to the men of its own stock who were trying their fortune in the narrow seas, and the Norman ports were open to ship’s companies returning from raids in England. By the summer of 990 the English and Norman courts had become openly hostile to each other. By the early autumn the news of their enmity had reached Rome, and Pope John XV dispatched an envoy with instructions to arrange a treaty between them. On Christmas day 990 he presented his commission to King Æthelred. Soon afterwards the king and his council drew up a set of terms which could be offered to the duke of Normandy. They provided that in future the king and the duke should accept a peaceful reparation of all the injuries which either might suffer from the other, and that neither of them should entertain the other’s enemies, not any of his subjects except such as could show letters of commendation under his seal. In early spring the bishop of Sherborne and two king’s thegns escorted the envoy to Rouen, where the duke agreed to these terms, on 1 March 991.” [Stenton, F.M. (1943) *Anglo-Saxon England*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 370-71.]

⁴ MS Cotton, Tiberius A. 15, fo. 171 b. Reproduced in Stubbs, W. (1874) *Memorials of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury*, London: Longman, (Rolls Series), 397.

⁵ This would appear to be Aethelsige I, Bishop of Sherborne (979-993).

⁶ Hardy, Thomas Duffus (ed.) *William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, Vol 1*, London, (1840), p.270. <https://ia600907.us.archive.org/15/items/willelmimalmesb00unkngoog/willelmimalmesb00unkngoog.pdf>

⁷ It is not unreasonable to assume that ‘Rogerus episcopus’ was a bishop of one of the dioceses in Normandy. That said, the only bishop in Normandy called ‘Roger’ was Roger, bishop of Lisieux (985/9 – c.1022). “Roger was, however, with the exception of the archbishops of Rouen, the most active member of the Norman episcopate in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. His origins are unknown, but he was probably related to the ducal line.” Allen (2009) agrees that it was this Roger, bishop of Lisieux, who was one of the oath-takers on behalf of Richard and the Normans on 1 March 991. [Allen, R. (2009) “The Norman Episcopate, 989-110”, PhD Thesis presented to the University of Glasgow, Vol. 1, 241-2.] <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1218/1/2009allenphd%5Bedited%5D.pdf>

- * *Rodulfus Hugonis filius* – Ralph [?](i) de Tosny], son of Hugh [de Calvacamp].⁸
- * *Turstenc filius Turgis*. Turstenc son of Turgis {(?)Thorgis}.

A number of authors have accepted that the second of these names is none other than Raoul (i) de Tosny (son of Hugues de Calvacamp), but this presents us with a problem since it would mean that Raoul (i) was still alive in 991 whereas his death is considered by other writers to have taken place c.975. But, although he would by then have been a very old man for his time, it is not impossible that he lived to 991. The evidence, here, is compelling to some – ‘*Rodulfus Hugonis filius*’ certainly seems to eliminate this person from being Raoul (I)(ii) de Tosny (955-1024).

This theory that there were two individuals successively with the name of Raoul de Tosny is supported by G.H. White in his *The Complete Peerage* (White, 1953) where he says that:

“He {Raoul (i) de Tosny} is usually confused with the Ralph who follows, but there is no authority for such identification, and the dates involved show that there must have been two Ralphs, belonging to successive generations.”⁹

Falconer Madan (Madan, 1899) made no such suggestion,¹⁰ but Joseph Huffman, writing almost a century later, agreed with this proposal of there having been two Raoul de Tosny’s in succession (Huffman, 1984).¹¹

Nevertheless, the situation is still very confusing to the casual reader, and sometimes it is easier to identify an individual by reference to his wife’s name, and/or the names of his children.

Raoul (i) was, through and through, a military man and in this occupation, he was singularly successful, creating an impressive reputation for his skill in battle. It would appear that he was Hugues (I) de Calvacamp’s younger son and it is

⁸ Many writers consider that it is not unreasonable to assume that this *Rodulfus Hugonis filius* is Raoul (i) de Tosny. It would be an appropriate place to find a man who was held in such high esteem in Norman circles, but such a conclusion would mean that we must assume that the previous date of his death – 955 – is erroneous, and that he lived at least to 991. Is this possible? The answer has to be yes – he would, by then, have been a very old man, but, if we accept that his date of birth (915) is an approximation, and that he may have been born up to perhaps ten or more years later, then it becomes quite possible. It is very unlikely to have been his son Raoul (I)(ii) de Tosny since, at such an important event, the father would have taken precedence, and, Raoul (I)(ii) de Tosny would not have been referred to as *Hugonis filius*. Nor can it have been the grandson, Roger (I) de Tosny, who was only an infant at the time.

⁹ Cokayne, George Edward and Geoffrey White (ed.) *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Vol. XII part 1: Skelmersdale to Towton*, 2nd edition. London: (1953), 754.

<https://www.familysearch.org/library/books/records/item/202803-the-complete-peerage-or-a-history-of-the-house-of-lords-and-all-its-members-from-the-earliest-times-v-12?viewer=1&offset=0#page=763&viewer=picture&o=info&n=0&q=>

¹⁰ Madan, Falconer (1899) *The Gresleys of Drakelowe*, Oxford: Private Subscription, 5.

https://archive.org/details/The_Gresleys_of_Drakelowe/page/n1/mode/2up

¹¹ Huffman, Joseph P. (1984) *Ralph III and the House of Tosny*, unpublished MA Thesis submitted to Western Michigan University, 1984. p.7.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4863&context=masters_theses

interesting to note this variation to the general rule that it was younger sons who found careers in the church. In the *Acta Archiepiscoporum Rotomagensium*, it is said of Raoul (I)'s brother Hugues (II) de Calvacamp that "he was indeed from an illustrious family"¹² although Hugues himself is described as being "unworthy in many deeds," since "after having put aside the obligations of the Holy Rule {of St Benedict}, he gave himself over entirely to the desires of the flesh." Indeed, Hugues (II) is known to have had "very many" (unidentified) children.

The Calvacamp family must, then, have been known to William (Longsword), son of Rollo, count of Rouen¹³, since it was he who, in 942, elevated Hugues (II) from the rank-and-file of the monastery of St Denis in Paris, to the archiepiscopal see of Rouen. William was, himself, to be count of Normandy from 927 to 942 so Hugues (II) and his brother Raoul (i) mixed with the very highest in the land!

The two brothers had a sister whose name has not come down to us. Hugues (II) is recorded as having given a gift of *Douvrend* as a dowry to his sister on her marriage to Odo, a knight. After Odo's death, she is said to have married Henri, a relative of Gautier II le Blanc, count of Valois & Mantes.¹⁴ It is sad that we have no record of her name, but it is unquestionably true that the two brothers had a sister.

At some point, possibly soon after his consecration as archbishop, Hugues determined to give his brother Raoul (i) part of the vast estates that comprised the demesne (possibly *mensa*) of the archdiocese. Hugues' newly acquired territories included the estates known as *Les Andelys* (*Grande Andely* and *Petit Andely*) and *Tosny*, directly to the south over the River Seine. These lands were known to be some of the most valuable of the archbishops' demesne because of their significant agricultural productivity. In the Norman era, as later, this was a strategically exceptional position because of the cliff formations along the north bank of the river. Although there was no major river-crossing here in the Norman era,¹⁵ the position

¹² "hic vero fuit prosapia clarus." *Acta Archiepiscoporum Rotomagensium*, in *Patrologia cursus completus omnium ss. patrum7 doctorum scri torum ue ecclesiasticorum sive Latinorum*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1853; reprint ed., Turnholt, Belgium: Brepolis, 1975), 147: 273-80. [Translation available at <https://journals.openedition.org/tabularia/pdf/2531>], p.51.

¹³ In early Norman times Rollo and his son William took the titles 'counts of Rouen.' In later years from Richard I (942-996) to William (1035-1066), the title became 'dukes of Normandy.'

¹⁴ "Un jugement de Richard II est rapporté par une notice relative au domaine de Douvrend. Celui-ci comprenait :Pucham, Douvrendel, Pucheuil, Amermeisnil, Hagenonmeisnil, Humesnil, Rannulfimesnil (ou Rainulfivallis ?), Le Coudret, Hupy, Cornepet, Montigny, Montuit et Etrimont, à Bailly[-en-Rivière]. Douvrend, autrefois partie du domaine de la cathédrale Notre-Dame de Rouen, était passé dans la dot de la sœur de Hugues, archevêque de Rouen, puis successivement entre diverses mains."

"Hic scriptum est quomodo villa de Duverent de dominicatu archiepiscopus exiit et quomodo prius postea rediit. Duverent fuit in dominio Sancte Marie ; Hugo archiepiscopus tulit de dominicatu et dedit ecclesiam militi Odoni in matrimonio sororis sue ; mortuo Odone, dedit iterum sororem suam cuidam Henrico cum eadem terra ; postea, defuncto Henrico, clamavit eam Walterus comes de Metanta"

« Acte 1436 », dans SCRIPTA. Base des actes normands médiévaux, dir. Pierre Bauduin, Caen, CRAHAM-MRSH, 2010-2019. [En ligne] <https://www.unicaen.fr/scripta/acte/1436>

¹⁵ The nearest major crossing was some six miles upriver at Vernon where a bridge is known to have existed from before 1223.

recommended itself to King Richard of England (the Lionheart) who began to construct a castle in 1196 which came to be known as *Château Gaillard*. Although it cost Richard a considerable sum, the castle was completed (it is said) in only two years and is considered to have had one of the most advanced designs of the time in Europe. Richard himself is credited with much of the design and it is said that he drew heavily on his experiences of the castles built in the Holy Land. Of course, being situated on the Seine, a hugely important trade-route, made Château Gaillard's commanding position very important. But Château Gaillard was not solely of military importance, it also served to project and reflect Richard's dominance over all his possessions, and it became one of his favourite residences.

Historically, *Grand Andely* was where Queen Clotilde, wife of Clovis, founded the first abbey in Normandy, in 511. Later, on the same site, the collegiate-church of Notre-Dame des Andelys was built, one of the most exceptional ecclesiastical monuments in France.

The point we are making here is that Tosny was one of the 'jewels in the crown' of the archbishop's territories. Hugues, himself, retained *Les Andelys* whilst his brother had *Tosny* across the river. Consequently, with a stroke of his pen, Hugues made Raoul (i) a rich man and *Seigneur de Tosny* – a member of the minor nobility. It was from this point onwards that the first line of the family bore the name "de Tosny"¹⁶ and, in so doing, they became one of the earliest Norman families to adopt this form of naming – using a *toponym* rather than a *patronym*.

¹⁶ It is a complete nonsense to apply the toponym "de Tosny" to any member of the family before Raoul (i). In so-called 'genealogical studies' one often comes across such ridiculous inventions as "Hugh de Calvacamp de Tosny" and other such variations, dreamt up by 'students' who should do a bit more studying!