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Summary,
Foreword

This work covers three genres of study which are intricately related. A purposeful lie has been created and unfortunately accepted by modern scholars; the roots of which are hidden in layers of misrepresentation. The genres of study can broadly be described as firstly; the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth, his Merlin prophecies and the account of his pseudo-history found in the ‘History of the Kings of Britain’ (HRB). The second area of study are the events that transpired at Glastonbury which cover the disinterment of King Arthur and the appearance of Joseph of Arimathea in Glastonbury lore. This I shall term Glastonburyana. Lastly, my exposé covers early Grail literature written by Robert de Boron and Chrétien de Troyes. These three areas of study make up a body of knowledge which is generally referred to as ‘The Matter of Britain’.

Normally in such studies there is a huge amount of speculation and conjecture due to the nature of dealing with events portrayed by chroniclers and manuscripts in an era when fraudulent accounts were commonplace. However, there is a pervading commonality throughout this exposé which can ultimately be tested which will show one way or the other whether the points put forward herein are based in truth.

In such cases of medieval studies, one could sometimes postulate that a topic has a relation to another where none exists as is seen in several scholarly works which have appeared over the last hundred years or so as a solution to the ‘The Matter of Britain’ has been diligently sought. The main three questions which embody this study of ‘The Matter of Britain’ are: Did King Arthur really exist? How did Joseph of Arimathea legend start at Glastonbury abbey? How did Grail literature reflect upon king Arthur and Joseph of Arimathea and why does this body of literature relate to an island called Avalon and Glastonbury Church.

I will be accused that the evidence provided in this study essentially pushes for one type of conclusion where there is no possibility of certainty. I am accused already that this work has not undergone any kind of peer review. Modern scholars are so intransigent they could not entertain the idea that new information has come to light or for one of them to rock the boat. No
A scholar has undertaken to find a definitive solution to the ‘Matter of Britain’, but by purposefully keeping our three genres of study unconnected they pontificate to no end while they strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

The main thrust of this work has virtually become an impossible task i.e. to expose that the prophecy of Melkin was not a fourteenth century invention as is currently thought and agreed by modern scholars. My aim toward this goal is achieved in the main by citing fraudulent works authored and concocted by Henry Blois. These include the impersonation of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Caradoc of Llancarfan and others.

I have no intention to distort the implications of what is reliably known. The problem is nothing is reliably known. I try to steer away from ill-founded or undocumented assertions, but at the same time, many of the views in this book run contrary to accepted theories put forward by modern scholarship, which are shown to be founded on incorrect a prioris.

This work has a fresh outlook on many of the accepted assumptions of modern scholarship. The three genres which are the subject of our investigation span more material than that which is commonly accepted as a tolerable area of expertise in the realms of scholarship. This makes for a lengthy tome, which if the reader is willing to endure to end; He or She will only be able to draw the same conclusion that I have determined for the most part. It is the foundation upon which to build and to the present era is the first understandable and workable solution to the riddle that became ‘The Matter of Britain’. Without linking all three genres of study, the seemingly disparate nature of their underlying commonality will not be discovered. It is my intention to uncover a lie\(^1\) which has far reaching ramifications when exposed.

Commentators interested in Arthuriana recognise the genius of Geoffrey of Monmouth. The genius is in fact Henry Blois. Geoffrey of Monmouth is a nom de plume.

The common denominator in all three genres in this investigation i.e. Arthuriana, Glastonburyana, and early Grail literature is Henry Blois. I do not set out to prove this as a goal, but it is merely a by-product of the main thrust of this work. It will become apparent that the concept of the Island of Avalon is a product of Henry Blois. This island originally an Island called

---

\(^1\) Cicero. The first duty of a man is the seeking after and the investigation of truth.
Ineswitrin donated to Glastonbury in 601 AD is in fact an Island on which the remains of Joseph of Arimathea are buried.

My qualification is the very fact that I am not a scholar and have not been primed to accept assumptions. I have not been taught to perceive or accept a fact or a consensus arrived at by previous researchers on any of the three genres but I have read nearly every opinion. Neither am I dim enough to accept that so many facts concerning Glastonbury lore and the *Matière de Bretagne* just coincidentally happened as a *fortuitous convergence of factors* because a scholar has decreed it so.

My main intent is to expose the fraudulent authorship of several works back in the twelfth century which were concocted wholly or interpolated by Henry Blois, the Bishop of Winchester, Abbot of Glastonbury and brother of King Stephen. This work exposes the existence of an Island in Devon, today called Burgh Island and its connection to Joseph of Arimathea and a tin mining heritage existing into antiquity. This work also exposes the island’s links with the mystical island of Avalon and Henry Blois.
Preface

Henry Blois was a genius who died in 1171. He had been brought up by his aristocratic mother until about the age of ten. He was able to absorb what interested him from a vast Library where he was schooled at Clugny in France until he was in his twenties. He hailed from one of the richest and noblest families in France. William the Conqueror was his grandfather. Henry Blois wrote *The History of the Kings of Britain* (HRB). It was Henry Blois who firstly interpolated William of Malmesbury’s *De Antiquitates* (DA) which establishes much of the myth surrounding Glastonbury. I will set out below that Henry Blois concocted the original Grail stories which connect Joseph of Arimathea and Arthur to Glastonbury and the chivalric Arthur of HRB to Avalon. It will become apparent that Henry Blois also composed the prophecies of Merlin.

If one breaks down the false premise from which commentators have started, and one is not duped by the apparent fraud which corroborates material from the various genres of investigation; all these subjects interrelate through Henry Blois. Henry Blois’ genius lies in the fact that his greatest coup transpired after his death. This was the disinterment of the ‘Chivalric King Arthur’ at Glastonbury because Henry Blois had previously manufactured the grave in his lifetime.

As we progress through the evidence which puts Henry Blois at the centre of the *Matter of Britain*, it becomes evident that he had to hide his association with the fraudulent tracts he had created. Henry Blois’ main defence from discovery was respectability and power. He was King Stephen’s brother and the most powerful prelate in Britain during his Brother Stephen’s reign. His position, his wealth, power and royal blood, enabled Henry Blois to create a persona to hide behind. He has affected European history by assuming the title of Geoffrey of Monmouth while writing the History of the Kings of Britain and inventing the first origins of Grail lore under such pseudonyms as Master Blihis, Blaise, Bleheris, Bliho-Bleheris and Bledhericus. In effect his output has more consequence to history than the writings of Cicero who he greatly admired.
Historians have had little to relate regarding the biography of ‘Geoffrey’. Any personal details are fabricated and based upon a false identity built specifically by Henry Blois to hide his authorship of HRB and the *Vita Merlini* (VM).

Our only view of the character of Henry Blois is arrived at through the words of contemporary chroniclers and by his known deeds, but once the evidence in these pages is revealed, it will be seen that there is far more to Henry Blois than is commonly understood.

It was not through malice that Henry Blois carried out what many may consider an outright fraud, but some of his actions were dictated by events. In the beginning, Henry Blois had no intention of creating what has now become known as *The Matter of Britain*. I will endeavour to lay bare the evolving sequence of events which complemented the formation of *The Matter of Britain* and the cause and reason for his secretive authorship.

Few have suspected it was the Bishop of Winchester who was responsible for the chivalric Arthurian legacy, but no modern scholar yet has set out to show the evidence in a way which can be substantiated. The pseudo-historical account which comprises the First Variant version and Vulgate HRB was not authored by the fictional Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bishop of Asaph. I will endeavour to show that *Galfridus Arturus* 2 never even existed, even though a trail has been left behind which seemingly provides evidence to the contrary. We will also discover the reasoning behind the wholly concocted prophecies of Merlin which were latterly added to the Vulgate HRB.

‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ pseudo-history has presented us with a colourful *History of the Kings of Britain* with a heritage stemming from the sack of Troy. Henry Blois has also fabricated legends which go to the heart of the Christian religion in Britain. Much of the Glastonbury myth has been caused by the interpolation of William of Malmesbury’s *De antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesiae* (DA) by Henry Blois.

What has added to the complexity of what transpired at Glastonbury has its roots with Jesus and Joseph of Arimathea. A virgin birth3 was

---

2 Gaufridus Arturus was the first appellation that Henry Blois gave the author of the book found at the abbey of Bec. Geoffrey of Monmouth was to become his name at a later date.

3 The virgin birth as spoken of by the prophets relates to the birth of the spirit in man not the ludicrous notion that a messiah was born from a single un-impregnated woman.
misinterpreted by the Jews which was prophesied\textsuperscript{4} as the Messiah’s destiny. The Gospel writers had to overcome logistical problems with a certain ‘Joseph’ the mundane father of Jesus. Relevant genealogies were provided as to the lineage of Joseph\textsuperscript{5} the carpenter, but the attempt to reconcile a heavenly and an earthly father of Jesus has a bearing on the ultimate conclusion of this study which is the substance of the Grail.

An attempt to overcome the problems of an immaculate conception was the root of the Gospel writer’s dilemma. The contrived disappearance of ‘carpenter’ Joseph in the gospel accounts is a subtle rationalisation employed by the Gospel writers following ‘Q’ who misunderstood the prophets’ words and the meaning of the prophetic virgin birth. The reality of an earthly father was a difficult conundrum to deal with eschatologically. A theologically more comprehensible uncle with the same name would seem a partial solution to the Gospel writer’s dilemma. Joseph of Arimathea’s removal of the body of Jesus from the cross and what transpired afterward to both the body and to Joseph of Arimathea is what gospel writers seem most at odds with. Posterity is left with a disappearance of the body of Jesus and Joseph and the rationalisations of St Paul’s eschatology. It is this confusion which partly leads to the later Grail legends in which ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ Arthur and knights seems to be anachronistically connected.

What transpired after the crucifixion are events which lead to Grail legend. The Grail’s relation to Glastonbury is down to a little known prophecy called the prophecy of Melkin discovered at Glastonbury. Our modern scholars, experts in this field of study, tell us the prophecy, first mentioned by John of Glastonbury, is a fake. This assumption is based upon the fact that there is no previous mention of it before the fourteenth century. The scholars who profess this opinion confirm and readily admit that they have no understanding of the Prophecy. It is this prophecy and its relation to Glastonbury and Henry Blois which is at the heart of the Grail legends and our present investigation.

Augustine, who came to Britain in the year 597 was the first Archbishop of Canterbury and is considered the "Apostle to the English" and a founder

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Isaiah 7.14} Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, a virgin will be with child and bear a son, and she will call His name Immanuel.

\textsuperscript{5}\textit{Matthew 1.16}. Jacob was the father of Joseph the husband of Mary, by whom Jesus was born, who is called the Messiah.
of the English Church. Although no Joseph of Arimathea tradition appeared before Henry Blois at Glastonbury; there can be no denial of the fact that there was a Celtic Briton church independent of Rome before the arrival of Augustine. The church of the Britons was originally established with a superior prestige than that of St. Peter and the establishment of this proposition is the ultimate outcome of this book.

Henry Blois was a serial interpolator, impersonator and author of many fraudulent works. Part of our inquiry involves a charter which grants an Island named ‘Ines Witrin’, donated by a Devonian King to Glastonbury in 601 AD, four years after the Roman church’s envoy Augustine sets foot on British soil. The charter indicates that Glastonbury was already a Christian institution at this early date and somewhat independent of Rome through the dark ages since the crumbling of the Roman Empire. It is the interpretation of this grant mentioned by William of Malmesbury in his Gesta Regum (GR) and DA which is at the heart of our investigation into the Matter of Britain.

Once I have established for the reader that a number of manuscripts were authored by Henry Blois, we will discover the reasons behind his authorship and anonymity. I will expose the ingenuity of his artifice in creating the persona of ‘Geoffrey’ and his impersonation and interpolation of other known authors after their deaths. These include Caradoc of Llancarfan, William of Malmesbury, Wace and Geffrei Gaimar amongst others.

Few have questioned the forgeries manufactured by what Lot\(^6\) calls the ‘officine de faux’ at Glastonbury. The exposing of certain facts within these pages should leave the reader in no doubt that both Vita Merlini and the HRB were written by the Bishop of Winchester, Henry Blois and not Geoffrey of Monmouth. Henry Blois at the height of his power was Legate to the pope and wielded a vast influence over Britain. His self-written epitaph on the Meusan plates provides evidence of his regard for the authorship of books as being greater than all things material. Yet it is the commonly accepted opinion of modern scholars that there is not one work authored by him. The only exception which has been left to posterity is his Libellus which relates to affairs concerning Glastonbury in its bland factual style.

\(^6\) Ferdinand Lot. ’Glastonbury et Avalon’, Romania 27 (1898), p. 537)
Although Henry’s *Libellus* is a genuine account of Henry’s achievements at Glastonbury, it also acts as a subtle devise meant to deflect any suspicion that his hand or authorship may be involved in other tracts of literature. The illustrious history of Glastonbury was concocted for the most part by Henry Blois and is part of the foundation for the *Matter of Britain*. William of Malmesbury knew Henry Blois well and refers to him as a remarkable man; a man known for his literary skill.\(^7\)

We shall also understand more of the stages of evolution in the construction of the HRB when we cover the events which occurred at the time the first edition was discovered at Bec. We will then better understand the various contradictions of allegiance portrayed by ‘Geoffrey’. It also becomes evident that the first edition of HRB, which I have termed the *Primary Historia*, related in précis (or synopsis), evidenced in Henry of Huntingdon’s letter to his friend Warin (EAW),\(^8\) differs in substantial storyline detail from the First Variant and from Vulgate version of HRB.

We will cover the reasons for the differences. Scholars have made presumptions concerning the dating of HRB based on the dedicatees life spans and have assumed that the copy of the History of the Kings of Britain found at Bec was substantially the same as the Vulgate version. I shall elucidate upon the progression of the HRB which went through four stages of evolution. We shall discover the reason behind the insertion of the *Prophecies of Merlin* into the HRB. I will uncover why there was a lapse of years before ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Vita Merlini* was written and the appearance of new prophecies concerning events in the Anarchy (supposedly recounted by Merlin’s sister). We will investigate why all works written by ‘Geoffrey’ that I propose in this work were written secretively by Henry Blois. I shall also cover why latterly *Gaufridus Artur* was given the title ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ and ultimately Bishop of Asaph.

Once we establish that several works including the anonymously authored *Gesta Stephani*, Caradoc’s *life of Gildas*, the interpolations into William of Malmesbury’s DA and parts of GR3 and other works\(^9\) emanate from Henry’s hand, we are then in a position to untangle what seemed to be

---

\(^7\) *Antiquities of Glastonbury* William of Malmesbury Ch.83

\(^8\) *Epistola ad Warinum*

\(^9\) For instance: Wace’s *Roman de Brut*, Geoffrey Gaimar’s *L’Estoire des Bretons* which was never even written
an unsolvable puzzle concerning Glastonbury, its association with Avalon, King Arthur, Joseph of Arimathea and the Holy Grail.

Henry Blois has employed many subtle methods to create his ingenious edifice of fallacious history. The underlying reasons for Henry’s deception will become clear, but his genius and brilliance are evident in the works he authored and in the fact he remained undetected. The means he employed to remain anonymous as the instigator of these works are several and by no certainty are all his works discovered in this present volume, as some of his output has not survived to the modern era.

Geoffrey of Monmouth’s epic which brings the ‘chivalric’ King Arthur onto the western historical stage has no mention of Joseph of Arimathea or Glastonbury. Shortly after the book’s proliferation, the Island of Avalon (Insula Avallonis) the place where Arthur was taken after the battle of Camlann, becomes linked to Glastonbury. A fraudulent unearthing of the bones of King Arthur, found with a bogus ‘leaden cross’ dubiously stating that the burial site is synonymous with Avalon, have (since that time) ensured both Avalon and Glastonbury are identified as the same location.

Glastonbury’s association with Joseph of Arimathea is primarily through the interpolations inserted into DA, the Insula Avallonis foretold in a prophecy by Melkin and an allusion in Robert de Boron’s Joseph d’Arimathie to the Vaus d’ Avaron. A fragment of Melkin’s work (i.e. the prophecy), was reproduced in John of Glastonbury’s Cronica sive antiquitates Glastoniensis ecclesie. Many scholars have followed Lagorio in thinking that Melkin’s prophecy is derived in essence as a composite, based on material derived from Robert de Boron’s Joseph d’ Arimathie which links Glastonbury by way of the Vaus d’Avaron.

I shall uncover that Glastonbury’s association with the name Avalon was manufactured by Henry Blois. The last known location of ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ concocted persona of a chivalric King Arthur was the Island of Avalon where he was taken grievously wounded. This has been accepted as Insula Pomorum, put forward as an alternative description or appellation to Avalon in the VM. Its synonymy with the island of Avalon as presented in HRB is confirmed in VM where the wounded Arthur is taken to the island
by Barinthus. As Watkin realises, this establishes Glastonbury as commensurate with Avalon as early as 1155.\textsuperscript{10}

The general acceptance of Arthur’s disinterment at Glastonbury is thought to be a fraudulent staging of the event by Henry de Sully and unconnected to Henry Blois. In fact, the disinterment stems from a polemic and propagandist strategy which was originally fostered by Henry Blois before his death by interpolating William of Malmesbury’s DA and by manufacturing the grave of Arthur. This view runs contrary to modern scholarship’s opinion which understands that any mention of Arthur in DA has been interpolated post Arthur’s disinterment in 1189-91.\textsuperscript{11} I shall adequately show that it was Henry Blois who planted the supposed bones of Arthur and the lock of Guinevere’s hair and fabricated the Leaden cross with its inscription. These were uncovered/ discovered twenty years after Henry Blois’ death in a manufactured grave between the \textit{piramides} in Glastonbury cemetery.

I will also cover the confusion regarding Yniswitrin as being another previous appellation of Glastonbury. This stems from propaganda found in Henry Blois’ impersonation of Caradoc in his concoction of the \textit{Life of Gildas}. This tract has direct repercussions on its relation to the 601 Charter mentioned by William of Malmesbury. It was driven by Henry Blois’ attempt to gain metropolitan status for the whole of South West England. I

\textsuperscript{10}Aelred Watkin. The Glastonbury Legends. P.17. \textit{If Avalon and the isle of apples are considered to be identical, and here again we are on the verge of identification of Avalon with Glastonbury}. Watkin has misunderstood that there is no transitional verge!!! The isle of Avalon appears in the First Variant in 1144 (not mentioned in the copy found at Bec related in EAW). William of Malmesbury died in 1143 and William had never mentioned the place or intoned that Glastonbury was synonymous with Ineswitrin in his \textit{Life of St Dunstan}, but Glastonbury’s assimilation of synonymy with Avalon was interpolated into DA by Henry Blois.

\textsuperscript{11}John Scott, The early history of Glastonbury. P.34. \textit{Finally we can be sure that all references to King Arthur must have been written after the purported discovery of his remains buried between the two pyramids in 1190-1}. This is the modern scholars view based mainly on Lagorio’s erroneous standpoint in that Arthuriana and Grail legend appeared at Glastonbury following the advent of continental Grail literature and \textit{a fortuitous convergence of factors}. Scott’s view, that any mention of Arthur in DA prior to the unearthing of his gravesite, could not have been interpolated before the event, does not hold true. There is ‘Caradoc’s’ association of Arthur to Glastonbury which stems from Henry Blois. Henry II died on 6 July 1189. If the date for the unearthing is correct in 1190-91, we should ask: how do we account for the reference to King Arthur in association with Glastonbury in a charter written by Henry II granting concessions to Glastonbury while still alive. Scholars need to recognise that Arthur was connected to Glastonbury by Henry Blois’ propaganda interpolated in DA long before Arthur’s disinterment. \textit{Carta Henrici Regis Secundi Filii Matildis Imperatrixis De Libertatibus Concessis Ecclesie Glaston}. Volume 1, P 186. The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury. Dom Aelred Watkin…… \textit{Baldredo, Ina, inclito Arthuro, Cuddredo et multis aliis regibus Christianis}....
shall also cover why the etymology concerning Ineswitrin is an additional last paragraph to a book already fraudulently written by Henry Blois who impersonated Caradoc of Llancarfan. The *Life of Gildas*’ first aim in composition was to associate King Arthur and Gildas with Glastonbury. It was written c.1139-40. Its additional last paragraph (added in 1144) was composed to contrive a synonymy between Glastonbury and Ineswitrin.

What I intend to show is that Glastonbury’s myth of the Grail stems from Melkin’s prophecy. Grail literature was initially instigated by Henry Blois on the continent in the guise of Master Blihis. The Melkin prophecy portends the discovery of Joseph of Arimathea’s body in the future. It is this prophecy which speaks of the *duo fassula* which has associated the ‘cruets’ and Grail with Glastonbury. The *duo fassula* is said by Melkin to be buried along with Joseph of Arimathea in *Insula Avallonis*. At the end of this volume there is ample evidence provided to show that the Prophecy of Melkin existed at the time Henry Blois was Abbot of Glastonbury. I also show that the Melkin prophecy is a genuine encrypted document and it acted as the inspirational template for the prime archetype of the Grail in the *sang réal*.

After the great fire at Glastonbury in 1184 there was a loss of many books, but the providential find of Arthur’s remains later in 1189-91 has forevermore provided the erroneous association of Glastonbury with the fictitious Isle of Avalon and thereafter Joseph of Arimathea with the Grail at Glastonbury.

Analysis of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s HRB has shown that virtually every episode, place or person can be linked by a previous association. ‘Geoffrey’s’ inspiration and his natural gift of inventiveness in the narrative storyline and in the characters he unfolds, in nearly every case, has a provenance and a purport to carry forward his pseudo-history. His work is based upon sources from which he has provided an echo of history. ‘Geoffrey’s’ attempt at providing a credible provenance for his HRB is insincere as he feigns to be translating the words of a previous writer from the British tongue into Latin or from a book *ex Britannia*.

Besides the episode which concerns King Lear,¹² which might be one of the few tales of the HRB which is thought to be entirely of ‘Geoffrey’s’ own

---

¹²The template for Henry Blois inspiration for the story of King Lear may well be based upon Henry’s father.
invention, there is an underlying framework which attempts to parallel events portrayed in older sources i.e. extant British annals.

Previous commentators on the existence of ‘Geoffrey’s ancient book seem undecided or unconvinced on the ancient book’s existence. ‘Geoffrey’ avows the historical substance for his HRB comes from this ancient ex Britannia book procured from the Archdeacon of Oxford wherein it supposedly bears witness to an Island called Avalon. One aim of this present work is to uncover the provenance of the Island of Avalon. The *Insula Avallonis* cited in Melkin’s prophecy is a real location (which was once known as Ineswitrin). The island is unconnected with King Arthur except through the authorship of HRB by Henry Blois. This goal will be achieved when the reader is fully appraised that Geoffrey of Monmouth did not exist and that he was a fabricated persona invented by Henry Blois, the bishop of Winchester and abbot of Glastonbury.

What appears from the outset is that ‘Geoffrey’s’ basis for writing the HRB is to provide a history about the Britons: ‘and it now remains for me to tell how they came and from where and this will be made clear in the following’. We shall cover the formation and development of the original Primary Historia found at Bec from an already created pseudo-history intended for Henry Blois’ Uncle Henry 1st and the Empress Matilda. To this original draft episodes of the Chivalric Arthur were added in 1137-8. ‘Geoffrey’s’ inspirational muses weave scenarios evidently drawn or formatted on previous works of known classical writers. Henry Blois as the author of HRB uses ancient insular annals as well as contemporary historian’s work as source material to anchor his epic in what may be termed a ‘conflated fabulation of history’. People, places, events, and legend, are made to seem as a genuine historical account.

Henry Blois’ genius also capitalises on the sentiment of the insular and Breton populace and its bravado regarding an Arthur which Henry transposes his Norman values upon..... to become the ‘Chivalric King Arthur’. There has never been a trace of the ancient book which ‘Geoffrey’ refers to or reference to whom may have authored it because it simply did not exist. Even the Gaimar epilogue which confirms the existence of such a book is part of Henry Blois’ deception.

Henry, writing as Geoffrey of Monmouth, supposedly cautions three ‘contemporary’ historians, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon and Caradoc of Llancarfan that his history is more complete by possession
of the source book. We shall cover Henry Blois’ impersonation of Caradoc of Llancarfan, but it was after Caradoc’s death when Henry wrote the life of Gildas. We will see how that manuscript inter-relates to the engravings found on the Modena Archivolt known to portray the ‘kidnap of Guinevere’. Although Gildas’s De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae\textsuperscript{13} does not mention Arthur, the bogus life of Gildas in effect establishes a relationship in antiquity between Arthur and Gildas through the episode concerning King Melvas at Glastonbury. We shall uncover that Henry Blois’ assertion that Caradoc is the contemporary of ‘Geoffrey’ in the colophon which mentions the three historians is purposeful misdirection. This colophon was inserted into some manuscripts of HRB post 1157 after Huntingdon’s death.

It will be shown in this present work that the device which has caused confusion amongst scholars is the use of retro-dating employed by Henry Blois, specifically employing the names of dedicatees and authors. Thus many of the previous conclusions about the composition and dating of HRB will need to be reassessed. ‘Back dating’ is a ‘primary device’ employed by Henry Blois. It is used by Henry Blois on several occasions to distance himself from the authorship of several works by time and by association.

Henry interpolates much of William of Malmesbury’s ‘Enquiry into the Antiquity of the Church of Glastonbury’ (DA) by composing most of the first 34 chapters of that book himself. After William’s death, we can also witness other interpolations in the C and B versions of William’s GR3. The tampering with these manuscripts is the root cause of much of the confusion which I hope to clear up satisfactorily.

Henry Blois also spends considerable effort to convince us that the patchwork compilation of the Historia Brittonum ascribed to Nennius (who may have been only a reviser, consolidator or an interpolator)\textsuperscript{14} is in fact the work of Gildas. The point of this is to convince posterity that Gildas wrote concerning Arthur.... which we know he did not! The HRB in effect attempts to persuade us that Nennius’s account is written by Gildas because it is the only pre-twelfth century annal which evidences Arthur apart from a few cursory references in a few accounts mentioned in some tracts

\textsuperscript{13}Gildas relates heavily to biblical sources and looks on the British as descendants of the Israelites, but his works generally bemoan the state of the British nation through the invasions and internal division of the Britons.

\textsuperscript{14}However, Grandsen’s Historical Writing in England p.6 does point out stylistic unity and comment upon the preface of Historia Brittonum which accuses the Britons of slothfully neglecting their past and concludes there is no earlier pre-cursor to the Historia from which it might be compiled.
concerning the lives of saints\textsuperscript{15} and the \textit{Annales Cambriae}. The \textit{life of St Cadoc} upon which Henry concocted his \textit{Life of Gildas} is the prime example. The \textit{life of Gildas} establishes a bogus association that Gildas is connected to Glastonbury and is partly the reason for Henry's invention of the \textit{Life of Gildas}. Gildas’ association with Glastonbury is only otherwise established by what Henry Blois has written in his interpolation of William of Malmesbury’s GR3 and expanded upon in chapter 7 of DA. However, the \textit{Life of Gildas} preceded the first interpolations into DA which were made in 1144. Secondary additions to DA which include the St Patrick charter were added c.1149. We shall also see a tertiary set of additions interpolated into DA c.1160-1170 which incorporate what I have termed Henry Blois’ second agenda.

Researchers have attempted to ascertain ‘Geoffrey’s’ underlying reason for writing the HRB apart from that stated by ‘Geoffrey’. Scholars have been duped into believing that ‘Geoffrey’ was an aspiring cleric seeking patronage and who professes his reason for writing was that he could find no previous writer who had given an adequate account of British history. The real reasons are multiple and set out further on. They include an account of how the composition of HRB evolved from an unfinished original ‘faux-history’ destined for the Empress Matilda pre-1134 which was then spliced together with additional material which became the epic concerning King Arthur written in 1137-8. This became what I have termed the \textit{Primary Historia}. The \textit{Primary Historia} is what Huntingdon witnessed at Bec which was then developed into the First Variant and then to one of the most influential books ever written; the Vulgate HRB. The present assessment among commentators is the assumption that the First Variant post dated the Vulgate version. This view is entirely erroneous.

Virtually nothing is known of Geoffrey of Monmouth, but the little that is known has provided a base for scholarship to assume he was a real historical person. Beginning with such a false premise has led to a maze of

\textsuperscript{15} This mention of Arthur as a named persona in history rebuts the suggestion of Ashe and Padel in assuming that there is a mix up in tradition between Riotamus and Arthur. However, the suggestion that Riotamus’s military expedition to the Continent is the inspiration for the Continental campaign which ‘Geoffrey’ ascribes to Arthur is a very plausible explanation in how Henry Blois (impersonating Geoffrey) allowed himself to stray from what is reliably known in history with the conflation of Riotamus’s expedition. O.J.Padel correctly points out: \textit{But it is a long way from this to supposing that Riotamus was the actual prototype of the legendary Arthur. As already mentioned, Arthur was famed in Brittonic folklore and local legend before Geoffrey wrote, and was the inspiration for his figure.}
misinformation concerning Glastonbury and events surrounding King Arthur’s disinterment. It has also led to the misunderstanding of the inspiration behind the Grail material. As the reader will discover, the basis for the events regarding Joseph of Arimathea in Britain and the true substance of what became known as the Grail in association with Joseph are based on genuine historical events.

It is a strange circumstance considering the amount written about Geoffrey of Monmouth and his HRB that we have such flimsy biographical details. As far as I know only two commentators\(^\text{16}\) have questioned the reality of the persona of Galfridus Arthur. ‘Geoffrey’ is only grounded in historical reality by his supposed witness to a few charters and the dubious fact that he became Bishop of St. Asaph and once stood in front of Theobald of Bec to be ordained.

These fictitious details will be shown to have been concocted by Henry Blois with the intention of secreting his authorship of what eventually became a contentious book; especially once the updated prophecies of Merlin were added to it. At this time Galfridus Artur became known by his later appellation Geoffrey of Monmouth. Orderic’s reference to the prophecies and Robert of Torigni’s reference to the Bishop of Asaph also have augmented the belief by commentators that ‘Geoffrey’ actually existed. These references will be dealt with in the appropriate place in this expose.

All other reference to Geoffrey is derived from comment about his work regarding the HRB or VM or from spurious personal details divulged by Henry Blois or from the Gwentian Brut. The Brut y Tywysogion records Geoffrey’s death in 1154-5, but this annal serves as a continuation of Geoffrey’s HRB and is definitively mis-directional regarding his other details. The Brut y Tywysogion has survived as several Welsh translations of an original Latin version, which has not itself survived. However, we will see that the original version was a chronicle written by Caradoc of Llancarfan in Latin and Henry Blois interpolated it with propaganda about ‘Geoffrey’.

As we progress we will understand that the original annal which Caradoc wrote pre-date’s the HRB and is the main reason why Henry Blois ends his HRB at the point where Caradoc starts his history. The colophon in

\(^{16}\) De Buck in Acta SS, LVII,94, and D.R. Thomas, Hist. Diocese of St Asaph Oswestry vol I, 33,214 regarding Geoffrey’s episcopate and biography
some versions of HRB mentioning Caradoc’s name is meant to misdirect; creating the sense that Caradoc is alive (along with Huntingdon and Malmesbury) and we are led to believe he is ‘Geoffrey’s’ contemporary who took up the mantle of bringing Geoffrey’s history up to date. I will show that this colophon was written after 1155.

Henry Blois who had many Welsh monks under his auspices has implanted material which substantiates his HRB in the *Book of Llandaff*. Many of the places like *Fluvium Periron* which no-one has definitively located, just happens to be given location in the *Book of Llandaff*. The subject of *Periron* is interesting concerning Henry Blois and will be discussed during an examination of why John of Cornwall’s edition of the Merlin prophesies locates *Periron* at Tintagel. Also, I will elucidate why the Merlin prophecies, although appearing to speak about similar subjects, vary in sense between the versions of JC, VM, and the Merlin prophecies found in Vulgate HRB.

Henry Blois himself publicized ‘Geoffrey’s’ death and is recorded in the *Brut y Tywysogion* (1154). We can account for Robert of Torigni’s reference to the bishop of Asaph as having come from Henry Blois himself at a meeting in Mont St Michel in 1155. The *Gwentian Brut* adds a number of details about the later period of ‘Geoffrey’s’ life, from his being ordained as bishop onwards. None of these details have any substance. It states that Geoffrey died in Llandaff and was buried there, but there is no grave site. Also, it names him a foster son of Uchtryd, archbishop of Llandaff and asserts that Geoffrey taught at, and served as archdeacon of St. Teilo in Llandaff. ‘Geoffrey’s’ death is certainly Henry Blois’ providentially timed invention as Henry II came to the throne as will become clear later.

Admittedly, other material could be accountable to the aggrandising of Llandaff by Welshmen at a later date due to ‘Geoffrey’s’ renown. His personal disclosures like ‘*pudibindus Brito*’ found in some texts are all part of the illusion that ‘Geoffrey’ could not be Norman. There is simply no contemporary who provides a personal detail of a meeting with him in the flesh; except that evidence which I will show has been provided and planted by Henry Blois.... most obviously as the bishop of Asaph on the *Treaty of Winchester*; (which itself was put together and the terms drawn up by Henry Blois), which brought the Anarchy to an end.

Before I can begin to untangle a spurious tradition at Glastonbury later on, it is necessary firstly to leave the reader in no doubt that the man we
think of as Geoffrey of Monmouth is in fact Henry Blois. After this is established beyond doubt or speculation by analysing the HRB and the *Vita Merlini*, we can then move on to the methods employed and the reasoning’s behind such a deception. The most difficult task for me is to convince the reader that Geoffrey of Monmouth is Henry Blois in the shortest and quickest way possible, because there is so much other material to cover after that to come to a solution of the Matter of Britain.

My task is made harder by the fact that the premise that Geoffrey existed, as a real living person, is so entrenched in commentator’s minds. Once HRB is understood as having been authored by Henry Blois, the evidence falls into place as certain other manuscripts are discussed. I shall establish his deception through a brief analysis of the HRB prophecies and those found in *Vita Merlini*.17

Afterward having shown the prophecies of Merlin were concocted from the mind of Henry Blois, it is just a short step to proving common authorship of the *faux*-history making up the rest of HRB. I shall then proceed to analyse the *Gesta Stephani* so that the reader is in no doubt that both HRB and GS were written by Henry Blois. We can then move swiftly through the tangible material in HRB regarding the continental battle scene in Autun (in the region of Blois) etc.... understanding that Henry is the author. The rest of the material authored by Henry Blois, will become obvious as the deception unfolds.

I will demonstrate the subtlety of his various devices and show how a different ploy in each tract is used to prevent his authorship being discovered. Different methods of propagating his agenda enabled him to remain undiscovered. Henry Blois interpolates corroborations into other texts authored previously by other writers to add to his fabricated history of the Britons. After discussing the Merlin prophecies, VM and the GS, I will explain exactly how Henry went about creating Geoffrey’s persona and show that the Vulgate HRB and the updated Merlin prophecies were not brought together until 1155. This has been achieved by Henry Blois grafting icons and personages (in VM especially) from Welsh prophetic material while looking backwards in time to past history and linking retrospectively...

---

17 Any reader wishing to follow the trail of the prophecies should read the chapter on John of Cornwall because this has the most certain evidence that Henry Blois wrote that Version. However I have left that until last so that it explains the progression of the prophecies which the reader will appreciate after having covered much other material.
to events recorded in insular annals of the Britons. This is how Henry Blois affects the ‘skimble skamble’ nature of the murky seeings and utterings of a Dark Age prognosticator called Merlin.

There are many evidences to take into account concerning ‘Geoffrey’s’ work. Orderic’s testimony needs to be considered along with Henry of Huntingdon’s précis of what I have termed the *Primary Historia*. Also, we must look at Henry’s relationship with abbot Suger and also investigate John of Cornwall’s testimony regarding the prophecies of Merlin. Robert of Torigni’s testimony regarding the Bishop of Asaph will also be investigated. Also, Alfred of Beverley’s recycled account of Geoffrey’s work. All of this will be dealt with in the appropriate places in this exposé.

The supposed ‘Geoffrey’ had already completed his *Primary Historia* by the latter half of 1138, but we also will discover that Merlin prophecies existed in an incomplete emerging form c.1139-46 which I have termed the *Libellus Merlini*. It was the political intent behind these prophecies in 1155 that were Henry’s crafty agenda and their production was inspired by Cicero’s *De Divinatione*.

Henry Blois was a genius, but he was a treacherous and deceitful Machiavellian character with evolving views toward Rome and religion. He was also sagacious, persuasive and an eloquent orator with finely tuned diplomatic skills and political savvy. It is this image which is partly understood by historians. I hope to expose to the reader another side of his complexity which is secreted in his subtle skill as an author. It should not be forgotten that Henry Blois was known as a scholar, a man who constantly wrote yet ostensibly left no writing of any worth as a legacy. Yet Henry Blois clearly thought his legacy would be greater than that of Cicero.

How was this at all going to be possible? Cicero’s influence on the Latin Language was so immense. It is said that "the influence of Cicero upon the history of European literature and ideas greatly exceeds that of any other prose writer in any language". Well, I disagree because Henry’s achievements are greater than those of Cicero in that we are still in the twenty first century trying to make sense of his legacy. The difference is that Cicero spoke the truth and Henry Blois has left us web of deceit and lies but still keeps us entertained.
Chapter 1

Who was the real Henry Blois?

A remarkable fact about Henry Blois is that relative to the power he held, so little is known of him. Characters such as Henry have usually left behind letters such as those of Gilbert Foliot;\textsuperscript{18} or historians have written biographies about them. Where Henry is concerned there is a dearth of personal anecdotes from which to compose a portrait of who he really was.\textsuperscript{19} However, from what is gleaned from various accounts he was well educated, complex and courageous. He was vain and maintained a regal veneer ostensibly to those he wished to oppose and was also conscious of his pedigree. He started out as an ardent believer in God having been brought up an oblate at Clugny and recognised God’s omnipotent force. Unfortunately, many of his endeavours were clandestine, so he did not always advocate the truth. He was a prime example of the nobili ecclesiastici destined for a high position in the church, but these were not always churchmen of their own volition. One side of his character surely believed, like his contemporaries, that all events transpired by divine consequence (his oratorical speeches reflect this) along with judgements pronounced about his brother in GS. He was an industrious builder and employer and benevolent to most under his auspices. However, he was manipulative and a schemer and a pragmatist. He was conscientious in some respects, compassionate, yet judgemental and wilful. Henry Blois was a split persona and a contradiction, never openly malicious, but his dark

\textsuperscript{18} It is not by accident that no letters exist for Henry Blois as he would purposefully have disposed of all the evidence which might have betrayed his viewpoints which we now find in his work under pseudonyms. Ironically, Knowles p.289, while on the subject of Henry Blois’ lack of letters says that they are ‘the best mirror of a man’s character and mind and motives whether he be a Cicero or a Bernard’. The irony is that Henry left no letters and looked upon himself as superseding Cicero in craft (which in effect he has attained), albeit under secreted authorship.

\textsuperscript{19} Two biographies on Henry exist. Lena Voss, Heinrich von Blois and Michael R. Davis’ Henry of Blois.
side was malign. The fact most important to this exposé is that he was a fabricator of intricately worked tales and worst of all, he was a liar.

Had Henry not lived, there would be no chivalric King Arthur nor Grail literature, but most importantly the location of Joseph of Arimathea’s burial site would be lost to the present era. Henry Blois was an able administrator and knew the value of cultivating a healthy pilgrim trade to both Glastonbury and Winchester by the appropriation of saint’s relics. Henry understood how to utilise the gullibility and superstitions of the medieval mind. Henry translated the relics of the Anglo Saxon saints of Birinus and Birstan, Haeddi and Aelfneah into the new Norman cathedral at Winchester.

Oddly enough, the ‘Holy Hole’ dug so that pilgrims could get close to St Swithun was foreseen as a prophecy by Merlin and was obviously intended as a work by Henry Blois when the late version of the prophecies were completed in 1155. The high water table under the New Minster caused several relics to be moved at the time as related by prior Robert of Winchester. Adam of Damerham relates many of the gifts donated to Glastonbury by Henry and his ‘gifts to God’ which he refers to on his Meusan plates were artful objects of value. Henry loved art and precious objects.... and there is a blatant contradiction in several reports of his character. On the one hand his avarice is recorded and on the other his clear generosity in the donation of precious artefacts is demonstrated. Henry understood the power of religious objects, but it seems obvious he invented an erroneous provenance and bogus history for many of the relics he produced. The most outrageous was some of the blessed Mary’s milk and some of her hair enclosed in a lion made of crystal.20 The most ingenious, which we shall cover in the chapter on the DA, is his miraculous find of the Sapphire which became part of an altar he had had constructed. Henry Blois’ imagination and unabashed willingness to invent, (even often what might seem blasphemous anecdotes), is the main subject matter of this present work. But, it is how he gets away with these blatant lies and also reconciles them to an obvious conscience, which is the most interesting part of his character and personality. It is as if there is a young cloistered and devout monk paired in the same body with a vain and manipulative...

---

20 John of Glastonbury in his Cronica ch.9, when mentioning Mary’s milk also says a crystal cross which the Blessed Virgin brought to the Glorious King Arthur must also be derived from some propaganda put out by Henry Blois.
egomaniac. Huntingdon recognised this duality and referred to him as a ‘monster’.

The intriguing part of Henry's character is how he was able to separate this duality of character in public life. The respect he maintained by most was partly comprised of deference to his aristocratic breeding but nearly all recognised his great intelligence. As a bishop, his word would have been respected and taken as truthful as long as the lies contained in his secret authorial works were never equated with him. It is plainly seen in Malmesbury's HN that Henry could hold an audience on a grand scale and used his oratorical skill. But some like William of Malmesbury as time went on, became wise to his guile. Naked men on dragons, as portrayed in the Merlin prophecies, clearly demonstrates there is no limitation to his muses. However, there are instances of the crossover of these two personalities where impossible stories, i.e. lies, related by him, have been believed as credible because of his status.... and these stories are often portrayed as miraculous. Henry loved the miraculous to awe his readers or listeners and hid behind the protection of respectability which the church afforded.

What little is known of Henry Blois is incidental and misunderstood and no clear picture of his complex character is understood until one can appreciate more about him from the works he left behind. Differences of opinion given in the few passages that mention his name by contemporary historians reflect the change of disposition he underwent from a scholarly youth; maturing and enduring the trials of conscience and temptations of power.... until the resignation of the loss of his power in 1158. From that point onward he fostered the image of a venerable churchman and statesman, yet it was in this period he instigated the initial stories of the Grail. Strangely, a point not mentioned by commentators, is Henry’s vanity which he had inherited from his father. His father at the siege of Antioch in a letter to Adela his wife had inflated his own importance and in William of Malmesbury’s first edition of GR, Stephen count of Blois is accused of

21 One such example is where John of Hexam relates what he has heard: We have learnt from a truthful source that as people were hearing mass one day at Windsor, a light had shone into the interior of the church. In astonishment, some of the men went outside and looking up saw an unusual star shining in the sky. Returning to the church, they saw that the light from the stellar rays was beaming inside. One wonder was followed by another. Many saw that the cross on the altar was moving from right to left and left to right in a manner of people in distress. This happened three times. Then for almost half an hour the whole cross moved and was bathed in pouring sweat before resuming its former state....I have learnt that Bishop Henry of Winchester narrated this story.
fleeing secretly using lies to turn back new arrivals.\textsuperscript{22} This was written before William met Henry Blois. William of Malmesbury was much older and it did not take him long to realise the temerity of the young Henry as shall become evident in the contention over Eadmer’s letter to the ‘youth’ of Glastonbury.

When William of Malmesbury was employed by the monks of Glastonbury and eventually presented the DA to Henry Blois c.1134, the dedicatory prologue has only commendations for Henry. After the usurpation of the English crown by King Stephen and Henry’s part in this affair, the HN\textsuperscript{23} portrays William’s change of opinion and feelings toward the Bishop of Winchester. William’s slight toward Henry’s father\textsuperscript{24} and the deference in which Henry held William (who thought of himself the successor and equal of the Saxon Bede) also explains why Henry has no qualms interpolating William’s DA to support his agendas after William’s death. Henry Blois’ primary and secondary agendas are elucidated later in this investigation in the chapters concerning William’s GR and DA.

Henry Blois was of noble blood, the Grandson of William the Conqueror through his mother Adela of Normandy; ‘a powerful woman with a reputation for her worldly influence’.\textsuperscript{25} Adela’s mother was Matilda of Flanders. Henry Blois’ father was Stephen Henry, Count of Blois, Count of Chartres, and also accounted, Stephen II Count of Troyes. Henry’s parents’ marriage was an arranged match by Adela’s father William the Conqueror. Henry had two elder brothers of note, Theobald and Stephen. William the eldest brother does not feature on the historical stage because of mental disabilities, but Henry also had sisters. His elder brother William had a son Henry de Sully, Abbot of Fécamp who plays a part later in this expose and also his sister and brother’s sons have a bearing on the propagation of the Grail literature. Henry’s brother Theobald had sons who were married to Marie of France and her sister Alix. This relationship was used as a conduit in the propagation of Grail literature at the Court of Champagne. It is a stupidity to think that the person who wrote The Lais of Marie de France\textsuperscript{26} is any other than Marie of Champagne, but we shall get to her later

\textsuperscript{22} William of Malmesbury GR. Vol I P635. Mynors, Winterbottom, Thompson.
\textsuperscript{23} William of Malmesbury’s Historia Novella current until 1143 when he died.
\textsuperscript{24} Henry’s father died in the Crusade at Razes when Henry was about two years of age.
\textsuperscript{25} William of Malmesbury GR. Vol I P505. Mynors, Winterbottom, Thompson.
\textsuperscript{26} Marie of France is second to ‘Wace’ and Robert to mention the ‘table roûnd’ so one could assume is part of Henry’s family circle. See Appendix 36
Henry was born in 1098/9 and brought up at the Abbey of Clugny in Burgundy probably from around the age of 10 years old. Here, he led a cloistered life and received an extremely good education and by all accounts was highly intelligent. He was widely read in both the Greek and Latin writers as becomes evident as the composer of HRB. He would have had access to a vast library from which his education prospered and would have studied the *Trivium*, of which ostensibly, he was an exemplary living product; a virtuous, knowledgeable, and eloquent person. The study of grammar, rhetoric, logic, poetry, history, and ethics were the core liberal arts. Henry was schooled in theology and had interests in philosophy and the writers of the ancient world, many of whose writings must have existed in the Library at Clugny.

From the source material used in HRB, I suspect that Henry may have had a photographic memory to some extent. However, Glastonbury also had a vast library at the time the bulk of the pseudo-history was being composed. Peter the venerable was Henry’s mother’s friend and became much like a mentor to Henry. It can be seen by letters between Henry and Peter that they fell out over differences.27 I have a strong feeling (but there is no evidence) that this cooling of relations happened when the power of Legate went to Henry’s head. However, returning from Rome in 1149, after his appeal to the pope to grant him metropolitan status for Western England, he lent Clugny abbey 1000 ounces of gold and 500 ounces to repair a Golden Cross…. and then later, while in self-imposed exile, bailed out again the abbey at Clugny.

From a noble family, Henry understood from reading the chronicles of the ancient world, the importance of History and the provenance it provides for races and nations. Henry is very conscious of his place in history and how posterity will perceive him…. as is evident in GS. He vainly wishes to be remembered well in posterity. Adam of Damerham says Henry made provision at Glastonbury that *festivals might be observed with more alacrity and his own name (alive or dead) more gratefully remembered.*

The *Bibliotheca Cluniacencis* relates that *this Henry, Bishop of Winchester, had formerly been a scholar and then a monk in this monastery of Cluny. The*

---

27 The letters of Peter the Venerable, Giles Constable: *Whereupon while I thought a mutual love which we had for one another was in a small space of time hurt, I was unable to disguise, so that not to cure the same, I would yield the antidotes of many words.*
Cluniac movement was the largest religious force in Europe second to the papacy before its decline in power at the rise of the Cistercians. To Henry, the Cluniac reforms and views were a part of his way of life. He had regard for the autonomy of the Church against the material influences of the state and the corruption of simony. I believe that Henry envisaged a partnership with his brother Stephen, governing England, church and state. However, as history tells, events evolved a different relationship between them after 1138 in the electing of Theobald of Bec as archbishop of Canterbury. The Cluniac reforms were a series of changes taking place in medieval monasticism which focused on restoring the traditional monastic life, encouraging art, education and caring for the poor. The driving force behind the reforms was an action against corruption within the church, particularly preventing simony and the acceptance of concubines. At the same time the Papacy wished to gain control of all clergy and wished to stop the investiture of bishops by secular rulers. The attempt at reform was to reinforce the rule of St. Benedict which enabled each monastic institution to choose its own abbot. The feudal system of lords granting lands to religious institutions and providing protection had bred corruption and ultimately resulted in a negative secular influence over religious houses across Europe and Britain. The wealth of the church and monastic institutions grew, so too did their power through bequeathals; while hereditary barons became envious of their increasing power. This had extenuated to rulers like Henry Ist and King Stephen delaying the appointment of bishops while reaping the reward in the interim. They would reward lucrative Sees and monastic holdings to their favoured advisors or relations to protect their interests.

The real cause of the Anarchy during Stephen’s reign was caused by Henry Blois’ organized usurpation of the Empress Matilda’s throne by Stephen. However, it was also a consequence of the baron’s allegiances who wished to counter the growing power of the clerics of these landed religious institutions and their aristocratic Bishops. If Henry Blois had not installed his brother on the throne, squabbles over allegiances and power would never have culminated in the Anarchy, the Civil war in England and Normandy between 1135 and 1153.

Thus, in contravention to Cluniac values, Henry Blois was elected to be abbot of Glastonbury by his Uncle King Henry Ist. It is not clear exactly if Henry came directly to Glastonbury from Cluny in 1126 or if he had spent time with his uncle in Normandy with his brother Stephen. There are
rumours that he had spent time in Bermondsey as Abbot or had even been assigned to oversee the building of a Monastery at Montacute which had been planned by his uncle. Once Henry had been elected bishop of Winchester, he became a Knight Bishop and he supplied knights to his uncle from Glastonbury and from Winchester and built a network of castles.

His knowledge of fortification and siege warfare and interest in architectural battlements is evident in the GS and was probably established by reading classical literature on wars fought in the ancient world and through what he had learnt by experience. In the *Red Book of the Exchequer* it lists Henry of Blois as Prior of Montacute. Montacute at this era was a possession of Glastonbury. It may well be that plans for a new religious house were in place which were subsequently shelved, but this is conjecture. Henry’s connection with Montacute will be discussed later, regarding his authorship of *De Inventione* concerning Waltham. Father William Good stated that Joseph’s body was most “carefully hidden” on a hill near Montacute. I will discuss this later as it pertains to knowledge encoded in Melkin’s Prophecy which most scholars have misguidedly determined as a thirteenth/early fourteenth century fabrication. Abbot Seffrid’s elevation to Bishop of Chichester left Glastonbury vacant and led to Henry’s appointment to abbot of Glastonbury by his uncle Henry Ist.

I hope not to labour the reader with historical context, but it is necessary to understand more of Henry Blois’ background if we are to recognise him as the author of the HRB under the pseudonym of Geoffrey of Monmouth. So, briefly, William Duke of Normandy (Henry’s grandfather) had invaded Britain and defeated Harold at Hastings in 1066 and was later crowned King at Westminster (the first of the Norman kings of Western England). William, subduing rebellion from relations in Normandy and the Capetian King Philip was injured after attacking the city of Mantes where his horse had stumbled.

William of Malmesbury gives a descriptive account of how the corpulent William the Conqueror had ruptured his intestines on the pommel of his saddle and retired to Rouen with a ruptured gut.... and after

28 H. Hal. *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, vol 2, 752. In a passage ‘ex libro Abbatis de Feversham’, it is stated that Henry was prior of Montacute previous to his appointment as Abbot of Glastonbury. Lena Voss in her autobiography of Henry Blois is unaware of this fact. It is here, a pertinent event transpired concerning that which Father William Good had to say about Joseph of Arimathea’s burial place. This event also becomes relevant when discussing Henry’s composition of *De Inventione Sanctae Crucis Nostrae in Monte Acuto et De ductione ejusdem, apud Waltham*, see William Stubbs 1861 JH & J Parker.
five weeks in agony, he died. His body was then taken for burial to the abbey he had founded in Caen. The body had been squeezed into a coffin too small for him and with the obvious travel delay and the putrefying stomach gasses made worse by the rupture, the body had exploded during the funeral.

William the conqueror’s eldest son Robert Curthose inherited Normandy and his younger brother William Rufus became King of England. Their youngest brother Henry Beauclerc received five thousand pounds of silver and the three were in constant contention. Robert was stirring rebellion against William Rufus in England and William retaliating by invading Normandy taking Bayeux and Caen. Robert Curthose, in the end, financed his army for the crusade by pawning Normandy to his brother. While Robert was on crusade, William Rufus was killed by a rogue arrow in a supposed hunting accident. The younger brother, Henry Beauclerc, did not delay in taking possession of the throne to become Henry Ist of England.

When Robert returned from the crusade eventually, the two brothers met at the Battle of Tincbebray where Henry Beauclerc’s knights won a decisive victory, capturing Robert and imprisoning him until Robert’s death in Cardiff Castle in 1134.

King Henry Ist had united Normandy and England, but Robert Curthose had a legitimate son, William Clito, whose claims to the dukedom of Normandy led to several rebellions which continued until 1128. However, in 1120 after staying in Normandy for the summer and autumn, on November the 25th a dreadful catastrophe happened as many of the nobles were returning to England. King Henry Ist fleet lay in Barfleur Bay in the north of Normandy. The King had recently taken into his fleet a vessel known as the ‘White Ship’, into which many of the nobles, his heir apparent and his bastard son had boarded. Orderic Vitalis relates that abuses and drunken insults were shouted to the priests that had come to bless the voyage across the Channel from inebriated nobles. The port entrance is lined on both sides by lurking rocks and the ship foundered, drowning Prince William and many other English and Norman nobles.

King Henry’s only remaining legitimate heir to the throne was his daughter the Empress Matilda, by his wife Matilda of Scotland, the daughter of Malcolm III of Scotland. Matilda was the product of a political marriage uniting a conquered Anglo Saxon England with Scotland. In 1125 the Empress Matilda’s husband Henry V the Holy Roman Emperor died which
presented King Henry Ist with a solution for succession after losing his son in the white ship disaster who would have been his natural heir.

King Henry married his daughter the Empress Matilda to Geoffrey V, Count of Anjou, in a union which he hoped would produce a male heir and continue the dynasty. King Henry was nervous about the barons accepting a woman as his heir after his death. He made them swear fealty to the Empress Matilda as the prospective heir on more than one occasion since the white ship disaster on 25 November 1120. These unfortunate set of circumstances would lead to the turmoil that was later termed by historians: the Anarchy. Matilda or Empress Maud, as she is otherwise known, had three sons by Geoffrey of Anjou, the eldest of whom eventually became King Henry II of England upon the death of King Stephen in 1154.

Upon the death of King Henry Ist on December 1st 1135, the throne was usurped by Matilda’s cousin, the said Stephen of Blois organised by the Machiavellian manoeuvrings of our Henry Blois, Bishop of Winchester. Given the pervading attitude to women on the throne, it may be that Henry Blois and Stephen had previously discussed such an action. Stephen was certainly swift in his travel to England to claim the throne whilst Matilda was in Normandy. Matilda had just realized she was pregnant again and after her previous near death experience in childbirth, she was reluctant to travel by sea to be crowned in England. She assumed her right of heritage was guaranteed, but there were already apparently rumours that nobles in France were planning to appoint Theobald to the throne, Henry Blois’ other elder brother. However, Stephen beat both Matilda and Theobald and was crowned with the help of his younger brother Henry Blois within three weeks of King Henry Ist death.

Matilda was at Argentan\textsuperscript{29} in Normandy, where she gave birth to her third son William on 22 July 1136, after Stephen had been crowned. There was little or no precedent for a woman to rule at the time which made it more readily acceptable by the nobility to accept Stephen as the alternative heir. Matilda was half-sister to the bastard born Robert, Duke of Gloucester, one of many of King Henry’s illegitimate offspring, who, reluctantly appeared and paid homage to King Stephen at court. He made a pretence of loyalty to the King for a short while, but eventually left for Normandy to

\textsuperscript{29}Geoffrey and Matilda had marched into southern Normandy and seized a number of key castles around Argentan that had formed Matilda's disputed dowry and those had fought on the side of rebels in 1135.
join his sister Matilda. When they returned to England in 1138, turmoil across Britain ensued as the barons sided by loyalty to Matilda and the Angevin cause or to King Stephen. King Stephen had paid vast amounts from the treasury at Winchester soon after his crowning to win the barons’ support and fealty.... and to keep them from defecting.

Before Henry Blois joined Clugny, his father was away on Crusade and his mother was left to manage the family affairs and estates in the region of Blois in his absence. The Blois region of France was considerable incorporating Clugny, Blois, Chartres, Langres, Avallon, Autun, Troyes etc. a large swathe of Burgundy. Henry Blois having witnessed a strong and competent mother carry on the affairs of an absent crusading father would inure Henry more readily to the acceptance of a female rule which was posited by King Henry before his death.

Henry Blois was loyal to his uncle and the King conferred on him the bishopric of Winchester in 1129 seeing the ability of the young Henry and what he had achieved at Glastonbury. It may be speculated that Henry Blois had been in Normandy with his uncle in 1128 because he would seem to be the ‘someone’, (according to Henry of Huntingdon) who recounted the hereditary line of all the Kings of the Franks and their heritage from Troy to King Henry on one occasion in Normandy. I will discuss this later when I cover Henry of Huntingdon, but I would suggest the elevation to Winchester in 1129 was based upon Henry Blois having a close relationship with his uncle and having been with his brother Stephen while with King Henry Ist in Normandy.

King Henry was known to be fond of both Stephen and Henry Blois. His Nephew at Glastonbury was responsible for the provision of Knights for the King’s service. It is with this in mind, we can understand Henry Blois’ wish to please his uncle and the prospective Queen Matilda.

It is vital to understand the beginnings of the construction of HRB as Henry Blois envisaged writing a book on the History of the Kings (and Queens) of Britain and their heritage from Troy. What I am suggesting is that Henry Blois commenced a history of the Britons as a way to seek favour to the future queen. The entertaining pseudo-history intended for

---

30 See Image 1
31 As O. J Padel ponders: Another aspect is Geoffrey’s purpose in writing his work, and its overall structure: is it primarily about Arthur, although he occupies only the final portion of the work; or was it intended as an overall history of Britain, with Arthur merely its high point
Matilda remained unfinished, yet posited the Trojan custom of primogeniture demanding that *dignitas hereditatus* should go to the first born. As we shall cover in progression, it is only after Henry’s time in Wales in 1136 and the initial purpose of his intended book had become redundant, (in that his brother was now King); that Henry added to his initial creation, originally intended for his cousin and Uncle. The original format was to expose that throughout British history there had been Queens and Matilda was no different.

It was in Normandy in 1137-8 that the Arthuriad was then added to the pseudo-history which had already been composed between 1129 and 1134-5 but had not reached its initial purpose of design as King Henry II died. Three years later the *Primary Historia* is deposited at Bec. The composition had laid dormant a few years in the interim between 1135-37 until the Arthuriана was added in 1137-38 after Stephen had gained the throne and Henry Blois had been to Wales in 1136. Henry Blois was second in the power structure in all England. In 1137 Henry went to Normandy to deal with De Redvers and Matilda and in his spare hours in Normandy in 1137 and the early part of 1138, Henry’s muses were at work. It was in this period Henry Blois extended his initial polemically contrived pseudo-history and added the tale of the Chivalric Arthur (still not fully expanded to Vulgate proportions) to an already unfinished (temporarily shelved) pseudo-history which also aggrandised Gloucester the ducal house held by Henry I bastard and Matilda’s half brother. This became the edition I have termed the *Primary Historia* discovered at Bec in January 1139…. of which we only have a précis in the form of EAW. It is for this reason there are so many seeming inconsistencies amongst many storyline variations, which scholars of HRB have been at odds to explain.

We should view the inspiration for the beginnings of an embellished pseudo-history portraying an illustrious heritage from Troy as being

---

32 For Example, as I have mentioned, primogeniture posited as a Trojan custom. For inconsistency we should look at Mempricus and Malin, Marganus and Cunedagius, Ferreux and Porrex, which Tatlock puts down to thoughtless embellishment. The pseudo-history was initially composed as a book to be presented to the future Queen or King Henry I to be read at court as entertainment so that Barons would accept Matilda more readily since her younger brother, William Adelin had died in the *White Ship* disaster of 1120. Thus, we have a string of fictitious Queens presented in HRB, but primogeniture was not a consistent theme for the plan of HRB and was only really an essential feature of the initial pseudo-history. The fictitious Queens were absorbed in the soup of transition from pseudo-history to *Primary Historia*. Ultimately there was a change of use of the original pseudo-history as it became the *Primary Historia*.
composed in direct contrast with the dower GR of William of Malmesbury. William’s history bolstered the heritage of the Saxons but Henry had conceived of a way of ingratiating himself to the future queen and his uncle by writing a semi-historical book which went further back than any other insular historian had chronicled. By decorating it with illustrious queens and setting a precedent for an easier transition to a female on the throne, we now have a reason why ‘Geoffrey’ appears to introduce so many female rulers into his HRB.

Even though William of Malmesbury may have thought well of Henry, (which is debatable), Henry was ambivalent toward the predominantly Saxon historian. But, by having close contact with William at Glastonbury, Henry had realized that prior to Gildas’ era, there was a nearly blank canvas in insular history in the period where Roman annals had left off. If one felt inclined one could invent an account of history freely without being tripped up corroboratively by other works.... but, Henry’s method of construction in HRB is a master-class in conflation.

At the outset then, the initial composition of HRB was instigated as a ploy to impress and supply entertainment and curry favour. But, part of Henry’s artifice was to include in this book a precedent which showed that in Britain there had been many good and highly capable queens who had ruled in history prior to his Uncle’s daughter’s prospective reign. Henry Ist designated Matilda as heir in 1127 and the barons were made to swear fealty as I have said, some more than once.

The bulk of HRB (minus the Arthuriad) was the first intended purpose for the composition of what might be termed the ‘initial pseudo-historia’. But, as Henry Blois is the author of HRB it should be understood why a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ seemingly undertakes to help the English Kings in their effort to assert their independence of the Kings of France. Dukes of

---

33 Gildas states that ‘I shall not follow the writings of my own country, which (if there ever were any of them) have been consumed in the fires of the enemy.

34 Henry, writing as Geoffrey, sets out in the dedication of HRB that no one had given a good account of insular history. So often while turning over in my own mind the many themes which might be subject-matter of a book, my thoughts would fall upon the plan of writing a history of the Kings of Britain, and in my musings thereupon it seemed to me a marvel that, beyond such mention as Gildas and Bede have made of them in their luminous tracts, I could find nothing concerning the kings that had dwelt in Britain before the Incarnation of Christ, or even concerning Arthur and the many others that succeed him after the Incarnation.

It should not be forgotten though that this is a rationale given for Geoffrey having written the book as no dedications were attached to the Primary Historia at Bec. The point is that it still reflects Henry’s own view for the initial construction of the pseudo-history for Matilda.
Normandy had been Vassals to the French Kings. Although the Saxons are not well portrayed in HRB, we must not mix up what was intended to be written and read out in the court of a queen and what was actually written after Henry's brother became King and Matilda was no longer the intended goal of his endeavour. The Saxons as a whole are seen as the enemy, but as we shall understand, the seeming resentment against the Normans (in the later Merlin prophecies) is against Henry II himself because Henry Blois writes prophecies intended to cause sedition. How and why this occurs will also become apparent as we move to the evidence which shows categorically that 'Geoffrey of Monmouth' never existed.

Matilda was descended from West Saxon Kings, so a flattering glorious insular history was originally envisaged by Henry at the outset of writing. William of Malmesbury had written GR partly to flatter King Henry’s Queen Matilda and her illustrious West Saxon heritage and latterly also dedicated a copy of his GR to the Empress Matilda confirming her rightful place as inheritor to the throne. Henry had plans to out shine William’s GR by producing a book outdoing past and contemporary historians with interesting and entertaining content, fabricating what could never be verified.

The book’s testimony to female reigns throughout insular history was its partial purpose of invention and guarantee of success, while portraying the alluring and illustrious heritage stretching back to Troy. With the first-hand knowledge of Wales and its topography…. and Caerleon’s archaeological remains, gleaned on an excursion fighting the Welsh uprising in 1136….Henry was able to expand (with the Arthuriad) upon an already composed pseudo-history. We can speculate that this might have mentioned the Warlord Arthur as a fledgling Arthurian tale, given that the tales concerning Arthur to which Malmesbury briefly refers were current among the populace. However, the chivalric Arthurian epic found in the Primary-Historia was an addition after Henry Blois had been to Wales.35

The creation of a chivalric Briton based on the persona of the warlord Arthur, presented an interesting and entertaining read. The unpublished ‘initial pseudo-history’, originally destined for Matilda was now spliced onto

---

35 Unfortunately no chronicler makes a direct reference to Henry’s brief excursion into Wales and again unfortunately just as we are about to get a description of Wales from the author of GS the folios are missing. However, we shall see that the author of GS is Henry Blois and also he was at the defeat of the Welsh at Kidwelly.
an epic about Arthur in the year Henry was based in Normandy in 1137-8. Arthur’s crown wearing and feast days where foreign dignitaries attend are largely based upon his uncle’s costly feasts of splendid luxury at Whitsun, Christmas and Easter where foreign envoys could witness the brilliant company of Henry Blois’ Uncle.

King Henry in William of Malmesbury’s words *absorbed the honeyed sweet of books* and would have been the first to appreciate the ‘initial pseudo-history’ if he had lived long enough. King Henry had repeated from youth that a *King unlettered is a Donkey crowned*. There was certainly enough in HRB to please his scholarly uncle. What must be made clear to the reader about the evolution and transition of the *Primary Historia* discovered at Bec is that it still had further developments to go. It was definitively an altogether different book than the Vulgate version which modern scholars believe was the version found at Bec. As political situations in the life of Henry Blois changed, the book evolved, through the First Variant stage in 1144 to its completion as the Vulgate edition in 1155.... with its edition of updated prophecies.

The mention of many Queens in Briton is part of the reasoning behind much of the first part of the HRB; inventing a precedent for female rulers in the antiquity of the Britons. There is Guendoloena who had married Brutus’ son and she reigned 15 years. There was Cordeilla the daughter of Leir. Marcia succeeded her husband Guithelinus and there was the daughter of King Octavianus and lastly of course Helena. For obvious reasons Boudicca in Tacitus’s description of events could not be a part of Henry’s history bias in that she was defeated AD 60 or 61, by the Roman governor Gaius Suetonius Paulinus. Boudica led the Iceni as well as the Trinovantes and others in revolt and her daughter’s were raped. To think that ‘Geoffrey’ has not read Tacitus is unreal. ‘Geoffrey’ converts his Troia Nova into Trinovantum as an eponyn based on Tacitus.

Henry’s mother acted much like a queen in her own region. It was however, Margan and Cunedag in HRB who objected that Britain should be subject to the rule of a woman and so the sentiment against the Empress Matilda was not new. It was partly the reason that many of the Barons supported Stephen as patrimony not primogeniture was the norm. Boadicea was hardly a reigning queen and even though Henry Blois writing
as ‘Geoffrey’ cannot be seen to draw on Tacitus,\textsuperscript{36} it is likely that Henry will have read the account of Tacitus’s father in law in Britain...in his youth while Henry was in the library at Clugny. Henry was not about aggrandizing Roman achievements in Britain but was certainly conscious of what was in the Roman annals which recorded the invasions.

We can speculate that the Trojan ‘initial pseudo-history’ was started by Henry Blois at the time when William of Malmesbury was writing the history of Glastonbury Abbey when William’s GR had been completed.

However, everything did not go according to plan, as fortune turned against the two intended recipients of the book. King Henry Ist died and Matilda became Henry (and his brother Stephen’s) nemesis. Rather than let his authorial efforts go to waste, Henry finished his book adding the Arthuriana by inventing the Welsh court at the city of Legions.\textsuperscript{37} What must be understood and accepted by scholars is that there were no prophecies and there was no Merlin mentioned in the Primary Historia left at Bec in 1138. While King Stephen expended his efforts in the North, Henry was in Normandy.

At this time Henry Blois was expecting to become archbishop of Canterbury on his return. He may (later in life) have had a longer term vision of becoming Pope.\textsuperscript{38} Although the Primary Historia was intended in part to entertain; the history presented for the most part was fabricated within a broad chronological outline of known insular history.

It was certainly not conducive for a bishop to be witnessed embellishing tales and passing them off as history. It was thus prudent not to attach his name to the manuscript. Henry Blois signed off with the (unlikely) authorial name Galfridus Arturus as Henry of Huntingdon related in his letter to Warin. This will of course appear incredible to the entrenched scholar studying Geoffrey of Monmouth, especially since the evidence has been

\textsuperscript{36} There is not much in Tacitus which would concur with Henry’s set of events.

\textsuperscript{37} In Huntingdon’s letter to Warin, even though it is a précis of HRB, it seems odd that the very brief account covering all the Arthuriad.... only supplies the skeletal outline of the expanded form found in the First Variant and Vulgate HRB. We might expect a certain amount of expansion on Arthuriana in the period between the finalisation of the Primary Historia finished in 1138 and the appearance of the First Variant version published in 1144. It is not a certainty that the whole chivalric court ideal in an expanded form found in the Vulgate HRB was initially part of the Primary Historia....the original Historia Brittonum as Huntingdon referred to it. Other storyline details vary from EAW to First Variant, but these additions cannot be explained by Henry’s polemically motivated insertions such as the three Archbishops etc in the later First Variant.

\textsuperscript{38} Speculum, VI 222
ploughed over by many commentators in the past seeing no reason to deny his existence.

The one thing I would caution the reader upon is that at no point has deception and fraud on such a grand scale been suspected.... and thus the position and persona presented by Henry Blois concerning Geoffrey of Monmouth has never been contested. What I will show is that the flimsy biographical details could easily have been (and were) planted by a manipulative Henry Blois intent on hiding his authorship. But, by the works we intend to cover, there can be no doubt that the author of the prophecies of Merlin is Henry Blois and we can easily deduce this from the material also found in the narrative of HRB that Henry is the author of both.

However, we shall discuss the sequence of how Henry carried out his deception later when we analyze the events regarding the prophecies and when they were attached to the final edition of the HRB. For the moment we should realize that the Primary Historia has as its base a pseudo-history initially written for Matilda, which (when it was written), was in no way contrary to the acceptance of Matilda as a future heir. This became the Primary Historia and (most definitively) there were no Merlin prophecies attached to this version. The fact that ‘Geoffrey’ tells us that he is merely translating verbatim a very ancient book from ‘old Briton’ into Latin, to render our present vulgate HRB (and he was commissioned to translate the prophecies) can be dismissed immediately. I will show in progression, Archdeacon Walter was dead when the Vulgate HRB (as we know it today) was published; and so were all the other dedicatees mentioned in other Vulgate versions.

Henry Blois’ personal attributes as a scholar were nurtured while at Clugny. Clugny was second to Rome as a religious institution and at that time was favoured by the papacy. Since its inception in 910 by the Duke of Aquitaine, Clugny had given birth to hundreds of satellite houses across Europe and many in Britain. The Cluniac’s main regard was for its adherence to Gregorian reform and ritualized liturgy. An increasingly rich liturgy stimulated demand for altar vessels of gold, fine tapestries and fabrics, stained glass, and the art of choral music. However, it was the Cluniac’s strict adherence to the liturgy which spawned a more materialist necessity which was to bring critics like Anselm of Bec and the austere Bernard of Clairvaux to oppose them later.
Abbe’ Bernard of Clairvaux\textsuperscript{39} despised Henry Blois and contention between the two was often appealed at Rome with the pope as arbitrator. While Henry Blois was young at Clugny, the huge abbey was under construction and undoubtedly led to his interest in architecture which we can see evidenced in later life. His interest in architecture was spurred on seeing the vaulted ceilings, radiating chapels and the statues of saints carved and painted that adorned the huge proportioned Romanesque church. His inability to hide subconsciously his inner interests when he comments on architecture\textsuperscript{40} and fortifications in the \textit{Gesta Stephani} is only one of his traits which betray his anonymity as the writer of that manuscript. Henry of Blois witnessed the Romanesque abbey church, the largest in Christendom being built, as he grew up at Cluny, even though it was not completed until the year after his election to the Bishopric of Winchester. One of the main patrons to the arts in the eleventh century was Henry Blois.

Abbot Hugh died at Cluny about the time that the young Henry entered the monastery and Hugh’s elected successor \textit{Pons of Melgueil} was to become the downfall of what was a prestigious institution; and probably, through Henry’s intervention, there were several grants made to that house during King Stephen’s reign. Much later, after the death of his brother, Henry Blois bailed out the Abbey financially when he sojourned there in deep reflection while distancing himself from the carnage which had transpired in England throughout the Anarchy. Henry spent most of his early time at Clugny under Abbot Pons until such time as Peter the Venerable took over after Pons had left the institution in a dreadful state.

\textsuperscript{39} It is not by accident that one of the 40 or so books donated by Henry Blois to Glastonbury noted by Adam of Damerham is by Bernard of Clairvaux (on loving God) and no doubt will have been used to confound Bernard in disputation.

\textsuperscript{40} Henry could be said to be a connoisseur of Architecture. Nicholas Riall, posits that ‘\textit{Henry had a lifelong fascination for buildings and architectural innovation. Quite probably the work undertaken at Glastonbury, St Cross, the hospital of St Mary at Winchester and Wolvesey Palace was influenced by what Henry saw of the development by Abbot Suger of the Monastic buildings at St Denis’}. We should not forget the edifice at Clugny either.
Chapter 2

Henry Blois at Glastonbury

King Henry I's wife, Matilda of Scotland, died on 1st May 1118. With the ensuing fiasco on the 'White Ship', King Henry's first attempt at leaving behind a legitimate heir was to marry Adelicia of Louvain in 1121, just after the disaster. Adelicia of Louvain was in her late teens and Henry was fifty-three. This union left no heir and hence the call for the Empress Matilda to perpetuate the line once her husband the Emperor had died. King Henry arranged a union between her and Geoffrey V, Count of Anjou. King Henry also arranged the marriage of his nephew Stephen, to Matilda of Bologne, who was of the Anglo-Saxon royal house.... her mother Mary being daughter of King Malcolm III of Scotland. King Henry I of England consolidated his position by strategic marriages of relations in an attempt at ensuring future harmony after his death, both in Normandy and in England.

It was Henry Blois who was directly responsible for persuading William of Corbeil, the archbishop, through subtle reasoning, to crown Stephen. It was Henry Blois who organized Stephen's reception by a select group of clergy and his acceptance as the future King. The powerful Bishop of Salisbury aided in this endeavour as the foremost baron in the Kingdom. Pregnancy had prevented Matilda making the journey. In three weeks from King Henry's death, the crown was on Stephen's head. This certainly could not have been achieved without the manoeuvrings of the Bishop of Winchester. Henry's manipulation of events by persuasion is testified by chroniclers and related in the form of an *apologia* in Henry's retrospectively composed GS (after his brother had died). Henry had studied Quintillian, yet ran counter to his caution against a 'practice of
making an evil use of the blessings of eloquence’. This trait became more recognized by chroniclers and was definitely recognized by William of Malmesbury as related in HN.

Henry Blois transformed from being an obedient servant under his uncle, to a power manipulator immediately upon his uncle’s death. The fact that Henry Blois was King Henry Ist nephew, the bishop of Winchester and had control over Glastonbury estates, gave him more power than any other bishop in manipulating the crown onto his brother’s head.

His time at Glastonbury before becoming bishop had not been unproductive. He turned Glastonbury abbey into a rich and healthy establishment. It was (by his own account), a rundown monastery on his arrival. Glastonbury had witnessed its lands being appropriated by deceitful clerks and land grabbing lords before Henry's arrival. This was Henry’s immediate concern as soon as he arrived at Glastonbury. Henry's seeming innocence and trepidation at reviving a rundown institution may or may not be genuine as he expresses in his libellus: ‘the monks were lacking in the necessities of life and the church was devoid of many great possessions. I confess that upon seeing these things I was pained; deceived by promised hope, I was ashamed to such extent that my passionate mind created confusion within me, because I had a preference to be until now a poor man of Cluny, to be close to the poor, rather than in charge of anything and elected to such a burden’.

The only reason for doubting this as a genuine sentiment is that much of the reason for writing the GS (as we shall discover), is to present his own case for what transpired in the Anarchy rather than leaving his reputation in the hands of chroniclers, who would not represent his own viewpoint to posterity. When his time came to receive the bishopric of Winchester, he did not relinquish his abbacy at Glastonbury which was an unusual occurrence. Maintaining abbacy of Glastonbury was condoned by King Henry, the pope, and the monks at Glastonbury, based upon what he had already achieved for them.41 He did however work tirelessly to regain misappropriated land and to enrich Glastonbury abbey, long after he had

41 Dom. David Knowles. The Monastic Order in England: Strangely enough, no contemporary was found to blame explicitly his retention of Glastonbury during his 40 years of Episcopal life, but whatever excuses he may have found for himself from reasons of expediency, such a practice was un-canonical, contrary to all monastic principle, and a precedent for the worst abuses.
taken on the Bishopric of Winchester. This can be witnessed in several charters regaining such lands as Syston, Uffculme and several others and through his building program at the abbey. Concerning Uffculme in Devon for example, he worked tirelessly for Glastonbury’s benefit even up to the Empress Matilda’s short dominance in 1141 where the Uffculme claim is finally concluded.

Even in Henry Blois’ *libellus* 42 he admits that he nearly didn’t bother concerning himself with reclaiming Uffculme as Robert Fitz Walter Flandrensis (who possessed it at that time) had previously obtained it from someone else, yet it was previously known that it was ’under the jurisdiction of Glastonbury from old’. 43 Henry did persevere because this Robert had sworn fealty to Stephen. Henry confronted him in front of the Curia to Robert’s shame, and regained the land for the abbey. Strangely enough, one can see in the *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normanorum*, 44 the charter 341 Glastonbury Abbey (1136, at Westminster) regarding the ‘Restoration of Uffculme which had been taken from the abbey by William .... more than half the text of the charter (as a whole), bears a strong resemblance to charter 948 restoring the manor of Wargrave to Winchester. So, Henry might have been producing charters prolifically now his brother was King. Henry is sure of making any claim he wishes, now Stephen is on the throne. Uffculme was a fourteen hide manor in east Devon and may have been part of the Glastonbury holdings prior to the invasion. At the time of the conquest a widow called Eadgyth held a life estate in Glastonbury property. She remarried a certain Walter de Douai, a mercenary of William the Conqueror’s, and as a reward from William the Conqueror, he received sixteen manors in England and the land is registered under his name in the Domesday book and no claim had been made. When this same Walter was ill he came for refuge in the abbey infirmary saying he would restore the lands once belonging to Glastonbury. But as soon as he recovered from his illness, he reneged on the deal and record of the incident remained at Glastonbury. But until Henry arrived, the monks had still not filed a claim. Walter died before Henry Blois arrived, and Uffculme then passed to his son Robert of Bampton.

---

42 Trans from M.J. Franklin, English Episcopal Acta VIII, 205-211. See Appendix 1
43 This interesting observation shows that the pre-Norman abbey had control over lands in Devon and has a bearing later in the investigation into the 601 charter of Ineswitrin by the King of Devon.
The rebellion of Robert Bampton is the fault of Henry Blois although this is not conveyed in GS. At Easter court in 1136 Henry Blois had Stephen issue a charter restoring Uffculme to Glastonbury. This angered Robert Bampton as his father had held Uffculme since Domesday survey and Robert felt dispossessed. As we have mentioned, it was Henry Blois who wrote the account of his brother, the anonymously authored *Gesta Stephani*, in which Henry describes this same Robert as ‘a knight not of the lowest birth or of small landed estate, but a winebibber and a gourmand and in peacetime devoted to gluttony and drunkenness’.

The *Gesta Stephani* goes on to say that he ‘changed his love of drunkenness for a spirit of rebellion’ and was summoned to Stephen’s court where he perjured himself. Potter and Davis,\(^45\) not knowing the author of the GS, remark that it is somewhat ludicrous to find the author of the GS linked with an unknown son of Robert of Bampton. They then go on to say that the only possible explanation is that the author had a special interest in the man.

Attempting to remain anonymous as the author of GS, Henry Blois can’t help himself castigating someone who had rebelled against his brother and with whom Henry himself had had a serious contention. Finally, Bampton was compelled to put his castle at the King’s disposal. Because Henry Blois wrote both the GS and his own *Libellus*, the sentiments match. In his account in the *Libellus* Henry says that it was ‘certainly a just provision and a very fitting sentence, that he who from desire of other men’s property had laid hands on what was not his, should by just decision of equity lose what was his own’.

Much later in the Anarchy, when Henry has no option but to side with the Empress against his brother; he again obtains a reaffirmation of the grant of Uffculme for Glastonbury through Matilda in a further updated charter. This was after Matilda’s assurance to Henry Blois to comply in giving the bishop control over all matters of chief account in England, especially gifts of bishoprics and abbacies should be subject to his control.\(^46\) The reaffirmation of the charter which runs contrary to a Matilda ally may well have been a test of her respect and promise to him, but it shows two

---


\(^{46}\) William of Malmesbury. *Historia Novella*
things: his dedication to Glastonbury, and more importantly, that he did change allegiance, even momentarily. This is a very pertinent point when we come to analyse the GS. It demonstrates that for a brief period, Henry thought it fortuitous to side with Matilda as the balance of power had swung her way and he increasingly perceived no way out of the inevitable train of events which was leading to her being crowned…. since his brother was imprisoned. It is a position strongly circumvented in the GS where Henry Blois portrays that the Bishop of Winchester was merely biding his time until the events turned. GS portrays that Henry had never any thought of swapping allegiance. Henry Blois in the GS is careful to point out for posterity that he only feigned a change of allegiance.

Anyway, this particular Uffculme charter refers to her honourable reception into Winchester. Bernard of St David's signs the charter and both he and Henry Blois had flanked the Empress Matilda as she entered Winchester. This point also becomes relevant later (concerning Henry Blois as the writer of the HRB) when we look at both Bernard's and Henry's likeminded attempts to create separate metropolitans for both Winchester and St David's.

The continuator of Caradoc's Brut y Tywysogion seems to also portray Menevia having had some preferment in ecclesiastical terms as he refers to the death of Bernard in 1147: after extreme exertions, upon sea and land, towards procuring for the church of Menevia its ancient liberty. Geoffrey of Monmouth's supposed uncle Uchtryd, bishop of Llandaff is said by the continuator of HRB…. the Gwentian Brut, to have died in the same year.

The reasoning behind the claim of metropolitan by St David's is based upon a reference in Asser and also in Rhygyvarch's Life of St David, but certainly the HRB provides supporting evidence for any claim as long as the HRB is deemed credible. Yet the prophecies of Merlin miraculously foretell of St David's re-instatement as a metropolitan. Bishop Bernard pursued this hope and requested metropolitan status many times to various popes. Henry Blois as the writer of the Merlin prophecies plants this envisioned event as having sprung from Merlin in the hope of spurring on what was predicted and thus fated.

47Rhygyvarch's Life of St David. ‘and his monastery too is declared the metropolis of the whole country, so that whoever ruled it should be accounted archbishop’.
Henry also requests the same from three popes regarding Winchester’s own metropolitan status. Something predicted was more likely to effect a desired action. Essential to understanding the inclusion of the Merlin prophecies into the HRB is that Henry Blois was also a keen admirer of Cicero, as becomes evident as we progress. Quintus says: ‘what nation or what state disregards the prophecies of soothsayers, or of interpreters of prodigies’. Henry Blois understands the impact of prophecies and uses them for political advantage while at the same time retro-fitting past historical events to seem as if they were accurate predictions of the future; which (at the time the prophecies were published) the reader of the prophecy can verify its accuracy. This course of action led the gullible to believe in those prophecies which were clear enough to understand and could be matched with past historical events.

Other prophecies of Merlin which were sometimes oblique in nature were interpreted with different meanings. Tatlock reckons that ‘Geoffrey’ got his idea of stopping halfway through HRB from Virgil’s Aeneid, who also similarly employs a marvellous prophecy. However, Tatlock does not realize that the Primary Historia was already a composite work of Henry’s pseudo-history with the added Arthuriana subsequently spliced onto it in 1137. He has no idea that the prophecies of Merlin were then spliced in after the Primary Historia’s discovery at Bec when the book evolved into what is known as the First Variant. Scholars have been led astray in the assumption that the dedicatees were alive at the time of publication of the Vulgate version.

Henry Blois’ reputation diminished with the advent of the Anarchy, after his management of affairs to ensure his brother’s crowning. When relating about previous bishops of Winchester which had passed away, Henry of Huntingdon in his letter to Walter comments: now there sits in their place Henry, (of Blois), nephew of King Henry, who will be a new kind of monster, composed part pure and part corrupt, I mean part monk and part knight.”

---

48 Cicero, p223 Book I, On Divination
49 ‘For wishes fathering thought’s’ as Tatlock puts it, ‘we might look at the glorification given to the quasi-primatial see of Winchester’. As an overall effect of having written HRB and as a direct result of the ‘hope of the Britons’ and the Merlin prophecies, Henry II son Geoffrey and count Conan IV daughter Constance gave their son the name Arturus. According to William of Newburgh, those who were said to have long awaited the Arthur of tradition cherished high hopes of an actual Arthur.
The Cistercian monk Bernard of Clairvaux who detested Henry called him the “Whore of Winchester”. Yet he was highly esteemed by such men as Archbishop Becket and John of Salisbury speaks well of his universal liberality towards the church, but these are views of Henry in his later guise as venerable churchman post 1158. What can be established in Henry’s transition in character is that between 1129-1158, Henry Blois could be considered a power hungry egoist who held power in his own right and vicariously through his brother and family heritage. From 1158 onward and his return to England, as time went by, Henry procured the image of a venerable old man, who, by his generous deeds to Becket and his family for example, and the high moral standpoint he took on religious issues, he became regarded as a trustworthy protector of the church. In his secret authorial works there is a completely different character at work.

After finishing the VM he posed as Wace to provide a vernacular Old Norman dialect version of the HRB adding more references and elaborations into the work like the ‘round table’.... also mentioned in DA (although not in the T manuscript) and in Chrétien’s Erec and Perceval and more importantly Robert de Boron’s work.

Geoffrey of Monmouth’s stated reason behind writing the HRB was finding no complete history of the Britons available. William of Malmesbury had travelled around Britain’s monasteries collecting material for his Gesta Regum (which he had finished by 1125) and his Gesta pontificum Anglorum before Henry had arrived at Glastonbury. William of Malmesbury will have discussed his sources or lack of them, and I believe this is partly what galvanised Henry into composing the faux-history which evolved into Vulgate HRB. Apart from Bede, Gildas, and the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, there was little to confute his interest in establishing a bogus heritage of the Britons from Troy. Nennius has this tradition also but as I shall cover later Henry Blois is directly responsible for promoting Nennius’ work as that authored by Gildas. As Newell suggests there are problems with Nennius once it is understood that it alone underpins the Arthur presented in HRB.

The Roman annals were scarce in Britain for obvious reasons. While Henry Blois had been at Clugny, he had read Gregory of Tour’s History of the Franks and it would appear to have been a young Henry Blois while in Normandy in 1128 with his uncle, who had reiterated the Franks’
provenance from Troy. Henry of Huntingdon records ‘someone’ as having told their history to King Henry Ist.

In the preface of the Antiquities (DA) William of Malmesbury refers to Henry Blois as someone who ‘deserves to be cherished and honoured in the deep embrace of Christ’ ..... A remarkable man besides his splendid birth, for his literary skill, and for the friendliness of his address, and for his kind hearted liberality’. This is a stark contrast to William of Newburgh’s assessment of Henry’s character, ‘He was a man of great power in the Kingdom, and was crafty and inordinately fond of money’. The difference of opinion just highlights the slide of Henry Blois’ reputation from the early days of King Henry Ist.

For a man that played such a pivotal role in state affairs, we have only have a few inconsequential notes that were written by him to the pope; one in 1139 and the other in 1160 and a few other random letters along with his Libellus. Is it not strange that a man of such attested literary skill and who accounts the authorship of books higher than all material wealth and art, should only leave behind his simplistic Libellus? (See appendix 1)

The Libellus is a brief tract written by Henry Blois that undoes any attempt to associate his hand in any of the works that he produced. In any kind of authorship one inevitably bears one’s heart on one’s sleeve and it is near impossible not to betray any prejudices or interests. It is inevitable that one betrays opinion and personal preferences and makes statements which would leave Henry open to accusation at a later date.... if for instance HRB was suspected to have been authored by himself.

Who could honestly look at the Libellus and the HRB together and suspect they were written by the same man?

Henry says he has: judged worthy to commit by pen anything which I have earnestly done at Glastonbury to future memory. Henry is conscious of his place in history and for this reason (in part) he writes the GS.

Henry was conscious of the fact that history records Kings, but he was adamant that he was going to be remembered well in history. As the King’s brother, this point is further established by the epitaph on the Mosan plates.51

51 See chapter, Henry Blois and the Meusan plates.
The cause of leaving behind his uninspired *Libellus* was not to spell out or witness his good deeds or confirm land ownership, but to misdirect any suspicious inquirer. The reader may think at the moment this sounds a little like a conspiracy theory, but by the end of this exposé the true Henry Blois is exposed. The *Libellus* also acts alongside the *GS* as a glossed character reference and *apologia* against his manipulation of affairs in the ‘Anarchy’, the civil war which contemporaries thought he was largely responsible for.

Henry’s *Libellus* also counteracts any suspicion of his hand in the interpolation of *DA*. The whole account in the *Libellus* is doubly devious as by this stage in his life when it was written, he had already composed HRB and written Perlesvaus and Robert de Borons work in Verse.

The *Libellus*, however, comes across as a heartfelt document; not devoid of Henry’s genuine achievements at Glastonbury, but we must not be fooled by Henry’s secondary motive for writing it. He complains of being *deceived by a promised hope* and recalling the awful state in which he found Glastonbury on Sigfrid’s elevation to Bishop. He wondered how circumstances had transpired to leave him such a huge task and recalls his steadfast purpose was the result of faith which overcame doubt in his ability to find a solution.

King Henry’s counsellor had been given custody of Glastonbury abbey when Sigfrid was elevated to Bishop of Chichester. In the short period before Henry Blois was elected, abbot Geoffrey Rufus took control of five churches belonging to the abbey. Henry used his influence as the King’s nephew to reinstate these against an influential courtier: *conquered at last by the request of the King, I retained two, three I gave up to him*. But, the three churches Henry had been constrained to leave with Geoffrey, reverted back to Glastonbury abbey upon Geoffrey’s death.

As history relates, Henry was an able administrator and it was not until he had witnessed power upon being appointed bishop of Winchester that desire for greater power ensued. In 1138 when King Stephen snubbed Henry Blois’ wish to be archbishop of Canterbury....soon after that betrayal Henry obtained the papal legation instead. This in effect gave him as much power as the King himself, but it inevitably led to the destruction of any pious purity and innocence which had been part of his youth at Clugny: *I was able to not be rich and famous and be deemed rich and famous*. Henry was at the centre of political life when his brother became King until such time he finds himself at Clugny in self-imposed exile in 1155.
Chapter 3

The prophecies of Merlin from the HRB

Before we look at the VM, my object is to show the reader in the quickest possible way that Henry Blois, as well as writing the HRB, also wrote all the prophecies of Merlin. He uses the prophecies to corroborate his pseudo-history of HRB and to further his political ambitions. Our experts on the prophecies of Merlin i.e. Chambers, San Marte, Faral and Taylor never suspect Henry Blois as author. The only elucidator of HRB with any insight, (the erudite Tatlock) has no suspicion that the bishop of Winchester is author of the work either. There are several reasons for this: the main is gullibility and a lack of ability to conceive a fraud on the scale Henry Blois has accomplished. The early material that pertains to the Matter of Britain is nearly all a product of Henry Blois. There would be no ‘Matter of Britain’
as it is generally perceived without Henry Blois’ input, but it is the dark secret which is veiled in Henry Blois’s invention which is the point of this exposé. It is Henry Blois’ fault that the body of Joseph of Arimathea has remained undiscovered until the present day.

Henry’s ability to deceive by seemingly writing from the standpoint of a Briton in the prophecies and appearing to have insular sympathies while writing as Geoffrey has obscured his identity. Also, by having effectively backdated the Vulgate *Historia* so that his audience believes it was published in the time of the cited dedicatees is probably the main reason Henry Blois has remained undiscovered as the author of the constituent parts which comprise the foundation of the *Matter of Britain*. With the addition of updated prophecies, it appears that Merlin did indeed predict things in the future. For this reason many commentators believe there was a genuine set of prophecies by Merlin. A case in point would be the prophecy concerning the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ (an unknown possibility in 1134) at a time from which some scholars avow that Orderic’s account of Merlin dates.

Also, there is the added confusion of Henry Blois writing as ‘Geoffrey’ who is posing as Merlin. In early prophecies i.e. before 1155, we are given the impression that our author was a Briton whose chief antipathy is against the Saxons and favours the Normans as vanquishers of the Saxons. This viewpoint was true at the time the early prophecies were constructed and when Henry’s brother was alive as king of England. It gave the impression that Merlin, (an ancient Briton) acquiesced in the Norman eradication of the ‘German worm’. However, what has confused scholars like Tatlock is where the prophecies predicted a restoration of the crown of Brutus for the united Celts because this is a twisted version of what had been previously stated in a separate early edition of the prophecies known as the *Libellus Merlini*. We are told Breton, Cornishman, Scot, and Welshman finally will restore the crown of Brutus. It is not by coincidence that of all the prophecies (excepting those in the vague Götterdammerung), the

---

52 J.S.P Tatlock, *The legendary History of Britain*. Strangely enough for someone as clever as Tatlock, he makes the observation: *Geoffrey is at pains to make the city of Winchester prominent and exalted; the prophecies reproach its perjured citizens and threaten its episcopal see with ruin*. It is astounding that he does not put together the fact that the citizens perjured themselves in the Anarchy (being convinced by Henry Blois to join Matilda) and the fact that it is only highlighted in ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-history that it was a monastic institution at the time Constans was alive…. and the bishop of Winchester just after HRB appeared was seeking a metropolitan for Winchester.
unification of the Celts is one that is blatantly clear, but strangely enough does not come true. The forces do not unite and Henry II is not beaten by the Celts. This is simply because both Conan and Cadwallader came to terms with Henry II and Henry Blois’ plan of sedition did not pan out.

It is the one prophecy which did not look backward to events concerning his Grandfather or Uncles’.... or the Anarchy; or events recorded in insular annals; or as a prophecy acting as a corroboration of his bogus pseudo-history presented in HRB. The reason for this is that it is the one and only time when Henry tried to use a prophecy to dictate events of political change in the short term. Most of Merlin’s other prophecies were a pretence looking forward to already transpired history. We cannot say this is the case concerning the ‘sixth in Ireland’ prophecy as Henry expected the invasion of Ireland to take place soon after the council held at Winchester where it was discussed in 1155 with him present.

Until one understands Henry Blois’ attempt at sedition and one has studied the Merlin prophecies in the rendition supposedly given by John of Cornwall, it is very difficult to make out why ‘Geoffrey’ (who wrote the Merlin prophecies) seemingly has a change of stance against Norman rule.

The first prophecy in HRB is fittingly about the church and Henry Blois’ aim is to run through history as presented in HRB. We are told: religious observance shall be done away and the churches shall stand in ruins. Also, fittingly, in the second prophecy in which we are told what the end result of the prophecies will be concerning the island of Britain.

Merlin foresees: At the last, those that are oppressed (the British) shall arise and resist the cruelty of them that come from without (foreigners). It is the hope of Henry Blois that King Henry II would be unseated. This is Henry Blois’ ultimate aim at the time the Vulgate HRB prophecies were updated; to unseat Henry II by inciting insurrection of the Celts through prophecy. Henry’s aspiration was to return from Clugny as an ‘adopted son’ to rule England. If this proposition seems far-fetched, the reader may turn to the prophecies of John of Cornwall which show clearly this aim. However, it is

---

53 There are other prophecies which did not come to fruition like the navigable channel to Winchester, but the canal project was started.
54 Henry did however foretell of the reinstatement of two metropolitans when predicting as Merlin and we may assume these are St David’s and Winchester.
55 There were other prophecies like the construction of the ‘holy hole’ at Winchester which were foreseen and came to fruition but other building projects like a canal from Winchester to Southampton which never materialised.
better for the reader to understand Henry’s many interpolations and agendas before moving onto the prophecies of JC and understand the make-up of the earlier Merlin prophecies.

The Vulgate version of prophecies which follow, run through history as presented in HRB concerning the Saxon invasion. Arthur, the Boar of Cornwall shall bring succour and shall trample their necks beneath his feet. Henry Blois pretends as Merlin to predict as if looking forward from Merlin’s era and foresee events recorded in insular annals, but the aim is to corroborate fictional (unhistorical) events presented in Henry Blois’ own concocted pseudo-historical HRB. In the prophecy above Henry Blois refers to Arthur as the Boar of Cornwall as part of a corroborative exercise which confirms his account of events in HRB where King Arthur combats the Saxons.

The islands of the ocean shall be subdued unto his (Arthur’s) power, and the forests of Gaul shall he possess. As we know from history, Rome was never subject to British rule, but as ‘Geoffrey’ posits, the Celts in the fourth century BC captured Rome under Brenno…. but Arthur’s continental battle never took place as presented in HRB and Arthur never took possession of Gaul. So, the author of the prophecies is definitely the author of HRB…. as Merlin is supposedly looking forward from a period c.500-600 AD.\textsuperscript{56} The house of Romulus shall dread the fierceness of his prowess and doubtful shall be his end. The house of Romulus is Henry’s mystical term for Rome; as if a seer hears things in a different way and understands the truth in the same way as the fictional foundation myth of Diocles of Peparethus.

It was Henry Blois posing as Geoffrey who left Arthur’s fate undecided in HRB on the Island of Avalon which our author of the prophecies refers to as a ‘doubtful end’. However, as we shall cover later, it is Henry Blois who plants the bogus body of Arthur at Glastonbury. Thereafter, Arthur’s end became less doubtful to the gullible.

Arthur’s ‘renown’ amongst the population was recorded by William of Malmesbury in GR1. Arthur’s real ‘fame’ is a product of his introduction into the Primary Historia and the Vulgate version of HRB…. and ultimately HRB’s translation into verse supposedly written by Wace. Henry Blois self-perpetuates the chivalric Arthur through Wace and by being the person

\textsuperscript{56} Tatlock comments on his belief that the prophecies and Historia are written by the same person. He comments on the mutual allusions and the echoes all through. P.416
responsible for originally instigating the Grail stories at his nephew’s court in Champagne. The chivalric Arthur’s fame is directly linked to Henry Blois.  

*He shall be celebrated in the mouth of the peoples, and his deeds shall be as meat unto them that tell thereof.*

Ironically, Henry Blois as the inventor of the chivalric Arthur persona is the one telling of Arthur’s deeds; yet he is predicting that *troubadours* would relate Arthur’s deeds; even though Henry is the one writing this particular prophecy and pretending to be Merlin.

Arthur supposedly has six successors but coincidentally there are six kings numbered in Henry Blois’ era, but we will get to this obfuscation and its reason shortly: *Six of his successors shall follow his sceptre, but after them the German Worm will rise.* After the Saxons, chronologically the Danes arrive. Henry Blois tries to replicate as far as possible, known history from the insular annals of Gildas and Bede. However, the fiction of Gormundus, arrived at from the French chanson de geste *Gormont et Isembart* (doubtfully known by a Welsh Geoffrey), is a part of the fictional pseudo-history of HRB: *The Wolf of the sea shall exalt him, unto whom the woods of Africa shall bear company.*

Through the prophecies and HRB’s (dual) mention of a totally fictional Gormundus and many other allusions in the prophecies, we can conclude the author of the prophecies is the same as the composer of HRB. We know Henry is concerned with the state of the church: *Again shall religion be done away, and the Sees of the Primates shall be transmuted.* Henry Blois’ main concern is his obsession with the primacy of Canterbury as it is through this primacy (determined by Rome) that he is subject to Theobald of Bec. Originally he had been Archbishop of Canterbury in waiting, until he was spurned by his brother and the position given to Theobald. This event is one of the main causes of the composition of the First Variant HRB after the loss of the legation and the death of William of Malmesbury.

The First Variant HRB is an expanded redaction of the *Primary Historia*. Henry’s concern with ‘archflamens’ in HRB and the establishment of two metropolitans in the prophecies are a result of his attempt to obtain

---

57 *The Saxons, having had experience of his shiftiness, went unto Gormundus, King of the Africans, in Ireland, wherein, adventuring thither with a vast fleet, he had conquered the folk of the country. Thereupon, by the treachery of the Saxons, he sailed across with a hundred and sixty-six thousand Africans into Britain…* HRB. XI, vii.

58 For example: The entombment of Caduallo in the brazen statue placed over a London Gate. Also, the emigration and canonization of Cadualadrus.
metropolitan status for himself. His intention was to gain metropolitan status for southwest England. Henry's reasoning for changing prophecies is complicated as he tried to cover his authorship later in his life.

He later squewed prophecies so that London appeared as the new metropolitan site to detract from Winchester when suspicion fell on him as author of the prophecies. In reality though, his attempt was aimed at Winchester, but this can only be understood completely once the prophecies are recognised as having been twisted in a later updated edition which is found in Vulgate HRB. Henry's polemic which also concerns us in the interpolations in DA was to show that the Briton archbishopric of London was established long before Augustine's arrival. The dignity of London shall adorn Dorobernia (Canterbury) and men shall resort unto the seventh shepherd of York in the realm of Armorica. Samson as ‘Archbishop’ of York is another of Henry’s conflations, but again proves the prophecies are too aligned with the pseudo-history of HRB to be written by any other than the inventor of the prophecies. Henry Blois’ attestation is that before the Saxons came there were three Archbishoprics. This point is made plain in the narrative of HRB and again in the prophecies of VM. However, here: Menevia shall be robed in the pall of the City of Legions and a preacher of Ireland shall be stricken dumb on account of an infant in the womb. We shall cover the allusion to St Patrick and Henry’s interest in him when we cover the Charter of St Patrick in the chapter on DA.

If one understands that Henry wrote an initial set of prophecies and then subsequently wrote another updated set and changed the sense of some of the previous which were in a separated Libellus version, (which were spliced into First Variant) and subsequently squewed in Vulgate HRB.... and then twisted slightly again (while others were added in VM).... it is safe to posit that several of the early prophecies must have been too obvious and were changed as suspicion fell on Henry as the inventor of the prophecies.

To fully explain the meaning of all the prophecies is impossible as many of them now have no meaning. The original prophecies have been squewed

---

59 At that time two of the Metropolitan Sees, York, to wit, and the City of the Legions, were vacant without their shepherds. Wherefore, being minded to consult the common wish of his peoples, he gave York unto Samson.... HRB VIII, xii.

Henry's bogus establishment of a metropolitan in Carleon is based on Rhgyfarch’s Life of David.

60 The three archbishops, to wit, he of Caerleon, Theon of London, and Thadioceus of York. HRB. XI, x.

However, the archflamens were not mentioned in EAW, which, if they had been present in the Primary Historia, would have been an extraordinary omission on behalf of Henry of Huntingdon.
to cause confusion and to hide Henry’s authorship. Originally the prophecies published in the separate *Libellus* had material which was too easily linked and could be associated with Henry. His authorship needed to be hidden once he had included the prophecies about the Celtic rebellion when Henry II came to the throne. To accept this will be difficult for modern scholars, because firstly, one has to accept Geoffrey is not real and the *Primary Historia* version found at Bec was not the same as Vulgate version.

*Primary Historia* had no prophecies in it and did not mention Merlin. Once it is understood that the dedicatees have no relevance in dating Vulgate HRB, one can understand the *Libellus Merlini* existing separately and undergoing an update in the Vulgate. Even though the First Variant pre-exists the Vulgate, and originally included the prophecies (without dedication and preamble).... its prophecies have been ‘corrected’ with the updated 1155 version of the prophecies found in Vulgate HRB. This again is difficult to accept until it is understood that the extant copies of First Variant today derive from one exemplar in which the prophecies were updated to the more recent version of prophecies found in the Vulgate.

In other words, when the First Variant was first published, it had the same prophecies as the contents of the separate *Libellus Merlini*. So, until scholars accept that Vulgate was published in 1155 and the dedicatees names (as contemporaries) in effect back date the Vulgate (giving the impression that the later Vulgate version was that found at Bec), it is impossible to grasp how the prophecies were updated and their meaning twisted. This is not easy to accept because scholars have been duped by Henry Blois artful retro-dating of the Vulgate version which mentions dedicatees and also by the colophon naming contemporary historians.

My main attempt in covering this topic is not to elucidate the prophecies but to show that they were written by Henry. Once the reader recognises the authorship of both HRB and the prophecies have a common author, we can then safely progress knowing HRB and the chivalric Arthur was a Blois invention. Rather than attempt elucidation of each prophecy, it would be more practical to cover the obvious prophecies which show Henry as the author. So we will progress from the beginning until Henry’s authorship becomes clear.

_The German Worm will find no refuge in his caves for the vengeance of his treason that shall overtake him._
Writing as the Briton Merlin, Henry makes out the Saxons will pay for the treachery carried out on the night of the long knives and so appears to cast his allegiance with the Britons.

They will prosper for a short while and shall wax strong, but Neustria’s tithe shall do him a hurt. A people clad in wood and tunics of iron shall come upon him and take vengeance upon him for his wickedness.

Merlin sees the Norman’s coming as saviours referring to the Saxons as foreigners. Oddly enough, if Merlin was a Briton, the Normans would just be replacing another lot of conquering foreigners. But as we know, Henry’s polemic for the early prophecies is motivated by a pro-Norman stance... as his brother Stephen is still alive. His position changed as King Henry II comes to the throne.

He shall restore their dwelling-places unto them that did inhabit them aforetime, and the ruin of the foreigner shall be made manifest.

The last thing the Normans did was alleviate the British populace. But again Henry is a Norman and in the persona of Merlin calls the Saxons foreigner’s and not the Norman’s likewise. This is not a Welshman writing.

The seed of the White Dragon will disappear from our little gardens and the remnant of his generation shall be decimated. The yoke of unending bondage shall they bear their mother by wounding her with hoes and ploughs.

The Saxons will become peasants of the land tilling it in eternal slavery until the Saxon gene is eliminated. What once was their Mother land is now their bondage. This is an odd sentiment for a supposed (Anglo-Norman ‘Geoffrey’) Welshman to have in favour of the Normans. At this stage (when the early prophecies were published), there was no sentiment to reinstall the Britons or bring back the crown of Brutus. In the next prophecy we move onto Henry’s predecessors around whom the earlier prophecies in the Libellus concentrated.

Two dragons will succeed, one of which shall be slain by the darts of malice, while the other shall perish under the shadow of a name.

William Rufus, as Henry of Huntingdon relates in his history is hit by an arrow and as many contemporaries suspect, an arrow of ‘Malice’. Walter Tirel shot him supposedly by accident in a hunting expedition in the new forest on 2nd August 1100. Is it not a strange circumstance that ‘Geoffrey’ calls it an arrow of Malice i.e. shot with a motive of hatred or envy, meaning he was killed intentionally rather than it being an accident. Alanus
states that nearly everyone understood it to be an accident. So, how is it that the author of the Merlin prophecy is more informed than the masses?

Duke Robert after his imprisonment perished under the ‘shadow of a name’ i.e. Duke Robert rather than King Robert. It is not remarkable that prophecies deal with kings, but in consideration of the vast time gap from the sixth century to the time of Henry Blois.... it is not coincidental that our seer refers to the conquest of Henry’s grandfather and then his two uncles. Merlin has an adept ability to focus his seeing powers on the same era his reading audience can appreciate and recall the recent past.

These following prophecies we can assume are part of the original set of prophecies that Henry hands to his good friend Abbot Suger. However, this does not necessarily exclude several other prophecies which were also part of his version which was the original *libellus Merlini*. Suger includes all the following and comments on them before his death in 1151. This is before the advent of the updated Vulgate version of prophecies:

*They shall be succeeded by The Lion of Justice, at whose roar the towers of Gaul and the dragons of the island shall tremble. In those days gold be extracted from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall flow from the hooves of them that low. They that go crisped and curled shall be clad in fleeces of many colours, and the garment without shall betoken that which is within. The feet of them that bark shall be cropped short. The wild deer shall have peace, but humanity shall suffer dole. The shape of commerce shall be cloven in twain; the half shall be round. The ravening of kites shall perish and the teeth of wolves be blunted. The Lion’s whelps shall be transformed into fishes of the sea, and his Eagle build her nest upon Mount Aravius.*

I will briefly go through this section elucidating the meaning.

*A lion of justice shall succeed, whose roar shall cause the towns of France, and the dragons of the island to tremble.*\(^{61}\) *In his days gold shall be extorted from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall be scattered abroad by the hoofs of lowing kine.*

Henry Ist is denoted the ‘Lion of Justice’ in the prophecies (and whose rule stretched over what ‘Merlin’ terms Gaul) to be archaic....and the island dragons (as we know) are the Britons and Saxons. Abbot Suger explains the prophecy as follows, probably having been prompted by the man who delivered the prophecies into his hands: *In his days was gold wrung by him*

---

\(^{61}\) Gildas called Maelgwn *insularis draco*, a term which Henry transposed to Celtic leaders.
out of the lily, that is, from the religious of good odour, and from the nettle, that is from the stinging seculars; his intent being that as he was a profit unto all, so also should all do service unto himself.

To my mind the lilly and the nettle are the highborn and lowborn who all pay tax to the Lion of Justice. Silver is distributed to the favourite Barons (those that low). As Merlin, Henry shows that his uncle ruled with an iron fist and everybody paid their due and was subject to his stern rule. However, it is probably best to defer to Suger’s elucidation.

Henry of Huntingdon relates that King Henry Ist predecessor William Rufus: ‘wrung thousands of gold and silver from his most powerful vassals, and harassed his subjects with the toil of building castles for himself’. King Henry Ist maintained and added to these coffers until King Stephen inherited a full treasury. He then distributed it amongst what Henry Blois refers to derogatorily as ‘lowing kine’ in the prophecy. Henry mentions the easy distribution of funds by Stephen to close advisors and Barons....as the author of GS specifies. Stephen in effect buys support and the coffers are soon depleted.... and Henry Blois is dissatisfied by the manipulation of his brother. Stephen’s childish piety and sense of honour, and his blindness toward flatterers is ultimately the breakdown of communication between the two brothers which led to Theobald of Bec being elected as archbishop. However, we may also have to defer to Abbot Suger’s elucidation: Silver flowed from the hooves of them that low when the strength of the castle safeguarded the plenty of the grange, and the plenty of the grange assured abundance of silver in the well-filled coffers’ Abbot Suger sees the meaning of the prophecy as wealth gained from good husbandry once castles were established to protect livestock.

The men with curled hair shall wear clothes of various textures and colours, and their exterior shall betoken their interior.

This ornate dress appeared in the court of Henry Ist and became a ridiculous show of outward vanity in Stephen’s rule. A few commentators of the time remark upon the adoption of hair style and the vain attire of the barons at court. It refers to foppish or dandyish hair styles and ‘peacockish’ dress of effeminate members of the laity. Doubtful it is that a sixth century

---
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Merlin or the Welsh cleric Geoffrey would pay much attention to dress code at court. Henry himself wore a scruffy beard and would have written this to highlight this new vanity at court to shame the very people as they listened. This trend had started in Henry I reign where bishop Serlo of Seez in a sermon at Carentan chastised the King and his men for their vain apparel.

_The feet of lurchers shall be cut off._ It is quite unrealistic to think that Merlin is seeing four or five hundred years into the future and bearing witness to the effects of Norman aristocratic sporting pursuits. It is more ridiculous that a Welsh Geoffrey\(^{63}\) would waste his time concocting prophecies predicting events which pertain to the Norman aristocracy’s sporting pastimes. Hunting dogs\(^{64}\) were maimed in the time of Henry Ist to prevent hunting on the King’s land…. so the hunted game subsequently benefitted. King Henry’s cruel hunting and forest laws were such that all dogs within a given radius of royal preserves were forced to suffer amputation of one paw making them unfit for the _chase_.\(^{65}\) It is known that Henry Blois kept two Lurchers (or greyhounds) as pets, and this may be the motivation for mentioning this seemingly random edict of Henry Ist.

_The beasts of chase (or wild deer) shall enjoy peace._

Henry of Huntingdon again states in reference to William Rufus: *If any one killed a stag or a wild boar, his eyes were put out, and no one presumed to complain. But beasts of ‘chace’ he cherished as if they were his children; so that to form the hunting ground of the New Forest he caused churches and villages to be destroyed, and, driving out the people, made it an habitation for deer._\(^{66}\)

The Normans were keen on hunting as a sport which witnessed their prowess. As another prophecy relates, they left this pastime to besiege and attack each other as the Anarchy took hold. It is a madness to think that any of this, (regardless of the fact that all these are Henry Blois’ forebears to which the prophecies refer), have any bearing on a Welsh cleric in Oxford (since it is obvious the prophecies and HRB have a common author). Why

\(^{63}\) Geoffrey of Monmouth is a complete fabrication and did not exist.

\(^{64}\) Orderic Vitalis. *Historiae ecclesiasticae* 4:238

\(^{65}\) Hammer. commentary 1935

\(^{66}\) Henry Of Huntingdon *Historia Anglorum* 217
would Merlin foresee the concerns of members of Henry Blois’ family and their sporting practices?

*The shape (for trading) of commerce shall be cut in two; the half shall become round.*

This is an allusion to the practice which prevailed of splitting the silver pennies into halves and quarters. The latter clause applies to the fact that these halves were called in...... and a coinage of "round" farthings issued instead. Florence of Worcester refers to these triangular pieces. King Henry’s statute, promulgated in 1108, commanded that the ‘abolus’ and the ‘denarius’ should be round. The introduction of the half and quarter was not instigated until much later, which has caused some commentators to think this prophecy a truly prophetic statement by Merlin. Now, if Merlin’s prophecies were written by ‘Geoffrey’.... what is Geoffrey doing concerning himself with affairs of state and the money supply, which would be under the auspices of the crown?

In Henry Blois’ era it was a big issue as Henry of Huntingdon relates;67 King Henry ‘had almost all the moneyers throughout England castrated and their right hands cut off for secretly debasing the coinage’.

Henry Blois was at the centre of government, and had his own coins minted at York.68 It is he who would be concerned with this issue of the state, not the canon ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ at Oxford. This practice of fractioning coins needed solution since Henry Ist reign and was still an issue in Stephen’s reign, and one that Stephen did not get around to solving in the Anarchy. However, Henry Blois is at the centre of this issue; especially concerning alms to the church as Legate. In the early prophecies, Henry Blois assumed it was safe for Merlin to use his ‘vaticinatory’ skill because a statute had been issued and it should already have been enacted at the mints, but the Anarchy prevented the statute being put into practice. The fact that Merlin foresees this issue should be enough to negate once and

---

67 *Historia Anglorum* vii. 36.

68 The royal control over the minting of coins broke down, leading to coins being struck by local barons and bishops across the country c.1141. A coin appears amongst a group of coins struck at York mint, c.1141 and has on the obverse the inscription HEN(RI)CUS EPS with S(TE)PHANUS REX on the reverse. Probably not a coin of Henry Murdac Archbishop of York 1151-53.
for all, that there is any truth whatsoever in the proposition that the prophecies were archaic.

*The greediness of kites will end and the teeth of wolves be blunted.*

In King Henry Ist era, he had complete control over the bishops’ greed (the kites) and curtailed the power of the barons (the wolves) so that all knew they were subject to the king and none aspired to rebellion.

*The Lion’s cubs shall become fishes of the sea, and his Eagle shall build her nest upon Mount Aravius.*

*The lion’s whelps shall be transformed into sea-fishes.* The allusion is to the drowning of Henry Ist sons on 25 November 1120. William Adelin, his legitimate heir and Richard his bastard both drowned. The prophecy foretells, with suitable vaticinatory mystique, those on the ‘white ship’ became fish food as the ship sunk off the rocks just outside Barfleur in Normandy. King Stephen, long before being crowned, had fortunately decided at the last minute, not to embark with the other drunks. Henry Blois’ sister however, Lucia-Mahaut, and her husband Richard d’Avranches, 2nd Earl of Chester, both drowned along with many other young nobles. In Orderic’s passage on the Merlin prophecies (which was unequivocally interpolated by Henry Blois into Orderic’s book XII), also leads into that interpolation by recounting the death of Duke Robert’s son. He also drowned on the white ship. Duke Robert too had ‘amazingly’ seen his son’s death in a vision. Henry Blois has a craft for deception. I will show further on that Orderic’s Merlin passage can only have been written by Henry but reflects this clump as early prophecies.

Anyone who read this ‘White ship’ prophecy from ‘Geoffrey’s’ audience (i.e. those reading Merlin prophecies) would know the meaning; and to which princes (lion’s cubs) the prophecy pertained. The accuracy of Merlin and his focus on church affairs, affairs of state, metropolitan Sees, Winchester, Henry’s uncle, and Henry’s family tree (over a supposed period of five hundred years), as he ‘foresaw’ across time, is ridiculous that the prophecies are afforded any credibility. Merlin’s audience coincidentally understood and interpreted the recent events to which the prophecies

---

69See note 6
referred. This is especially fortuitous when one considers such a diverse number of other events and kings that came and went in the time span which supposedly had transpired since the prophecies came to be translated at Alexander’s request. Modern scholars should realize that the prophecies are totally bogus. The propensity of the prophecies to revolve around those related to Henry Blois far outweighs any credence that these are the fanciful inventions of a Welsh cleric from Oxford called Gaufridus Arthur. What is most astounding is that if Merlin could see to the Sixth King i.e. to 1153 when King Henry II came to the throne; and then onto 1155 where Henry Blois finds out his intention of invading Ireland; how could any scholar like Crick think the dedication to Alexander was real when Alexander died in 1148. Would the principle of backdating not occur as a possibility? That Merlin’s sister Ganieda in VM could see to the battle of Coleshill in 1157 is even more astounding when Geoffrey died in 1154-55. Funnily enough, it is R.S Loomis’s observation that makes me smile: Robert died in 1147 and Alexander in 1148 and thereafter a dedication to either would have no point. It is for this exact reason in logic that Henry Blois backdates through the dedicatees.

Although Robert of Gloucester probably never saw these prophecies, his son also died in the disaster. Huntingdon and Malmesbury both give account of the ‘White Ship’ disaster. There is a poem about the disaster that was either written by Henry Blois or more possibly inspired the prophecy. Orderic states: I desire not to dwell on this mournful theme, and will only quote one short poem from a distinguished versifier: (See note 6)

His eagle shall build her nest on the Aravian Mount.

There has been much discussion about the ‘Montem Aravium’ by scholars. What is certain is that ‘Geoffrey’ never had Snowdon or Eryri in

70 Modern scholar’s totally misdirected assumption is summed up by Michael Curley: in order to discount Alexander’s interest in the PM, one would have to regard as a blatant fabrication, Geoffrey’s claim that Alexander himself initiated the project. Such a claim was not likely to escape the bishop of Lincoln. The same can be said for his claim that Walter the archdeacon gave him a very ancient book. Not if they are dead Michael!!!

71 Arthurian literature in the middle ages. R.S. Loomis p.81

72 In the later Vulgate version Henry Blois is keen to show his partiality to being Welsh to avoid discovery: since he slew the giant Ritho upon Mount Eryri, that had challenged him to fight with him. For this Ritho had fashioned him a furred cloak of the beards of the kings he had slain. Of course Henry Blois was known for his unkempt beard but in the earlier First Variant where no seditious prophecies were found the fight was in the Alps
mind when ‘he’ first composed this prophecy as some deluded commentators have suggested. The only reason this was later implied was to intone that ‘Geoffrey’ had a Welsh bias. The Empress Matilda is the Eagle in ‘the third nesting’ prophecy where it applies to her third child William by her husband Geoffrey. The white ship incident highlighted in the ‘lion’s cubs’ prophecy refers (in the same sentence) to the only legitimate heir which could now follow Henry Ist. The Lion’s whelps became fish food (see note 6); Henry Ist is the ‘Lion of Justice’. So, it is not by accident that the concern of our mysterious author is on the Eagle.

The ‘Aravis Range’ is located just before entering the Alps 90 miles south east of Clugny. Henry Blois will have passed through them numerous times on his way to Rome because they form part of the direct route from Clugny. Certainly, he would have already made the journey across the range himself at the time of composing the prophecies. Most certainly, a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ would not know of this mountain range. The solution to this reference lies in Henry’s (Geoffrey’s…. read Merlin’s) reference to crossing the Alps, and the Alps themselves being equitable (as a geographical divide) with Rome in the mind of our mystic seer named Merlin. In Henry Blois’ mind, figuratively, the Alps and Aravis range are synonymous with Rome and one would think he derived this assimilation having travelled frequently through this range. The Merlin prophecy below referring to clerical marriage, (a big issue due to payment of concubinage), in Henry’s time as Legate, refers to Rome in the same way:

They that wear the cowl shall be provoked unto marriage, and their outcry shall be heard in the mountains of the Alps.

---

73 It is extraordinary that Curley in his analysis comments that the Eagle on Mount Aravia may refer to the Empress Matilda’s Marriage; If this identification is correct, the marriage would form a pair of family events along with the episode of the White Ship. Any political bias in this prophecy, if it indeed does refer to Matilda is difficult to perceive. The problem is that scholars tend to perceive nothing of Henry Blois’ input and why Merlin focuses on subjects closely allied to Henry Blois. A cleric in Oxford would doubtfully know where the Aravian range is, let alone code Matilda’s association with Rome or make comment on her third Child.

74 It is not by accident that Wace has the same geographical understanding of the Alps as a natural barrier to Rome but instead of montem aravium Wace refers to it as ‘Mount Bernard pass’ also in the Alps. ‘Geoffrey’ pretending to be Merlin earlier makes plain to what his montem aravium alludes when he writes as Wace; probably, because the reference was so obscure. Tatlock could not work out that it alluded to the crossing of the Alps.
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The same reference to Rome as being equitable to the Alps is again used by Henry in the prophecies: *and the report of that work shall pass beyond the Alps*\(^7\) i.e. the news will get to Rome.

The Aravis mounts are part of the French pre-alps, a lower chain of mountain ranges west of the main chain of the Alps. When it is understood how the Alps and Aravian range equate to Rome in Henry’s mind, it is easy to see how Empress Matilda who was *regina Romanorum* is making her nest on Mount Aravium. While still a child, Matilda was married to Henry V, Holy Roman Emperor and was crowned queen of the Romans.\(^7\) This is the sequence of logic whereby Henry derives: *His (Henry Ist) eagle shall build her (Matilda) nest on the Aravian Mount (Rome).* Again, I must point out that all the prophecies are highly relevant to Henry Blois, rather than a Welshman from the Welsh marches.

I suggest that Henry’s first set of prophecies, which we know Abbot Suger possessed, included this allusion to *montem Aravium* and I think when Henry finalised the vulgate HRB prophecies, he tried to hide its obvious poignancy to Matilda by having the giant Ritho fight Arthur for the mantle made of beards on mount Aravius i.e. for the purpose of deflection. This episode detracted from the association with Rome whereby his own authorship might be suspected.... having passed through the region several times and because of the prophecy being pertinent to Matilda. However, there are comments on Henry’s beard (which was unruly and long) and thus connects the ridiculous Ritho episode back to him. We should ask: how is it that Matilda and Henry Blois, who are connected by so many events, are a concern of a certain Merlin who seems to provide prophecies that an audience in the second quarter of the twelfth century would find highly relevant. Is it really a coincidence that the prophecies just happen to focus on Henry’s arch-enemy in reality, and fortuitously get translated in this same era? Especially, when we know ‘fictionally’ there is someone trying to associate Arthur to Glastonbury and it is painfully obvious the writer of the prophecies is the Abbot of Glastonbury.

*Venedocia shall be red with a mother's blood,*

\(^7 \)HRB, VII, iv
\(^7\)Later in life, Matilda led Norman chroniclers to believe that she had been crowned by the pope himself.
Venedocia, as Giraldus Cambrensis informs us, is the ancient name for the region of North Wales. This prophecy plainly alludes to the continual rebellion in the North of Wales from King Henry Ist time through the Anarchy up to Henry II reign. So, really, it is a prophecy of little consequence.... but is true for contemporary Anglo-Norman readers to recognise. Because of the ensuing Welsh war, Henry Blois chose Asaph as the place for a perfect cover to locate an already dead ‘Geoffrey’. It is probably no coincidence that Asaph is the ‘recorder’ of events.... just as Henry has made ‘Geoffrey’. Yet no-one could have verified ‘Geoffrey’s’ existence until long after his supposed death. By then, as we know, there is a trace of a bishopric whereas none was recorded when ‘Geoffrey’ was supposed to be alive. I shall cover this point in detail later.

The house of Corineus will be slayed by six brethren.

Corineus was said to be a companion of Brutus, after which Cornwall takes its name. The six brethren put to death like the six sons of Erectheus, are (according to Alain de Lisle), the six sons of Fremun, who was viscount of Cornwall under Henry Ist. This may be the most likely solution. However, few of Henry’s audience grasped Henry’s Breton and Cornish affiliation which he bestowed on himself and his brother in the earlier prophecies to liken his brother as a returning Arthur. John of Cornwall’s prophecies (which Henry wrote last), actually sheds a different light on the reference and shows Henry’s ability to confuse in the flux of these prophecies: 'In sex Francigenis unius sanguine matris, Triste rubens solium tot mortes tot mama passum'.

‘there with the six Frenchmen born of the blood of the same mother, the throne, sad and reddened was subjected to so many deaths, so many evils’.

In John of Cornwall’s edition of prophecies, which were Henry Blois’ latest rendition (even though dated before 1156), Henry is pretending to be a Cornishman as author.... and therein the Cornish (house of Corineus) are not being slayed by the six brothers (or six Cornish brothers are slayed) as in Geoffrey’s Version, but the brothers have become French. We can also see ‘Venedocia’ has disappeared and the ‘throne’ is transposed with the same description. We can see by this example Henry Blois’ method of

78 Isaiah 36:1
conflation and warping of the meaning of the original. Henry, posing as John of Cornwall in this context is referring to the six brothers all born of his mother Adela. It also refers to Stephen’s enthroning bringing chaos during the Anarchy. Posing as John of Cornwall, Henry pretends an explanation of this passage by way of commentary which accompanies the JC edition.

Henry had five elder brothers all legitimate through his disgraced father Stephen II, of which Henry was the youngest. The eldest was William, Count of Sully, the next in line was Theobald II, aka Thibaud IV Count of Champagne; and one brother Odo of Blois, aka Humbert who died young. King Stephen of England, and Philip Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne were his other two brothers. These are the six brothers (including Henry) or Frenchmen. John of Cornwall’s prophecies were concocted later than 1155 (even though scholarship is duped by the dedication). So, we can see Henry’s ability, between the different versions, to adapt the meaning for his current propaganda agenda. Originally, the prophecy probably did pertain to the six sons of Fremun, viscount of Cornwall yet after 1155 the prophecy is referring to him as he hopes to return to England as the adopted son.

Henry’s vanity in recording details of his own presence is also understood by leaving behind the name Master Blehis in connection to Grail literature. Also the white haired old man on the ‘snowy white horse’ who becomes ‘adopted’ in the John of Cornwall rendition, but we will get to that soon when I elucidate the JC prophecies. Henry created the JC prophecies in the hope he might persuade others of his own suitability to succeed the throne after Henry II had been fortuitously unseated by the Celtic sedition as the last Grandson of William the Conqueror.

However, let us continue on through these Vulgate HRB prophecies:

_The island shall be bathed in the tears of night, and thence the people shall be incited to all sorts of villainies._

Henry Blois at the beginning of the GS portrays the state of affairs in England, where, after the reign of Henry I and the accession of Stephen, a lawlessness pervaded throughout England. This was partly caused by the decimation of livestock through disease, but primarily through feudal fighting between the barons during the Anarchy. Henry Blois gives a vivid description of this in GS.
His progeny shall aspire to soar aloft,... the fact that Matilda is the eagle and tries to soar aloft gives the impression from the prophecy that she tries to regain her position, but new men shall rise to favour and eminence. This speaks specifically of Henry Blois and his brother. At the time of writing of the original prophecies, the expectation was still that Henry’s plans for a church led state would come to fruition.

Wherefore, girded about with the teeth of wolves, shall he climb over the heights of the mountains and the shadow of him that wears a helmet.

Here again, the heights of the mountains refers to the trip involved getting to Rome and thus the Alps become Rome.

Here, we see that Henry Blois (when the prophecies were originally written), sees himself and his brother as a partnership. King Stephen, under the protection of his brother Henry, who was the Wolf from Wolvesey (girdled about);79 using possibly ‘the tooth of the wolf’ (singular) originally. The point Henry was making is that the prophecy alluded to himself by vaticinatory pun, the Wolf from Wolvesey. The Helmeted man is the Pope and Henry as Legate is the shadow of him that wears a helmet. Henry refers to himself in fatuous prophetic imagery as the shadow of the pope i.e. the Legate.

From 1143 to 1963, the papal tiara was solemnly placed on the pope’s head during a papal coronation and resembled a helmet.80 The conclusions we can draw from this are that the original Libellus Merlini prophecies were written after March 1139 when Henry became Legate probably c.1142-3.

Albany shall be moved unto wrath, and calling unto them that are at her side shall busy her only in the shedding of blood.

Albania is employed as the archaic term for Scotland so as to appear as if Merlin is speaking from the past. Henry Blois dislikes both the Welsh and Scots and this is evident through ‘Geoffrey’ and as the author of GS.

King David’s hostility to Stephen can be understood as an effort to uphold the intended inheritance of Henry Ist, i.e. the succession of Matilda.

79 Wolvesey Palace was the residence of Henry Blois. Bishop Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester 963 - 84, was the one to build the first Bishop’s residence on the small island in the middle of the Itchen. This island was originally called Wulf’s Isle, a name that corrupted in time into Wolvesey.

80 See Note 3 Papal Coronation
King David joined her when she arrived in England, and later knighted her son, the future Henry II. As soon as Stephen was crowned on 22 December 1135 King David decided to make war on Stephen. King David marched into northern England, and by the end of January he had taken several castles. A treaty was agreed whereby David would retain Carlisle and David's son Henry was granted the earldom of Huntingdon. However, the first Durham treaty quickly broke down after David took insult at the treatment of his son Henry at Stephen's court.

David prepared again to invade England in 1137. Henry Blois makes it clear in the VM prophecies that he mistrusts the King of the Scots for his ability to break agreements. This is painfully clear in GS also. However, the prophecy here in HRB is a generalized sentiment held by Henry Blois about the fractious warring Scots. Since the early prophecies were not written until c.1141-43, one might assume the prophecy is a reference to the battle of Standard fought in August 1138. The 'calling in of those who dwell by her side' is recorded by Ailred of Rievaulx as the Galwegians from Galloway in South-West Scotland, the Cumbrians and Teviotdalesmen; the men of Lothian, the islanders and the men of Lorne in the South-West Highlands and Moravians, men from Moray in North-East Scotland.

A bridle-bit shall be set in her jaws that shall be forged in the heart of Armorica.

This prophecy above is difficult to understand. The obfuscation in this case is overdone. I think it refers to Geoffrey V, who was the Count of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine in the 'bosom of Brittany'. Perhaps it refers to the husband of Matilda tempering the rash and haughty Empress; especially considering the following:

He will cover the Eagle of the broken covenant (vows) and the Eagle shall rejoice in her third nesting.

The allusion is of a copulative nature which is expressed in the resultant third child. The reference is to Matilda as the 'eagle'. The 'broken covenant' pertains to broken oaths of all the Barons who swore to her father that they would remain loyal to her after his death. The 'third nesting' is the birth of Matilda’s third child William, on 22 July 1136. This is important to Henry Blois because of its opportune timing and the fateful reason Stephen was

---

81 I shall cover this point later.
82 It is preposterous that some modern scholars still believe that the interpolation into Orderic concerning the Merlin prophecies predates 1135.
able to be crowned King. Matilda had nearly died while giving birth to her second son. This was the cause of her unwillingness to travel to England at the time Stephen was crowned.

There was not a high expectation for Empress Matilda’s survival when she became pregnant for the third time after the earlier complications. Matilda was not going to risk crossing the channel because she was probably already suffering ‘morning sickness’ and unwilling to make the sea voyage. It is because of this pregnancy that Henry Blois was able to speed Stephen’s usurpation of the crown…. the grounds for which are set out in the *apologia* of the GS. The GS provides various rationalizations for the crowning of Stephen. Why Merlin keeps focusing on events pertinent to Henry Blois must be obvious. But it also substantiates the fact that a living *bonafide* persona ‘Geoffrey’ is an illusion and Henry Blois is the author of the prophecies.

*The rulers cubs shall awaken and forsaking the forests to hunt within the walls of cities.*

It doubtless can be interpreted as ‘the Normans’ will leave the normal practice of hunting in the woods for the new practice of warring in cities which transpires throughout the anarchy. This is confirmed in the next sentence where *No small slaughter shall they make of them that withstand them.*

I am at a loss to give any sure interpretation regarding the *tongues of bulls shall they cut out.*

*They shall load with chains the necks of them that roar, and the days of their grandsire shall they renew.*

The prophecy seems to refer to Henry and Stephen returning back to the ‘Glory days’ of their Grandfather, William the Conqueror, when all were subject to him. Them that roar are the Norman lion’s cubs i.e. specifically Stephen. The necks of the baronial lords are loaded with chains as chains are a symbolic representation of reward for acceptable and weighty

---

83The cutting out of bull’s tongues could have a papal implication concerning Stephen’s attempts at getting Eustace crowned, involved the ignoring of papal instruction. Concerning the tongues of bulls as an alternative interpretation: Nearly all the chroniclers alive at the time, relate that in Britain there was a cattle disease which decimated the cattle stocks just before Stephen’s reign. I suggest this may have been a disease called wooden tongue disease. The disease starts suddenly with the tongue becoming hard, swollen and painful. Affected animals drool saliva and cannot eat. Maybe some barbarous solution was to cut out their tongues. Certainly Henry Blois has something in mind; and as we have seen ‘lowing kine’ can be obsequious Barons, it is any one’s guess as to what the prophecy alludes to.
service; often hung in medieval times with a pendant of the coat of Arms. This prophecy would have been one of the original *Libellus Merlini* prophecies which establishes that Stephen and Henry are rightfully running the country as grandchildren of William the Conqueror.

For the most part, what I have covered so far existed in the First set of Prophecies, which, I assume, existed as the *Libellus Merlini*. This circulated separately and was distributed nonchalantly to a select few like Abbot Suger. We might speculate that the *Libellus* was originally composed to foretell (as if it were fated from long ago) that Stephen would be king; i.e. King Stephen’s rule had been foreseen. Who could challenge what was fated? However, it is difficult to know exactly how Henry has squed the prophecies.

*Thenceforward from the first unto the fourth, from the fourth unto the third, from the third unto the second the thumb shall be rolled in oil. The sixth shall overthrow the walls of Hibernia and change the forests into a plain.*

It is not by coincidence there is no ‘fifth’ in the kingship line mentioned; especially not Matilda, even though numerically she is the fifth. She would not be accounted as one of ‘the consecrated’ by oil. So, this passage from Vulgate looks as if it has been updated from an original early prophecy which originally spoke of only four i.e. before Matilda and Henry II arrived. This is supposition because we know Henry would hardly mention Matilda as the fifth anyway, but one might imagine that because the consecration was an issue, it was written after the fact i.e. Matilda was not consecrated (crowned). If Matilda was not consecrated, the point is Henry II is the ‘Sixth’ which obviates the fact that the prophecy was written after he was crowned.

Matilda’s aborted crowning means she was never officially crowned. Certainly the prophecy of the ‘sixth’ overthrowing the walls of Ireland, post-dates 1155. The mystical sounding vacuous first part of the prophecy above counting the four kings seems to me to be attempting to sound the same as the previous (original) prophecy (in counting from Stephen’s Grandfather) originally to only 4 and most probably would have been in the original *libellus Merlini* until the update which went to six.

We know the prophecy has been subsequently updated. Whether or not the first sentence was in the original set of Prophecies or not is inconsequential.... as it is obvious the second sentence post-dates the council at Winchester in September 1155. If the first sentence was in the
original *Libellus* it would indicate that the numbering system of the first four was instigated at that time.... and Matilda was just referred to as the eagle and not numbered because Stephen was still alive. Hence the ‘Sixth’ becomes apparent when the Vulgate prophecies are updated in 1155.

There is little advantage for us to trawl through all the prophecies as it is plain they were written by Henry Blois. This is not the objective of this exposé. My objective is to show clearly that Henry Blois is an arch interpolator of other manuscripts and once this is established, we can then understand much more about the HRB and its connection to DA and the Prophecy of Melkin and how they relate to Grail literature through Henry Blois.

However, to avoid further misunderstanding by the scholastic community, it is worth briefly looking at the evolving process of the prophecies of Merlin over time, which in essence has overlaid new material on what was originally published as a separate *Libellus Merlini*. Henry Blois’ illusion was also, at the same time, attempting to make the prophecies seem consistent from the first earlier edition. This is what has confused commentators on the Merlin prophecies in the various redactions of the prophecies found in Vulgate HRB, VM and JC.

As far as I can understand what has transpired is that an original set of prophecies were written. These were then added to and contained allusions to the period in the Anarchy and the period preceding it. Henry thought that some prophecies were found too obvious i.e. they could lead back to Henry as the author. In 1155 a set was produced which squewed the originals and split them up so that the sense was harder to grasp from one prophecy to another and continuity was broken up. However, in 1155 several prophecies were added to predict the fall of the Normans in Britain through the uprising of the combined Celtic nations.

These updated prophecies were added to the exemplar of the original First Variant version when the Vulgate version was published. The body of the Vulgate version varied in structure from First Variant because it was no longer aimed at a papal audience, so the dedicatees and colophon were added into the Vulgate essentially to backdate it. People were curious as to where the prophecies came from and who Galfidus Arthur was and where he was.

Subsequent to the publishing of the Vulgate, Henry decided to establish a more realistic Merlin who was seen to connect to events through
historical figures such as Taliesin and Rhydderch in his new output called the *Life of Merlin*. Original prophecies were followed nearly verbatim in VM and some from the updated prophecies of HRB were included. Also, Merlin saw/spoke fresh prophecies that had not featured in the HRB. Most of these new visions were localised and gave the impression that Merlin saw into the future concerning Dumbarton, Carlisle, and Camartheon etc. where Merlin had been fictitiously newly installed for VM. So, Henry does a little localising of his prophecies to appear that Merlin now pertains to the North.

I believe Henry contrived to locate Merlin because sceptics asked how it was that there was no previous record of Merlin. The structure and beauty of *Vita Merlini* had little interest for Henry, as it was specifically composed as a propaganda exercise. ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ in 1157 had been supposedly dead three years and a casual scenario for the composition of VM invented by Henry Blois was welded together based upon Irish and Welsh bardic material along with excerpts from Isidore of Seville’s *etymologiae*. The one point which positively shows that Henry Blois is the inventor of the prophecies is that a large part of the Anarchy’s most important events are covered by Ganieda (Merlin’s sister). This was obviously done so that Merlin was not accused of updating the material as the recent events had transpired since Henry had first published his *Libellus*.

Just so we can finish with these prophecies in HRB, I will just cover a few random prophecies to itemise what I have just explained above. It is not by accident that *Two cities shall he robe in two palls*, where both his friend Bernard at St David’s and Henry himself are petitioning for metropolitans.... *and virgin bounties shall he bestow upon virgins* most probably refers to Henry’s setting up of a nunnery at Winchester. However, this next piece is purely to aggravate the Celts to unseat Henry II and Henry Blois refers to King Henry II as the Lynx and predicts the downfall of the Normans and refers to the strife amongst the foreigners.... which constituted the Anarchy.

*...the Lynx that sees through all things, and shall keep watch to bring about the downfall of his own race, for through him shall Neustria lose both islands and be despoiled of her ancient dignity. Then shall the men of the country be turned back into the island for that strife shall be kindled amongst the foreigners.*

The Lynx is Henry II and Henry Blois is predicting he is going to be the downfall of his race and the Normans will lose England and Ireland.
Henry’s actual plan was to get the Celts to rebel while Henry was in Ireland. This never happened.

As we shall see later, the old man is Henry Blois himself who had a white horse and the Periron is the river Parrett on which he built a mill. *An old man, moreover, snowy white, who sits upon a snow-white horse, shall turn aside the river of Pereiron and with a white staff shall measure out a mill thereon. Cadwallader shall call unto Conan, and shall receive Albany to his fellowship.*

As we shall cover, both Cadwallader and Conan are contemporary enemies of Henry II at the time of writing and pertains to what Henry Blois is hoping will happen.

*Then shall there be slaughter of the foreigners: then shall the rivers run blood: then shall gush forth the fountains of Armorica and shall be crowned with the diadem of Brutus. Cambria shall be filled with gladness and the oaks of Cornwall shall wax green. The island shall be called by the name of Brutus and the name given by foreigners shall be done away.*

The allusion to Armorica is directly related to Conan duke of Brittany. Henry Blois even lets us know that Henry II will be succeeded by himself (all going to plan) in the JC prophecies. In the following though, he alludes to himself as the goat probably because of his beard and in reference to the camp of Venus which is Winchester. His word will rule over the land and Henry’s intended prediction is that with himself on the throne, there will at last be peace in Britain.

*He will be succeeded by the He-goat of the Castle of Venus having horns of gold and a beard of silver, and a cloud shall he breathe forth of his nostrils so dark as that the face of the island shall be wholly overshadowed. There shall be peace in his time,*

The date of the next prophecy which refers to the two kings at Wallingford where the bishops (those of the bishop’s staff) were Henry Blois and Theobald of Bec.... must post-date 1153.

*Two Kings shall encounter in nigh combat over the Lioness at the ford of the staff.*

The two kings are Stephen and Henry II. The lioness’ rights are what the whole Anarchy has been fought over. Henry Plantagenet (Henry II) and Stephen agree terms for ending the civil war. Under the terms of the Treaty
of Westminster, Stephen is to remain King for life, but thereafter the throne passes to Duke Henry.

_They that wear the cowl shall be provoked unto marriage, and their outcry shall be heard in the mountains of the Alps._

As we have seen Henry Blois posing as Merlin does not want to refer to Rome but pretends through the mists of time and refers to pope or Rome often in allegory as the Alps

The question of concubinage and the fact that several clergy were provoked into marriage was dealt with by Henry Blois as Legate and he referred many contentious decisions concerning concubinage to Rome. In 1022 Pope Benedict VIII banned marriages and mistresses for priests. However, at the First Lateran Council of 1123 priests, deacons, subdeacons, and monks were forbidden to have concubines, contract marriage, or even remain married.... and the Clergy were not happy about it. It is the ridiculous edict of the Catholic Church which has caused the abuse of innocent youth across the world by the Roman priesthood until the present era.

However, Henry Blois probably attended the second Lateran Council since William of Malmesbury reckons (as far as he can remember) that Henry became Legate in March. Canon 6 decrees that those who in the sub-deaconate and higher orders have contracted marriage or have concubines, be deprived of their office and ecclesiastical benefice. Thus the Prophecy: 'provoking marriage of those that wear the cowl'.

Canon 7: commands that no one attend the masses of those who are known to have wives or concubines. But that the law of continence and purity, so pleasing to God, may become more general among persons constituted in sacred orders, we decree that bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, canons regular, monks, and professed clerics (conversi) who, transgressing the holy precept, have dared to contract marriage, shall be separated. For a union of this kind which has been contracted in violation of the ecclesiastical law, we do not regard as matrimony. Those who have

---

84 The Treaty of Winchester was the agreement ending the Anarchy to which the infamous Bishop of Asaph put his name. The Treaty of Winchester seems to be the addendum following in 1153, allowing Stephen to remain King of England for life but appears to be after the death of Eustace as it mainly makes provision for Eustace’s brother. These documents made clear that Stephen had adopted Henry Plantagenet as his heir.

85 The pope presiding the council began on 2 April and it seems to have ended before 17 April 1139
been separated from each other, shall do penance commensurate with such excesses.

This Council thus declared clerical marriages not only illicit though valid before, but now invalid ("we do not regard as matrimony"). The marriages in question are those contracted by men who already are "bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, canons regular, monks and professed clerics".

Now, how is it again that Merlin focuses on affairs of the church so pertinent to Henry Blois’ legation?

*Three springs shall well forth in the city of Winchester, whereof the streams shall separate the island into three portions.*

This could refer to the third Metropolitan originally as it now has Britain divided into three.

Also, Henry foresaw a navigable channel/canal down to Southampton from Winchester supplied by the two rivers and expected the engineering project to come to fruition. The Anarchy prevented it and his name is linked with the start of such a work in reality.

This prophecy, which was in the original *Libellus Merlinit* (as it is predicted to happen in the then future) is followed up by skimble skamble devised to disguise the fact the project never came to fruition and Henry's connection with it. Tradition says it was the Bishop of Winchester that is said to have devised a grand plan for improving the trade both of Winchester and Alresford by the construction of a "navigation" on the river Alre⁶⁶ and Itchen. Alresford Pond was started by Henry as the prophecy predicts and constructed in order to create a head of water for a canal. This canal is supposed to have run from Alresford Pond to Winchester. It is said to have been constructed on the orders of the Bishop of Winchester.

That Henry had already devised the production of the VM when he updated the Vulgate prophecies is obviated by the inclusion of the forest of *Colidonitis* to match with the new location of Merlin in VM.

The next prophecy is about Winchester written after the rout of Winchester where the citizens which Henry Blois had originally persuaded to accept Matilda as ‘their lady’ subsequently refused to swap allegiance back to Stephen when Henry Blois reverted his own allegiance back to his brother. On the orders of Henry Blois, Winchester was set ablaze. Henry

---

⁶⁶ In some texts it has *Fons Annæ* and we know the camp of Venus (which will be renewed) is Winchester after Henry’s reconstruction and thus we can speculate that Henry had plans for the three springs appearing in Winchester, one of which was to be navigable to Hamo’s port which is Southampton.
combines his present agenda, (again concerned with unseating Henry II) and blames the woes of Winchester on their perjury…. yet he is fully aware of his own instruction to burn Winchester.\textsuperscript{87}

Come together Cambria, and bringing Cornwall with thee at thy side, say unto Winchester: 'The earth shall swallow thee: transfer the see of the shepherd thither where ships do come to haven, and let the rest of the members follow the head.' For the day is at hand wherein thy citizens shall perish for their crimes of perjury.

Henry Blois intonates in the prophecy that the destruction of Winchester was because of the townsfolk’s treachery in changing allegiance. Most readers were familiar with the scenario that Henry himself persuaded them at first to accept Matilda. Henry wants Winchester upgraded to a metropolitan. Henry (latterly) squewes the purport away from Winchester to London.

Again the citizens of Winchester are blamed for the fact that their city was burnt, \textit{Woe unto the perjured people, for by reason of them shall the renowned city fall into ruin.}

We know that Henry is the Hedgehog with the pun on Hericus instead of Henricus and we know he rebuilt the city.

\textit{The Hedgehog that is laden with apples shall rebuild her.}

What is happening here is that Henry has written earlier prophecies about his aspirations to rebuild after the fire. In this version he is updating the prophecies in the HRB in 1155; so, he is trying to make it appear that the updated version still matched the older one. Because the engineering works did not transpire, the whole sense of the prophecy is now associated with the Thames just to confuse the reader, but Henry had in fact boasted in an earlier prophecy that the report of his engineering endeavour at Winchester (having been foreseen by Merlin) would find renown at Rome. What we do know for certain is that he did have a ‘mighty palace’ at Winchester and we may speculate that he intended to rebuild the city walls with six hundred towers. \textit{He shall add thereunto a mighty palace, and wall it}

\textsuperscript{87}William of Malmesbury states: \textit{…..but the people of Winchester gave her (Matilda) their unspoken loyalty, remembering the faith they had pledged to her when they were induced to do it, almost against their will by the Bishop. Meanwhile firebrands flung from the bishop’s tower upon the houses of the citizens, who, as I have said, were more zealous for the Empress’s success than the Bishop’s, caught and burnt an entire nunnery within the city and the monastery called Hyde without. That Henry is responsible for the burning of Winchester is confirmed by John of Worchester’s report: \ldots the bishop is reported to have said to the earl of Northampton, \textit{‘Behold earl, you have my orders, concentrate on razing the city to the ground.’}
around with six hundred towers. London shall behold it with envy and trebly increase her walls.

The Thames river shall compass her round on every side, and the report of that work shall pass beyond the Alps.

As will become apparent in progression, the current copy of the prophecies comes from the updated Vulgate version of HRB which I will show was written in 1155. As I have suggested, it is likely that a river was previously un-named and the whole prophecy originally applied to Winchester. In the updated version where too much of the previous information seemed too highly pertinent to Henry Blois he has added the Thames to take the focus from Winchester and himself. It must not be forgotten that when Henry wrote the previous *Libellus Merlini* prophecies, he was the King’s brother and Merlin just happened to be focusing on events which ‘coincidentally’ revolved around Henry Blois. In the updated version however in 1155, he is inciting rebellion; so there was a need for the utmost caution and obfuscation of any evidence that Henry was author of the prophecies. But, at the same time, the prophecies still had to resemble in content the previous set of prophecies. Even though William Newburgh writes 20 years after Henry’s death, Newburgh still knew that: a writer in our times has started up and invented the most ridiculous fictions....

Within her (Winchester Cathedral) shall the Hedgehog hide his apples and shall construct passageways under-ground.

The so-called ‘Holy Hole’ in the retro-choir at Winchester Cathedral which still exists today is a small doorway leading into a short passage which goes nowhere. Originally this was constructed by Henry Blois as a means of increasing alms derived from pilgrims, allowing them to go underground past the crypts of saints and relics.\(^88\) The high water table under the New Minster caused several relics to be moved at the time as related by prior Robert of Winchester. The prophecy may also refer to more practical constructions underground to alleviate the flooding of the crypts which still occurs today.

---

\(^88\) The small ‘Holy Hole’ was originally a larger passage which enabled pilgrims to crawl from outside the cathedral directly beneath St. Swithun’s Shrine. Bishop Henry also surrounded Swithun with the bones of various Saxon Kings and Bishops in lead coffers, which he had removed from their ‘lowly place’ of burial.
What seems to have transpired is that Henry is trying to deflect attention from himself. In earlier prophecies (in the *libellus Merlini*) some of the blatantly obvious prophecies that he has prognosticated could lead back to him as author. Unfortunately no copy of these have been definitely identified at the present (as an early separate *Libellus*), but it seems fair to say with his new updated prophecies which incite the Celts to rebellion, his older prophecies which were less guarded, needed to be squewed so no suspicion would lead to Henry. Henry tries to deflect any attention he may have focused on himself or Winchester by obfuscating. He predicts (as if he were Merlin) that these things will occur when two unlikely events transpire. Thus any sceptical person who may be suspicious of Henry's authorship of the prophecies are immediately non-plussed because stones do not speak and neither has the English channel shrunk.

*In that day shall stones speak, and the sea whereby men sail into Gaul shall become a narrow straight.*

Henry Blois then follows this with more ridiculous propositions seemingly seen through a glass darkly, keeping his obfuscation less like an insertion but more as a train of connected events seen by Merlin.

*Men will call from shore to shore, and the soil of the island shall be enlarged. The hidden things that are beneath the sea shall be revealed, and Gaul shall tremble in fear.*

There seems little point in continuing because there is such obfuscation and squewing of previous prophecies which Henry is attempting to dissemble, that it seems too uncertain to attempt to find rational meaning. The dragon of Worcester is Waleran and the dragon of Lincoln was Alexander and the ass of wickedness was Theobald of Bec, but it would be unlikely a sage from the sixth century would focus on those who Henry Blois disliked.
Chapter 4

Henry Blois and the Vita Merlini

Tatlock, for whom I have the utmost respect,\(^8\) and who has penetrated HRB to elucidate its construction, would be embarrassed by the blindness he suffered from not seeing Henry Blois as the author of the prophecies; especially when he tells us that it is impossible to believe that ‘Geoffrey’ wrote all the prophecies. If Tatlock had not suffered this blind spot, nearly every argument put forward to show that some prophecies were written by a separate individual other than Geoffrey would bolster the case for Henry Blois as the author of VM, HRB and the prophecies.

It is doubtful anyone will fully understand all the prophecies of Merlin in HRB, but Tatlock is misguided where he says it is hard to believe the

\(^8\) If indeed one of the many hundreds of scholars over the past hundred and fifty years had indeed entertained the possibility of Henry’s authorship, we might be able to assign the title scholar to any one of them. However, the myopia which persists in the scholastic community is like a genetic disease passed down, where no-one can see the wood for the trees. This is more testament to Henry Blois’ brilliance than their lack of it.
prophecies ever had any intelligible meaning for anyone.\textsuperscript{90} They were most certainly written by Henry Blois just as VM is written by him; and for the most part they certainly had meaning originally. For consistency, many of Merlin’s prophecies are repeated from Vulgate HRB into VM, but there are many additions. Once we understand the prophecies were written by Henry, we can then see why many of the prophecies themselves (supposed to have come from a sixth century Merlin), substantiate parts of the pseudo-history comprising HRB, which, supposedly ‘Geoffrey’ wrote. The reason we may never fully understand every prophecy is that they have undergone editorial changes by Henry in the final HRB in the Vulgate version published in 1155.

These were followed by new prophecies by Merlin in VM and other prophecies by Taliesin. Ganieda’s introduction into VM helped substantiate Merlin’s vaticinatory reliability. I do not wish to bore the reader who does not need to know why and when VM was written and the quickest way to establish who wrote VM is to read Merlin’s sisters prophecies because all of them are itemised as events written in the Gesta Spephani authored by Henry Blois.

As Henry Blois changed the sense to some prophecies and added to the original set (which we may suppose Abbot Suger had); it becomes difficult to divine the sense or purport on occasion and to whom the prophecy refers; yet at other times it is crystal clear that the prophecies speak of events which are wholly translatable to Henry’s world view and interests, especially being the author of the \textit{Primary Historia}, the First Variant and Vulgate HRB.

It would be foolish of anyone to presume to attempt to unveil the meaning of each prophecy as some prophecies have purposefully been squeezed at a later date to hide Henry’s authorship when he has previously been less guarded. There seems to be a defining reason for writing the VM with several prophecies seemingly repeated from HRB. Not only has Henry Blois squeezed some prophecies from HRB in VM by Merlin himself, but he has added two more sets of prophecies which see clearly on other subjects not touched by Merlin, through Taliesin and Ganieda.

However, I feel that the whole of VM has a half-hearted approach in layout and purpose by comparison with the well-structured HRB. So, we

\textsuperscript{90}Tatlock. P.416
should try to find out why Henry went to the trouble of producing the seemingly uninspired VM.

Henry wishes to demonstrate or corroborate that the updated prophecies in HRB (which differed from those known by contemporaries to have existed in the earlier *libellus Merlini*) were in fact written or understood to have existed (in another work) by the now dead ‘Geoffrey’. and so Henry Blois wrote the VM. After 1155 sceptics of the prophecies antiquity were trying to discover who had added seditious prophecies to the originals. This is why many of the prophecies in VM are changed in purport from the Vulgate HRB’s new updated set (making some a lot less specific).

In effect by writing VM, Henry not only locates Merlin in antiquity (not accomplished in HRB), but has him surrounded and interacting with sixth century contemporaries; but most importantly the seditious prophecy which encourages the Celts to unite to re-establish the crown of Brutus is found in VM as well..... which puts its composition in between 1155-1158.

Therefore if ‘Geoffrey’ is now known to be dead then those trying to find the person who added the most recent prophecy are non-plussed because there it is in another of ‘Geoffrey’s’ works.... which, since he died in 1154, could not (as the logic goes) have been added to thwart Henry II. This same argument applies to the ‘Sixth’ in Ireland prophecy also. Gerald of Wales relates that the VM Merlin is clearer and comments on the modern insertions he detects in the prophecies saying that ‘not all these prophecies are probable, nor all fabulous’, but Gerald says King Henry II wants to read a copy. So the idea that the VM was instigated to counter the argument that someone was inciting sedition is not so silly if Henry II wanted to check to see if the prophecies were the same as found in Vulgate HRB or the *Libellus Merlini*.

The *Vita Merlini* is written in classical Latin hexameters and considering what is achieved in converting prose source material from Isidore into this form of poem, it is a remarkable achievement. It has been paid little

---

91 This argument is also given credence by the fact that the colophon of HRB, which, in effect adds a confirmation that the dedicatees were alive at the time the prophecies were added..... is an addition to the Vulgate to counter the argument that the dedicatees were not found in the First Variant version and were added subsequently. The colophon speaks to William of Malmesbury and in effect pre-dates the Vulgate to at least 1143.
attention by commentators. Tatlock\(^{92}\) believes the VM was written in 1154. I can say with certainty it was not written until after 1155 because of the reference to the 19 years of Stephen’s reign and if I am correct Ganieda’s reference to Coleshill in 1157.

The VM begins with a dedication much like the HRB. Where VM is dedicated to Robert de Chesney, most HRB copies are dedicated to Robert of Gloucester. These two (along with Alexander) were detested by Henry Blois and therefore allaying any suspicion that either work might have been composed by him. Both works offer their dedicatees the humble offer of being corrected. In the Vita: *I am preparing to sing the madness of the prophetic bard, and a humorous poem on Merlin; pray correct the song.*

In the HRB:

*Robert, Duke of Gloucester, show favour in such wise that it may be so corrected by thy guidance and counsel as that it may be held to have sprung, not from the poor little fountain of Geoffrey of Monmouth, but rather from thine own deep sea of knowledge, and to savour of thy salt.*

Let me state for the record categorically that no dedicatee ever received a copy of HRB or VM from Geoffrey of Monmouth. Modern scholars have derived their entire analysis of dating based on these late insertions of the dedicatees names into Vulgate HRB which were neither present in the *Primary Historia* found at Bec or the First Variant version constructed c.1144.

The first Variant in 1144 by comparison with the latter Vulgate Version obeyed a stricter adhesion to known annals with direct quotes from Bede, descriptions of gore from battles scenes were tempered along with other unpleasing details which might offend the pious such as rape, proud or arrogant speeches of British pride were toned down or excluded (if they were even composed at the time), prayer and God’s judgement abounded for the lot of Men and biblical references were splattered throughout along with classical quotations. All designed for one purpose; to endear papal approval of Henry Blois’ designs on Metropolitan. All dedications were

added to the Vulgate HRB after their deaths.\textsuperscript{93} The converse applies to the VM. The difference is that when the VM circulated Robert de Chesney was alive until 1166.

Unfortunately and by a huge coincidence ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ aka the ‘Bishop of Asaph’ had been consigned to death by Henry Blois. This anomaly in Henry Blois’ methodology may explain the lack of copies which were propagated. It may even be the case that the dedication to Robert was added by Henry after Robert de Chesney’s death just as he had done with all\textsuperscript{94} the dedicatees in the copies of Vulgate HRB. Most commentators date the VM to 1154 as they assume Geoffrey died in 1154-5. The ploy of Henry Blois by appearing to ask correction is so that the reader is duped into thinking that he is humbly appealing to a contemporary patron or dedicatee.

Henry Blois makes a pretence in both HRB and VM as if his dedicatees were patrons of his work, but due to his ability in both cases to propel his work into the public domain, this is just part of his smoke and mirrors routine whereby Henry Blois appears to be a cleric ‘Geoffrey’ trying to advance his position. Henry Blois is so clever at this that he gives the appearance (in the dedication of VM) of seeming dissatisfied with the acknowledgement he received from Alexander and hopes for better with Robert de Chesney. He makes out that his last dedicatee in Lincoln (Alexander) did not recognise him by reward.

Writing the VM after 1155, Henry predates his work to c.1148-9 by the use of the word ‘just’ regarding his fictional relationship with his fictitious patron Robert de Chesney: \textit{whom you have just succeeded, promoted to an honour that you deserve...} The reason for doing this was to show the continued patronage of the bishops of Lincoln. Alexander did not commission the translation of the prophecies of Merlin simply because they are all made up by Henry Blois. The dedications found in Vulgate HRB were written after the death of the dedicatees and as I have stated, did not exist in the \textit{Primary Historia} found at Bec (where no prophecies were even included in that first edition).

No-one had ever met or seen Geoffrey of Monmouth and although Henry Blois had consigned him to death in 1154-5, it is clear that the tone and

\textsuperscript{93} There may be an original dedication to Robert of Gloucester in a First Variant version but this also would have post-dated 1147.

\textsuperscript{94} This even applies to the Count of Meulan
compositional content of VM was authored in Henry’s time at Clugny between 1155-58. Henry authored VM while in a state of depression at his sudden loss of power, status and wealth.

The word ‘just’ implies Robert de Chesney is recently installed. Therefore, many commentators have assumed the Vita was written in 1148. This point will be addressed when I cover the backdating of the HRB. For the moment the dedication has little bearing on our investigation. The false air of humility for the most part ensured for the contemporary reader that it ‘had been’ a commissioned work.

Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, had no regard for Robert. Henry had tried to secure the bishopric of Lincoln for one of his nephews but was thwarted by the pope and others. The pope agreed with the Lincoln chapter in their election and appointed Robert de Chesney as bishop. Chesney employed Foliot as a clerk at Lincoln. It is Gilbert Foliot’s letters which give some background to Chesney’s election, showing that King Stephen of England and his brother Henry of Blois, attempted to secure Lincoln for one of their relatives.

The candidates put forward by Stephen and Henry Blois were Henry de Sully, abbot of Frécamp, Gervase, abbot of Westminster, and Hugh, abbot of St Benet of Hulme. Henry de Sully was the son of William, Count of Chartres…. Stephen and Henry Blois’ eldest brother. William, as oldest, had not received his birthright as the eldest son to the comptal throne. He was considered too aggressive and mentally incompetent. Another candidate put forward for the bishopric of Lincoln was Gervase, the illegitimate son of King Stephen and his mistress, Damette. The third proposed candidate was Hugh, abbot of St Benet of Hulme. He was the illegitimate son of Stephen.

Henry Blois in VM makes a pretence flattering Robert de Chesney calling him a leader and a teacher in the world... promoted to an honour that you deserve... and the clergy and the people all were seeking it for you. This is contrary to Henry’s real feelings. Henry betrays himself as author with his constant reference to muses: were all to sing with my mouth and all the

95In about 1160 Chesney became embroiled in a dispute with St Albans Abbey in the diocese of Lincoln, over his right as bishop to supervise the abbey. The dispute was eventually settled when the abbey granted Chesney land in return for his relinquishing any right to oversee St Albans a dispute Henry was involved in.
96There was an incident where he threatened to kill Bishop Ivo of Chartres over a jurisdictional dispute and his mother Adela conferred the inheritance to Theobald II, the second eldest son.
Muses were to accompany me, and betrays too much knowledge of their provenance established in Greek literature later on in the Vita Merlini.

He again refers to muses on his personal epitaph on the Meusan plates. It is as if Henry believes he is inspired by muses. Again, to Alexander in the dedication to the prophecies of Merlin in HRB: Howbeit, since it so pleased you that Geoffrey of Monmouth should sound his pipe in these vaticinations, eschew thou not to show favour unto his minstrelsies, and if so be that he carol out of time or tune do thou with the ferule of thine own muses.

Henry Blois in VM then launches into the body and purpose of the text: Well then, after many years had passed under many Kings, Merlin the Briton was held famous in the world. He was a King and prophet; to the proud people of the South Welsh he gave laws, and to the chieftains he prophesied the future. Reassuring his reader, Henry picks up the same Merlin that the HRB had made famous. But in VM he now consciously attempts to locate him by the historical cross referencing of bardic literature rather than the mythical un-defined and fabricated Merlin Ambrosius of HRB. (See note 2). This is the first time we hear that Merlin is a King.

Merlin had come to the war with Peredur and so had Rhydderch, King of the Cumbrians. Merlin is found lamenting as the battle took place around him: O dubious lot of mankind! as blood flowed all around. Henry assumes Cambri (Cymry), (now applied to the Welsh), was formerly used of the Britons just as he does in the HRB and has them making war on Gwenddoleu and routing the Scots.

Next in VM we find Merlin refusing food and filling the air with so many and so great complaints, new fury seized him and he departed secretly, and fled to the woods not wishing to be seen as he fled...

Henry Blois had departed secretly from England and he (like Merlin) hides himself away at Clugny hidden like a wild animal, he remained buried in the woods, found by no one and forgetful of himself and of his kindred. At Clugny, Henry reflects back on the years of his brother’s reign and reflects on how God has brought him from the most powerful man in Britain to be in self imposed exile. It is 1156 and Henry II is on the throne and King Henry II has confiscated six of Henry’s castles and virtually made him powerless. The VM can be summed up in mood as a reflection upon Henry’s part in the Anarchy seeing violence and now he has come to centre himself in the forest and evade the shallowness and excesses of court life. The forest
is Clugny far from the life of the previous 19 years of political intrigue at which he was central as a Machiavellian manipulator of events. Henry like Merlin is full of grief at the loss of his brother.

Henry Blois fled across the channel without permission just as Merlin reflects in VM. *Christ, God of heaven, what shall I do? In what part of the world can I stay, since I see nothing here I can live on.... Here once there stood nineteen apple trees bearing apples every year; now they are not standing. Who has taken them away from me?*

The 19 trees which are now not standing are the years that his brother was King, (fruitful years), but now he is dead. King Stephen reigned for 19 years from 1135-1154. Henry introduces the apples here as they are part of his design in the translocation of ‘Avalon’, the island he had named in the HRB. Henry’s methodology in the creation of what became known as the ‘Matter of Britain’ is the creation of a ‘conflatory’ soup of detail where icons are subconsciously and hazily cross referenced. Through this confusion, allowance is given for the appearance of inaccuracy through the ages. A connection of apples and the county of Somerset leave no doubt in the readers mind that the Avalon of HRB is synonymous with an *Insula Pomorum* through Barinthus.

Henry further opines in the persona of Merlin and sees that it is the will of God that he has been brought low so quickly from such lofty office. He cannot hide from the fact that many blame his interference for much of the cause of the Anarchy: *Now I see them - now I do not! Thus the fates fight against me and for me, since they both permit and forbid me to see. Now I lack the apples and everything else. The trees stand without leaves, without fruit; I am afflicted by both circumstances since I cannot cover myself with the leaves or eat the fruit.*

Henry, now at Clugny with Peter the Venerable his mentor (who he refers to as a ‘Wolf in old age’), marvels that Clugny, the greatest of all religious houses is in financial trouble. He has to bail out the establishment and feed 400 monks out of his own personal wealth. Peter had secreted and moved Henry’s wealth abroad after Henry had attended the last council of King Henry II’s court held at Winchester in September 1155.

It was at this court they had discussed invading Ireland. Peter the Venerable in old age had found himself unable to turn around the decline at Clugny and Henry Blois relays this as if conversing with a wolf in the wood metaphorically:  *You, O wolf, dear companion, accustomed to roam...*
with me through the secluded paths of the woods and meadows, now can scarcely get across fields; hard hunger has weakened both you and me. You lived in these woods before I did and age has whitened your hairs first. You have nothing to put into your mouth and do not know how to get anything, at which I marvel, since the wood abounds in so many goats and other wild beasts that you might catch. Perhaps that detestable old age of yours has taken away your strength and prevented your following the chase. Now, as the only thing left to you, you fill the air with howlings, and stretched out on the ground you extend your wasted limbs.”

As with some split personalities, Henry Blois was shy and suffered from bouts of depression and certainly this must have been the case in 1155. As the VM reflects, Henry is in a state of depression and is an ode to how he strayed from his upbringing at Clugny in the pursuit of knowledge to become a material bishop knight at the heart of violent times; the Anarchy much of which he is responsible for.

The impetus for much of the updating of the Merlin prophecies which we shall see is designed to unseat Henry II. Whereas in the first prophecies the Norman’s were seen as fellow kindred freeing the Britons from the Saxons, there is now a distinct change in that Merlin now foresees the downfall of the Neustrians; especially Henry II. The one vital observation about the change of attitude in VM from previous positions in Libellus Merlini where the evolving hope of the Britons was in the return of a redeemer king Arthur; Merlin does not hold this position now, but foresees Conan and Cadwallader along with the Scots and Cornish overcoming Henry II. It is not until the reader gets to read JC’s prophetia that Henry’s true design is unveiled as I will cover in progression.

Henry Blois now sets the scene of the madman Merlin being overheard by a traveller in the glades of the Calidonian forest: Now this traveller was met by a man from the court of Rhydderch, King of the Cumbrians, who was married to Ganieda and happy in his beautiful wife. She was sister to Merlin and, grieving over the fate of her brother, she had sent her retainers to the woods and the distant fields to bring him back.

Merlin is found lamenting in a long naturist soliloquy. The traveller sent to bring him back to his sister then sings in the hope of soothing his madness by music on the cither about Guendoloena. O the dire groanings of
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mournful Guendoloena! O the wretched tears of weeping Guendoloena! I grieve for wretched dying Guendoloena! There was not among the Welsh a woman more beautiful than she... for she does not know where the prince has gone, or whether he is alive or dead; and

Ganie da weeps with her, and without consolation grieves for her lost brother.... so great is the grief that consumes them both. Not otherwise did Sidonian Dido grieve when the ships had weighed anchor and Aeneas was in haste to depart; so most wretched Phyllis groaned and wept when Demophon did not come back at the appointed time; thus Briseis wept for the absent Achilles.

Merlin’s madness is gradually assuaged by the music and he became mindful of himself; and he recalled what he used to be, and he wondered at his madness and he hated it. Henry hated his circumstances and reflects on what he had and who he was and now at Clugny brought so low.

Merlin then asked to be led to the court of King Rhydderch. Gaineda his sister was there at court and he was reunited with his wife Guendoloena.

Henry Blois’ artifice throughout the Vita Merlini is to express his views using Merlin as a voice piece. He also does this in the same way through Ganieda and Taliesin. Henry Blois includes in the VM what can be termed as ‘padding’. Amongst this, the real reasons for writing the Vita are revealed.

I have no wish to bore the reader by traipsing through the VM, but it lays the groundwork which shows Henry’s authorial subtlety. As the narration of the Vita continues, Merlin points out his sister’s affair to the King by correctly predicting the calamitous death of someone. His sister tries to hide her infidelity by ridiculing Merlin’s prediction in the hope of proving her innocence against the accusation of the affair. Merlin goes back to the woods; he unselfishly frees his wife Guendoloena from his marriage bond, and then for some unknown reason decides to kill her suitor. Henry’s sources for what can only be called narrative filler are from Irish, Welsh, and Scottish sources.

After these distractions Henry Blois again gets down to the real business behind his construction of the VM and remembers he is Merlin in the sixth century and he is now on: the top of a lofty mountain the prophet was

98 Sidonian Dido here with solemn state, did Juno’s temple build. Virgil’s Aenid, book 1
99 Henry Blois was familiar with the Heroides of Ovid.
regarding the courses of the stars, speaking to himself out in the open air.

“What does this ray of Mars mean? Does its fresh redness mean that one King is dead and that there shall be another? So I see it, for Constantine has died and his nephew Conan, through an evil fate and the murder of his uncle, has taken the crown and is King.

Henry reminds us of the Merlin from the HRB; and we are now in the reign of Aurelius Conan, which according to the HRB began about two years after the voyage of Arthur to Avalon and lasted for about two years putting us around 542.\textsuperscript{100} Henry Blois pays little account to dating, more an overall chronology as seen in the HRB. The Battle of Arderydd where Henry Blois has set the stage for Merlin at the beginning of the poem, was fought about 577. However, Henry’s aim is to anchor the Merlin of the HRB to the Welsh \textit{Rhydderch} so that he can set his narrative in a contemporaneous era. The narrative is only secondary to his main purpose. Henry’s purpose is to manipulate events by his audience believing the prophecies of Merlin come true, both from the HRB and the VM.

Henry of Blois posing as Geoffrey of Monmouth just uses the backdrop of Merlin in the woods and the characters he involves, to set a stage ready for his polemic. The disjointed appearance of the VM is caused by inconsequential situation and narrative which sets up his main speakers, Ganieda, Merlin and Taliesin, which all speak to Henry Blois’ agenda and by comparison to his character development of protagonists in HRB offers little in VM…. which comes across as rather flat.

We now find Merlin in the woods again in a house and his sister is supplying him food. Then wandering about the house Merlin would look at the stars while he prophesied (for example the following), which he knew were going to come to pass as Bede and Gildas had related.

“O madness of the Britons whom a plenitude, always excessive, of riches exalts more than is seemly. They do not wish to enjoy peace but are stirred up by the Fury’s goad. They engage in civil wars and battles between relatives, and permit the church of the Lord to fall into ruin; the holy bishops they drive into remote lands.

\textsuperscript{100} As we shall discuss further on in the \textit{Vera Historia} Arthur supposedly reigned for 39 years and died in his fortieth year. HRB states that Arthur died in 542 and also says that Arthur acceded the throne at the age of 15. We can calculate therefore that according to Henry Blois (the writer of HRB and the \textit{Vera Historia}) that Arthur must have been born in 486 acceded to the throne in 503 and died 39 years later in 542.
This sentiment exactly is reiterated in the HRB by ‘Geoffrey’ rather than through the supposed words of Merlin. Essentially, Henry is taking up the mood of Bede bemoaning the downfall of the warring factions of the Britons while presenting himself as a Welsh author being partisan with the same values but more so presenting Merlin in true character.

*The nephews of the Boar of Cornwall cast everything into confusion, and setting snares for each other engage in a mutual slaughter with their wicked swords. They do not wish to wait to get possession of the Kingdom lawfully, but seize the crown.*

This could not be more precise as a description of Henry Blois and his brother Stephen. However, this reference to the Boar of Cornwall, which his audience associates with Arthur, betrays Henry Blois’ real affiliations and motivations as he sees himself and his brother as part of the heritage of ancient Britons from Brittany who emigrated during the 6th century when the Saxons encroached on Dumnonia. We start to understand why Henry Blois (as Geoffrey) has such a positive attitude toward Brittany throughout the HRB. Contrarily, we can understand why he holds the Welsh in such low regard as they revolted against his brother Stephen. Yet, commentators have been puzzled by this believing ‘Geoffrey’ was Welsh and from Monmouth. Henry’s hate of the (contemporary) Welsh witnessed in HRB is plainly seen in GS and stems from his time in 1136 in Southern Wales.

*The fourth from them shall be more cruel and more harsh still; him shall a wolf from the sea conquer in fight and shall drive defeated beyond the Severn through the realms of the barbarians.*

Until one understands Henry changing the purport of previous prophecies it is impossible to make head nor tail as he changes icons from the original *libellus Merlini*. Originally the sea Wolf was the Danes. The description in this case of the sea wolf is in reference to the Robert of Gloucester’s and the Empress’ return to England. The prophecy specifically relates to her brother Robert of Gloucester who accompanies her across the Channel to land near Arundel. Robert of Gloucester had left Arundel immediately to rally forces from Bristol before King Stephen had arrived. It was rumoured that Henry Blois had made a pact with Robert of Gloucester
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101 See appendix 18
102 The Fourth is in reference to the fourth in line from William the Conqueror. The Conqueror was followed by William Rufus and then by Henry II, making King Stephen the fourth.
to install Matilda and oust his brother from the throne. It was clear that, in
the latter part of 1138, his Brother was deliberately snubbing him for the
election of Archbishop of Canterbury. But this is specifically skirted over
(strangely enough) by the author of the GS. His meeting with Robert of
Gloucester is mentioned in cursory manner in GS simply because it was
undeniable. Many afterward knew the meeting had taken place.

However, as the reader will realise, the gist of the GS always maintains
that Henry had only ‘appeared’ to change allegiance and the author of GS
portrays a position whereby Henry constantly supported Stephen. The GS
maintains the view.... what may have seemed a change of allegiance
outwardly.... was in appearance only. The GS storyline maintains that
events dictated a change of allegiance, as a more propitious course of action
at that moment in time. Henry would have us believe in GS that he was
always loyal to Stephen. This meeting of Robert and Henry suggests
otherwise.

However, since the episode where Bishop Roger of Salisbury was abused
and more specifically church rights of Canon law were broken.... Henry
Blois, who was already disappointed with his brother in other previous
disputes, not so much plays both sides, but has had enough of the discord
which prevailed throughout the country through his own actions installing
his brother on the throne. Henry Blois had definitively been thwarted and
the Archbishopric had been bestowed on Theobald of Bec.

However, through the machinations of Henry Blois, who had met Robert
of Gloucester secretly, a full on battle was avoided for the present. Henry
Blois met Robert on the road while Robert of Gloucester was intent with
helping his sister at Arundel. Henry Blois dissuaded Robert from an attack
on his brother’s forces which were presently besieging Matilda at Arundel.
Henry Blois in his own words\textsuperscript{103} from the GS: \textit{as though he had not caught
up with the Earl, came to the King with a large body of cavalry.}

Henry had manipulated events so that his brother King Stephen would
not have to besiege Arundel or witness a staged full on battle. Henry had
cleverly come up with the plan of escorting Matilda to her brother’s castle

\textsuperscript{103} The \textit{Gesta Stephani} is part apologia for Henry Blois’ own tarnished reputation as a manipulator. It is also a
sentimental memorial to his dead brother, and part genuine history. The details are too specific on occasion for
GS not to have been written by Henry Blois himself even though it appears otherwise. He conceals himself by
employing devices to deflect suspicion of his authorship.
in Bristol. In a way, Matilda’s and Robert’s plans were temporarily defused and they were then both in Bristol (by the Severn).

Now back to the following prophecy in the VM which is fairly complicated: *This latter shall besiege Cirencester with a blockade and with sparrows, and shall overthrow its walls to their very bases.*

The obvious inference is that ‘the latter’ is the fourth just spoken of i.e. Stephen.

At Cirencester in 1141 the Empress and Robert, Earl of Gloucester built a ‘motte and bailey’ castle near the Abbey church and in 1142 Stephen found it virtually undefended and attacked. He captured the inhabitants and Castle with the rampart and stockade and burnt it to its foundation. According to William of Malmesbury, Stephen must have come looking for the Empress who had just escaped the besieged castle at Oxford, but she was thereafter at Wallingford. Stephen might have heard of the amassing of the Empress’s troops there, but they had recently moved off and thus it was easy to capture and destroy. However, Henry writing as ‘Geoffrey’ in VM has another objective in mind. He wishes to squew and confirm the words of Merlin found in HRB which appeared in Henry’s first edition *Libellus Merlini* (written while Stephen was alive). This reference to Cirencester was squewed in VM to conform (corroborate) with the Battle of Cirencester spoken of by Bede which was fought in 628.

‘Geoffrey’s’ original allusion to Cirencester is that *Gormund made war upon Careticus, and after many battles betwixt them, drove him fleeing from city unto city until he forced him into Cirencester and did there beleaguer him.* Both Gormundus the African and Isembardus the Frank, allied to the Saxons, carry out the siege. Gormundus the African is wholly an invention by ‘Geoffrey’ as he tries to concoct history along the lines of history found in the insular annals by employing fictional characters.

The later Wace version of HRB has tinder-carrying sparrows. This idea is also found in *Brut Tysilio* which as we shall see later has had Henry Blois’ hand upon it; seen clearly in the references to Walter and reference to Caradoc of Llancarfan. Wace adds that Cirencester was, after that event, called Sparrowchester. There appears to be no etymology that will explain *Sparewenchestre* except like so many other instances ‘Geoffrey’ loves his
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etymology and will create a story round it. Gaimar\textsuperscript{106} gives a slightly longer account, making Cerdic (as below) the leader of the besieging force, but also we shall see from Gaimar’s epilogue that Henry Blois has definitely had his hand in this publication also. The reference in VM is the fire that Henry saw at Cirencester with his brother. We know he was there as the detail of the episode is good in the GS.

Tatlock has pursued the source of most of Geoffrey’s fabrications and it appears nearly every fabrication or embellished episode has a definable source of inspiration; but these events and the names seem to be taken from the \textit{Chanson de Geste Gormont et Isembard} and are ‘melanged’ with Guthrum’s occupation of Cirencester in the year 879, mentioned in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ASC). Coincidentally, \textit{Seginus Dux of the Allobroges}, Henry’s family’s own territorial people around Blois appear in the Chanson which ante-dates ‘Geoffrey’ and he probably associated the name with Sewinus archbishop of Sens…. again, in Blois lands.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Before Cerdic could conquer}
\textit{Much from the Britons.}
\textit{Then was Cirencester besieged.}
\textit{But by the negligence of the Britons}
\textit{It was set on fire by sparrows,}
\textit{Which carried fire and sulphur into the town.}
\textit{And set light to many houses.}
\textit{And the besiegers who were outside}
\textit{Made an assault with great courage.}
\textit{Then was this city conquered.} (Gaimar)
\end{quote}

In VM we find more detail concerning Robert of Gloucester: \textit{He shall seek the Gauls in his ship, but shall die beneath the weapon of a King.}

Robert went to France to get aid from Matilda’s husband, Geoffrey IV of Anjou, and returned to England with the Empress’ very young son Henry, (later to be King Henry II). Robert of Gloucester died at Bristol Castle, where he had previously imprisoned King Stephen. Gervase of Canterbury places Robert’s death in 1146 and this date is corroborated by the Annals of Winchester. The Annals of Margan Abbey, has October 31, 1147, and the date John of Hexham gives is 1148. However, Henry Blois seems to

\textsuperscript{106}\textit{Historie des Engles}, 11. 855
understand more about Robert of Gloucester’s death than historians portray. No chronicler attests how Robert died, but we shall see further evidence here in the VM that Henry assumes his audience is apprised of the same information he has.... and hence his allusion to the ‘weapon of a King’.

Once we understand Geoffrey of Monmouth’s, (Henry of Blois’) ploy of mixing his own recent prophecies, updating them, and sometimes changing the sense from the previous prophecies c.1150 and weaving his inventions around the first set of prophecies and adding more in VM; Merlin appears to relate to certain topics consistently as icons reappear over the three sets. We can then understand in the later Vulgate HRB and VM prophecies that the sense has been changed. Commentators on the VM (like San-Marte) naïvely believed the prophecies portend events further than 1158. Some try to unlock the meaning of the prophecies believing they are consistent and actually did predict events from the sixth century. This is plain nonsense! Henry Blois in his construction of the prophecies uses the artifice of splicing what is known history and interlacing it with his own knowledge of recent events which are also couched as prophecy from that same ancient era when Merlin is supposed to have prophesied.

Henry, on occasion refers back to his own fabricated false history in the HRB which establishes further both Merlin’s prophetic powers and HRB’s historicity as credible for those that are gullible. Henry confirms known historical events which add to the aura of prescience and here in VM makes the effort to attach Merlin’s prophecies to Welsh and northern bardic tradition. Once the authorship of the VM is established and once this mechanism is perceived, it is easier to pick out which mode of deception Henry is using.

The reason for the mix of anachronistic events is to seem more like biblical prophecies which have no strict chronology but ‘see’ through time indiscriminately. Part of Henry’s devise here is to give the air of antiquity; as if Merlin’s Prophecies were all foreseen back in the dark ages. Much of the archaic content which Henry employs can be understood by his audience historically as seemingly accurate; especially when considered in conjunction with the false history as presented HRB. These are events which already have passed, but which Merlin supposedly predicted correctly and have verifiably come to fruition or can be understood
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historically. The overall effect of a mystical prophet foretelling of events that his audience can directly relate to (some of which is set on a contemporaneous stage of recent history), is testament to Henry’s illusory brilliance.

_Rhydderch shall die, after whom long discord shall hold the Scots and the Cumbrians for a long time until Cumbria shall be granted to his growing tusk. The Welsh shall attack the men of Gwent, and afterwards those of Cornwall and no law shall restrain them. Wales shall rejoice in the shedding of blood; O people always hateful to God, why do you rejoice in bloodshed?_108 _Wales shall compel brothers to fight and to condemn their own relatives to a wicked death. The troops of the Scots shall often cross the Humber and, putting aside all sentiment, shall kill those who oppose them._

Henry’s complaint against the Southern Welsh, the Northern Welsh, the Scottish and the Cornish is that they always fought amongst themselves. In various places in the HRB and _Vita Merlini_, Henry (as Geoffrey) bemoans this tribal hate as the main cause for the depletion of the Briton’s power before the Saxons and Danes arrived. Henry sees these old Britons, (more properly the Celts), clearly as relatives with the Bretons because of the exodus.

What has confused most commentators with ‘Geoffrey’s’ seemingly contradictory stance (regarding the Welsh especially), is that Henry personally hates the Welsh of his present day, but understands that they constitute part of what he sees as a ‘once ancient independent Christian culture’ prior to the Saxon invasion and prior to Augustine’s arrival. Henry Blois as a Norman is fully cognisant of the early establishment of Christianity in Britain, being concerned with this issue from his earliest days at Glastonbury, as we shall get to when covering DA.

As I have implied already, Henry Blois tries to manipulate events against Henry II by rousing sentiments of these old Britons as a collective, through his prophecies. This takes place after his self-imposed exile between 1155-
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1157. However, the above prophecy is pure skimble-skamble based on what Henry knows of British history from ASC, Bede and Gildas.

Not with impunity, however, for the leader shall be killed; he shall have the name of a horse\(^{109}\) and because of that fact shall be fierce. His heir shall be expelled and shall depart from our territories. Scots, sheathe your swords which you bare too readily; your strength shall be unequal to that of our fierce people.

Henry was no fan of the Scots either and especially King David as we shall clearly witnessed when I cover the GS. Anyway, not wishing to bore the reader, it is worth looking at these prophecies as some are more current than the latest version of prophecies which constitute those found in Vulgate HRB.

The city of Dumbarton\(^ {110}\) shall be destroyed and no King shall repair it for an age until the Scot shall be subdued in war.

Carlisle, spoiled of its shepherd, shall lie vacant until the sceptre of the Lion shall restore its pastoral staff.

These two prophecies not in the *Libellus Merlini* or Vulgate HRB are inserted in VM just so that Merlin appears to come from the north.

Carlisle was destroyed by the Northmen and restored by William Rufus. In 1133 Henry Ist, the “Lion of Justice” of the *Prophecies*, re-established its bishopric. Æthelwulf (1133-1155), an Englishman, who Henry Ist had established at Carlisle in 1102 died in 1156. It was a recent event at the time of writing of the VM and Henry either knew the Bishop personally or had news of his death by a traveller *en route* to Rome. It is most likely the sense of ‘the spoiling of its shepherd,’\(^ {111}\) but Carlisle has its relevance because Henry is portraying that Merlin is predicting about things in the north as Henry has now located him there in VM. Especially, this would have relevance to Henry’s audience of VM as this now is the most recent event to have come to fruition by Merlin the seer all the way back in antiquity. Our Merlin has a remarkable focus on events just prior to and including the Anarchy and to the time when Henry is writing (the year after the nineteen years of his brother’s reign).

Segontium and its towers and mighty palaces shall lament in ruins until the Welsh return to their former domains.

\(^{109}\) See appendix 1.5  
\(^{110}\) See Appendix 2  
\(^{111}\) I do not think this has any relevance to Henry II being knighted at Carlisle.
The ruins of the old Roman station of Segontium are on the hill above the modern city of Carnarvon. It was situated on higher ground to the east giving a good view of the Menai Straits. There was a ‘motte and bailey’ castle in the area in Henry’s day, but it is doubtful Henry made it this far north in 1136 to have knowledge of the location personally. However, having read the Roman annals, Henry Blois would know Segontium was founded by Agricola in 77 or 78 AD after he had conquered the Ordovices in North Wales. The reason for naming Segontium is it implies Merlin knew the place by that name; thus giving the illusion of antiquity for the VM prophecies. More importantly, Merlin is again seen to be prophesying about things further north than the Merlin Ambrosius of Vulgate HRB. ‘Geoffrey’ ever faithful to his illusion of the prophecies coming from a Brythonic Merlin, proposes a location with Roman ruins so his audience would be fooled into thinking the prophecies so old that even the old name was current when the prophecies were told. The Earl of Chester, Hugh d'Avranches, gained Norman control of north Wales in 1088 by building three castles; one at Caernarfon. The Welsh recaptured Gwynedd in 1115, and Caernarfon Castle came into the possession of the Welsh princes and so Merlin is acquitted again with the powers of accurate prophecy.

Porchester¹¹² shall see its broken walls in its harbour until a rich man with the tooth of a wolf shall restore it.

The city of Richborough shall lie spread out on the shore of its harbour and a man from Flanders shall re-establish it with his crested ship.¹¹³

The fifth from him shall rebuild the walls of St David’s and shall bring back to her the pall lost for many years.¹¹⁴

The prophecy here changes in time as Henry Blois harks directly back to the narrative of HRB confirming material derived from the British annals (from which the HRB was constructed) and concerning the emigration to Brittany at the advent of the Saxon encroachment.

The City of the Legions shall fall into thy bosom, O Severn (Sabrina), and shall lose her citizens for a long time, and these the Bear in the Lamb shall restore to her when he shall come.¹¹⁵

¹¹² See appendix 3
¹¹³ See appendix 4
¹¹⁴ See appendix 5
¹¹⁵ See appendix 6
Saxon Kings shall expel the citizens and shall hold cities, country, and houses for a long time. From among them thrice three dragons shall wear the crown. Two hundred monks shall perish in Leicester and the Saxon shall drive out her ruler and leave vacant her walls. He who first among the Angles shall wear the diadem of Brutus shall repair the city laid waste by slaughter. A fierce people shall forbid the sacrament of confirmation throughout the country, and in the house of God shall place images of the gods.

This last section of VM prophecies is set out to appear to conform to known events on the Saxon arrival and the eradication of the British church. ‘Rome’, in the next prophecy, refers to Augustine of Canterbury who became Archbishop. Henry Blois however, by stating he is bringing God ‘back’ establishes the fact that he was not the founder of the Church of the Britons and this fact would not be lost on Papal authorities regarding Henry’s application for metropolitan for Winchester. Therefore, Henry’s intended polemic is that primacy should not be held by Canterbury when both Winchester (by the accounts in HRB) and Glastonbury by the accounts in GR3 and DA (and Caradoc) clearly were established before Canterbury (even though fictionally by Henry’s interpolations).

Afterward Rome shall bring God back through the medium of a monk and a holy priest shall sprinkle the buildings with water and shall restore them again and shall place shepherds in them. Thereafter many of them shall obey the commands of the divine law and shall enjoy heaven by right. An impious people full of poison shall violate that settlement and shall violently mix together right and wrong. They shall sell their sons and their kinsmen into the furthest countries beyond the sea and shall incur the wrath of the Thunderer. O wretched crime! that man whom the founder of the world created with liberty, deeming him worthy of heaven, should be sold like an cow and be dragged away with a rope. You miserable man, you who turned traitor to your master when first you came to the throne; you shall yield to God. The Danes shall come upon [you] with their fleet and after subduing the people shall reign for a short time and shall then be defeated and retire.
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120 See appendix 11
Two shall rule over them whom the serpent forgetful of his treaty shall strike with the sting in his tail instead of with the garland of his sceptre.\footnote{This refers to Matilda and Stephen ruling at the same time. He also was forgetful of his oath to the church and Henry himself. Instead of being able to rule with ‘garlanded sceptre’, Stephen is stung as if from a serpent’s tail. Henry makes plain in the \textit{Gesta Stephani} it is God’s judgement against Stephen for wrongs against the church.}

This section of the prophecies would seem to be Merlin referring to historical events in the Saxon and Dane era which Henry Blois’ audience would naturally accept as historic events, especially the Danes coming in ships. It is however, dispersed with allusions to recent events which they can also recognise. We see here Henry Blois’ mechanism of employing prophecy so it appears as genuine like biblical prophecy operates i.e. the prophet sees across time and picks out events from different eras as they appear to him.

In the next section, Henry refers to Neustrians\footnote{See appendix 32} as if he has no connection with them and to inappropriate behaviour of the Bishops in his time.

\textit{Then the Normans, sailing over the water in their wooden ships, bearing their faces in front and in back, shall fiercely attack the Angles with their iron tunics and their fierce swords, and shall destroy them and possess the field.}\footnote{The faces front and back is difficult to unravel and may refer to figureheads fore and aft of the ships, but the allusion is to the Norman Conquest and more specifically the battle of Hastings.} They shall subjugate many realms to themselves and shall rule foreign peoples for a time until the fury, flying all about, shall scatter her poison over them.\footnote{The Norman subjection of Wales and Scotland the subsequent power feuds of continental.} Then peace and faith and all virtue shall depart, and on all sides throughout the country the citizens shall engage in battles.\footnote{This directly relates to the Anarchy.} Man shall betray man and no one shall be found a friend.\footnote{To convey the mistrust that prevailed throughout the country during the Anarchy is the aim of the prophecy. This could be a personal reference to Henry’s own snubs from Stephen and the changes of allegiance, ‘no one keeping their word’.} The husband, despising his wife, shall draw near to harlots, and the wife, despising her husband, shall marry whom she desires.\footnote{See appendix 9} There shall be no honour kept for the church and the order shall perish. Then shall bishops bear arms, and armed camps shall be built. Men shall build towers and walls in holy ground, and they shall give to the soldiers what should belong to the needy. Carried away by riches they shall run along on the path of worldly things and shall take from God what
the holy bishop shall forbid. Three shall wear the diadem after whom shall be the favour of the newcomers. A fourth shall be in authority whom awkward piety shall injure until he shall be clothed in his father, so that girded with boar’s teeth he shall cross the shadow of the helmeted man.

Four shall be anointed, seeking in turn the highest things, and two shall succeed who shall so wear the diadem that they shall induce the Gauls to make war on them. The sixth shall overthrow the Irish and their walls, and pious and prudent shall renew the people and the cities.

When he has made these predictions, Henry Blois, as far as he can into the present, reminds his reader that they are from the same source as those prophecies of Merlin found in the HRB and the Libellus Merlini. However, not only has Henry Blois updated prophecies in the Vulgate HRB, but now he has come up with new prophecies. Some which are designed to have us believe that Merlin is connected to the north and others which have insights into the anarchy which were not in the original updated prophecies found in Vulgate HRB.

All these things I formerly predicted more at length to Vortigern in explaining to him the mystic war of the two dragons when we sat on the banks of the drained pool.

We should not think that the composer of VM is any different from the author of HRB and most commentators assume ‘Geoffrey’ is the author of VM, but there are those who think VM was written by another author other than ‘Geoffrey’. The foremost device which locates Avalon at Glastonbury is found in VM as Henry Blois now informs us it is called Insula Pomorum.

Henry Blois convinces his audience these prophecies were made while sat next to Vortigern. His gambit of remixing some of the prophecies found in the Vulgate HRB and the Libellus Merlini are so that the prophecies of Merlin in the Vulgate HRB and those found in the VM are convincingly contemporaneous i.e. they are consistent and came from Merlin... who ‘Geoffrey’ had originally founded upon Nennius’ boy Ambrosius. Suspicion must have been much more acute as the updated Vulgate prophecies were published in 1155 and seen to have additions which were

---

128 See appendix 10
129 See appendix 12
130 See appendix 13
131 See appendix 14
132 See Appendix 36.
not in the *Libellus Merlini*. William of Newburgh angrily protests against them and the historicity of HRB. William of Newburgh who wrote around 1190 had problems with ‘Geoffrey’…. challenging the authenticity of the Arthurian legends. ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-history did not concur with Gildas. William of Newburgh wrote: *It is quite clear that everything this man wrote about Arthur and his successors, or indeed about his predecessors from Vortigern onwards, was made up, partly by himself and partly by others, either from an inordinate love of lying, or for the sake of pleasing the Britons.*

He also says: *only a person ignorant of ancient history would have any doubt how shamelessly and impudently he lies in almost everything.* William of Newburgh comments again: *But in our own days, instead of this practice, a writer has emerged who, in order to expiate the faults of these Britons, weaves the most ridiculous figments of imagination around them, extolling them with the most impudent vanity above the virtues of the Macedonians and the Romans. This man is called Geoffrey, and his other name is Arthur, because he has taken up the fables about Arthur from the old, British figments, has added to them himself, and has cloaked them with the honourable name of history by presenting them with the ornaments of the Latin tongue....*

*Since these events agree with the historical truth set forth by the Venerable Bede, all the things which that man took care to write about Arthur and either his predecessors after Vortigern or his successors, can be seen to have been partly concocted by himself and partly by others, either because of a frenzied passion for lying or in order to please the Britons, most of whom are known to be so primitive that they are said still to be awaiting the return of Arthur, and will not suffer themselves to hear that he is dead....*

*For how could the old historians, to whom it was a matter of great concern that nothing worthy of memory should be omitted from what was written, who indeed are known to have committed to memory quite unimportant things, how could they have passed over in silence so incomparable a man, whose deeds were notable above all others? How, I ask, could they have suppressed with silence Arthur and his acts, this king of the Britons who was nobler than Alexander the Great.....*

*With even greater daring he has published the fallacious prophecies of a certain Merlin, to which he has in any event added many things himself, and*
has translated them into Latin, [thus offering them] as if they were authentic prophecies, resting on immutable truth....

There was suspicion on the prophecies also. Abbot Suger had commented on several prophecies before 1150 and the impression of early provenance provided by the interpolation of Merlin prophecies into Orderic’s work has given scholarship the illusion of early transmission of those found in Vulgate. The illusion of a continuous unadulterated set of prophecies is also aided by the back dating of Vulgate HRB through its dedications, but there is less evidence of suspicion on the prophecies themselves (recorded) than that of the dubious historicity of the main body of HRB. The publication of John of Cornwall’s set of Merlin prophecies by Henry Blois greatly aids the illusion that the prophecies were originally of Brythonic origin.

William Newburgh’s comments about historians like Bede: who indeed are known to have committed to memory quite unimportant things, how could they have passed over in silence so incomparable a man, whose deeds were notable above all others?... should be enough to point out that not everyone was gullible. We should be very wary of Nennius’ testimony because we can see blatantly that Henry Blois actively promotes Nennius as Gildas’ work.... but I shall cover this shortly.

Henry reveals too much contemporary information in the VM prophecies. His vanity got the better of him specifically alluding to himself in the prophecies. However, because commentators believe ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ died in 1155, they think it is the reason behind the Vita having had so much less exposure. The real reason for its apparent lack of readership is that because of its lack of historicity (and the fact it was in metered rhyme) it did not get copied as much in the monastic system i.e. it was not considered important enough to be copied as extensively as ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB.

The veracity of Merlin’s prophecies is often given credence by scholars asking: How could any prediction of the ‘sixth’ invading Ireland be a fraud since the invasion was not accomplished until 1171? It is coincidental that

---

133 William Newburgh Historia regum anglicarum. Newburgh writing c.1190 would probably be more surprised than anybody when King Arthur’s gravesite is unveiled and King Arthur appears to be in a real grave which has laid dormant 20 years.

134 It seems fairly certain that the initial distribution and copying was carried out by Henry Blois as he travelled.
this is the year of Henry Blois’ death. It has been this particular prediction which alludes to an event after ‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed death, which has for the most part provided the aura of prescience and substantiated Merlin’s credibility as a prophet. For the less gullible commentator, Henry’s knowledge of the Winchester court discussion about invading Ireland subtracts from any predictive ability ascribed to Merlin.

Merlin’s predictive ability has especially been given credence by the insertion/interpolation of the passage concerning some Merlin prophecies into Orderic which also refers to the ‘sixth’ invading Ireland. Some commentators date the interpolated chapter on Merlin’s prophecies in Orderic to 1136 or thereabout. Given the nature of the prophecies it is not only preposterous but naive to think that the sixth King i.e. Henry II, could be predicted to invade Ireland from this early date.\(^{135}\)

At this point in VM, it is as if Henry Blois has just remembered why he is writing the Vita and suddenly ends these prophecies from Merlin and returns to the narrative storyline of the mad Merlin. Henry closes this prophetic section by introducing Gildas and names Taliesin and records Taliesin’s recent instruction under Gildas, which immediately provides contemporaneity for Merlin with Gildas and Taliesin.

\(^{135}\) The passage in Orderic which establishes credibility for the existence of the prophecies for ‘scholars’ by its appropriate insertion and clever reference to ‘time’ is quite obviously an interpolation and will be covered shortly. Crick, appears to be duped into believing the existence of a body of prophecies by stating *Orderic Vitalis, first known reader of Geoffrey’s Merlinian prophecies, understood their function immediately.* In the same analysis she states: *the Prophecies of Merlin, the core of Geoffrey’s own Historia, was arguably Geoffrey’s own creation.* How then is it possible to predict the Sixth in Ireland if it is Geoffrey’s work and yet supposedly written prior to Henry I death (or even Orderic’s) unless ‘Geoffrey’ is an actual prophet. The evident solution is that it is an interpolation by Henry Blois into Orderic, as he is the inventor of both Merlin and Geoffrey. Henry Blois dupes posterity by inserting an entire section concerning the Merlin prophecies which were originally in the early *Libellus Merlini* with one added prophecy (the sixth in Ireland) qualifying their existence in the time of Henry I by stating (in the Orderic interpolation): *up to the times of Henry I and Gruffudd, who still, “uncertain of their lot, await the future events” that are ordained for them.* I realise that to become a scholar one must spend a lot of time in dusty libraries and not much on the street. But one does not even have to be ‘street wise’ to recognise the obvious guile and intended insinuation in Henry’s interpolation. The interpolation in Orderic must have taken place post 1155.
But you, dear sister, go home to see the King dying and bid Taliesin come, as I wish to talk over many things with him; for he has recently come from the land of Brittany where he learned sweet philosophy of Gildas the Wise.\(^{136}\)

Ganieda returned home and found that Taliesin had returned and the prince was dead and the servants were sad. She fell down lamenting among her friends.

Gildas becomes highly relevant later when we consider Henry Blois’ hand in the manipulation of Glastonbury material in GR3 and DA.

We now hear Ganieda speaking about the death of the King. With only slight variation, it is as if Henry Blois were doing the same internal lamenting for his brother and using Ganieda as mouthpiece. It is couched as a poetical and thoughtful tribute to her husband Rhydderch. As I have made plain earlier, Henry Blois has lost his power, his castles and his brother. The vision of his future when he wrote the original *Libellus Merlini* prophecies has now been played out. Henry Blois continues on until, (still speaking through Ganieda), he laments leaving all his nephews which he had fought so hard to elevate into positions of power in England and laments leaving his walls of Winchester and clothes himself in the monk’s mantle as he is, in his present state at Clugny.

Therefore I leave you, ye nobles, ye lofty walls, household gods, sweet sons, and all the things of the world. In company with my brother I shall dwell in the woods and shall worship God with a joyful heart, clothed in a black mantle.”

Henry Blois is setting up his next astonishing piece, by bringing Taliesin and Merlin together with the most cursory introduction: *Meanwhile Taliesin had come to see Merlin the prophet who had sent for him to find out what wind or rain storm was coming up, for both together were drawing near and the clouds were thickening. He drew the following illustrations under the guidance of Minerva\(^{137}\) his associate.*

Henry Blois uses his scholastic knowledge of previous writers through the ‘voice piece’ of Taliesin to propagate the propaganda for his new vision concerning Glastonbury. He has based much of the setting of the VM on records from the Book of Taliesin who is also contemporaneous with

---

\(^{136}\) The *Life of Gildas* by the Monk of Rhuys tells that after Gildas settled in Brittany people began to flock to him to entrust their sons for their instruction to his superintendence and teaching.

\(^{137}\) *Minerva* was the Roman goddess of wisdom and sponsor of arts, trade, and defense also mentioned in the prologue of John of Cornwall’s prophecies
Rydderch, so they provide the anchor of contemporaneity with Merlin. He has also extracted ideas from Irish and Scottish sources. Some of the information in Taliesin’s speech in VM has been traced back to men such as Pliny, Solinus, Martianus Capella, Pomponius Mela and Rabanus Maurus. Henry Blois posing as Geoffrey of Monmouth through extracts taken from Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae* now speaks as if in the words of Taliesin. However, he starts this long nature episode reverting to Aristotle: *Out of nothing the Creator of the world produced four [elements]*

Henry then follows on with a lengthy piece on origins and discussions on various topics concerning stars, dragons and fish etc. Just as Isidore of Seville covers a variety of naturist topics; so does ‘Geoffrey’. Isidore also leads into his discourse on Islands much the same way as Geoffrey of Monmouth does starting with Britain: *Of these [islands] Britain is said to be the foremost and best, producing in its fruitfulness every single thing.*

He then proceeds by describing the various British blessings found in the country culminating with the pleasing baths found in the city of Bath. Henry’s aim is to refer back to the HRB before launching into his next piece which names *Bladud* from the HRB.

In the HRB, *Bladud* is the founder of Bath. We can actually witness Henry’s mind at work here. He is enabling himself to establish as fact in the Vita, the connection between Bladud and Badon and as we know the earliest mention of the Battle of Badon is in Gildas’ *De Excidio Britanniae* where Ambrosius Aurelianus organized a British resistance. But, as we know, Geoffrey does his best to conflate Ambrosius with Arthur (or even Merlin) and Nennius has Badon as the place of King Arthur’s last battle. But, Geoffrey’s Camlann is also brought into the salad of confusion from the *Annales Cambriae* where Arthur and Mordred fell (AC mentions Medraut, but it does not specify that he and Arthur fought on opposite sides), as Henry Blois has Mordred in Cornwall purely because Henry knows the topography and of the river Camel.

---

138 See Appendix 16
139 Adam of Damerham witnesses that Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae sive Origines* was donated to Glastonbury abbey by Henry Blois.
140 Aristotle Metaphysics.
141 It becomes plain that Henry knows Cornwall, but this only becomes evident when we cover John of Cornwall’s prophecies.
142 From the *Annales Cambriae*, Camblanus becomes Geoffrey’s Camlann. However, more probably Colchester was called Camulodunum and Henry changed the location having visited Cornwall and Tintagel. Henry Blois
His main intention in VM is to conflate Badon (where Arthur’s battle took place) with Avalon. As the reader will understand shortly, the purport behind Henry’s very clever design is to set up Arthur’s last known location, the Island of Avalon of HRB fame as being synonymous with Glastonbury. So let us see in this next extract from the HRB, why Bladud’s name is important to Henry and why this contrivance is essential to his overall plan for the future of Glastonbury.

Next succeeded Bladud his son, in whose hands the Kingdom remained for twenty years. He builded the city of Kaerbadon, that is now called Bath, and fashioned hot baths therein, meet for the needs of men, the which he placed under the guardianship of the deity Minerva, in whose temple he set fires that could not be quenched, that never turned into ashes, but as they began to fail became as it were round balls of stone.  

Returning back to the VM we can now see where he is guiding his contemporary audience and every reader of the HRB and the *Vita Merlini* since 1157.

Besides all these it has fountains healthful because of their hot waters which nourish the sick and provide pleasing baths, which quickly send people away cured with their sickness driven out. So Bladud established them when he held the sceptre of the Kingdom and he gave them the name of his consort Alaron.

Immediately he has named this ‘Alaron’ which he has now established as being the same as where we find Bladud, (who we know was the founder of Badon, where Arthur’s battle took place); after one line on the healing powers found in this Alaron he does his trickiest bit of sophistry and conflation, he calls the same place an Island and to confuse us further he says it is near Thanet.

Our ocean also divides the Orkneys from us. These are divided into thirty three islands by the sundering flood; twenty lack cultivation and the others are cultivated. Thule receives its name “furthest” from the sun, because of the solstice which the summer sun makes there, turning its rays and shining no

---

143 HRB II, x  
144 The account of Bladud is found in the HRB, II, x.  
145 Geoffrey’s purposeful confusion of Avalon, the *Vaus d’Avaron*, used by Robert de Boron (3123, 3221) and the ‘*gran valee*’ in the Perlesvaus’ description of Avalon, obviously represent the same locality.  
146 See Appendix 15
further, and taking away the day, so that always throughout the long night the air is full of shadows, and making a bridge congealed by the benumbing cold, which prevents the passage of ships.

I have shown in appendix 15 why Henry Blois has a peculiar concern regarding the island of Thanet. The above material is taken from Pytheas’ account through Diodorus or other ancient chroniclers who comments of Pytheas’ travels. Even though the special status afforded by Thanet as being near to Henry’s primary purpose (a conflation with Avalon), Isidore of Seville also talks of the same list of Islands and many others beside in the Mediterranean. Isidore provides the basis of material for ‘Geoffrey’s Islands in VM. The ensuing Island material is derived from Isidore’s XIV.vi, De insulis (“concerning islands”) but it becomes apparent why there is a change in order from his list of Islands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vita Merlini</th>
<th>Isidore’s Etymologia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thanatos</td>
<td>Thanet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Orkneys</td>
<td>Ultima Thule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thule</td>
<td>Orkneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gades</td>
<td>Gades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Hesperides</td>
<td>The Fortunate Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Gorgades</td>
<td>The Gorgades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Argire &amp; Crisse</td>
<td>The Hesperides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ceylon</td>
<td>Chryse and Argyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Fortunate Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than reveal his real intention, Henry Blois has decided to set up his intended objective, (that of exchanging the Avalon of HRB to be synonymous with the ‘Island of Apples’) in amongst what appears to be Taliesin pronouncing upon the subject of ‘Islands’ just after the obvious intended conflation of Alaron with Badon. Henry Blois already has another project planned in the manuscript which was the forerunner of Perlesvaus, where unfortunately, he cannot change the name Insula Avallonis (for reasons that will be explained shortly).

The fact that Arthur was taken to Insula Pomorum shows to the gullible that it must equate to the Avalon in HRB. The logic of such an assumption is because the island now appears to be located in Somerset because Arthur
had appeared at Glastonbury in the concocted life of Gildas. Posterity has been led to a conclusion to which Henry directed us in that: *Insula Pomorum* must be Glastonbury. In 1191 when the leaden cross was unearthed, Glastonbury was unequivocally associated with Avalon, but the interpolator of DA has made this association long before the discovery. It is only modern scholars erroneous chronology which assumes Avalon’s association with Glastonbury was made after the disinterment.

A Welsh ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ has little to gain in associating Arthur with Glastonbury. Henry Blois not only is responsible for the connection of Arthur to Glastonbury made by impersonating Caradoc, but he is also responsible for the naming of Avalon and the invention of the character of the Chivalric Arthur. He is responsible for Arthur’s association to Glastonbury found in DA and is responsible for creating Arthur’s grave between the pyramids. It is hardly surprising that as ‘Geoffrey’ in VM, Henry persuades his audience that the apple country of Somerset possesses an Island which is known as *Insula Pomorum* where Arthur is known to have been taken by Barinthus.

The only assumption one can draw and to which the reader has been led in VM is that Glastonbury must be the same location as Avalon with all the other evidences which corroborate such a conclusion found in DA. Henry Blois has achieved his goal and posterity and scholarship is none the wiser even today. It will become apparent also that Henry Blois, amongst other works of anonymity, is the author of the initial Perlesvaus.

The VM continues on with Taliesin pronouncing on the Islands:

*The most outstanding island after our own is said to be Ireland with its happy fertility. It is larger and produces no bees, and no birds except rarely, and it does not permit snakes to breed in it. Whence it happens that if earth or a stone is carried away from there and added to any other place it drives away snakes and bees.*

Isidore’s work describes Ireland: Ireland (Scotia), also known as Hibernia, is an island next to Britannia, narrower in its expanse of land but more fertile in its site. It extends from southwest to north. It’s near parts stretch towards Iberia (Hiberia) and the Cantabrian Ocean (i.e. the Bay of Biscay), whence it is called Hibernia; but it is called Scotia, because it has been colonized by tribes of the Scoti. There no snakes are found, birds are scarce, and there are no bees, so that if someone were to sprinkle dust or
pebbles brought from there among beehives in some other place, the swarms would desert the honeycombs.

Isidore is not certain about who the inhabitants are and conflates the Scottish to Irish, but knows its proportion and position. ‘Geoffrey’ (Henry Blois) knows where Ireland and Scotland are, so he does not pretend to be ignorant, which obviously Isidore is. 147

The island of Gades lies next to Herculean Gades, and there grows there a tree from whose bark a gum drips out of which gems are made, breaking all laws.

Isidore’s version of Gades: Cadiz (Gadis) is an island located at the edge of the province of Baetica. It separates Europe from Africa. The Pillars of Hercules can be seen there, and from there the current of the Ocean flows into the entrance of the Tyrrhenian Sea. It is divided from the mainland by a distance of six hundred (Roman) feet. When the Tyrians, who had come from the Red Sea, occupied it, they called it in their language Gadir that is, “enclosed,” because it is enclosed on all sides by the sea. This island produces a palm-like tree whose sap, when mixed with glass, produces the precious stone called ceraunius.

It is a coincidence that Pytheas mentions this substance as floating. One would assume it is Amber 148 since it comes from tree sap. It is here that Geoffrey of Monmouth changes the order found in Isidore because Isidore follows with the Fortunate Isles. But ‘Geoffrey’ keeps this until the end of Taliesin’s discourse, so that it seemingly grafts into the main point of renaming Avalon. However, ‘Geoffrey’ continues with Hesperides:

The Hesperides are said to contain a watchful dragon who, men say, guards the golden apples under the leaves.

147Saint Isidore of Seville (c. 560 – 4 April 636) served as Archbishop of Seville and Geoffrey surely knew his source would be discovered, however the source for Geoffrey’s purposes is contemporaneous enough.

148Herodotus in book 3 says ‘I cannot speak with certainty nor am I acquainted with the islands called the Cassiterides from which tin is brought to us….it is never the less, certain that both our tin and our amber are brought from these extremely remote regions, in the western extremities of Europe’. What Herodotus was actually referring to is known as British glass a sometime by-product of the smelting process of tin.
Isidores Hesperides\textsuperscript{149} are: The isles of the Hesperides are so called after the city of Hesperis, which was located within the borders of Mauretania. They are situated beyond the Gorgades, at the Atlantic shore, in the most remote bays of the sea. Stories tell of an ever-watchful dragon guarding golden apples in their gardens. There, it is said, is a channel from the sea that is so twisted, with winding banks, that when seen from afar it looks like the coils of a serpent.

On Isidore's Hesperides we find Golden apples not as Geoffrey later attests they are on the Fortunate isles from where he derives his \textit{Insula Pomorum}. ‘Geoffrey’s’ artifice is revealed when he would rather attach his ‘apple’ scenario to an Island described adjectively (fortunate) rather than overcoming some previous nomenclature like Hesperides. We can witness the conflation with the enchanted orchard of the classical Hesperides which is eventually doubly conflated with Glastonbury later on by Henry through ‘\textit{Isle de Voirre}’ or Isle of Glass. I will cover this conflation later through Henry’s ingenious etymological conversion of Ineswitrin to Ynes Gutrin which gives the Glass Island which Caradoc (Henry Blois) first introduces in \textit{Life of Gildas}. It is also though Henry Blois and his relationship with Marie and Alix, and their relation to Chrétien de Troyes where we meet Maheloas as lord of the \textit{Isle de Voirre} which relates to Caradoc’s Melvas and his \textit{Urbs Vitrea}.

\textit{The Gorgades are inhabited by women with goats’ bodies who are said to surpass hares in the swiftness of their running.}

Isidore's \textit{Gorgades} are described thus: The Gorgades are islands of the Ocean opposite the promontory that is called Hesperian Ceras, inhabited by the Gorgons, women with swift wings and a rough and hairy body; the islands take their name from them. They are separated from the mainland by a passage of two days’ sailing.

\textsuperscript{149}According to the Sicilian Greek poet Stesichorus, and the Greek geographer Strabo, in his book \textit{Geographika} (volume III), the garden of the Hesperides is located in Tartessos, a location placed in the south of the Iberian Peninsula. Since they are beyond the Gorgades which one must assume are the Canaries it would seem the Hesperides may be the Cape Verde Islands as Isidore states: Islands (\textit{insula}) are so called because they are ‘in salt water’
Argyre and Chryse bear, it is said, gold and silver just as Corinth does common stones.

Isidore's Argyre and Chryse are: are islands situated in the Indian Ocean, so rich in metal that many people maintain these islands have a surface of gold and silver; whence their names are derived.

Celon blooms pleasantly because of its fruitful soil, for it produces two crops in a single year; twice it is summer, twice spring, twice men gather grapes and other fruits, and it is also most pleasing because of its shining gems. Tiles produces flowers and fruits in an eternal spring, green throughout the seasons.

Celon and Tiles are Geoffrey's addition and not found in Isidore's account on the Islands in the Sea.

The island of apples which men call “The Fortunate Isle” gets its name from the fact that it produces all things of itself; the fields there have no need of the ploughs of the farmers and all cultivation is lacking except what nature provides. Of its own accord it produces grain and grapes, and apple trees grow in its woods from the close-clipped grass. The ground of its own accord produces everything instead of merely grass, and people live there a hundred years or more.

Isidore's Fortunate Islas are described as: The Fortunate Isles (Fortunatarum insulae) signify by their name that they produce all kinds of good things, as if they were happy and blessed with an abundance of fruit. Indeed, well-suited by their nature, they produce fruit from very precious trees; the ridges of their hills are spontaneously covered with grapevines; instead of weeds, harvest crops and garden herbs are common there; hence, the mistake of pagans and the poems by worldly poets, who believed that these isles were Paradise because of the fertility of their soil. They are situated in the Ocean, against the left side of Mauretania, closest to where the sun sets, and they are separated from each other by the intervening sea.

We can see that Henry ('Geoffrey') has made Isidore's Islands singular; and now conflated it with the apples of the Hesperides to suit his goal in the

150 Pliny refers to Chryse as an Island and was on the Medieval mappaemundi as an Island. Mention of Argyre is made in the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea as the last part of the inhabited world toward the east. However in Pliny’s Natural History he mentions a Land of Gold via a peninsula. Pomponius Mela, says two lands lay to the east of India one Argyre was said to boast soil of Gold and Chryse was said to have soil of Silver. ‘In the vicinity of Tamus is the Island of Argyre, in the vicinity of the Ganges, that of Chryse’.

151 See Appendix 17
translocation of a nebulous Avalon in HRB to be located at Glastonbury. The implications of this are huge at this date of 1157. At this point in VM Henry now leaves Isidore and a versification of his work which he employed for his own ends.

In the HRB we hear of Avalon twice; once where Arthur is ...girt with Caliburn, best of swords, that was forged within the Isle of Avalon. The second is where the renowned King Arthur himself was wounded deadly, and was borne thence unto the island of Avalon for the healing of his wounds.

We were not introduced to Morgen or her sisters in the HRB, but one assumes that ‘Geoffrey’s’ reason for their inclusion in VM was to give a valid reason why his hero of the HRB was taken to Avalon, i.e. she can cure the sick and his wounds. Of course the nine sorceress priestesses of Pomponius Mela’s island of Sena are to be conflated with the nine maidens on Insula Pomorum in VM and of course again, in Henry’s interpolation into DA.

To add to Henry’s salad of conflation in DA, Avalloc just happens to have daughters and supplies the eponym for Avalon just to complete the confusion. In this instance alone we can witness Henry’s brilliance which started out innocently by randomly picking a name from a Burgundian town just as he had selected the environs of Autun for Arthur’s fictitious continental battle.

To not recognize that the conversion of a completely fictitious island to which a fictitious chivalric Arthur was taken to, (to what is nowadays understood to be a real location of Avalon) is to underestimate the brilliance of Henry’s subtle method of translocation. The translocation also bears witness to the evolvement of Henry’s propagandist thought processes where Arthur was firstly associated with Glastonbury in the Life of Gildas. Henry had initially posited Ineswitrin as synonymous with Glastonbury because by doing so it established the 601 charter’s credibility.

---

152 Scholars have contrived an a priori which assumes the name Avalon has no association with Glastonbury until Arthur’s disinterment when the leaden cross is found.
153 HRB IX, iv
154 HRB XI, ii
155 It will be discussed later on in the chapter on Vera Historia de morte Arthuri, Henry’s later addition of this lore to HRB where Morgen is also mentioned.
156 We should remember that the DA interpolations which associate Avalon with Glastonbury existed in DA long before the unearthing of the Arthur in 1189-91.
At that time Henry wished Glastonbury to be recognized as Ineswitrin. By the end of the evolution of his propaganda Henry has effectually converted Ineswitrin at Glastonbury into Avalon at Glastonbury.

Even though ‘Geoffrey’ in VM places Taliesin at the scene of Arthur’s arrival in *Insula Pomorum*, it is irrelevant since we can clearly see Taliesin’s inclusion in the narrative is because Henry Blois utilises material derived from Taliesin which comprises some of the VM.

There nine sisters rule by a pleasing set of laws those who come to them from our country. She who is first of them is more skilled in the healing art, and excels her sisters in the beauty of her person. Morgen is her name, and she has learned what useful properties all the herbs contain, so that she can cure sick bodies. She also knows an art by which to change her shape, and to cleave the air on new wings like Daedalus; when she wishes she is at Brest, Chartres, or Pavia and when she will she slips down from the air onto your shores. And men say that she has taught mathematics to her sisters, Moronoe, Mazoe, Gliten, Glitonea, Gliton, Tyronoe, Thitis; Thitis best known for her eitner. Thither after the battle of Camlan we took the wounded Arthur, guided by Barinthus to whom the waters and the stars of heaven were well known. With him steering the ship we arrived there with the prince, and Morgen received us with fitting honour, and in her chamber she

---

157 Pavia is presumably Paris; Brest and Chartres also places more relevant to Henry Blois than a Welsh Geoffrey of Monmouth.

158 ‘Geoffrey’s reference to the battle of Camlann is made to accord with an entry in the 10th-century *Annales Cambriae*, recording the battle in the year 537 which mentions Mordred (Medraut). ‘The Strife of Camlann in which Arthur and Medraut (Mordred) perished’.

159 There seems little doubt that the *Navigatio Brendani* is the source; the early eleventh century account of the voyage of St. Brendan. Followed by the Norman poem (ed. Fr. Michel), *Voyages Merveille de St. Brendan* (Paris 1878), where a certain ‘Barintz’ does the same (II. 75,101) and this version would certainly be known by Henry Blois as it was written for his uncle’s Queen Adeliza. Barint in the St Brendan legend starts the saint off on his voyage by telling him of a marvellous isle.

160 ‘Geoffrey’ has based Arthur’s arrival at Avalon after the battle of Camlan. ‘Geoffrey’s’ artifice is clearly revealed in setting up the association of ‘Alaron’ with his various Island material which leads into his Fortunate Isle scenario. ‘Geoffrey’s’ statement in the HRB where Arthur ‘wounded deadly, and was borne thence unto the island of Avalon for the healing of his wounds, where he gave up the crown of Britain unto his kinsman Constantine’ assumes that giving up his crown, he died there at Avalon and was never seen again. It is this same assumption that facilitated any credence given to the fabricated find of Arthur’s remains at Glastonbury in 1191. As we know, initially in *Primary Historia*, Arthur is not taken to Avalon, otherwise this would have been mentioned by Huntingdon. In First Variant (Bern 568) Henry Blois uses the ambiguous word *letaliter* ‘mortally wounded’, so a clear progression in storyline is witnessed; ultimately, to where a grave is manufactured by
placed the King on a golden bed and with her own hand she uncovered his honourable wound and gazed at it for a long time. At length she said that health could be restored to him if he stayed with her for a long time and made use of her healing art. Rejoicing, therefore, we entrusted the King to her and returning spread our sails to the favouring winds.”

Henry Blois, not forgetting that Merlin is supposedly speaking prior to the Saxon invasions, makes recorded British history into predictions that appear to have come true.

Merlin said in answer, “Dear friend, since that time how much the Kingdom has endured from the violated oath, so that what it once was it no longer is! For by an evil fate the nobles are roused up and turned against each other’s vitals, and they upset everything so that the abundance of riches has fled from the country and all goodness has departed, and the desolated citizens leave their walls empty. Upon them shall come the Saxon people, fierce in war, who shall again cruelly overthrow us and our cities, and shall violate God’s law and his temples. For He shall certainly permit this destruction to come upon us because of our crimes, that He may correct the foolish.”

Taliesin then postulates by means of prophecy the expectation of the Britons. Henry Blois using the voice of Taliesin pretends to state ‘the hope of Arthur’s return’ into a current hope of the 6th century. I would not be surprised if Henry Blois left the prophecy open so that at some future date it might apply to him; especially as he would be returning by ship if some mishap were to happen to Henry II. Until the reader is acquainted with the prophecy of the seven Kings supposedly by Merlin and translated by John of Cornwall this proposition seems foolish; but Henry Blois definitely had plans to return as a ‘chief’ if Henry II had been overcome by the Celts. In any case, the meaning reiterates the same feeling current at the time, to which William of Malmesbury referred. It also conveys the same sentiment as that found in the prophecies of HRB; of a lost noble nation needing to be

Henry Blois to coincide with Arthur having died at Avalon. Also if we take Alfred of Beverley’s evolved First Variant we can see that Henry Blois has not reached his second agenda in the development of Avalon: Alfred omits mention of Avenall in his reworking of the passage concerning Caliburnus. Henry got his idea of the sword being made on an island from the Aeneid where Aeneas’ arms are made by the Cyclops on the isle of Lipari
returned to its former peace. The return of an Arthurian figure, a saviour, might be more in line with what Henry Blois is trying to propose.

Merlin had scarcely finished when Taliesin exclaimed, “Then the people should send someone to tell the chief to come back in a swift ship if he has recovered his strength, that he may drive off the enemy with his accustomed vigour and re-establish the citizens in their former peace.

Henry Blois then cuts Taliesin short with an unequivocal prediction through the mouth of Merlin. Merlin speaks with powerful authority as he did in the HRB prophecies. He contradicts Taliesin’s generalised hope and sets about telling us what will transpire which his audience (having read HRB) knows has already taken place historically. This in effect confirms Merlin’s accuracy in the prediction about the Britons being enslaved for many years.

“No,” said Merlin, “not thus shall this people depart when once they have fixed their claws on our shores. For at first they shall enslave our Kingdom and our people and our cities, and shall dominate them with their forces for many years. Nevertheless three from among our people shall resist with much courage and shall kill many, and in the end shall overcome them. But they shall not continue thus, for it is the will of the highest Judge that the Britons shall through weakness lose their noble Kingdom for a long time, until Conan the venerated leader of the Welsh, who shall join together Scots and Cumbrians, Cornishmen and men of Brittany in a firm league, and shall return to their people their lost crown, expelling the enemy and renewing the times of Brutus, and shall deal with the cities in accordance with their consecrated laws. And the Kings shall begin again to conquer remote peoples and to subjugate their own realms to themselves in mighty conflict.” “No one shall then be alive of those who are now living,” said Taliesin, “nor do I think that any one has seen so many savage battles between fellow citizens as you have.”

---

161 The three Geoffrey refers to may be Cadvan, Cadwallo, and Cadwallader, on the basis of Book XII of the HRB.
162 See appendix 18
163 See appendix 19
164 See appendix 20
We now have Henry's true desire of unseating Henry II confirmed in actual speech by Merlin rather than found in a list of other prophecies. It is hard to grasp to which three Henry is relating to because Henry has morphed the prophecies since he published the initial *Libellus Merlini* to which his friend abbot Suger refers. Maybe originally the three were Constans Uther and Ambrosius\textsuperscript{165} against the Saxons. Maybe it is a case of Henry squewing the number three of the Kings used to indicate William the conqueror, William Rufus and Henry I, but it is not clear.

What is clear is that the prophecy's main purport, whether originally relating to the Saxon era (as is indicated by an initial resurgence and then an eventual subjugation of the Britons) is that the end of the subjugation comes through Conan and Cadwallader both coincidentally fighting against Henry II in 1155. So here we have a clear indication that Henry Blois is trying to rouse the indigenous Celts through prophecy. Henry Blois writing as Geoffrey has made it clear that if the Bretons (with Conan) and the Welsh (with Cadwallader), along with the Scots and Cornish rise up against the invaders (specifically the Angevin Henry II) they will once again retain the crown of Brutus.

I hope the reader can get an insight into how manipulative the real Henry Blois actually was. Not only did he invent the story of Brutus in HRB, he is now predicting that the fictitious crown would return to the indigenous Britons. When the reader understands the JC prophecies we will see upon whose head the crown is foreseen i.e. the seventh King….Henry Blois!!!

All these things Merlin recapped for our benefit to run according to the history as it was understood, so that we and ‘Geoffrey’s’ Anglo-Norman readers were amazed at Merlin’s accuracy. Merlin, speaking in the sixth century, comes out with a prediction, remarkably up to date by coincidently naming two people\textsuperscript{166} on the current political landscape. Henry Blois affects sedition through a fraudulent prophecy of Merlin inciting Conan and Cadwallader to rebel against Henry II; prompting them to join in firm league, to subjugate their own realm to themselves.\textsuperscript{167} In John of Cornwall’s

\textsuperscript{165}Ambrosius’ name is employed in HRB to conflate with Gildas and Bede’s accounts as he is the resistance leader conflated with Arthur by ‘Geoffrey’.

\textsuperscript{166}Not Cynan and Caduallo or Caedwalla

\textsuperscript{167}We can see the same seditious prophecy in Vulgate HRB: *Cadwallader shall call unto Conan, and shall receive Albany to his fellowship. Then shall there be slaughter of the foreigners: then shall the rivers run blood: then shall gush forth the fountains of Armorica and shall be crowned with the diadem of Brutus. Cambria shall*
rendition of the prophecies of Merlin (also fabricated by Henry Blois) it becomes evident that Henry sees himself as the natural replacement of Henry II once the rebellion has succeeded.

The last statement of Taliesin’s in the passage above underlines that Henry Blois’ conception of Merlin is as someone who lives through the ages and has witnessed these battles fought between the Britons themselves, the idiocy of which he laments constantly in that their power is reduced which has allowed the foreigners to dominate them. He has seen the various foreigners through the ages and the chaos they bring, and the sentiment of Merlin can be understood as: (my words) ‘Oh, if only the Celts, the Britons of a bygone age would stop fighting amongst themselves they would not have been invaded down through the ages’.

Merlin said, "Indeed, that is the truth. For I have lived long and seen much; our own folk turning on one another, and the chaos the barbarian brings.

The brief exchange acts as a conversational narrative conjunction before Henry Blois launches into the next lot of text, the object of which again is to endorse the historiography of the HRB.

“And I remember the crime when Constans was betrayed and the small brothers Uther and Ambrosius fled across the water. At once wars began in the Kingdom which now lacked a leader, for Vortigern of Gwent, the consul, was leading his troops against all the nations so that he might have the leadership of them, and was inflicting a wretched death upon the harmless peasants. At length with sudden violence he seized the crown after putting to death many of the nobles and he subdued the whole Kingdom to himself. But those who were allied to the brothers by blood relationship, offended at this, began to set fire to all the cities of the ill-fated prince and to perturb his Kingdom with savage soldiery, and they would not permit him to possess it in peace. Disquieted therefore since he could not withstand the rebellious people, he prepared to invite to the war men from far away with whose aid he might be able to meet his enemies. Soon there came from divers parts of the world warlike bands whom he received with honour. The Saxon people, in fact, arriving in their curved keels had come to serve him with their helmeted

be filled with gladness and the oaks of Cornwall shall wax green. The island shall be called by the name of Brutus and the name given by foreigners shall be done away. Here again, we are told the he-goat from the castle of Venus with a silver beard will succeed and there will then be peace in his time. It does not take too much imagination to see who this might refer to.

168 The same is posited by Robert de Boron who obtained his sense of Merlin from Henry Blois.

169 HRB, VI, v-xix.
soldiery. They were led by two courageous brothers, Horsus and Hengist,\textsuperscript{170} who afterwards with wicked treachery harmed the people and the cities. For after this, by serving the King with industry, they won him over to themselves and seeing the people moved by a quarrel that touched them closely they were able to subjugate the King; then turning their ferocious arms upon the people they broke faith and killed the princes by a premeditated fraud while they were sitting with them after calling them together to make peace and a treaty with them, and the prince they drove over the top of the snowy mountain.

Henry Blois in this last section confirms his HRB’s historiography, whereas, before, it was written in the form of historical record in the body of HRB, it is now re-iterated here in the VM as a future awaiting…. predicted by the prophet whose vaticinations undoubtedly have materialised as history for Henry’s audience. If the reader needs any help understanding this; this was revealed to Vortigern at the same time as the original prophecies in the HRB.

These are the things I had begun to prophesy to him would happen to the Kingdom.

Henry Blois then goes on to relate that Vortigern had tried to repel the Saxons he had initially invited to Britain until he was betrayed by Rowena Hengist’s sister who he was infatuated with and who poisoned him. Rowena recalls her brother back to Briton. Henry never forgets to put himself in character as Merlin, supposedly speaking as an ancient Briton and of ‘our’ army.

This therefore he did, for he came with such force against our army that he took booty from everybody until he was loaded with it, and he thoroughly destroyed by fire the houses throughout the country.

We then hear a complete contradiction in the story line where, (while these events were happening), Vortigern, now alive again, is defeated by the returning Britons from Brittany. The only reason I suspect for doing this is to locate Vortigern’s tower (for the narratives sake) in Wales so that he is differentiated from the good Britons who returned from Brittany\textsuperscript{171} and associated with the savages (in Henry’s mind) that now inhabit Wales. This

\textsuperscript{170} See appendix 1.5
\textsuperscript{171} HRB XII, xix: And, as barbarism crept in, they were no longer called Britons but Welsh, a word derived either from Gualo, one of their Dukes, or from Guales. Also we can see Henry’s hatred of the Welsh of his era: But the Welsh, degenerating from the nobility of the Britons, never afterwards recovered the sovereignty of the island...
is entirely consistent with ‘Geoffrey’s’ sentiments. By doing this, Henry allows himself his own personal views on the Welsh and offers by way of explanation the reason he is derogatory toward them.

“While these things were happening Uther and Ambrosius were in Breton territory with King Biducus and they had already girded on their swords and were proved fit for war, and had associated with themselves troops from all directions so that they might seek their native land and put to flight the people who were busy wasting their patrimony. So they gave their boats to the wind and the sea, and landed for the protection of their subjects; they drove Vortigern through the regions of Wales and shut him up in his tower and burned both him and it. Then they turned their swords upon the Angles and many times when they met them they defeated them, and on the other hand they were often defeated by them. At length in a hand to hand conflict our men with great effort attacked the enemy and defeated them decisively, and killed Hengist, and by the will of Christ triumphed.

This episode is aligned with the pseudo-history concocted in HRB but has nothing to do with the inciting to rebellion of the Celts found in the prophecies.

After these things had been done, the Kingdom and its crown were with the approval of clergy and laity given to Ambrosius....

Henry Blois always conscious of the role of Church in the state mentions its relationship far too much throughout the VM and HRB which betrays his own sentiments of the Cluniac, Gregorian reformation he had high hopes of achieving when he installed his brother Stephen on the throne. Henry carries forward with the story line repeating and setting in order the events for the most part recorded in the HRB. The point of recapping of all this to Taliesin is fairly pointless except for reasons of corroborating the historiography of the HRB and by padding out the text. That is until he arrives at his real objective which is to splice in new prophecies as if told contemporaneously with those found in the Vulgate HRB.

Ambrosius dies and his younger brother Uther takes to fighting battles over by the Humber. He is then succeeded by his son Arthur who is still a boy and ‘Therefore after seeking the advice of clergy and laity he sent to Hoel, King of Brittany, and asked him to come to his aid with a swift fleet, for they were united by ties of blood and friendship’......whom at length conquered his enemies the Saxons and forced to return to their own country, and he calmed his own Kingdom by the moderation of his laws. He also subdued
the Scots and Irish and subjugated the Norwegians far away across the broad seas, and the Danes whom he had visited with his hated fleet.

He conquered the people of the Gauls after killing Frollo to whom the Roman power had given the care of that country; the Romans, too, who were seeking to make war on his country, he fought against and conquered, and killed the Procurator Hiberius Lucius who was then a colleague of Legnis the general, and who by the command of the Senate had come to bring the territories of the Gauls under their power. 172 (Vita Merlini)

Henry has no option but to invent fictional Roman names because of the existence of the Roman annals. Merlin is now re-iterating and corroborating the fictions as presented in HRB. Henry had already tried to infer that Britons had overtaken Rome, but one cannot have a fictional battle at the valley of Siesia without a commander which could be conflated by his name with a real Roman in the annals. However, Henry has neatly brought us to the juncture in the HRB where Arthur has to return from France to take on Mordred.

Meanwhile the faithless and foolish custodian Modred had commenced to subdue our Kingdom to himself, and was making unlawful love to the King's wife. For the King, desiring, as men say, to go across the water to attack the enemy, had entrusted the queen and the Kingdom to him. But when the report of such a great evil came to his ears, he put aside his interest in the wars and, returning home, landed with many thousand men and fought with his nephew and drove him flying across the water. There the traitor, after collecting Saxons from all sides, began to battle with his lord, but he fell, betrayed by the unholy people confiding in whom he had undertaken such big things. How great was the slaughter of men and the grief of women whose sons fell in that battle!

In the Vulgate HRB we have Arthur being delivered to an Island called Avalon. We can witness Henry leading from an island Alaron through pointless text lifted from Isidore to introduce us to the Fortunate Isle (singular) which is also known as Insula Pomorum. Arthur was to receive medical care there. However, the readership of VM now has the confirmation of his trip to Avalon backed up by Taliesin, who accompanied Arthur to Insula Pomorum, but it is now not just an Island, but a court of the maidens.

172 See Appendix 31
After it the King, mortally wounded, left his Kingdom and, sailing across the water with you as you have related, came to the court of the maidens.

The problem for Henry Blois is that Arthur is taken to Avalon in First Variant and Henry has fabricated the name from a Burgundian town and probably from the similarity of place name where his father was killed, i.e., the Battle of Ascalon. The Island Ineswitrin is the real inspiration for his mystical isle as presented by Melkin in his prophecy and to which Henry Blois has changed the name to Avalon (in the prophecy also related by JG). Only Henry knows that it equates with the same location in which Melkin has said Joseph of Arimathea is buried and had called Ineswitrin.... but Henry Blois has no idea where Ineswitrin exists (except that it is in the old Dumnonia).

Melkin’s prophecy was the inspiration for his fictitious island he has called Avalon on which he has conveyed Arthur according to the tale in HRB and (by Barinthus) in VM. Now, this small shift of definition I just bring to the attention of the reader because Arthur is now at the palace of the nymphs or court of maidens. It is plain that it is Henry who has interpolated the piffle about Avalloc and his daughters in DA, but what I am trying to demonstrate is that Henry does not care what allusions or conflations he makes; his aim (or post 1158 agenda) is to have the reader of DA, VM and HRB all understand that Glastonbury was once known as Avalon. He accomplished his mission because when Gerald of Wales spoke of Avalon he understood that it was the old name for Glastonbury. Gerald was not convinced solely by the leaden cross which was unearthed in front of him. He had already read HRB, VM, and most importantly, the interpolated DA (as I shall cover shortly).

However, moving on to the conclusion of this section of VM which is in essence a recap of HRB (cleverly, more convincingly confirmed by Henry posing as ‘Geoffrey’ in the contemporaneous words of Merlin):

Each of the two sons of Modred, desiring to conquer the Kingdom for himself, began to wage war and each in turn slew those who were near of kin to him. Then Duke Constantine, nephew of the King, rose up fiercely against them and ravaged the people and the cities, and after having killed both of

173 Henry’s Father died May 19, 1102 in Ramla, Holy Land at the Battle of Ascalon. This may have some Freudian bearing on the choice of name in choosing the Burgundian town’s name.
them by a cruel death ruled over the people and assumed the crown. But he did not continue in peace since Conan\textsuperscript{174} his relative waged dire war on him and ravaged everything and killed the King and seized for himself those lands which he now governs weakly and without a plan.

We now enter a phase where Henry remembers that he is still the narrator of a story concerning the madness of Merlin with his friend Taliesin. After the praising of God, Henry now introduces a spring which miraculously will heal his madness. Not the most original of ideas but enough to hold and delight his readers and puts the storyline in context after the whole recap of the faux history in HRB. \textit{...and all his madness departed and the sense which had long remained torpid in him revived, and he remained what he had once been - sane and intact with his reason restored.}

Merlin then continues on in soliloquy professing to understand the movement of the heavens and the workings of animals etc. before ending with the fact that due to the water he is now normal again: \textit{For now I have the water which hitherto I lacked, and by drinking of it my brains have been made whole. But whence comes this virtue, O dear companion, that this new fountain breaks out thus, and makes me myself again who up to now was as though insane and beside myself?}

At this point in the text we are told ‘Taliesin answers’ but in effect does not. He instead enters into a lengthy monologue lifted again from Isidore’s XIII, Xiii. \textit{De diversitate aquarum}, (concerning the diversity of bodies of water).

The point of which this monologue serves is to relate back to the healing of the fountain which has cured Merlin of his madness where we hear amongst other such marvels for example that of: \textit{another fountain, called Cicero’s, which flows in Italy, which cures the eyes of all injuries.} And also of: \textit{The land of Boeotia is said to have two fountains; the one makes the drinker forgetful, the other makes them remember}.\textsuperscript{175}

Merlin then commences his own lengthy monologue; its main constituents sourced from Isidore’s XII.vii, \textit{De avibus} (concerning Birds). This goes on for some time but is also not relevant to our discussion but it commences with: \textit{Merlin presently said to them, “The Creator of the world...}

\textsuperscript{174} The original Duke of Brittany not the contemporary Conan Earl of Richmond c. 1138–1171.

\textsuperscript{175} Similar non-sense was in the prophecy about the fountains at Winchester in the HRB prophecies.
gave to the birds as to many other things their proper nature, as I have learned by living in the woods for many days.

Then Henry introduces another character into the storyline with the intent of carrying out a clever bit of subliminal contortion on the part of the reader; in the hope conflation is caused in his readers minds. He introduces us to a man named Maeldinus who, with the story line in VM, is associated with apples and would naturally lead any future investigator that enquires into his name to make the obvious conflation Henry has led us to. It is a conflation between *insula Pomorum* and Insula Avalonis. It is not by coincidence a certain Melchinus in his prophecy (found at Glastonbury) refers of the island of Avalon; especially now that Henry has substituted the original name of Iniswitrin to *Insula Avalonis* on the prophecy. I propose throughout this work that Melchinus’ prophecy is the inspiration behind Henry naming Avalon as the mystical island where Arthur was to be buried. It is based on the Island on which Joseph was supposedly buried.

The Melkin prophecy (originally about Ineswitrin) is Henry’s template for the place Arthur is taken after his fight with Mordred. Considering Melkin’s prophecy speaks of an undiscovered sepulchre, I would suggest Henry’s notion of planting Arthur’s body in the graveyard at Glastonbury is derived from Melkin’s prophecy which in effect refers to Joseph’s undiscovered tomb. Nor would it be too difficult to work out that Melkin’s *duo fassula* are the template for Henry’s Grail. In progression I will show that the Melkin prophecy existed at the time Henry Blois was alive and he was responsible for the change of name on the prophecy from Ineswitrin to Avalon.

It seems propitious therefore that a certain Maeldinus is introduced as a character in VM which suggests to readers also that his name is associated with *Insula Pomorum* and therefore Avalon.

*After he had finished speaking a certain madman came to them, either by accident or led there by fate; he filled the grove and the air with a terrific clamour and like a wild boar he foamed at the mouth and threatened to attack them. They quickly captured him and made him sit down by them that his remarks might move them to laughter and jokes. When the prophet looked at him more attentively he recollected who he was and groaned from the bottom of his heart, saying, “This is not the way he used to look when we were in the bloom of our youth, for at that time he was a fair, strong knight and one distinguished by his nobility and his royal race. Him and many*
others I had with me in the days of my wealth, and I was thought fortunate in having so many good companions, and I was. It happened one time while we were hunting in the lofty mountains of Arwystli that we came to an oak which rose in the air with its broad branches. A fountain flowed there, surrounded on all sides by green grass, whose waters were suitable for human consumption; we were all thirsty and we sat down by it and drank greedily of its pure waters. Then we saw some fragrant apples lying on the tender grass of the familiar bank of the fountain. The man who saw them first quickly gathered them up and gave them to me, laughing at the unexpected gift. I distributed to my companions the apples he had given to me, and I went without any because the pile was not big enough. The others to whom the apples had been given laughed and called me generous, and eagerly attacked and devoured them and complained because there were so few of them. Without any delay a miserable sadness seized this man and all the others; they quickly lost their reason and like dogs bit and tore each other, and foamed at the mouth and rolled on the ground in a demented state. Finally, they went away like wolves filling the vacant air with howlings. These apples I thought were intended for me and not for them, and later I found out that they were. At that time there was in that district a woman who had formerly been infatuated with me, and had satisfied her love for me during many years. After I had spurned her and had refused to cohabit with her she was suddenly seized with an evil desire to do me harm, and when with all her plotting she could not find any means of approach, she placed the gifts smeared with poison by the fountain to which I was going to return, planning by this device to injure me if I should chance to find the apples on the grass and eat them. But my good fortune kept me from them, as I have just said. I pray you, make this man drink of the healthful waters of this new fountain so that, if by chance he get back his health, he may know himself and may, while his life lasts, labour with me in these glades in service to God.” This, therefore, the leaders did, and the man who had come there raging drank the water, recovered, and, cured at once recognized his friends. Then Merlin said, “You must now go on in the service of God who restored you as you now see yourself, you who for so many years lived in the desert like a wild beast, going about without a sense of shame. Now that you have recovered your reason, do not shun the bushes or the green glades which you inhabited while you were mad, but stay with me that you may strive to make up in service to God for the days that the force of madness took from you. From now on all things
shall be in common between you and me in this service so long as either lives.” At this Maeldinus (for that was the man’s name) said, “Reverend father, I do not refuse to do this, for I shall joyfully stay in the woods with you, and shall worship God with my whole mind, while that spirit, for which I shall render thanks to your ministry, governs my trembling limbs.” “And I shall make a third with you, and shall despise the things of the world,” said Taliesin. “I have spent enough time living in vain, and now is the time to restore me to myself under your leadership. But you, lords, go away and defend your cities; it is not fitting that you should disturb beyond measure our quiet with your talk. You have applauded my friend enough.”

At this point in the story it looks as if Henry Blois was finding it tedious to pad out a storyline in which the main point was to implant polemic and uphold the pseudo-history of HRB. It is here that Henry decides to have one more dabble in Prophecy before an abrupt end to the work, as the three men Merlin, Taliesin and Maeldinus176 send their audience away and remain in the wood along with Merlin’s sister Ganieda.

The next set of prophecies Henry Blois wishes to impose on the reader are supposedly spoken by Ganieda, who, incredibly sees into the future from the sixth century. Incredibly so much that is relevant to her reading audience in the twelfth century, who have just lived through the Anarchy. Even to a Norman audience her prophecies must stretch credibility; to believe that the one occasion Ganieda is found prophesying, amazingly, the content of the prophetic vision pertains to the era in which the book which contained her vaticinations was published.

The chieftains departed. The three remained, with Ganieda, the prophet’s sister, making a fourth, she who at length had assumed and was leading a seemly life after the death of the King who so recently had ruled so many people by the laws he administered. Now with her brother there was nothing more pleasant to her than the woods. She too was at times elevated by the spirit so that she often prophesied to her friends concerning the future of the Kingdom. Thus on a certain day when she stood in her brother’s hall and saw

176 The fact that there is a King Melvas at Glastonbury and a Maheloas, a great baron, lord of the Isle of Voirre in Chrétien’s ‘Erec’ and here a Maeldanus (of royal race) all attached to Glastonbury, all having emanated from Melkin or the Maeldanus in the Life of Cadoc (on which Henry based his life of Gildas) just indicates Henry’s ability to conflate sources.
the windows of the house shining with the sun she uttered these doubtful words from her doubtful breast.

Any reader who has just been bored while traipsing through the construction of VM as we have just done, will shortly be able to make a bonefide decision about whether or not Henry Blois is writing these prophecies. What most scholars already understand is that whoever wrote the Merlin prophecies wrote HRB. Once this is understood it becomes very evident from Ganieda’s prophecies below that the author of GS is the same person also.

Ganieda starts with the three defining moments of the Anarchy, the seizing of Roger of Salisbury and Alexander of Lincoln at Oxford, the siege at Winchester and the battle of Lincoln. If truth were told, the Anarchy probably would not have taken place if Henry had not manipulated the crown onto his brother’s head. The events are so highly relevant to him, it is doubtful that there was anyone who would be more concerned with such issues. Again, the content exposes Henry Blois as the author but I have put the explanation in the appendix so I can move on from VM as some elucidations are lengthy.

I see the city of Oxford filled with helmeted men, and the holy men and the holy bishops bound in fetters by the advice of the Council, and men shall admire the shepherd’s tower reared on high, and he shall be forced to open it to no purpose and to his own injury. I see Lincoln walled in by savage soldiery and two men shut up in it, one of whom escapes to return with a savage tribe and their chief to the walls to conquer the cruel soldiers after capturing their leader. O what a shame it is that the stars should capture the sun, under whom they sink down, compelled neither by force nor by war! I see two moons in the air near Winchester and two lions acting with too great ferocity, and one man looking at two and another at the

177 See appendix 21
178 See appendix 22
179 See appendix 23
180 See appendix 26
181 On 14 September, 1141, Queen Matilda and Empress Matilda, ‘the two moons’ brought their rival forces to the rout of Winchester. See also appendix 22
182 Duke Henry the future King Henry II and Stephen are the two lions, and the one man looking at two and another man looking at two are Henry Blois and Theobald of Bec already mentioned at the ‘Ford of the Staff’ (Wallingford). Henry Blois and Theobald of Bec are the peacemakers as neither side (situated each side of the
same number, and preparing for battle and standing opposed. The others rise up and attack the fourth fiercely and savagely but not one of them prevails, for he stands firm and moves his shield and fights back with his weapons and as victor straightway defeats his triple enemy. Two of them he drives across the frozen regions of the north while he gives to the third the mercy that he asks, so that the stars flee through all portions of the fields. The Boar of Brittany, protected by an aged oak, takes away the moon, brandishing swords behind her back. I see two stars engaging in combat with wild beasts beneath the hill of Urien where the people of Gwent and those of Deira met in the reign of the great Coel O with what sweat the men drip and with what blood the ground while wounds are being given to the foreigners! One star collides with the other and falls into the shadow, hiding its light from the renewed light. Alas what dire famine shall come, so that the north shall inflame her vitals and empty them of the strength of her people.

It begins with the Welsh and goes through the chief parts of the Kingdom, and forces the wretched people to cross the water. The calves accustomed to live on the milk of the Scottish cows that are dying from the
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river), wanted to fight. As Henry equates himself with Cicero he would know: A bad peace is always better than a good war.

The one man is Henry Blois looking at the two. The two are the Queen Matilda, Stephen’s wife and the Empress Matilda. ‘Another’ is Robert of Gloucester looking at the two also, preparing for battle.

William the Conqueror was accounted the first, William II, was the third son of William the conqueror of England, called William Rufus. He was the second. The third was Henry Ist and the fourth was King Stephen the brother of Henry Blois. Orderic Vitalis... crowned on the eighteenth of the calends of January being the fourth King of the Norman race

See appendix 25
See appendix 24
See appendix 27
See appendix 28
See appendix 29
See appendix 30

‘In the same week, a like good fortune smiled on King Stephen in another part of the Kingdom. For the earl of Albemarle and Roger de Mowbray had an engagement with the King of Scotland,’ and having put to the sword a multitude of the Scots, avenged the cruel slaughter which these people had made of the English without any respect for the Christian religion. The Scots, it appears, fearing the sword which threatened them, fled towards the water, and rushing into the river Tweed where there was no ford, in their attempt to escape death, met it by drowning. ‘After the war had continued for a length of time between the two Kings, and it had been accompanied by great atrocities on the one side and on the other, to the general loss, envos were sent by divine inspiration, to treat of peace between the two Kings, now weary of pillage and slaughter, as well as of continual anxiety and toil; and thus their alliance was renewed’.
pestilence shall flee. Normans depart and cease to bear weapons through our native realm with your cruel soldiery. There is nothing left with which to feed your greed for you have consumed everything that creative nature has produced in her happy fertility. Christ, aid thy people! Restrain the lions and give to the country quiet peace and the cessation of wars.”

The word Neustrians is employed for Normans so that an air of antiquity is maintained. Here, unlike in the original Libellus Merlini where the Normans were saviours, we now fully understand that Henry II is on the throne and Henry’s only hope of return to England is to rouse the Celts to rebellion by castigating the Normans. Henry Blois does not betray his Norman heritage; just as he averts all suspicion of authorship of the Gesta Stephani by being on occasion derogatory about himself. The stratagems employed to divert suspicion of authorship in the various works in the course of this exposé are varied and ingenious. Henry Blois writing as ‘Geoffrey’ in the VM, speaking as Ganieda, Merlin or Taliesin feigns British nationality:

1. The war-lord Horsa and many others met their deaths at the hands of our men.

2. She promptly sent word overseas to her brother to come back with sufficiently large forces to overcome our warrior people.

3. Our men made a great effort in an attack

4. And they conquered by the sword all the territories of our native land that lie beyond the Humber.

5. During this time the faithless and foolhardy guardian of our realm

6. Your power will not prove a match for our fierce nation.

Berating the Normans has the same effect. The confirmation of that which I have maintained about Henry employing the prophecies to rouse all the Celts to come together is laid bare here. The VM was written at the time between 1155 and 1158 when Henry is trying a desperate ploy to

---

192 See appendix 30. Also, a poem in Canu Taliesin entitled The Battle of Gwen Ystrat: “The men of Catraeth arise with the day around a battle-victorious, cattle-rich sovereign this is Uryen by name, the most senior leader.”

193 We should also note that Henry’s importance in determining events is evidenced in a self-written epitaph on the Meusan plates: lest England groan for it, since on him (Henry Blois) it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.
retain power. No Norman or Anglo-Norman, especially a cleric in Oxford, would have the audacity to write that the ‘Normans should depart and cease to bear weapons through our native realm with your cruel soldiery’. It is no wonder Gerald relates that King Henry wanted to obtain a copy of VM.

If the reader is still not convinced that Henry Blois is the author of these prophecies and the instigator of these updated prophecies which incite rebellion, he should read the version of Merlin’s prophecies supposedly put out by John of Cornwall (which I cover in Chapter 30). This version puts Henry as the seventh king and Henry Blois vainly sees himself as an ‘adopted son’ firmly on the throne in England.

However, no Norman could deny in the period just after Stephen’s death that the entire country was depleted. Henry’s audience would understand that it was indeed an accurate prediction by Ganieda. Henry’s last devise is to appeal to Christ (as if it were a Briton speaking) through Ganieda that peace may come.

Ganieda having seen so many tumultuous events which apply to the reign of Stephen, six hundred years in her future, may have tested the whole of VM’s credibility. However, Henry’s vanity had Ganieda see things which concerned Henry directly. It is not by coincidence that historical records of events to which Ganieda alludes and which provides the explanation of all of Ganieda’s prophecies are covered in detail in GS (again authored by Henry Blois). Deflection and secrecy of authorship was vital, especially when we consider the consequences if the Bishop of Winchester was discovered in such a deception and of the invention of Merlin.

She did not stop with this and her companions wondered at her, and her brother, who soon came to her, spoke approvingly with friendly words in this manner, “Sister, does the spirit wish you to foretell future things, since he has closed up my mouth and my book? Therefore this task is given to you; rejoice in it, and under my favour devoted to him speak everything.

‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ speaking through Merlin then goes on to convince his readers that Ganieda spoke of future events by the spirit and contrives the rhetorical question referring to his book of the prophecies of Merlin. Such a device verifies the credibility of such a book for the naïve and gullible of his reading audience (even to modern scholars). I think Henry realises that some of his audience may pay little respect to prophecies from a woman no one has heard of before. So, the great Merlin adds his stamp of authority explaining (so that we might understand how it
is that we are blessed with Ganieda’s insight) and the reason Merlin’s mouth has been ‘shut’. This indeed must be because (in reality) Merlin’s initial book (libellus Merlini) was already published and it had already been squeeved from its original to the updated prophecies found in the Vulgate HRB.

Such prophecies as the Dumbarton and Carlisle prophecies were added here in VM and it would seem odd for more newly invented prophecies to turn up that had not previously been mentioned. Henry could not help himself in referring to the major parts of the Anarchy which Merlin had somehow missed and so they were seen by Ganieda instead.

The close to VM is rather a dull and an odd circumambulation of logic on which to end an extraordinary invention.

I have brought this song to an end. Therefore, ye Britons, give a wreath to Geoffrey of Monmouth. He is indeed yours for once he sang of your battles and those of your chiefs, and he wrote a book called “The Deeds of the Britons” which are celebrated throughout the world.

Whether ‘Geoffrey’ wrote this with his original or not is only contested on the point that the colophon exists in one manuscript. However, it acts as a confirmation that the two works of HRB and VM are by the same supposed author who, (even though this VM has only recently been published circa late 1156 to 1157) is now dead and supposedly died in 1154. Tongue in cheek, Henry Blois suggests a memorial to a person that never lived. The real problem would have been laying the wreath on his grave because there wasn’t one. More importantly it gives the illusion that all these prophecies were written before Henry II came to the throne.

Henry Blois lived until 1171, so there is the possibility of later additions by Henry. However considering Henry’s recall to England, by Theobald of Bec, the terminus post quem fits the recently received news at Clugny. This is the news of a July battle at Coleshill. A battle in which Henry II was victorious and remained alive and therefore Henry Blois’ wish of insurrection was doubtful to come true; hence, the sudden termination of the VM with these events and a return to Winchester and the King’s Court.

There may only be one objection to an 1157 completion date which Tatlock discusses, but these

---
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should be dismissed. Tatlock gives a completion date not much after 1148. The discrepancy arises in a comment on the differentiation between *Merlinus Ambrosius* and *Merlinus Caledonius* or Silvester. The assertion for a date prior to 1157 is based upon two library catalogue descriptions of Geoffrey’s HRB one copied from the other in Normandy, where we read...

Libri XII, *in quorum septimo continentur prophetiae Mellini, non Silvestris, sed alterius, id est Mellini Ambrosii*. The comment on the two Merlin’s is derived from Bec library, but Crick informs us, the Leiden manuscript was catalogued in 1160, so I can see no reason to assume a date prior to 1157 given that ‘Geoffrey’ did not die in 1154-5. Tatlock seems to assume the Leyden MS, which has the VM prefixing the whole volume (containing much besides the HRB), who assigns an early HRB date (basing his premise purely upon the dedication), proposes as said.... ‘not much after 1148’ for the Vita. He dates the second of the library cataloguing ‘between early 1152 and 1154’ and the first even earlier. This would have to be wrong on account of Stephen’s nineteen years and the sixth in Ireland prophecy.

No previous proposition should prevent us here maintaining a completion date for the Vita Merlini as late as Aug- Sept 1157; and the *terminus post quem* of Chambers, Faral, Parry and Bruce is inconsequential based mainly upon the 13 December 1148 election date of Robert de Chesney to Lincoln and its supposedly recent transpiration made to appear by reason of the word ‘just’. Dedications as a form of dating in both HRB and VM have no bearing on the date of the work as commentators such as Crick need to understand before teaching another generation of scholars incorrectly.  

We can rely on Ganieda’s prophecy of the two kings meeting at Wallingford to set a date of at least 1153. That is, if it had not been shown that the ‘sixth in Ireland’ prophecy could only have occurred later than 1155. If we take the later suppositions of sedition and Coleshill.... we can get a date as late as 1157; nearly ten years after Tatlock’s date. Their early

---

196 Crick’s 76&92 MSS  
197 The Historia regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth IV. Dissemination and reception in later middle ages Prof. Julia C. Crick, 204  
198 The most balanced scholar in his approach to Geoffrey’s work is Prof. O.J.Padel: What is certain is Geoffrey’s subtlety and the complexity of his work: the gravest error that we students can commit is to underestimate it. The more one learns about his work, the more one feels that Geoffrey was always one step ahead of his twentieth-century readers: anything that we may establish, by dint of hard work and detailed scholarship, is open to revision by some future discovery.
reckoning too is based on Henry Blois’ propaganda (book of Llandaff) which provided the date of the Bishop of Asaph’s death along with the conclusion drawn about De Chesney’s recent election in 1148.

Henry’s dedication to Robert de Chesney was just another form of ruse to hide Henry’s identity by choosing and flattering those who he had little respect for. It was also made to keep up the illusion that the bishop’s of Lincoln were his patrons. Not even Robert de Chesney could deny that his predecessor might have commissioned the prophecies from Geoffrey and that Geoffrey had taken it upon himself to write VM for his own further advancement appealing to a patron of the same diocese. There was no request involved, and of course, if De Chesney did see VM, he would assume that Geoffrey died before he could present it. Henry Blois did not need their patronage and the entire dedicatory tone was a stratagem meant to mislead. The dedication could of course have been added after De Chesney’s death as ‘Geoffrey’ had done with Vulgate HRB.

The first definitive assertion of differentiation between the two Merlins’ is by Gerald de Barri in Itinerarium Cambriae written in 1188-91 long after Crick’s 1160 date for cataloguing the Leiden MS. However, 1160 is still two years subsequent to Henry’s move back to Winchester from Clugny. Even though Henry Blois was patron to Gerald,199 Gerald never suspected Henry Blois as the author of HRB. Gerald, happy to quote Merlin, had not much good to say about ‘Geoffrey’. To my mind, (disregarding the possibility of Henry’s vaticinatory ability), the whole paragraph toward the end has to have been written after the event of Coleshill. Such a flimsy detail regarding the death of Geoffrey in 1155 seems immaterial since his persona is a fabrication anyway.

Taliesin was a sixth century poet and bard whose work has partially survived in Welsh manuscript, the Book of Taliesin. Taliesin who is believed to have sung at the courts of at least three Celtic British Kings would of course interest ‘Geoffrey’ and provide a contemporaneous companion and bouncing board in the VM for Merlin. Taliesin’s work dated from a few poems to the sixth century, praises King Urien of Rheged and his son Owain mab Urien, and several of the poems imply that he also served as the court

199 David Knowles. Saints and Scholars. P 55. It is largely due to Gerald’s record, who only knew Henry in his later life after his return from Clugny in 1158, which has secured Henry’s reputation in posterity as a revered elder statesman of the church giving generous patronage and wise council to such as King Henry II and Becket alike.
bard to King Brochfael Ysgithrog of Powys and his successor Cynan Garwyn, either before or during his time at Urien’s court. Some of the events to which his poems refer, such as the Battle of Arfderydd may be the source for historical annals as he seems to have been at the battle.

Taliesin’s name is directly linked with the Y Gododdin from which we have the poetic account previously mentioned and he is also mentioned in Nennius’s Historia Brittonum. Strangely, it would seem that this second Merlin Sylvestris is modeled upon Taliesin as even Taliesin’s parentage like Merlin’s was suspect. Although not an incubus, Taliesin was adopted as a child by Elffin, the son of Gwyddno Garanhir, but also more to the point, he has a possible connection to the original Melkin, (Meldred, Melvas, Maelgwn, all Kings) as Taliesin prophesied the death of Maelgwn from the Yellow Plague. Taliesin also became companion of Bran the Blessed and King Arthur which sounds suspect as a late addition. But in the life of St Cadoc we hear ‘in those days, a certain King, of the name of Maelgon, reigned over all Britain’ which I am sure was ‘Geoffrey’s’ reason for the inclusion of Maeldanus as a contemporary with Taliesin and Merlin in VM. The triple death divination and a prophetic madman called Lailoken befriended by St Kentigern of Glasgow (d.603) certainly associates more closely with a Calidonian Merlin.

The reasons for reconstituting Merlin in the Vita Merlini is because in HRB ‘Geoffrey’ had put no flesh on Merlin’s bones. His prophecies were the substance of Merlin Ambrosius in HRB. Later in this exposé we will see Henry’s ingenuity to explain how it is that Robert de Boron possesses certain knowledge i.e. of Joseph and the Grail where Merlin is posited (just as he is the VM), as a type of reappearing time traveller through the ages.

To make Merlin seem more real, Henry needed to give him location at a point in time with the added reality of interactive contemporaries who existed in history in the era projected by ‘Geoffrey’.

As Tatlock points out one must be wary of assuming that every authentic legendary or historical Briton name here reflects in the attached narrative authentic tradition. Invented narrative attached to authentic names belonging to the same period concerned or other periods, is so common in the HRB as to be fairly called its formula.

---
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As I have mentioned, it seems that Henry employs a metaphor, interchanging the woods for Clugny as opposed to the material world at court he had been part of; full of double dealings, deceit and lies. He had been greatly concerned with affairs in the Anarchy, during the years his brother was in power. I suggest that the innocence of the cloister boy returning home was like rediscovering inner peace. Clugny was the woods, the forest of Calidon, and a place to heal ones conscience from the madness he had endured in England and this is reflected in the opening to VM (especially with the 19 years coinciding with his brother’s reign). I might suggest that some who were religiously instructed from an early age undergo a self-realisation of past misdemeanours and account this religious experience as a form of madness within themselves. This may be part of the reason for its inclusion as part of the storyline in the Vita.

Although not suggested by its manuscript tradition, it would seem from the later references to the VM that it was popular, but I believe the reason for its lesser dissemination as opposed to that of the HRB is that Henry did not propagate copies throughout the monastic system on the continent.... probably because it was less acceptable in verse. It had much less history and was designed to be read aloud at court. Therefore, it was not reproduced and distributed on the scale of the HRB. HRB’s distribution was simply achieved by handing it out to grandees and abbeys in the course of Henry’s travels; innocuously secreting its authorship, by presenting it as an interesting and inoffensive work by a non-descript cleric called Gaufridus Artur or after his supposed elevation to bishop and then his subsequent death.... the Vulgate was widely understood as having been written by Geoffrey of Monmouth (as in the text....rather than Gaufridus as stated in Primary Historia).

The Vita Merlini in general can be seen to be derived from various sources, but it has a disconnected style compared with the unique condensation and organised construction of the HRB. The Vita is no less contrived but its structure is haltering; as if Geoffrey after a long focus has to realign his plot to make sure that the points for which the Vita was produced are made. The overall effect is in a less flowing structure than the HRB, (but to have versified some of Isidore’s work is already a feat). Maybe this is acceptable to Henry, who, throughout the matter of fact HRB, presented it as believable History. Henry adjusted his sights and agenda and in his first word says: I am preparing to sing the madness of the
prophetic bard, and a humorous poem on Merlin. He in fact carries out certain intended facets which in effect help to align his propaganda concerning a partly fictional history which was to become known as the Matter of Britain.
Chapter 5

Henry Blois and the Gesta Stephani

It is an odd occurrence that Winchester is mentioned 16 times in the HRB and given much prominence, yet Glastonbury is not mentioned once. Many of the 12th century episodes alluded to in the prophecies in the VM and Vulgate prophecies in HRB are found similarly referred to as events recorded in the GS. What I hope to show here, by a short review of the GS, is that the author of the GS is Henry Blois also. We can then establish a pattern of deceptive authorship which we can then extend to other texts partially or wholly authored by Henry Blois and explain why Henry’s self proclaimed epitaph on the Meusan plates paints himself as another Cicero…. and an ‘author’ above all things material.
There are too many sentiments which are common to the GS which are found in the HRB and the Vita. There are too many observations in the GS which coincide with personal interests that Henry Blois is known to have had. The GS is the only detailed contemporary history which covers the whole of Stephen's reign.

What first strikes the reader of the GS is that it appears as a chronicle, but from the construction, one can see it is written by a diarist reflecting back on notes made previously and on details supported by memory. One can discern that episodes are observations of a person close to events from which a biography on the acts of King Stephen's reign is constructed. It is clear that the GS was written by someone who on many occasions gives accounts which are very detailed. In some instances Henry Blois witnessed the scenes and some episodes he recounts having heard second hand. There are certain events where he is known to have been historically at the scene, witnessed by other chroniclers, where detail in GS could only be from an eyewitness. Henry might have obtained first-hand accounts with blow by blow detail from contemporary courtiers at the heart of the affairs. As a diarist, these events were recorded and used in the construction of the GS along with his memory. Henry was intimately tied to events concerning King Stephen.

The GS is written with interested involvement for the subject matter, affection for Stephen and with retrospective empathy.... understanding the viewpoint, travails and events to which Stephen reacted in the 19 years of his reign. It was written after Stephen’s death and there is no animosity or pique displayed by Henry against Stephen in most of the episodes.

It has been remarked by numerous commentators that the GS was written by a churchman. The bishop of Bath has been posited as a possible author. I do not believe Henry’s diary details were in any way meant specifically for the construction of the GS, but were simply employed retrospectively as a record of Stephen’s reign because so many episodes involved and concerned Henry Blois. The reason for thinking the GS is taken from a diary is that there are no dates throughout and yet the whole account follows the passage of time.

Our anonymous author, hiding his identity, wishing to present an apologia for himself in the form of a biography of Stephen, did not concern himself with dates because nearly all the events followed chronologically in
his own mind.\textsuperscript{201} One event leads to the next from itemized sections in his own diary record; not forgetting the diary was acting more of a prompt for memory providing him retrospectively the train of events in time.

Henry passed through several stages in his life; from the bookish pious cloistered young man to the self-assured high born favoured nephew of King Henry who arrived at Glastonbury to prove his merit and worth. After the election to Winchester until the death of Stephen, material rather than pious concerns take precedent. There are other contemporary historical chronicles which portray Henry Blois in a non-complimentary light; and even as a dark force in much of the political manoeuvrings of the Anarchy. It is with this in mind, we should also consider the benefits of writing such a dedicated history about his brother. The way the GS is presented distorts the truth for readers in posterity. It acts at times as an apologia to accusations and perceptions of Henry Blois’s underhanded role in events which were held by contemporaries or perceived by chroniclers.

Therefore, the purpose of maintaining anonymity is firstly to present Henry in a positive light, because Henry Blois wants to be held in high esteem by posterity. Secondly, Henry is writing a polemic apologia and therefore; if many of the views are to be accepted as unbiased and credible, there must be no suspicion of authorship by Henry Blois.

Henry understands history and how it is conveyed through the actions of kings by chroniclers. Henry wishes to present the saga of the Anarchy to posterity (retrospectively), by presenting a positive aspect for his part in the cause of the Anarchy. Henry has a twofold agenda in writing GS: Firstly, to present his own side of the story so that his character in history is not that which is left negatively portrayed by other chroniclers. Second, his intent is to account for his brother’s actions. But, we must not be duped into thinking anything other than the GS’s main purpose is the aggrandizement of Henry’s place in history.

We know Henry has delved into history having accomplished the composition of HRB. He knows that the GS will be studied by posterity. Without the information found in GS, there would be some Merlin prophecies in the Vita and HRB which would be difficult to elucidate. Some views pertaining to events specifically involving Henry or his brother’s

\textsuperscript{201} Strangely enough, like ‘Geoffrey’s’ work, it is the chronology of events from which we can determine the approximate date.
actions are duplicated exactly in GS and the Vita Merlini. A case in point would be how Henry finds it difficult to understand how his brother makes a pact with King David for a third time\textsuperscript{202} when David has broken the previous two. It is an impossibility that the writer of the Merlin prophecies just happens to hold the exact same view as the author of GS and it is even less likely that Merlin, the sixth century seer, (if he had ever existed) would have commented upon what Henry had such a hard time understanding in his brother’s forgiving nature.

The powerful bishop of Winchester opens himself for criticism if authorship were claimed, as many of Henry’s deeds are made to appear in a better light than how contemporaries understood his actions. Henry refers to himself as Legate before it happens chronologically in the text of GS,\textsuperscript{203} but this is mere artifice on his behalf to feign third party authorship. He uses other devices which we will come across in the text, but Henry Blois is a master of deception. He refers to his nephew with the wrong name as if a chronicler was misinformed. It is virtually the only factual mistake in the manuscript apart from the glaring truth that Henry did momentarily swap allegiance to the Empress Matilda, but this is never admitted in GS. Henry Blois’ sister Agnes has a son Hugh de Puiset who he purposely names as Henry ‘\textit{whom we have since seen become Bishop of Durham}’.

Henry Blois is a master of deception and his reference to Henry of Anjou as ‘the lawful heir’ (the future Henry II) is also artful deception. It is evident by the tone of the text that Henry Blois set out to give the impression to his readers that his sympathies or allegiance as the anonymous author has shifted to the Angevin cause.

In Henry’s case his allegiance never shifted after the rout at Winchester. It was always Henry’s hope that Eustace (Stephen’s son) until his death in 1153 would inherit the crown and Henry had fostered his relationship with Eustace as a loving uncle in prospect of him becoming King. Yet the ‘lawful heir’ gambit is posited as if our author held this view in 1147 about the future Henry II.

Henry Blois was certainly involved with the events preceding the Anarchy in Bristol and Bath. His contempt for the Bristolians and the duke of Gloucester’s stronghold is evident, referring to it as the pit of perdition.

\textsuperscript{202} The third time was after the rout of Winchester.
\textsuperscript{203} This would infer that the GS was not written as a chronicle contemporaneous with the passage of time but was written retrospectively.
and of the people, ‘unrestrained in the commission of every crime had by open robbery and stealthy thefts thrown the country into confusion’. It was probably Henry’s engineering prowess that hatched the plan to build a dam across the harbour mouth and flood the city…. which is recounted at this time in GS.

The reason we can assume the GS is transcribed from detail supplied by his diary is that Henry, when writing, anticipates events in the future i.e. he references the diary which when written he was unaware of the future outcome of the event and often refers futuristically to peoples demise or the conclusion of the event he is referencing. When giving account of how his brother came to the crown he gives himself a glowing reference, and already accounts himself as legate of all England: then rapidly gathering a strong body of knights, who had flocked altogether from every quarter, he (Stephen) hastened to Bishop Henry, on whom his enterprise entirely depended. For that man was his brother by both parents, a man of inexpressible eloquence as well as wonderful wisdom; with fortune smiling favourably on his wishes he became Abbot of Glastonbury and Bishop of Winchester and was enthroned in the Kingdom by the apostolic see as legate of all England.

The position of papal Legate did not transpire until 1139. Also, when speaking of Miles of Gloucester, in reference to events in 1136, Henry already knows of his death in 1143 and says he will expound more fully in what follows…. which means, when he gets to that point chronologically in his diary he will deal with Miles’ death. These are not the only examples of anticipation, but there are several more. To take into account that GS is written after the fact and not as a record of current events, we should consider who is in the King’s company…. or at least would have such in depth knowledge of affairs for the length of time spanning nineteen years. Our author is obviously a churchman and the only person eligible (as possible author) at the centre of events is Theobald of Bec…. but GS starts three years before his election. In any event, Theobald is hardly likely to write such an empathetic biography.

Some episodes at the beginning of the GS and at the end are in such detail (as I have said)…. chronological order is being recounted as an account from previous record and memory. The Bishop of Bath was not on hand for the length of time and would probably not provide detail in such minutiae from start to finish retrospectively. Especially, at times with such
intricate eyewitness detail of the scenes described. Our author, on many occasions is next to his King Stephen. It is on these days that the diarist’s record comes alive. Also, if we look at the detail in the GS’ account and match it to the movements of Henry Blois, there are four or five periods in the account where the detail is lacking. For instance there are 17 pages covering the year 1136. The period in 1137 for instance has half a page because Henry Blois was in Normandy for a large part of the year. This is in fact where he composed his *Primary Historia* which he then deposited at Bec. We can see then that as an account constructed by a diarist, the gaps in GS would make sense as a diarist records his own daily events. For a chronicler the gaps would not be accountable.

Henry was in Normandy for quite a time. Apparently, according to Gervaise of Canterbury he left England in Advent 1136 to do his brother’s bidding abroad as vice regent of Normandy since Geoffrey of Anjou had raided in September. Orderic Vitalis gives account of what Henry Blois deals with until his brother Stephen lands in Normandy in March 1137. Stephen arrived in Normandy briefly in 1137, where he met with Louis VI and Theobald (Henry’s other elder brother) to agree to an informal alliance against ‘Handsome’ Geoffrey and Matilda, to counter the growing Angevin power in the region. Stephen probably also attended their mother’s funeral near Clugny. However, Henry for this period is not recording events concerning Stephen in England hence the gap in the GS. For the other periods mentioned where detail on Stephen is scant, Henry is either at Rome or Cluny.

The GS account is mainly centred on what transpires in Britain but we know Stephen and Henry both concern themselves with actions on the continent. Henry is feigning the appearance of authorship by an insular cleric.

In 1137, Stephen attests a charter at Rouen with his brother Henry renewing a grant to *St Mary de Fontrevault*. It is possible Henry Blois went to Rome sometime from March through to December to try to secure the job of Archbishop of Canterbury since he was acting incumbent as Archbishop Corbeil had died. Another blank period of the GS is late in 1138 where

---

204 Orderic Vitalis, VI, xiii, 479
205 Geoffrey V, *le Bel* known as Geoffrey Plantagenet was the Count of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine by inheritance from 1129 when he married the Empress and then Duke of Normandy by conquest from 1144.
Henry heard of Theobald of Bec’s elevation to Canterbury and may have visited Rome again.

He was however, present at Theobald’s of Bec’s inauguration according to Gervaise on the 8th of January 1139. Some chronicler’s dispute Henry was present. It was just after this event that Henry of Huntingdon, accompanying Theobald of Bec to Rome, discovers the *Primary Historia* while tiding over at Bec *en route*. The GS picks up on June 24th where the Bishops are arrested and Henry has out-manoeuvred Theobald. It is possible he arranged to receive the Legation at Rome before Theobald of Bec receives his pallium. William of Malmesbury thinks it was March 1st that Henry Blois was appointed Legate. So, this may put Henry in Rome and therefore explains the gap in recorded events in England and of Stephen’s exploits. The first anybody hears of Henry’s appointment is on the very day where events relevant to Stephen start again in the GS as he returns back from Rome as Legate.

When pope Innocent died on Sept 24th 1143 Henry again went to Rome. A year later after Celestine died he was back in Rome in 1144 requesting the legateship once more. It was at this time Henry Blois uses an interpolated DA along with a First Variant version of the *Historia* to make a case to obtain metropolitan status over south west England. In 1145 John of Hexam relates that Henry, Bishop of Winchester, on his way to Rome again tarried at Clugny as pope Innocent had died. In 1149 Henry travelled to Rome again to request Winchester be made a metropolitan as foreseen in the Merlin prophecies.

In 1151 there is only half a page in the GS and the Winchester annals say Henry went to Rome to refute the charges of the monks of Hyde abbey. If Henry Blois was not in the country and not being fed detail at court (about Stephen and its relevance to GS), this would account for the lack of material and eyewitness detail concerning Stephen. If Bishop Henry had missed current events because he is known to be elsewhere there is usually a corresponding gap in detail regarding Stephen in GS.

The first thing to realize about the GS is that it is in part an apologist’s view. In effect it conveys a sentiment which makes Henry Blois appear in a better light historically. Considering it took only 22 days from the death of Henry Ist until Stephen was crowned.... we should look at the introduction in GS to identify the principles of Henry’s polemic.
The GS starts off by saying when King Henry was alive peace pervaded the country. But then it tries to maintain that throughout the country it was heard that the King had died and general anarchy reigned. It also goes on to say that the animals that had been carefully nurtured before were now extremely rare. Henry Blois is trying to create an appearance of a shambolic state of affairs so that the reader can accept the reasoning’s behind the rushed crowning. It seems fair to posit that Henry and his brother had previously hatched such a plan knowing that few of the barons, (even though having sworn allegiance), were keen on a queen Matilda and reticent about a female as ruler.

The GS establishes the rationale and makes excuse (as an apologia) for the train of events running contrary to those pre-planned by King Henry before his death. The GS supplies contrary evidence against the accusation of usurpation to make it seem as if all actions were considered for the good of England.... rather than the train of events occurring by Henry’s manipulation. Contemporary historians had the correct view as Henry of Huntingdon makes clear: Henry, bishop of Winchester, who had taken the lead in disturbing the Kingdom, by giving the crown to his brother Stephen. The GS provides sound reasoning in apologetic terms for what many considered an underhanded and rushed crowning by a small elite.

Whether the barons and the rest of the clergy would have supported Matilda’s election or not made no difference.... the coronation was now an irreversible fact, consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The GS pretends a state of disorder and maintains that in the short period between King Henry Ist death and that which Stephen had managed to cross the channel, the countryside had suddenly become barren: it was wonderful how so many myriads of wild animals, which in large herds before plentifully stocked the country, suddenly disappeared, so that out of this vast number scarcely two could now be found together. They seemed to be entirely extirpated, insomuch that it is reported a single bird was a rare sight, and a stag was nowhere to be seen.

This is not to deny, as most chroniclers recount, an animal plague hit Britain in 1131.... as the Anglo Saxon chronicle for example relates: This same year was so great a murrain of cattle as never was before in the memory of man over all England. That was in neat cattle and in swine; so that in a town where there were ten ploughs going, or twelve, there was not left
one: and the man that had two hundred or three hundred swine, had not one left.

This is entirely different from a state of peace to Anarchy in three weeks, since most of the country would not have heard of the King’s death before Stephen’s arrival. We are presented with a scene that represented the British countryside during the Anarchy and shortly after; not as it is portrayed here, pretending that all had been plundered and pillaged and all the people plotted against each other. The author purposely conflates two issues to portray a bleak scene which in the author’s mind presents a good rationale behind the solution found to overcome the circumstances i.e. to inaugurate a good strong leader as soon as possible.

The GS continues with this pretence, ‘one man pitilessly assailed another each his neighbour’, presenting a scene of Anarchy before it happened. Events are thus presented so that Stephen’s crowning appears as expediency, providing national stability. The GS is used as a vehicle to present the rationale behind the alacritous anointing, which most in the Kingdom believed to be caused by the manipulations and machinations of Henry Blois.

The GS presents a scene of complete breakdown in civil society in the space of two weeks. Henry starts by saying ‘when the English were conducting themselves in so disorderly and disastrous fashion and, loosening the restraints of justice, Stephen count of Boulogne a man distinguished by his illustrious descent landed in England with a few companions’. We are then told that Stephen is the dearest of all the nephews of King Henry Ist, the peacemaker; and the GS states that after landing, he journeyed hastily to London.

The GS goes on to tell us that ‘those shrewd in Council summoned an assembly and taking prudent forethought for the state of the Kingdom on their own initiative they agreed unanimously to choose the King’. This of course, made necessary because in the preceding paragraph there had been anarchy. The GS presents the account as a response to the march of events rather than its real purpose of providing an apologist view: ‘For this they said every Kingdom was exposed to calamities from ill fortune when a representative of the whole government and the fount of justice was lacking’. Notice the all-inclusive and cohesively concordant ‘they’, rather than any hint of a singular manipulator.
Henry Blois has just supplied himself the excuse for the rapid crowning. He goes on to say ‘it was therefore worth their while to appoint as soon as possible a King who, with a view to re-establishing peace for the common benefit, would meet the insurgents of the Kingdom in arms’. The apologist viewpoint is continued when referring to the Londoners, ‘it was their own right and peculiar privilege that if their King died from any cause a successor should immediately be appointed by their own choice; and they had no one at hand who could take the King’s place and put an end to the great dangers threatening the Kingdom except Stephen, who they thought had been brought among them by Providence. The Londoners had no such prerogative or precedent, but the GS presents the evidence as if it was the Londoner’s will that was duly carried out, and not that of Henry Blois.

We are then led to believe that when these arguments had been heard in the general assembly and had been favourably received by all, without any open objection, they all universally approved Stephen as King. In confirmation of the point that his brother had been crowned to prevent the apparent breakdown of society, Henry Blois goes on to say, ‘so Stephen, having with such good fortune obtained both the title of King and the Royal crown, armed himself like a man to establish peace in the Kingdom’.

Our supposed anonymous author then launches into how ‘Stephen rapidly gathering a strong body of Knights, who had flocked together from every quarter, he hastened to Bishop Henry, on whom his entire enterprise depended’. Henry would not deny what is reliably known, but downplays his part as matter of fact. Now, this may seem a diversionary point to make at the present juncture, but Henry’s vanity is never too far away as we shall see when I cover the Perlesvaus and Grail literature by a certain Master Blihis (Monseigneur Blois) concerning ‘Gawain who overcame Blihos-Bliheris, whom no man at Arthur’s court knew’.

Likewise, in the GS, Henry can’t suppress his own vanity when he expresses: ‘for that man was his brother by both parents a man of inexpressible eloquence as well as wonderful wisdom; with fortune smiling favourably on his wishes he became Abbot of Glastonbury and Bishop of Winchester and was enthroned in the Kingdom by the apostolic see as legate of all England. He then, overjoyed at his brother’s success, came to meet him with the Winchester Citizens of chief consequence, and after they had had a short communal conference escorted him respectfully into the town, the second place in the Kingdom’.
The point is, once one establishes the deception, it becomes easier to identify the methods employed in the extensive fraud of Henry Blois which utilizes many more means of transmission than the GS, HRB and VM.

Firstly, in the GS he refers back to himself as legate at the time of Stephen's crowning which he knows to be inaccurate. He refers to himself as a third party ‘Bishop of Winchester’ and imbues the sense of a recorder of events.... i.e. anyone could be the author, but one is led to believe it could not be Henry Blois. For instance the chronicler refers to the ‘Bishop of Winchester's brother's success. The dupery must be pointed out, as Henry goes out of his way to make sure that his authorship is not suspected. On the subject of authorship and before we move on to analyze several points in the GS, it is necessary to clear any doubt that Henry Blois is the author.

Amazingly, Potter and Davis are duped by Henry’s devices saying: *if we proceed to the question of the author’s political affiliations, there can be no doubt that he belonged to a party of the Kings brother, Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, whom he describes as ‘a man of inexpressible eloquence as well as wonderful wisdom’. He explains not only his activities, but also his motives, defends his conduct in the crises of 1139 and 1141 and disparages the members of the Beaumont family.*

Howlett’s theory is that the author was Henry Blois’ chaplain. In either proposition, all commentators seem to be bemused by how the author censures Henry Blois. They also find it difficult to understand how the author writes *‘not like an underling but as a man of stature’* and conclude that many of the statements made in the GS ‘sounds not like the voice of the bishops chaplain, but like the voice of the Bishop himself’. Both Potter and Davis conclude that *‘the author was a reformer in the tradition of Henry Blois’*, yet cannot see through the obfuscation.

One thing becomes very plain before the end of this exposé: it is my irritation with scholarship’s inability to join the dots of the three genres under investigation. They are so close to the answer trying to rationalize ‘*for if Robert Bishop of Bath is to be identified as the author of the GS and the study of his entourage has failed to produce any other candidate; it must follow that the account of his capture is autobiographical’*. Wrong! Henry Blois was there also.

However, Potter and Davis do recognize that the GS was written by a scholar and admit his literary composition is far grander than the ordinary Chronicle.... yet if they had done a comparison with the HRB they would see
that the ‘affected’ high tone in which the GS is written stems from Henry Blois’ great learning in classical literature and in having written the HRB and his tone is not affected.... but consistent with everything we know of Henry Blois the orator who held Cicero as an idol. It is his learning, evident in the composition of HRB, which has evidently changed his choice of words which gives the classical tone. Thus, at times, Henry forgets himself, that he is now writing a history chronicle when he refers to Woodchester in Gloucestershire as *Castellum de Silva*. Potter and Davis assume this is an affectation, but this is a man who likens himself to Cicero, who has read the classics in Greek and Latin and therefore is merely making a choice of words that come freely to him like the commanders of towns being called: *praeses, praeceptor, primipulus, commanipularius* or *summus primas* and soldiers as *Legionarii* and *Centenarii*. These classicism's are a story teller’s tools and are found throughout the HRB and VM where men *breathed forth the life that now can never know the longer day*, and dying men have, *his own last hour* and are replicated in the GS where men have classically their last breath, *ad extrema deveniens*.\(^{206}\)

The aftermath of Geoffrey’s battle at Autun and the burial of the dead is out of the siege of troy with all the literary conventions of the classics from the *Aeneid*, *Pharsalia*, where the fallen *vomit forth their lifeblood* and the slain *drum the earth with their heels* are all part of Henry Blois’ voracious reading of the classics while growing up at Clugny. That Henry could put in the mouths of his protagonists of HRB so well the tone and temperament of a classical battle speech or rousing retort is testament to his vast knowledge of the classics.

It is evident that the devices employed by Henry Blois to mislead his readership as to the authorship of the GS, have manifestly worked. Henry Blois in the GS never claims to have seen any of the events which he describes because the authorship could be traceable, but much like the HRB, there are few dates. Bishop Robert of Bath was not the author; although he was a Cluniac and a protégé of Henry of Blois who employed the said Robert at Glastonbury Abbey before becoming Bishop of Bath. His appointment was through the direct influence of Henry of Blois in March 1136.

\(^{206}\) In the *Vera Historia*, which may have been Henry Blois’ own addition to a First Variant version, the youth who threw the Elm spear at Arthur had it immediately thrown back by Arthur and lodged in the youth’s back: *Qui transfixus, spiritum max exhalauit uitalem.*
The vocabulary syntax and style of the GS match exactly with that of the HRB and sentiments of the Merlin prophecies; laced with affiliations concerning the church. The most obvious clue is the detail in description of certain episodes that Henry Blois attended and also the wide range of locations visited; described with eyewitness detail in most cases, throughout the Anarchy. The most commonly mentioned place in the GS is of course Winchester and the events that transpired there are not only mentioned in minute detail, but are also replicated for the most part as prophecies in the *Vita Merlini*. The one place that is never mentioned is Glastonbury except in the one allusion to Henry Blois being the Abbot of that institution. Can modern scholarship not see that Glastonbury is not mentioned in HRB also…. and deduce the reason?

Henry Blois continues on to confound those seeking the identity of the author. If scholarship does not recognize this next reference as guile, they will remain duped by Henry Blois’ brilliance: ‘at this time there was in the town of Winchester a certain William, a most faithful guardian and steward, of King Henry’s treasures, who had often been implored by the Bishop, with the added inducement of a bribe, to handover the Castle to him and open the Treasury. But the more insistent the Bishop in entreaty, the more inclined was the treasurer the refusal’.

If anyone in the future were to be suspicious of the GS authorship falling to the bishop of Winchester…. who would suspect that somebody would write in such a derogatory tone about oneself? This is precisely one of the devices used throughout the GS. If the author was with Stephen, it seems unlikely he would know this detail anyway.

However, we are then told that the treasury was very rich from the time of the most ancient Kings; a point which would interest the writer of the GS as the one who had tried to access it and who was bishop of the city in which the treasure was kept. We then hear that ‘reports spread through the Kingdom, the tidings of the new King’s arrival, a great many, and those especially who before the accession had found themselves in friendship to him or his brothers, received him with joy and jubilation. This sentence alludes surely to himself mainly. Although elder brother Theobald had gallantly deferred the crown to Stephen, by the time Theobald could have done anything about it; it was already a fait a compli …. even though the nobles in
Normandy had proffered Theobald as the preferred replacement for the Empress Matilda.

The GS then informs, (in concordance with Henry of Huntington), that William of Corbeil, ‘Archbishop of Canterbury, a man having the countenance of a dove and the habit of a monk, but more greedy in keeping money he had got than lavish in spending it’. Firstly, it should be noted that it was Henry Blois who was charged with running the see of Canterbury when William of Corbeil died and Henry will probably be the one who found his treasure. But, Henry makes out that it was the King’s agents who found *a countless quantity of coin laid up secretly in his strong boxes.*

After a brief negative biography concerning William, the account continues where, the King’s supporters were engaged in persuading William of Corbeil to anoint Stephen as King. William replied ‘that it mustn’t be done lightly or done in haste’. William also brings up the objection that King Henry had bound his chief men of the whole Kingdom by oath to his daughter Matilda and therefore it was contrary to this arrangement to desire anybody else as King.

King Stephen’s supporters, we are told (probably Henry Blois, Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, Hugh Bigod and a few others,... as it was only a small conclave present), did not deny that they had given their oaths to King Henry’s daughter; but rather they had been compelled to make the oath. On the attestation of Hugh Bigod, we are conveniently informed by our author that King Henry had subsequently relieved the barons of their obligation of allegiance. The spurious grounds on which this miraculous *volte face* is rationalized is ‘that they swore unwillingly and that the oaths would not be kept’. What the GS leads us to believe is that King Henry lay on his deathbed at his hunting lodge at Lyons-la-Forêt and regretted that he had previously made the nobles swear unwillingly, not once but twice,... and thus relieved them of their vow just before death.

King Henry attempted to build up political support for Matilda in both England and Normandy, demanding that his court take oaths first in 1127, then in 1128 and again some in 1131. There is no doubt that the GS’s

---

207 Many of these barons had taken an oath to stay in Normandy until the late king was properly buried, which prevented them from returning to England.

208 It seems fair to assume Henry persuaded Hugh Bigod, the late King’s royal steward, to swear that the King had changed his mind about the succession on his deathbed, nominating Stephen instead. Historians doubt that Hugh Bigod’s account of Henry I’s final hours was truthful.
account in part is accurate in what it portrays, as to the arguments and persuasions used to convince William of Corbeil to go ahead with the coronation; but King Henry did not release his barons no matter what Hugh Bigod professed. It was also posited and publicly maintained by Roger of Salisbury that he was released from the oath he had taken to the Empress because he had sworn only on condition that the King should not give his daughter in marriage to anyone outside the Kingdom.\(^{209}\) These are the echoes of the real arguments used to convince William of Corbeil to hurry up with the process of crowning Stephen. Henry Blois understood that most in the realm were cognizant of his manipulations in the usurpation of the crown. This is borne out by contemporary chroniclers such as Malmesbury and Huntingdon. Henry fully understands how his reputation will be understood in posterity, thus the need for the GS presenting his manipulations in a glossed *apologia* with a reasoned rationale for his involvement now the two main chroniclers’ are dead and cannot contest his position put forward in this *apologia*.

Understanding the political acumen of Henry Blois, it would not be too improbable to suggest that Henry dreamt up the following. As part of the polemic, William of Corbeil is told that: ‘*in his death agony, with very many standing by listening to his truthful confession of his errors, even very plainly showed repentance of the forcible imposition of the oath on his barons*’.

If this were really true we would never have had the Anarchy because no-one wanted a Queen.

And therefore William of Corbeil as archbishop is advised that ‘*it is eminently advisable to accept gladly as King a man whom London, the capital of the whole Kingdom, has received without objection, and who, moreover, was a suitable candidate owing to his just claim of close relationship*’. Especially propitious when the rationale is added to the bogus proposition that the Kingdom is being plundered and torn to pieces, (or so goes the gist of the *apologia*). How, one wonders, does our anonymous author know all this detail at the beginning of Stephen’s career?

William of Corbeil is convinced by all present that he should crown a man ‘*of resolution and soldiery qualities, who, exalted by the might of his vassals and by the fame of his wise brothers who will supply their assistance and whatever is lacking to him*’. Then Henry Blois goes on to

\(^{209}\) William of Malmesbury. *Historia Novella*, 452
explain: 'therefore, swayed by these arguments and some others that I passed over for the sake of brevity, the Archbishop, with the bishops and numerous clergy present, consecrated and anointed him as King over England and Normandy'.

There certainly were not numerous clergy present at the time William de Corbeil was being browbeaten and it is no wonder that Henry wishes to pass over the arguments that prevailed at the proceedings with brevity.... as many must have been contrary. But not one is mentioned.

We are led to believe the coronation, (when numerous clergy were present), was all part of the same proceedings. As the other historians note, it was Henry Blois (as he himself nearly expresses), who manipulated the crown onto Stephen's head. There is no part of the contemporary audience that would have believed that Henry played a minor role in the proceedings which led to the crowning.

William of Malmesbury also concurs that Stephen was aided by his brother Henry 'granting him an easy acquiescence, allured indeed by a very strong hope that Stephen would continue the ways of his Grandfather'.

The manipulations are enshrouded in the GS by a portrayal of events and rationales, which, in effect, act as an apologia for Henry Blois.... even though his intentions were noble toward the church. One point to consider is that, if Robert of Lewes the future Bishop of Bath is thought to be the author of the GS, he must have thought to make note of all the various points of contention and persuasion with a view in mind to writing an account of Henry’s brother from the outset.

Henry Blois’ artifice continues as he refers to ‘Robert Earl of Gloucester, son of King Henry, but a bastard, a man of proved talent and admirable wisdom’ as he establishes the tone of a balanced chronicler. Most would think Henry Blois would only have animosity for Robert of Gloucester. Henry would have had numerous encounters against him and in fact probably even conspired with him on one occasion to prevent a blood bath occurring at Arundel. This view is held according to the GS version. Gervaise of Canterbury has a different point of view and thinks that Robert of Gloucester ‘had been urged to do this (invade with the Empress) by the council and assent of Henry, Bishop of Winchester, because he had not been elected to the archbishopric of the church of Canterbury after the death of
William'. Gervaise thinks that their meeting and their relationship was partly due to Henry conspiring to help Matilda and Robert.... after being snubbed for the post of Archbishop of Canterbury.

Apparently, Henry wrote letters to Robert of Gloucester conspiring and inviting the return of Matilda, since he had been overlooked by his brother for the archbishopric appointment. He was accused of this change of allegiance later.... and it is only the GS which presents the view which runs contrary to what seems to have been commonly understood. Anyway, referring to Robert of Gloucester as a man of ‘admirable wisdom’ (as the GS does), would surely exclude Henry as a possible author and is all part of his deflection of authorship device. The illusion of dedicating some copies of the HRB to the Duke of Gloucester is all part of distancing himself from suspicion of authorship when he finally publishes the Vulgate version. Henry Blois goes on to say in GS (covering the fact that he is the advisor), that when Robert was advised: as the story went, to claim the throne on his father's death, deterred by sounder advice, he by no means assented, saying it was fairer to yield it to his sister's son to whom it more justly belonged.

It was probably Henry Blois who persuaded a truculent Robert of Gloucester to do nothing as Stephen was already King. Matilda had nearly died giving birth to her second son Geoffrey and Matilda at the time of coronation was recently pregnant again. Robert, being a bastard, could not claim the throne, but his sister was at Argentan more concerned with getting through another pregnancy. She eventually gave birth to her third son (third nesting), William, on 22 July 1136 and Robert stayed reluctantly compliant until he declared for Matilda in 1138. The broken oaths of the barons, gilded over by Hugh Bigod’s false testimony is aptly described by Henry Blois posing as Merlin in the HRB prophecies where he posits Matilda as the Eagle: This shall the Eagle of the broken covenant be gilded over, and the Eagle shall rejoice in her third nesting.211

However, another indicator of Henry Blois’ authorship is that the same exact point of view and polemic which are found in the beginning of the GS were recorded as being voiced by Henry himself at Winchester on April 17 1141. Henry Blois had summoned on behalf of the Empress Matilda, a large
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210 Gervaise of Canterbury, II,73
211 Orderic Vitalis is thought by some commentators to have possessed the prophecies in 1135. This is incorrect.... see Tatlock, The legendary history of Britain, The Merlin prophecies p. 421. I will cover this interpolation in Orderic shortly.
body of clerics to his Legatine Council and before he had even written the
GS, in a brilliant piece of oratory, he explains to the Council why it was that
he changed allegiance, while maintaining the moral high ground, and
makes the same point as that stated in the GS, in that; King Henry had ‘died
in Normandy without a male heir. Therefore, because it seemed tedious to
wait for the lady, who made delays in coming to England since her residence
was in Normandy, thought was taken for the peace of the country and my
brother allowed to reign’.

Henry Blois also makes it clear in the GS that Stephen's defeat and
captivity in 1141 was not down to bad luck ‘but was a judgment from God’.
This is Henry Blois’ view, so we hear Stephen ‘crying out in a voice of humble
complaint that his mark of ignominy had indeed come upon him because God
avenged his injuries’. Henry Blois leaves us in no doubt that the injury in
question was that of the arrest of the three bishops, Roger, Alexander and
Nigel which here in the GS he describes as a monstrous sin against God
himself. As we have mentioned before, Henry Blois found this such an
affront to the church, he again mentions it in the Vita Merlini. I see the city
of Oxford filled with helmeted men, and holy men and holy bishops bound on
the decision of the Council.

Henry Blois sets up his apologia with an aura of national satisfaction
where Stephen has taken the crown by general consent and Robert of
Gloucester dutifully pays homage to the accepted King. Henry Blois
establishes in the GS that an air of peace, now pervaded over the country
and King Stephen, attended by a large bodyguard made a progress
throughout England with the splendour that befits the Royal Majesty and he
made very great efforts to re-establish peace in the Kingdom.

Henry of Huntingdon while referring to previous Winchester bishops
shrewdly depicts what is in store for the nation: Their seat is occupied by
Henry,(Blois) the King’s son, who promises to exhibit a monstrous spectacle,
compounded of purity and corruption, half a monk, half a knight.

However, in GS, Henry Blois now sets the state of affairs in Britain as a
whole by starting out his commentary with the Welsh and Wales. We know
from the HRB his distaste for the Welsh, even though Geoffrey of
Monmouth is supposed to be from there.

---

212 William of Malmesbury. Historia Novella.
Now Wales is a country of woodland and pasture, immediately bordering on England, stretching far along the coast on one side of it, abounding in deer and fish, milk and herds; but it breeds men of an animal type, naturally swift footed accustomed to war, volatile always in breaking their word as in changing their abodes. When war came and the Normans conquered the English, this land also they added to their dominion and fortified with numberless castles; they perseveringly civilised it after they had vigorously subdued its inhabitants; to encourage peace they imposed law and statutes on them; and they made the land so productive and abounding in all kinds of resources that you would have reckoned it in no wise inferior to the most fertile part of Britain.

In other words: had it not been for the presence of the Norman overlords the poor Welsh would have remained savages! This man has seen the effects of Norman domination of Southern Wales. As the reader will become aware before the end of this exposé Henry Blois is in Wales in 1136 dutifully aiding his brother at the outbreak of the Welsh rebellion while Stephen is in the North dealing with King David.

This is the very reason our author starts here chronologically when he commences his account in GS: But when King Henry died and the peace and harmony of the Kingdom were buried with him, the Welsh who always cherished a deadly hatred of their masters, broke their compact with them utterly, and appearing in bands at different places; they made hostile raids in various directions; they cleared the villages by plunder, fire, and sword, burnt the houses, slaughtered the men. And first they advanced into a district by the coast, called Gower, very pleasant and rich in every kind of produce, and when knights and footmen to the number of 516 massed in one body against them, they surrounded them on every side and laid them all low with the edge of the sword. Then rejoicing greatly at this first success in their insurrection, they streamed boldly over every quarter of Wales; addicted to every crime, ready for anything unlawful, they spared no age, showed no respect for any order, were not restrained from wickedness either by time or by place. When the first occurring’s of this rebellion were reported to the ears of the King, proposing to check their wanton recklessness he sent to subdue them Knights and archers whom he had hired at very great expense.

The writer of the VM has similar views on the Welsh: Wales will always enjoy spilling blood. Nation abominable to God, why do you enjoy spilt blood?
And again in the HRB: *into the parts of Wales, not knowing what to do against this accursed people.*

The writer of the HRB has a good knowledge of Wales. Does it not seem strange that a man writing a biography of Stephen launches into his initial text after his coronation of Stephen prologue, with a description of Wales? It is my view that Henry Blois visited Wales on a few occasions, probably in King Henry’s time to begin with but also at the beginning of Stephen’s reign as a trusted brother to quell the Welsh rebellion. Not only did Glastonbury have land in Wales, but it was a short sail from Bridgewater. King Henry Ist took control of the port at Swansea and seized the Gower peninsula from the Welsh changing ‘Gwyr’ to Gower.

Henry de Beaumont, the Earl of Warwick, was given lordship of Gower to protect the port at Swansea from invaders. Henry de Beaumont erected a castle to oversee the River Tawe, the castle at Swansea. There were other castles built at Penrhys, Llanrhidian, Oystermouth and Loughor. The Battle of Gower took place on New Year's Day 1136 a year after Stephen’s coronation. Since Henry starts the GS with this account he may have been involved in the subsequent attempts to quell the rebellion, eager to help his brother…. still being on good terms with him and being able to supply knights.

The GS goes on to explain that after the death of Richard Fitz Gilbert in April, the rebellion proper took hold, where royalist/Norman forces were captured, put in churches and burnt. It goes on to explain the rescue of Richard’s wife by Miles of Gloucester, who Henry despises. He relates also that he later became an Earl (not by hereditary right but by servility to Matilda).

One thing to notice about the proportion of space our unknown biographer gives in his account to affairs in Wales is that there seems too much detail for a biographer of Stephen; but proportionate for someone who is concerned with state affairs and the rebellion in Wales and would probably be recounting much from memory about that time. But, more importantly, attitudes are betrayed. The author of GS has been to Wales. Anyway, Richard Fitz Gilbert’s brother is dispatched with an ‘immeasurable sum of money’ to beat back the enemy; not the sort of detail Robert of Lewes

---

213 HRB VI, xvi
the overseer of Henry Blois’ huge architectural endeavour at Glastonbury would know about.

I will include the last extract on Wales that the author of GS includes, because it highlights several points about Henry. If one is careful to observe throughout the GS, Henry, in the third person, gives many instances of his judicious council and therefore, when he is not mentioned explicitly, it should be understood that it is him giving the council. He cannot outwardly state in many situations it is him as the advisor, otherwise he would uncover his authorship. But, to advise the King to leave the Welsh for the moment and let them destroy themselves shows a good understanding of the Welsh situation. Henry’s presence in Wales explains Henry’s knowledge of Wales’ geography and topography found in the Arthuriad.

Throughout the GS there is continual remark or concern over the status of a person’s nobility or birth. One could not be more illustrious in the Norman pecking order than the grandson of William the Conqueror. The reference to birth and nobility is simply not a recurrent observation someone without nobility would concern himself; especially after just referring to Richard Fitz Gilbert as a ‘man distinguished for his truly noble birth’.

Robert Fitz Harold, a man of very noble descent, was also dispatched to subdue the Welsh, but in another direction; and there, after gaining many glorious victories over the enemy, he impregnably fortified among them a castle which at the time was almost unoccupied, and when he had carefully garrisoned it with men prepared for any fate, he returned to England with a small escort, after many notable exploits, to procure reinforcements. The enemy, greatly encouraged by his absence and fearing his return, gathered in one body, and when they had besieged his Castle for a very long time, since the occupants were short of food and Robert could not bring aid soon enough on account of the unbearable fury of their attack, at length they forced its surrender and destroyed it. Therefore, when the Welsh were troubling the land in this fashion, it seemed to the King that he was striving in vain, in vain pouring out his vast treasure to reduce them to peace; and so, advised by more judicious council, he preferred to endure their insolent rebellion for a time, in order that, with fighting at a standstill and disagreement setting them all at variance, they might either suffer a famine or turn on each other and be exterminated by mutual slaughter. And indeed we have seen this happen in a
short while. For being continually occupied in slaughter and plunder they left the whole land so untouched by the plough and so empty of men that no hope at all of the future livelihood remained, but worn out with plague and hunger, after the death of the animals which followed on the plundering of them, they themselves shared the same fate, since the air became pestilential from the rotting bodies. These things which happened in Wales at different times, I have brought together and dealt with briefly, that I might not have to stray from the course of my narrative whenever some conspicuous event required more adequate treatment in its proper place.

Henry then moves on from his account of Wales in GS and gives a loving assessment of his brother’s character. Henry is concerned about his brother’s well fare as he describes King Henry’s old stalwarts Miles of Gloucester and Payne Fitz John... (again, of low birth), being brought into subjection. The author’s concern for the state of political affairs and certain barons’ non-compliance to Stephen’s Kingship, comes across as a personal affront also.

The Pillars of the church sat arranged according to rank, as the chief leaders of the church held Council at London. A discussion of the state of the church takes place where the faults in King Henry’s reign were now to be rectified along the lines of what Stephen had agreed when Henry Blois had manipulated the crown on his brother’s head. Henry had acted as guarantor and had convinced William of Corbeil to crown Stephen under oath about the restoration and maintenance of the freedom of the church. The King listened to this patiently, freely granted them all their requests, and gave orders that the freedom of the church should be firm and inviolable, its laws valid and unshakeable, and that its servants of whatever profession or order, should be treated with the utmost respect. And he would have kept his word, had it not been that perverse councilors who sometimes lead a good disposition astray... urged him to break these promises.

We can see what was agreed by Stephen’s charter at Oxford and Henry Blois directly refers to the Beaumont twins’ (perverse councillors) accusation against Roger of Salisbury, Alexander, and Nigel. The Beaumont’s are jealous of Henry Blois’ burgeoning power base and give advice to Stephen which Henry disagrees with.

---

215 This same attitude to the Welsh (and Britons) is coincidentally held by ‘Geoffrey’ and by Merlin.
216 What this actually means is that Henry dealt with this issue as it occurred in his diary because he was present in Wales.
We then move on in the GS to Robert Bampton *a Knight not of the lowest birth* who Henry had already, (even at the point being related in the GS), had problems with (as we related earlier) regarding when he was abbot of Glastonbury. Robert Bampton was an Angevin supporter and was summoned to court for rebellion and disloyalty and compelled to put his Castle at the King’s disposal and deliver all he possessed to his merciful discretion. And this certainly was a just a provision and a very fitting sentence, that he who from desire of other men’s property had laid hand on what was not his, should by a just decision of equity, lose what was his own. The King was advised because needs so required to send the body of Knights to take over his Castle accompanied by Robert himself: Vengeance indeed for Henry and indicative of authorship should the reader still be in any doubt. Anyway, on the way to Devon, Robert Bampton catches his escorts off guard and when all had feasted lavishly at a splendid banquet and were buried, he stole away from them. Henry, because of his personal disputes with Robert Bampton, is pleased to tell us of his dreadful death amongst strangers while exiled in Scotland.

The next episode concerns *Baldwin de Redvers*, Exeter and Plympton where, by the description, we know it is an eyewitness account of the sieges. We know Henry Blois is at Exeter anyway. But we can deduce Henry is writing the GS as it is him who comments on architecture throughout GS.... one of his great interests; and on his insight to military strategy and the use of siege engines. But, how does the author know that the expenditure by the King for the three months siege is fifteen thousand marks?.... unless he is someone engrossed in affairs of state as the King’s brother would be. Why would our anonymous author comment on someone’s eloquence? Certainly someone would, whose own epitaph vainly likens himself to Cicero and bequeaths Quintillian’s *Institutio Oratoria* to Glastonbury abbey. The three month siege at Exeter in 1136 is coincidentally mentioned by Merlin in Vulgate HRB prophecies where the bull breaks it horns against the Walls of Exonia.

*At once two of them, the first in rank and dignity of the whole Castle, were sent to the King, men already skilled to adorn their speech with charm and*
give their words, whenever it suited them, the term that wisdom and elegance most required. But he, under the persuasion of his brother the Bishop of Winchester’s advice, showed them a front of iron, refused to listen to them, and drove them from his presence with threats; for the Bishop, observing their sagging and wasted skin, the look of torpor on their faces, drained of the normal supply of blood, and their lips drawn back from gaping mouths, perceived that they were suffering from agonies of thirst and that therefore it was anything but wise to give them permission to leave the Castle, it being certain that they would very soon surrender on whatever terms the besieger desired.

Henry Blois betrays himself as a scheming strategist and what detail of personal discomfiture of the besieged recalling facial details second hand from the bishop. Henry then shows his pique at the other Barons who persuaded the King to have pity on the occupants of the castle and obviously thought it an error of judgment to let all these rebels free.... to come again another day.

Baldwin de Redvers gathered new forces and went directly to the Isle of Wight where Baldwin had a Castle... very finely built of stone and very strongly fortified. And the King followed him, because the King had anticipated his crafty design, left the Castle of Exeter together with the neighbouring county in charge of the Bishop of Winchester and rapidly followed Baldwin, to Southampton. Stephen defeats Baldwin who is forced into exile. Baldwin goes over to Normandy and stirs up trouble for Stephen over there, obviously complaining of his mistreatment to the Empress Matilda.219

Before coming to a section in the GS where pages in the manuscript are missing, we hear: when the King had learnt more fully that these things were happening in Normandy, he sent envoys across the sea for he could not go there so quickly himself on account of the heavy burden of pressing affairs...

We know that one of those envoys was Henry where Orderic Vitalis informs us Henry Blois: heard from weeping plaintiffs heartrending accounts of the wicked crimes committed by traitors in that leap year,(1137) listened to the woeful complaints of the terrible disturbances in Normandy, and was able to see with his own eyes clear evidence of these things; burnt buildings

219 This essentially is the cause of Henry Blois being on location in Normandy in 1137 where he composes the Primary Historia (the HRB found at Bec). Henry Blois was in essence the King’s envoy who, coincidentally, the author of GS omits to name.
roofless and desecrated churches, devastated villages emptied of their settlers, and people utterly destitute in the heart of their native land, since they had been roughly deprived of everything they possessed and pillaged with impunity by their own rulers as well as foreigners, and still struggled on without the presence or protection of their rightful ruler to hearten them.\textsuperscript{220}

We then move on in GS to the siege of Bedford in 1138 where we know from descriptions that Henry is there as an eyewitness to events. By this time Henry Blois has already deposited the \textit{Primary Historia} at Bec. Orderic also says: \textit{Stephen was so indignant that he took arms unadvisedly against the rebels and, against the advice of his brother Henry, bishop of Winchester, laid siege to Bedford, but as it was the season of Christmas, and the winter was very rainy, after great exertions he had no success; indeed, the sons of Robert de Beauchamp defended the place with great resolution, and until the arrival of the bishop, the King's brother, rejected all terms of submission to Stephen……At length, when five weeks after the bishop came to Bedford, they submitted, and following his advice, which they thought good, and by his help, they were reconciled to the King and surrendered the place.}

Henry does not state in the GS that he negotiated the settlement whereby a deal was struck by Miles and Henry that the castle went to Stephen and the surrounding estates were left in the hands of the Beauchamp’s. Next in GS we hear in 1138 (when Henry is back in England) of the effects of ash making the sky red from some volcanic eruption. (Probably Eyjafjallajökull or Grímsvötn in Iceland). Henry, (pandering to the superstitious portents understood by his readers) seems to think the red sky an omen of what was to come i.e. events in Northumbria with King David and the return of Matilda.

As he does in his section on Wales, Henry launches into the Scottish expedition and its causes, being very careful not to say that Matilda had been disinherited, but that she had not received what her father had willed and deprived of the Kingdom promised to her on oath by the barons. A subtle nuance from a person who is wholly guilty of the said deed and in said \textit{apologia}. As we know, deals were struck by Stephen much against Henry’s better judgment because Henry opines that the King of Scotland breaks the deal three times in both the prophecy of Merlin found in the \textit{Vita Merlini} and here exposed like-mindedly in GS.

\textsuperscript{220} Orderic Vitalis. VI, xiii, 479
It is hard to say if Henry was present, in the north as much of the text is again missing in GS and it is only from his description of the battlements that we get a sense of his presence. But this description could have come from Knights in the northern campaign.

However, the King departs Scotland after the 1st treaty of Durham and Stephen himself went west in an attempt to regain control of Gloucestershire, first striking north into the Welsh Marches, taking Hereford and Shrewsbury, before heading south to Bath. Stephen hears that Bristol is being fortified with provisions for those committing against the King. Our widely read author of GS cites its fortifications and situation being similar to Brindisi from Lucan’s _Pharsalia_.

He goes on to describe Bristol’s ideal military and commercial situation and the existing royalist faction of Bath and the Bristolian Angevin forces. As the Royalists are scouting Bath a hostage is caught, so the Angevin’s force presents itself at Bath asking to see the Bishop of Bath who is duly kidnapped and used as hostage in exchange. Henry knows the lay of the land in Bristol and Bath, but we can identify Henry as the author by his outrage at the kidnapping and treatment of the Bishop of Bath who is a personal friend.

At once they laid sacrilegious hands on the preacher of the gospel, the ministrant at God's holy table, and the venerable sower of all men’s faith and religion, the steward of the grain in the Lords Granary, who carries in his breast the ark of God and the divine manna, they addressed with shameless insult and threatened to hang unless he handed Geoffrey back to them. It seems lame that the Bishop of Bath is postulated as the author of the GS. Who would refer to himself as a simpleminded man who believes every word? And if we did, he would hardly refer to himself as like another Jacob who lived guilelessly at home.

In the next extract, from where does our author get his interest in military stratagem and incisive engineering knowledge? Who would be giving his brother advice and commenting on those opposing his good advice: urging in opposition that it was a waste of time and labour without profit. This is Henry Blois speaking. He is annoyed that his ideas are not
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221 We know that Henry Blois posing as ‘Geoffrey’ has read the Pharsalia as he twice quotes from it…. Once in a sneer at Caesar and then actually naming Lucan. It is not impossible to conceive that Henry travelled there. He may have heard of its fortifications from crusaders heading to the Holy land as it is an obvious embarkation port.
being acted upon, in order that the siege might be continued. Don’t forget these are details from a diary.

And then, going away towards the impostor Bristol, he led his army near the town and when he called a council of war and asked his barons how he could most effectively besiege it, by what engines he could put most weight into an assault, by what means he could most readily bring it to submission, he received differing and doubtful advice according as some obeyed him loyally, others deceitfully.\(^{222}\) Some recommended the throwing in of a huge mass of rocks, beams, and turves at the point where the approach to the town narrowed and the two sides nearly met, that with the mouth of the harbour blocked the enemy might no longer get supplies from rowing boats, in which they chiefly put their trust, and also the rivers that wash around the sides of the town, as has been said, might be forced back with rising waters when their current was checked, gathered into a lake broad and deep as a sea, and immediately flood the town. They also approved the King’s building castles on each side of the town to prevent the constant traffic both ways over bridges, and of his keeping his army in front of the Earl’s Castle for some little time and afflicting the inmates with hunger and many kinds of suffering. But others and those especially who only pretend to serve the King and rather favoured the Earl, made these men’s sound and acceptable council of no avail, urging in opposition that it was a waste of time and labour without profit to try to block up the unfathomable sea with masses of timber or stone, since it was very clear that anything rolled in would either sink and be swallowed up from the mere depth of the water or else be entirely washed away and brought to nothing by strong flooding tides.

What Henry is intoning is that his engineering advice was been confuted by devious advisors who did not have Stephen’s best advantage at heart. Interestingly, when Henry wrote the prophecies of Merlin, he had foreseen and designed such an engineering feat for Winchester involving the river Itchen, (even though he calls it the Thames later in the updated squewed edition to obfuscate), the renown of which would reach Rome; and we know the ‘Hedgehog hiding his apples’,\(^{223}\) is the underground chamber in

\(^{222}\) This is not a clerical chronicler at work, but someone who fully understands the duplicity and deceit of certain barons close to Stephen i.e. those especially who only pretend to serve the King and rather favoured the Earl...

\(^{223}\) Henry knows he has built the subterranean passage under Winchester cathedral and plays on the word hericus for Henricus. Some translators trying to make sense of the passage have translated: \textit{It shall be rebuilt by Eric, laden with apples}
the Cathedral that he excavated for viewing the saints relics: *He shall add thereunto a mighty palace, and wall it around with six hundred towers. London shall behold it with envy and trebly increase her walls. The Thames river shall compass her round on every side, and the report of that work shall pass beyond the Alps. Within her shall the Hedgehog hide his apples and shall devise ways under-ground. * 

*Three fountains shall well forth in the city of Winchester, whereof the streams shall dispart the island into three portions.*

It is a strange coincidence that tradition says it was the Bishop of Winchester that is said to have devised a grand plan for improving the trade both of Winchester and Alresford by the construction of a "navigation" on the river Alre and Itchen. Alresford Pond was started by Henry as the prophecy predicts and constructed in order to create a head of water for a canal. This canal is supposed to have run from Alresford Pond to Winchester. It is said to have been constructed on the orders of the Bishop of Winchester. Henry was an engineer in many respects seen in the arrangements for a water supply at his palaces. Gerald of Wales noted his creation of ponds, aqueducts and fountains at Wolvesey palace.

Anyway, I just mention this to show that our author of GS is telling us that similar engineering feats were being posited as a solution to overcome Bristol. One must ask how is it that our author of GS understands that the engineering dam idea has any veracity as opposed to the deceitful advice of other advisors?

Once the Bristol episode in the GS is over, we move to Castle Cary which Stephen also besieges and then moves onto Harptree where we hear that; *had it not been suggested to him by the advice of wise men that this Castle too he could most conveniently treat in check by the soldiers he had left at Bath....* The point is that the person relaying the GS also gives account from the route down to Bristol and what happened at Harptree on the way; so it would hardly be the Bishop of Bristol who was earlier castigated by the King for exchanging Geoffrey, before he arrived at Bath. He must have been *en-route* with the King’s forces down to Bristol and Bath. Henry Blois is
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225 In some texts it has *Fons Annae* and we know the camp of Venus (which will be renewed) is Winchester after Henry’s reconstruction. Thus we can speculate that Henry had plans for the three springs appearing in Winchester, one of which was to be navigable to Hamos port which is Southampton.
purposely disguising himself as the author. It is the same tactic used for disguising himself as Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Potter and Davis state, while trying to discover who the mysterious author might be: the author writes like an underling but as a man of stature and pronounces moral judgements as if his opinion were one that mattered...and his learning is such that it must surely have marked him for promotion at any rate in the eyes of Henry Blois... Our author pretends to be an underling and is a man who hears and sees much of what the King sees and is in audience to hear opinions. Scholars seem to possess an ineptitude which, they, by their naivety, conceal the very thing they wish to elucidate or expose.

The Bishop of Winchester at this stage is eager to see Stephen’s reign flourish, but next, Henry Blois opines in the GS that Stephen had to deal with various anxieties and tasks of many kinds which continually dragged him hither and thither all over England. It was like what we read of the fabled hydra of Hercules; when one head was cut off two or more grew in its place. That is precisely what we must feel about King Stephen’s labours, because when one was finished others more burdensome kept on taking its place without end and like another Hercules he always girded himself bravely and unconquerably to endure each.

Our cleric (for it is obvious the author is a churchman) has studied Greek Mythology; but we know Henry has read Orosius, Suetonius, Silius Italicus, Horace, Livy, Virgil, Ovid, Statius, Quintillian, Plato, Aristotle, Sallust, to name but a mere few of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s classical sources. Henry Blois then mentions in the GS, Alexander’s wondrous battles against foreigners. It is a strange coincidence that quite a few old HRB manuscripts have the Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelum with them.

Following on, the GS continues: but you will find King Stephen’s afflictions and struggles many times as great and far heavier to bear, and of course all the more grievous in that they were brought on him by servants from his own country and vassals bound to him by oath. For that the persecution of friends and countrymen is wont to be more painful and more bitter the Lord bears witness, complaining of him that ate his bread and yet raised his heel against him more than he complains of others. Hence he says elsewhere ‘a man’s foes shall be they of his own household’. For that reason too some philosopher says ‘there is no plague more deadly than an enemy
under your own roof'. Then let him who wishes to read and know wondrous things hearken and learn more fully the story laid before him.

The Philosopher is Boethius and the quote from the *Consolation of Philosophy* which again shows Henry Blois’ wide array of reading. Unfortunately we will never know just how the election of Theobald of Bec was covered by Henry Blois as more pages are missing from the GS. It almost seems that anything that could definitively confirm for us that Henry is the author is on a missing page. Anyway, one can certainly ascertain where the narrative is heading before going blank as we are warned of propitious events concerning what most likely would have been in progression the double dealing of Stephen, who denies Henry Blois his goal of the Archbishopric of Canterbury.... and then Henry’s reaction to it.

However, it is plainly stated elsewhere that God’s judgement rested on Stephen. Henry Blois in his own mind and as the author of the GS puts it down to two incidents; his own rebuff concerning Canterbury, (considering he had put the crown on Stephen’s head) and the fact Stephen had broken canon law in arresting the Bishops after swearing to maintain the freedom of the Church.

The whole affair is very complex and William of Malmesbury gives a concise account of how the arrests took place and of the council at Winchester which transpired afterward. The problem is that Henry can see both sides of the argument and could possibly envisage that Roger, Alexander and Nigel castles could be transferred to increase Matilda’s powerbase. However, it was the abuse to the church which riled Henry Blois after his brother had given oath to maintain the freedom of the Church. At Devizes, we again see the author commenting on construction: *a Castle of the Bishop of Salisbury, constructed with wonderful skill and impregnable fortifications.*

Henry as Legate summoned King Stephen and Churchmen to Winchester. Henry’s complaint was that the church should be able to judge and hand out justice if Roger, Alexander and Nigel were guilty under canon law, rather than the King’s swift justice. Henry is in quite a tricky position throughout this whole affair as he too is implicated when the Bishop of Rouen clarifies the point concerning churchmen owning castles. Henry was definitely allied and behind Stephen to this point in Stephen’s reign, but it is here he sees that his brother listening to bad advice has made a large blunder to which he personally has taken great offence.
For to do one in the sight of men is acknowledged to be a great transgression; to bring the other to pass is considered, and really is, a monstrous sin against God himself. Hence also the Lord says in the words of the prophet, 'he that touches you, touches the apple of mine eye'. And in the gospel 'he that despiseth you despiseth me'. And to inflict dishonour so rashly and recklessly, or dishonourable extortion, on the ministrants at the holy altar he thus forbids them in the words of the prophet saying 'touch not mine anointed'. For my part, I proclaimed firmly and boldly that God himself cannot be more swiftly or more grievously offended by anything than by any man's offence, in word or deed, to those appointed to serve at his table. Just listen to this man's high tone in castigating a King (or rather a brother).

In the GS it is a remarkable fact that the Bishop of Winchester is not mentioned in this affair and the council which followed at Winchester becomes a council was held in England. This was the turning point of Stephen’s reign and the part Henry Blois played was strictly centre stage much as William of Malmesbury relates it in HN. It becomes obvious that if this were a chaplain of Henry Blois or even the Bishop of Bath as author, they both would have at least mentioned Henry Blois or the Bishop of Winchester or the Legate’s involvement. Henry hiding his authorship is plainly the reason the chief judge of these affairs is not mentioned by name.

The GS downplays Henry Blois’s part firstly, because, at the council it is plainly seen in William’s Historia Novella account of the same events that it is Henry himself who is the main force in bringing his brother to book. Secondly, if he were to vent his opinions and rationale concerning the arrests, suspicion of authorship would fall on him because all of those opinions are stated clearly in the Historia Novella to have been expounded by Henry and GS is written afterward.

Now, the reader may well think what difference does it make if Henry did write the GS. Well, if you can write one book you can write others and this is not something that Henry wishes others to consider. How then may we rationalise his self-professed epitaph on the Meusan plate that an ‘author is greater than art or jewels,’ unless he sees himself as a great author and understands (like the classics) the benefit and beauty of well written literature surpassing the less transmittable forms of art which degrade with time. Henry is the author of the greatest contemporaneous book which has
affected the outlook on British history i.e. HRB. This is the reason for his statement on the epitaph which we will investigate shortly.

However, Henry can be seen trying to find a solution to the disagreement by offering advice to the three bishops to hand over their castles to the King. Henry owning more castles than any other bishop is morally compromised, yet it is not he who is being accused......and even to peril of death unless they put at the King's disposal the castles they had built with so much care and regarded with so much affection. However by advice of their friends, (for they still had some in the gathering at court, though very few) they were persuaded and firmly convinced that they must get their release from the dishonourable arrest under which they were kept and entirely satisfy the King's wishes, especially as what belongs to Caesar must be rendered unto Caesar, and there is nothing that should be taken in exchange for a man's soul.

There is a sharp contradiction between Malmesbury's HN account and the GS account which is only reconcilable if indeed the author of GS was Henry Blois.

William of Malmesbury states: however the legate and the Archbishop did not fail to pursue the course that their duty prescribed for they fell as supplicants at the Kings feet in his room and begged him to take pity on the church, pity on his soul and reputation, and not suffer a divorce to be made between the monarchy and the clergy. Though he rose respectfully and removed the stigma that their act had laid on him, yet taken up with the advice of wicked men, he showed no fulfilment of righteous promises.

In the GS account written by Henry Blois we have a stark contrast in outcome: but because it was justly decided and judiciously determined by all the clergy that on no grounds could he lay hands on the Lord's anointed, he softened the harshness of the church's severity by a humble submission, and putting aside his Royal garb, groaning in spirit and with a contrite heart, he humbly accepted the penance enjoined for his fault.

There can only be two reasons for the GS’s disagreement with William’s account. Either the King privately (in his room) humbly accepted his wrongdoing in front of Theobald and Henry or Henry as the writer of the GS, after his brother's death, glosses over his intractability. Considering Henry Blois’ change of allegiance, it is probably the latter. However, there is one more consideration to take into account. If Roger’s castles were seized, how did Kidwelly Castle (Lidelea) come into Henry Blois’ possession, a point
we shall cover in due course. But, one point to make is that Henry Blois himself was suspicious of Roger and his relatives always being surrounded by guards before the arrest: And because he (Roger) hoped that their (Matilda's) arrival in England would be soon, according to frequent messages they had sent from Normandy, everywhere he went and especially to the Kings Court, he was encircled by a large and numerous bodyguard of troops, on pretence that he was leading them to help the King; he added to his retinue a great and surprising number of friends, that he might both please the King in the meantime on this account and at once be ready to aid if they arrive, those to whom he granted a more cordial and willing obedience.

We can witness a lovely foray into irony as Henry Blois pretends a distanced analysis of the taking of the Bishops castles: so when these things had in this manner been fulfilled, we wonder at the surprising good fortune that was the Kings lot, in as much as after he had drained his own treasuries almost to exhaustion to protect the Kingdom, he suddenly came to enjoy the fruits of others toils, and what had been stored up in the castles for his own injury and damage, as was reported, was given up for his honour and profit alone without any toil at all on his part.

Anyway, the outcome of the whole affair was that the three most powerful clergy (bishop knights) had submitted their castles to Stephen along with their wealth while Henry Blois as chief hypocrite kept all of his and may well have gained one of Roger's. From this episode in GS, after a brief discourse on events in Devon and Somerset, we move on to the arrival of Matilda and Robert of Gloucester at Arundel (the beginning of the Anarchy proper).

Robert had left during the night and was on his way to Bristol Castle to garner support and the King was dividing his troops. One lot stayed to ensure Matilda remained within the castle as the King with his other troops pursued Robert: But, since he was far from achieving his desire (for the Earl had not gone by the main road but by a hidden by-way), he turned hastily back to besiege those who had withdrawn into the Castle. The Bishop of Winchester, on hearing of their arrival, at once had all the by-roads blocked by guards, and at length met the Earl, it was rumoured, and after a compact of peace and friendship had been firmly ratified between them let him go.

---

226 It should also be noted that at the time of writing the GS, Henry had administered for a time the bishopric of Salisbury and may well have transferred Lidelea to be the possession of the Bishop of Winchester.
unharmed. This was the popular report, but in every man of right feeling it must be doubtful, or rather quite incredible, that a brother should greet the invader of his brother's Kingdom with a kiss and let him go uninjured from his sight to rouse the Kingdom to more violent rebellion against his brother. So the Bishop, as though he had not caught up with the earl, came to the King with a large bodyguard of cavalry. On observing that the King was determined to prosecute the siege he (Henry) said that the plan was useless and unacceptable both to the King himself and to the Kingdom. For if he were preparing to besiege the Countess of Anjou in one part the Kingdom, her brother would immediately rise up and disturb the Kingdom in another; and so it was wiser for the King himself and more beneficial to the Kingdom to let her go to her brother unharmed, that when both with their forces had been brought into one place he might more easily devote himself to shattering their enterprise and might more quickly arrive with all his forces for a heavier attack. So when an agreement had been made and a truce accepted under sanction of an oath he let the Countess go away to her brother, feeling sure he could overcome them the more freely in as much as both were being brought into one part of the country.

This extract establishes for posterity two things. It counteracts the contemporary accusation of a duplicitous Henry, but it does not deny the meeting between Robert of Gloucester and Henry Blois (which was common knowledge) and could not be denied even in this GS apologia. Our author is keen to establish that the bishop of Winchester is not accounted duplicitous. It is made to appear as if it were not so much a meeting by arrangement but by Henry having blocked the roads appearing to act for his brother. It portrays Henry not as a turncoat but a smart strategist genuinely concerned still for his brother's welfare. It provides a rationale for what was a contemporary accusation against Henry's betrayal of his brother and his duplicity. Many considered him the main instigator and manipulator of affairs. Some, later, even accused Henry of being in touch with Robert and Matilda prior to their landing in England, corresponding secretly.

However, it will have come out into the public domain of court gossip that the meeting took place and many wondered at why Henry made no mention of it to his brother on arrival at Arundel. The wording, ‘as

---

227 Historians are uncertain as to why the Empress was released, but we can safely say that it was the persuasive influence of Henry Blois who was secretly siding with the Empress. The persuasion was easy as Arundel Castle was considered almost impregnable…. so why would Stephen risk tying up his army in the south whilst Robert
though he had not caught up with the earl’ is included as part of the narrative because it was common knowledge. It was known (or latterly discovered) that having met Robert, Henry had said nothing to his brother. This probably became common knowledge to both sides when both Robert and the King became prisoners later on. Don’t forget, Henry was now Legate and had been dealt a blow by his brother in being passed over as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The point is skirted over and made to appear in the GS as if it were part of the plan that both Matilda and Robert were to be brought together at Bristol for Stephen’s advantage…. as it was also known that it was on Henry’s advice that Matilda was escorted by himself to Bristol to join her brother Robert. Now, it is a very difficult to divine at which point Henry’s allegiance changed as GS emphatically denies it did. Was it when his brother was imprisoned and expediency dictated a change of sides or was it before, as many accused him of corresponding with Robert and the Empress prior to their arrival? William of Malmesbury relates in HN: the ‘witness’ in the council accuses Henry and that Henry Blois’ cool lack of response to the witness was anything but a denial.

Whatever the answer, the GS acts as a polemical apologia against the proposition of his ever having changed sides before his brother was captured at Lincoln. However, given that Henry Blois was snubbed by King and Queen in his wish to be archbishop and he had witnessed his brother’s capacity to turn on the Bishop Knights who were possessors of Castles…. there could be some truth to the proposition that he encouraged Matilda to come. But, had it not been for the episode at Ely where the writer of the GS is definitely present siding with the king.... there would be no discrepancy.....as long as the GS is understood in part, to be an apologia for Henry. It becomes clear why the narrative passage was constructed in this way. Of course the usual obfuscation is continued throughout the GS as things are ‘reported’ or as it was ‘rumoured’, ‘so it is said’, or ‘they say that’... etc.

roamed freely garnering support in the west. Stephen may also have released Matilda out of a sense of chivalry. Henry Blois himself relates that his brother’s sense of Chivalry was his undoing. This is especially evident in the three times he allowed King David of Scotland to break a deal without learning from the previous two times. This affected Henry so much it was even included in the prophecies of VM. Stephen had a generous, courteous personality and women in general were not normally expected to be targeted in Anglo-Norman warfare. Hence, Henry Blois escorted her as was promised by him at the secret meeting with Robert earlier.
The GS continues with exploits at several castles such as Wallingford and Henry opines in several places the distress Stephen goes through, but always expresses it as God’s will in payment for his actions. We then get to the point in GS where Roger, Bishop of Salisbury dies and Stephen appropriates several treasures. As we know, Henry Blois is a lover of art and comments on the pieces he has obviously seen, that his brother has appropriated: *He left Salisbury Cathedral a countless quantity of money, and likewise a great many vessels of hammered goldsmiths’ work, some of silver, some of gold, artistically and splendidly engraved. All these fell into the King’s hands, with the approval indeed by the voluntary offer of the canons themselves...*

Henry goes on to say the money was spent on good deeds for various religious institutions. But, Henry does not relate about his efforts to install his eldest brother’s son *Henry De Sully* into the bishopric of Salisbury against Waleran of Meulan’s protégé Philip d’Harcourt.

We now arrive at the passage in the GS where Nigel decides to take revenge against Stephen where he abandons the weapons of the gospel and the discipline of the Church militant, he put on the man of blood and after hiring in Ely, at his own expense, knights....he holed up there:

*Now Ely is an agreeable island, large and thickly inhabited, rich in land that is fertile and fit for pasture, impenetrably surrounded on all sides by bogland and fens, accessible only in one place, where a very narrow track affords the scantiest of entries to the island and Castle, wondrously set, long since, right in the water in the middle of the opening of the track, makes one impregnable castle of the whole island. The King then on hearing the truth about the bishops beginning a rebellion, hastily arrived there with a large army, and after examining the wonderful and unconquerable fortification in place, he anxiously consulted a number of persons about the means of breaking in with his men. When at length advice was given and approved that he should collect a quantity of boats at a place where the water surrounded the island seemed to be less wide, place them broadside on, and build a bridge over them to the shores of the islands with a foundation of hurdles laid lengthwise, the King was much delighted and ordered the work to be speedily done; and when at length a bridge had been skilfully constructed in this way over the boats, he and his men quickly came to the shores of the island beyond. But when the water had been crossed by this device there still remained muddy fens, in which a shallow ford suitable for crossing, was*
secretly shown to the King. **They say that** a monk who knew the district of Ely very well, both gave the advice about crossing the water and acted as guide, as well as informant, in the showing of the ford among the fens. We have seen him afterwards in recognition of this service, inducted into a church not by Peter’s key but rather by Simon’s, and given the title of Abbot of Ramsay, and we know that afterwards, on account of this unjust induction into a church, he endured many toils and afflictions through God’s just judgement on what he did in secret.

It would be incredible to think that someone who had such inside knowledge or able to give such detail was not present. Not only is the location perfectly described, but as always, through the eyes of a military tactician/engineer…. taking into account a location’s defences and how it might be assailed or assaulted. As we have discussed, advice when mentioned in GS is usually that which has emanated from Henry Blois. At length, it will be him that comes up with the solution, but to avoid future accusation of a churchman laying siege to another, he piles all the blame on Daniel the monk from Peterborough, the future abbot of Ramsey. I cannot say one way or another whether Daniel himself was present, but it makes no difference to Henry because at the time of writing the GS the abbot is dead. Even if Daniel did show them a path through the fens…. to avoid accusation, Henry implies that the whole feat (including the engineering of a bridge), which the author explains in fine detail…. rests entirely on the monk. It seems extraordinary that detail such as the hurdles being laid lengthwise should be recounted by anyone else but an eyewitness.

At this time Nigel had fallen foul of both Henry and Stephen and as he escaped to the ‘receptacle of filth’ known as Bristol, Geoffrey de Mandeville remained at Ely opposing them. This is a good indication of Henry’s guile and shows how he is able to construct the GS so as to appear that the book and its subject matter is about the ‘acts of Stephen’, while at the same time polishing for posterity his role in the Anarchy.

There follows several incidents in the southwest involving Robert of Gloucester and Stephen and the taking of Devizes by **Robert Fitz Hubert** and events involving **Geoffrey Talbot**. As always, judgement by the author is from God and the author knows his bible. Henry decides not to mention his attempts as mediator as related by William of Malmesbury. To do so would draw attention to himself and his role.
As we pass through the battle of Lincoln in the GS where Stephen is captured and his subsequent imprisonment at Bristol, Henry manages his best retrospective gloss implying his hands were clean of any connivance in his brother’s capture, but as always puffed up by his vanity. The passage portrays his blameless expediency in reacting to events. It basically paints his actions as a man taking advice to make a pact; always with the intention (given the right moment) to revert his allegiance back to his brother. We can see later that it was probably just his revulsion to how he was treated by the Empress, which caused him to manipulate events that were the cause of her having to flee from London.

I believe, if Matilda had not acted haughtily to Henry and with deference, Henry might not have reacted to the appeals from Stephen’s wife to help his brother. For those who know how events turned out in posterity, the GS portrays a scenario of a man pressed by the turn of events, who by expediency had to comply in co-operating with Matilda. The GS gives the impression that Henry had the intention of reverting sides back to Stephen given the right opportunity and thus he is portraying for posterity his unwavering allegiance except by duplicity.

The truth of the matter is that Henry swapped sides to have what he thought would be total control over the English church. Matilda turned out to be a disagreeable choice and he reverted back to his brother's side as the lesser of the two evils... probably not on the Queen’s request but by rallying support of the Queen (Stephen’s wife) to turn the tide of events back to his own favour playing both sides.... hoping to escape his demeaning position under the Empress.

She was advised to win the attachment of Henry bishop of Winchester, the Kings brother, because he was reckoned to surpass all the great men of England in judgement and wisdom and to be their superior in virtue and wealth; for, she was told, if he were willing to favour her party he must be honoured and made her first councillor, but if he showed himself in any way hostile and rebellious the whole armed force of England must be sent against him. The Bishop was in a quandary; on the one hand it was most difficult...

---

228 In fact, William Newburgh implies it was Henry who started the siege because he had had enough of the Empress Matilda. After stating Henry Blois was inordinately fond of money, he states: In order to raise the siege, he summoned from Kent (the only area unaffected by reason of the King’s calamity) William of Ypres and the Queen and from other districts numerous individuals who were irritated by the disdainful tyranny of the woman. After he had amassed massive forces.....
to support the King’s cause and restore it to its former flourishing condition, above all because he had not provisioned or garrisoned his Castles well enough, on the other it appeared to him a dreadful thing and unseemly in the sight of men to yield so suddenly to his brother’s foes while that brother was still alive. So he was in bewilderment and dragged this way and that by different hooks, until, strengthened by more acceptable advice, he resolved to make a pact of peace and friendship with his enemies for a time, that with peace thus assured to him and his, he might quietly watch the inclinations of the Kingdom and how they were displayed and might rise more briskly and with less hindrance to assist his brother if the chance were offered. So when they had jointly made a pact of peace and concord he came to meet her in cordial fashion and admitted her into the city of Winchester, and after handing over to her disposal the King’s Castle and the Royal crown, which she had always most eagerly desired, and the treasure the King had left there, though it was very scanty, he bade the people, at a public meeting in the marketplace of the town, salute her as their lady and their Queen.

Henry Blois alludes to Matilda’s parade in Winchester as if by public meeting all decided to salute their Lady. No mention of his own machinations in the Chapter house where the council took place. The ‘Deeds of Stephen’ professes to be a book about King Stephen, but Stephen is the glue around which Henry splices in his polemically slanted apologia concerning himself. It is remarkable how our author glosses over the defining moment of the whole period; the events which were going to decide Stephen’s fate at the council of Winchester on the 7th of April 1141. Now, if our author were anybody else except Henry Blois, it seems more than likely that even a cursory précis of events would have been recorded. The reason they are not is obvious. Luckily, we have William of Malmesbury’s account which clearly indicates that Henry’s allegiance had changed. This is the one event whereby the illusion of never having changed sides (the case presented in the GS) would uncover his duplicity. Henry skirts round the implications of the council, otherwise his carefully crafted apologia put forward in GS is contradicted. We know this by the declaration he made there. Up until these statements were made, secret conclaves had been held among the clergy by Henry and it seems as if Henry was seeing which way the wind blew before openly coming down on
one side of the fence or the other. Obviously, all the clergy thought it prudent to side with the Empress Matilda.

William of Malmesbury relates by narration and quotation an un-airbrushed version of what was openly declared by Henry. This runs contrary to the position Henry himself paints in GS. William of Malmesbury records what plainly is a duplicitous piece of oratory, saying the Legate’s speech was much to this effect: *That by appointment of the pope he (Henry Blois) took his place in England and it was therefore by the pope’s authority that the clergy of England were gathered in this council to discuss the peace of the country, which was suffering a very perilous shipwreck. In the time of King Henry, his uncle, England had been the peculiar habitation of peace, so that through the activity, spirit and vigour of that pre-eminent man, not only did the natives, whatever their power or position, not venture to create any disturbance but likewise all the neighbouring Kings and princes, following his example, both inclined to peace themselves and invited or forced their subjects to it. That King, some years before his death had had the whole Kingdom of England and also the Duchy of Normandy confirmed on oath by all the Bishops and barons to his, formally Empress, his only surviving offspring by his first wife, if he failed of a male successor by his wife from Lorraine. ’And cruel fortune’ he said, (Henry Blois) ’showed a grudge against my preeminent uncle, so that he died in Normandy without a male heir. Therefore, because it seemed tedious to wait for the lady*[^229], who made delays in coming to England since her residence was Normandy, thought was taken for peace of the country and my brother allowed to reign. But though I made myself a guarantor between him and God that he would honour and exalt holy church, maintain good laws and repeal bad ones, I am vexed to remember and ashamed to tell what manner of man he showed himself as King, how no justice was enforced upon transgressors, peace at once brought entirely to an end, almost in that very year, *bishops arrested and compelled to surrender their property*, abbacies sold and churches despoiled of their treasure, *the advice of the wicked hearkened to*, that of the good either not put into effect or altogether disregarded. You know how often I made application to him, sometimes personally and sometimes through the bishops, especially when I called a Council for this purpose in the year mentioned before and again nothing but hatred. And if anyone will

[^229]: Henry actually borrows this expression from William of Malmesbury and inserts it in GS.
consider the matter aright he cannot be unaware that while I should love my mortal brother I should esteem far more highly the cause of my immortal father. Therefore since God has executed his judgement on my brother in allowing him to fall into the power of the strong without my knowledge that the Kingdom may not totter without a ruler I have invited you all to meet here in virtue of my position as Legate. The case was discussed in secret yesterday before the chief part of the clergy of England, whose special prerogative it is to choose and consecrate a Prince. Therefore, first, as is fitting, calling God to our aid, we choose as lady of England and Normandy the daughter of a King who was a peacemaker, a glorious King, a wealthy King, the good King, without peer in our time, and we promise her faith and support.

William says there was discreet applause or some acquiesced to what was said by their silence. I am sure many were stunned at his duplicity. Henry Blois as orator had taken the moral high ground saying he was ashamed of his brother’s behaviour against the church. This is not someone who is quietly watching the inclinations of the Kingdom as is stated in the GS; this is the powerbroker, the shaker and mover of the Kingdom and he has declared for the Empress. Everyone in the secret conclaves and in the council knew that Henry openly declared for Matilda.... all contemporaries knew this fact. Why is it that mention of the council of Winchester and Henry’s position as turncoat is avoided in GS? Why is the impression given in GS of Henry's undivided support for his brother? It is simply because Henry (as author) did not want to go down in history as the primordial instigator of the Anarchy in facilitating the crowning of his brother and as the continuator of it having changed his allegiance back.... albeit with a push from his brother’s wife.

If the Empress had not disrespected Henry and broken her word to him and begun to be arbitrary and headstrong as the GS puts it, the crown would have been on the Empress’s head. The trouble was that Henry, (the King and Queen ‘maker or breaker’) eventually decided he was better off before as the King’s brother and would have more chance of accomplishing a Gregorian state and his own personal ambitions through his brother. If his brother was eventually released by Henry’s doing, his power would be

---

230 HN. Potter. p. 52-54, chap 493
231 This is vainly expressed in his own self written epitaph found on the Meusan plates: lest England groan for it, since on him it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.
restored and the king would be indebted. He was also offered the propitious momentum to reverse the situation by the rebellion of the Londoners, which was most undoubtedly brought about by Henry Blois’s interference.

No one should be fooled by Henry Blois or underestimate his ability. He was indeed a complex man. Henry was a supremely able financier and administrator. As a builder, art patron, connoisseur and collector of antiques, he was without rival in his age. The hangover of a proper cloistered education lingered into an unshakable belief in God and zest for the church as equal to state; but Henry’s faith was undoubtedly not in its purest form…. as his ability to lie and manoeuvre and create fraudulent tracts has little to do with God’s true ministers. His accusations against greed, witnessed in the GS, against William of Corbeil, Roger, Alexander etc. was a hypocrisy blinded by his own narcissism and he was fully culpable himself. His obsession with art and his building projects required wealth and he freely admits his wealth in the GS, but it is not until his back is against the wall, when his brother dies, that his own obedience to mammon is displayed as he transfers his movable wealth abroad.

We can see the reasons in this next extract for the reversal of fortunes of the Empress. The bishop of Winchester’s pique is obvious, but Henry cleverly shows that it was not his personal feelings that were offended but also those of her most ardent allies. The sense implies that the mood of the country as a whole was for change back to Stephen…. Since Matilda’s true character was discovered. It may be more to do with Henry’s Machiavellian orchestration of events to fulfil his own desires. Since both Robert of Gloucester and King David were dead at the time of writing the GS, this assertion could be made freely that they were of the same inclination against the Empress. William of Malmesbury directly confutes this assertion by stating: her brother Robert, constantly with her, increased her prestige in every fitting way, by speaking affably to the chief men...

It must not be forgotten, our author likens himself to Cicero; he has studied oratory arts and rhetoric and is a manipulator not only of events, but words. The GS continues: Then she, on being raised with such splendour and distinction to this pre-eminent position, began to be arbitrary, and rather headstrong, in all that she did. Some former adherents of the King, who had agreed to submit themselves and what was theirs to her, she received ungraciously and at times with unconcealed annoyance, others she drove from her presence in fury after insulting and threatening them. By reckless
innovations she lessened or took away possessions and lands of some, held on a grant from the King, while the fees and honours of the very few who still adhered to the King she confiscated altogether and granted to others; she arbitrarily annulled any grant fixed by the King's royal decree, she hastily snatched away and conferred on her own followers anything he had given in unshakeable perpetuity to churches or to his comrades in arms. What was a sign of extreme haughtiness and insolence, when the King of Scotland and the **Bishop of Winchester** and her brother, the Earl of Gloucester, the chief men of the whole Kingdom, whom she was then taking around with her as a permanent retinue, came before her with bended knees to make some request, **she did not rise respectfully, as she should have**, when they bowed before her, or agree to what they asked, but repeatedly sent them away with contumely, rebuffing them by an arrogant answer and refusing to hearken to their words; and by this time she no longer relied on their advice, and she should have,.......(could this be any other than the opinion of Henry Blois).... and had promised them, but arranged everything as she herself thought fit and according to her own arbitrary will. **The Bishop of Winchester, seeing these things done without his approval**, and a good many others without his advice, was sufficiently vexed and irritated, yet he disguised all his feelings with caution and craft, and watched silently to see what end such beginning would have.

What we should ask is: how is it that our author is encamped so closely to Stephen in one instance and somehow ingratiates himself instantaneously into Matilda's court. The GS acts as an *apologia* for Henry Blois portraying continuous commitment to his brother. He makes out that any change of side was not of his own will but under compulsion by the turn of events.

What we hear from William of Malmesbury is entirely different. Henry had in fact from the beginning (when escorting Matilda from Arundel) been confederate to her cause and a witness attests to this in court to a red faced Henry Blois.

*I do not say that these words of the Legate were gladly received by all, but certainly no-one confuted them; all the clergy bridled their lips from fear or respect. There was one layman, an envoy from the Empress, who publically contradicted the Legate, by the pledge he had given to the Empress, to make any decision in that council to prejudice her position, saying he (Henry) had given her his pledge, not to aid his brother in any way, unless perchance he*
sent him twenty knights, but no more. Her own coming to England had been caused by frequent letters from him; the King’s capture and imprisonment were mainly due to his connivance. The envoy said this and a great deal more in very harsh terms without any attempt to appease the Legate, but the latter could not be induced by any severity of language to betray anger, being as I said before, a man not slow to carry out what he had once taken in hand.232

Having written a flattering dedicatory piece in the prologue of DA in 1134, William of Mamesbury is quite aware of what Henry Blois is capable.... and how his lust for power has changed him since his brother became King. Are we in any doubt as to William’s evidence? He certainly knows the true nature of Henry Blois. Now we can understand why the GS was written. William even knows the inconsequential details concerning the twenty knights; so the truth about what was implied earlier in GS.... by Henry having met Robert of Gloucester on the road, yet pretending to offer his brother good advice, is blatantly confirmed as a duplicitous lie. Here it is confirmed that Henry was confederate with Matilda.

Henry may be implicated in the capture of his brother by conveying intelligence of his movements as is implied by William. It is only because of Henry’s revulsion at Matilda’s haughtiness that he decides to back the lesser of two evils i.e. his brother. It is only when everyone finds out his duplicity in hedging his bets (and the truth comes out) that Henry tries to square events by picking certain points which could rationalise his actions.

The way the facts are presented imply that never at any stage has Henry’s allegiance changed. This is simply not true. Again William of Malmesbury states that Henry who had adjourned proceedings while waiting for the contingent to arrive from London states: *The Londoners came on the Wednesday and, on being introduced into the council, pleaded their cause to the extent of saying they had been sent by what is called the commune of London and brought not contentiousness, but a request for the freeing of their Lord the King from captivity. All the barons who had earlier been received into their commune were urgent in demanding this from the

---

232 William of Malmesbury’s HN, Potter p.6. William having known Henry at Glastonbury is fully aware of his duplicitous position, especially as the witness for the Empress laid bare his double-dealings against his brother. I doubt the accusation of connivance in the capture of Stephen as related in Malmesbury’s HN by the witness is untrue. This makes Henry Blois a truly Machiavellian character in his pursuit of power, but also shows the guile in the production of a book which for posterity puts the gloss on his character defects as presented here in the GS apologia.
Lord Legate, the Archbishop and all the clergy who were present. The legate answered them at length and with eloquence and made the same speech as the day before in opposition to what they asked. Moreover, he added it was not fitting that the Londoners, who held a special position of superiority in England, should give comfort to those who had abandoned their Lord in war, by whose advice he had dishonoured holy church...

William is here showing the true course of events. Henry was in opposition to his brother and had sided with Matilda. This is plainly revealed in William’s next extract: meanwhile a certain man named Christian, if I remember rightly, a clerk of the Queen as I have heard, stood up and held out a document to the legate; he read it in silence and said at the top of his voice that it was not valid and ought not to be read out in so great an assembly, especially one of persons of rank and religion. For, he said, apart from other things written in it that were worthy of reproof and censure, the name of a witness had been added who the year before, in the same chapter house in which they were sitting, had used the most insulting language to reverend bishops. When he shuffled thus, the clerk did not fail to perform his commission, but with splendid boldness read the letter before that audience, the substance being as follows: ‘the Queen earnestly begs all the assembled clergy, and especially the Bishop of Winchester, the Lord’s brother, to restore to the throne that same lord, whom cruel men, who are likewise his own men, have cast into chains’. The legates answer to this proposal was to the same effect as to the Londoners. They, after discussing the matter, said they would take back the decree of the Council to their fellow citizens and give it all the support they could. The council broke up on the Thursday after excommunicating many of the Kings adherents, notably William Martel who had formerly been King Henry’s butler and was then King Stephen’s steward. He had mightily exasperated the legate by seizing and stealing much of his property.

All of this transpired while we are left with the impression given by the GS that Henry watched silently. Henry was in Matilda’s entourage and it was at this time (between her arrival at London and his having made the citizens of Winchester swear allegiance to her), that his vanity was obviously slighted. He had had to subjugate himself to an arrogant women

---

233 HN, Potter p. 54 chap 495  
234 HN, Potter p.55, chap 496.
who had promised so much, but not kept her word toward him. William of interjects with sarcasm: *the lord Legate also was at hand to serve the empress with what seemed to be a zealous loyalty.* William of Malmesbury understands the duplicity of Henry Blois.²³⁵

Now, I do not want to quote endlessly from passages from the *Historia Novella* and the GS. My intent is to show firstly the cleverness of Henry Blois and the fact that; if he could write this with the clear intention to deceive, we must consider the other works he has duped modern scholars into believing were written by others.

To establish that the GS was written by Henry Blois as an *apologia* for the part he played in these events and to disguise his machinations which brought these events to a head, we should look to the comparison of these two accounts. William of Malmesbury states in HN: *The Londoners, who had always been under suspicion and in a state of secret indignation, then gave vent to expressions of concealed hatred; they even laid a plot, it is said, against their lady and her companions. The latter, forewarned of it and avoiding it, gradually left the city in good order with the kind of military discipline. The Empress was accompanied by the legate, David King of Scots, uncle of that woman of masculine spirit, her brother Robert, then as always sharing his sister's fortunes in everything, and, to put it briefly, by all her adherents unharmed to a man. The Londoners, learning of their departure, dashed into their lodgings and carried off whatever had been left in haste.*²³⁶

William is not present in London and hears that Matilda’s entourage left in an ‘orderly fashion’ on being averted to the possible rebellion by the Londoners. There is no doubt that Henry Blois was at the ‘well cooked’ feast with them and he was the one who tipped off the Empress’s entourage. This action gained two advantages; he was not embroiled in any fracas that ensued and was seen to be supporting the Empress should the Londoners not catch up with the Empress…. if events turned out that she remained with a grip on the country. It also avoided the imminent crowning that was

²³⁵ When William dies Henry Blois has no problem interpolating both DA and GR but can do nothing to change what is written in HN. Henry does not like William because of William having accused Henry’s father of being a liar. Henry in effect has to write GS to counter what would have been a slight on his character in posterity left by the account in HN.

²³⁶ HN. Potter p.56 Chap 497
shortly to take place. Henry also saw the opportunity of separating himself from her company as is related shortly.

William of Malmesbury, therefore, knows nothing about the reasons for the Londoner's open rebellion, which only Henry could relate, because he was present in court at the Londoner's supplication. William's reasoning for the later change of allegiance by Henry has to do with Stephen's son Eustace being denied his inheritance. Henry tells us that the Empress demanded money from the Londoners and their supplications for lenience against the tax were ignored as in the GS: *when the citizens express themselves in this way she, with a grim look, her forehead wrinkled into a frown, every trace of a woman's gentleness removed from her face, blazed into unbearable fury, saying that many times the people of London had made very large contributions to the King; that they had lavished their wealth on strengthening him and weakening her, that they had previously conspired with her enemies for her hurt, and therefore it was not just to spare them in any respect or make the smallest reduction in the money demanded. On hearing this, the citizens went away gloomily to their homes without gaining what they asked.*

The bishop of Winchester's personal distaste for the Empress is clear. The fact that we know he is present even by Malmesbury's account and the fact that our author of GS describes her wrinkled forehead shows Henry Blois is there. It would be illogical that any person present in the court could have been an admirer of Stephen, which our author of the GS most certainly is. Henry seeing his brother's wife (the Queen) being abused and the Londoners rejected, decides to incite the rebellion of them against the Empress. I would suggest the only person in the Empress's party who could have had knowledge of the potential uprising is the one man who had decided to conspire against Matilda: *Just about this time too, the Queen, a woman of subtlety and a man's resolution, sent envoys to the Countess (Matilda) and made earnest entreaty for her husband's release from his filthy dungeon and the granting of his son's inheritance, though only that to which he was entitled by her father's will; but when she was abused in harsh and insulting language and both she and those who had come to ask on her behalf completely failed to gain their request, the Queen expecting to obtain them by arms what she could not by supplication, brought a magnificent body of*

---
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troops across in front of London from the other side of the river and gave orders that they should rage most furiously around the city with plunder and arson, violence and the sword in sight of the Countess and her men. The people of London then were in grievous trouble. On the one hand their land was being stripped before their eyes and reduced by the enemy’s ravages to a habitation for the hedgehog\(^{238}\) and there was no one ready to help them; on the other that new lady of theirs was going beyond the bounds of moderation and sorely oppressing them, nor did they hope that in time to come she would have bowels of mercy or compassion for them, seeing that at the very beginning of her reign she had no pity on her subjects and demanded what they could not bear. Therefore, they judged it worthy of consideration to make a new pact of peace and alliance with the Queen and joined together with one mind to rescue their King and Lord from his chains, since having incurred a just censure for too hastily and too heedlessly abandoning the King they were in some fashion accepting, while he was still alive the tyranny of usurpers that was laid upon them.

Notice how the Londoners and the Queen come up with the idea of rebellion all on their own with no hint of Henry’s involvement. But why, one must ask, did the entire forces of Matilda and Robert descend on Winchester thereafter, if his hand was not recognised behind the uprising?

So when the Countess, confident of gaining her will, was waiting for the Citizens’ answer to her demand the whole city, with the bells ringing everywhere as the signal for the battle, flew to arms, and all, with a common purpose of making a most savage attack on the Countess and her men, unbared the gates and came out in a body, like thronging swarms from beehives. She, with too much boldness and confidence, was just bent on reclining at a well-cooked feast, but on hearing the frightful noise from the city and getting secret warning from someone about the betrayal on foot against her, she with all her retinue immediately sought safety in flight. They mounted swift horses and their flight had hardly taken them further than the suburbs when, behold, a mob of citizens, great beyond expression or calculation, entered their abandoned lodgings and found, and plundered everywhere, all that had been left behind in the speed of their unpremeditated departure. Though a number of barons had fled with the Countess under the stress of fear, she did not however keep them as permanent companions in

\(^{238}\)Cf. Isaiah 14:23.
this disorderly flight; they were so wondrously shaken by the tumult of the sudden panic that they quite forgot about their lady and thought rather of saving themselves by making their own escape, and taking different turnings, the first that met them as they fled, they set off for their own lands by a multiple of byroads, as though the Londoners were hot on their heels. And the Bishop of Winchester for his part, who was they say, privy to this plot and its instigator, likewise some others, both bishops and belted Knights, who had assembled at London with overweening display for the enthronement of their lady, very rapidly made for various refuges. She, with her brother the Earl of Gloucester and a very few other barons for whom flight in that direction was the most convenient mode of escape, came at full speed to the city of Oxford.

How is it that our author was present to supply detail on what transpired among Matilda’s troupe? Henry writes as any chronicler would and includes the negative material implicating himself as privy to the plot as it was pointless to deny such a fact…. being common knowledge. Henry ‘waters down’ knowledge of the plot by the Bishop of Winchester in the pretence of being the unbiased anonymous chronicler of GS by implying that who was they say, privy to this plot and its instigator, but presents a justification of his being separated by the first resistance that met them as they fled. Even though rumours abounded that Henry was the instigator of the plot, he cleverly includes (as any chronicler might) the common rumour ‘they say’. He makes out that his support for Matilda was at all times duplicitous.

Our author says Henry was part of the fleeing party with the Empress. How then could he be the innocent fleeing for his life (who got separated as the GS account relates) when Malmesbury says that the Empress was forewarned and left in good order? It would seem that William of Malmesbury heard the account, probably from Robert of Gloucester. Henry Blois not wishing to be seen by posterity as duplicitous manufactures a reason for flight and the ensuing separation. The outcome of which, he ends up back in Winchester and they at Oxford. However, the way the GS then presents events justifies that Henry was never a turncoat at all, but had his brother’s best interests at heart continuously and it was events that transpired around him in which he found himself back on the royalists side i.e. there is no suggestion of collusion or duplicitous intention before the
arrival of the Empress at Winchester. A truly marvellous piece of polemical sophistry!

So, when they had thus been frightened away from London, all who favoured the King and were in deep depression from his capture, joyously congratulated each other, as though bathed in the light of a new dawn, and taking up arms with spirit attacked the Countess’s adherents on every side. The Queen was admitted into the city by the Londoners and forgetting the weakness of her sex and woman’s softness, she bore herself with the valour of a man; everywhere by prayer or price she won over invincible allies; the King’s lieges, wherever they were scattered throughout England, she urged persistently to demand their Lord back with her; and now she humbly besought the Bishop of Winchester, legate of all England, to take pity on his imprisoned brother and exert himself for his freedom, that uniting all his efforts with hers he might gain her a husband, the people at King, the Kingdom a champion. And the Bishop, moved both by the woman’s tearful supplications, which she pressed on him with greatest earnestness, and by the dutiful compassion for a brother of his own blood that he felt very strongly, often turned over in his own mind how he could rescue his brother from the ignominy of bondage and most skilfully restore him to his Kingdom. But the Countess of Anjou, cunningly anticipating his craft, arrived at Winchester with a highly equipped force to catch the Bishop if she could: and when she, surrounded by a very large retinue, had entered one gate before the citizens knew anything of her coming, the Bishop mounted a swift horse, went out by another gate, and made off to his castles at full speed. Then she, sending out a summons on every side, gathered into a vast army the whole array of those who obeyed her throughout England, and gave orders for a most rigorous investment both of the bishops Castle, which he had built in very elegant style in the middle of the town, and of his Palace, which he had fortified strongly and impregnable just like a Castle.

As explained already, William of Malmesbury does not implicate Henry Blois in any collusion before Winchester and merely relates what a witness in court says, but may suspect he has a hand in such affairs. William, writing after the rout of Winchester has obviously heard Henry’s justifications for his actions. William explains that it was the Empress’s denial of Eustace’s estates that effected the turn in Henry’s affections: The Legate, enraged by this affront, kept away from her court for many days and, though often summoned back, persisted in refusal. Meanwhile he had an
intimate conference at Guildford with the Queen, his brother’s wife, and influenced by her tears and offers of amends he resolved to free his brother; he also gave absolution without consulting the bishops, to all the members of his brother’s party whom he had excommunicated in the council. His complaints against the Empress were likewise current throughout England: that she had wished to arrest him; that all the barons of England had kept their faith with her but she had broken hers, being unable to show restraint in the enjoyment of what she had gained.\textsuperscript{239}

Henry writing in the GS goes on to name all present on the Empress’s side before what eventually became known as the ‘rout of Winchester’ and judging by previous comments, Henry Blois’ enmity for Miles of Gloucester is clear. However, to continue his authorship sham referring to himself in the third person and other devices, he also seemingly commends who he loathes when he says in GS: Miles of Gloucester, whom to the pleasure and satisfaction of all, she then made Earl of Hereford. Then continues on to say: all of them with a wonderful concentration of large forces from every quarter devoted themselves alike to the siege of the bishops Castle with one mind and the same unflagging zeal.

The GS states that Henry Blois made off to his castles outside the walls of Winchester obviously leaving his forces within. He is then referred to devoting all his efforts to harassing them outside the town. This is an important point, because later the monks of Hyde accuse the Bishop of purposefully burning not only their monastery but most of the city. The implication here is that it was the bishop’s forces cut off and being besieged, which launched the firebrands (supposedly not under his instruction).

However, he was absolved from this action by the pope and probably used the excuse that he was not in his own tower at the time the firebrands were being launched from the castle. However, we are not even sure, (as we have covered already), if there was a separate tower from the castle in the middle of the city. The citizens of Winchester who were less morally flimsy than Henry himself, had been made to swear allegiance to Matilda by Henry initially and remained on her side. William of Malmesbury relates: But the people of Winchester gave her their unspoken loyalty, remembering the faith they had pledged to her when they were induced to do it, almost against their will by the Bishop. Meanwhile firebrands flung from the bishop’s
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tower upon the houses of the citizens, who, as I have said, were more zealous for the Empress’s success than the Bishop’s, caught and burnt an entire nunnery within the city and the monastery called Hyde without.\textsuperscript{240}

Henry relates the spectacle in the GS: This was a remarkable siege, nothing like it was ever heard of in our times. The whole of England, together with an extraordinary number of foreigners had assembled from every quarter and was there in arms, and the roles of the combatants were reversed in so far as the inner besiegers of the bishops Castle were themselves very closely besieged on the outside by the Kings forces... it being clear that the town had been burnt in a frightful conflagration by the bishops troops and that the people were suffering very severely from the wasting hunger and lack of food.

Anyway, we stray from the point that I am trying to make by getting engrossed in the details of the rout of Winchester. But, before we leave it, Henry does make the point about this King of Scotland which he brought up in the VM and is obviously affected by his brothers soft dealings with King David: and what am I to say of the King of Scotland, who was taken for a third time as the story goes, but let go, as always, on consideration of a bribe.

This is Henry’s personal feeling because he knew that David would be continual trouble and could not be trusted to hold any deal. Stephen was tied by family loyalty through his wife. For this to be mentioned by Henry Blois in VM, as I covered earlier, shows that he thought his brother’s leniency to a person who could not keep his word was imprudent.

Henry ends the scenario with: such was the rout of Winchester, so terrible and wonderful in the eyes of all that even the oldest man can hardly remember one like it in our age.\textsuperscript{241}

We all know the outcome of the rout of Winchester; the Duke of Gloucester gets captured and exchanged with King Stephen. It is here that book II of the GS starts where Henry opines that after such suffering (on both sides) it should have been a general restoration of peace. He blames it on the Countess of Anjou always breathing a spirit of unbending haughtiness and says that she arrived back in Oxford and strengthened her garrison and trying to keep the King’s men effectively in check, sent out
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men to Woodstock, Radcot, Cirencester and Bampton. Henry must have been to Bampton as is recorded in the Uffculme dispute, but again displaying his interest in architecture: *in the village of Bampton, right on the church tower, which had been built in olden times of wondrous form, and with extraordinary skill and ingenuity.*

As regards Cirencester, where ‘Stephen gave it to devouring flames’ in the GS; this is also reiterated in the *Vita Merlini:* This latter shall besiege Cirencester with a blockade and with sparrows, and shall overthrow its walls to their very bases. The *Sparewencestre* of Wace we will deal with later, but suffice it to say for the moment that Henry was at the burning of Cirencester castle in 1142 and from that the other inventions concerning sparrows come from Henry’s muses in Wace.

The GS then passes on to the siege at Oxford where the Empress Matilda escapes the Castle at Oxford across the ice and flees to the Castle of Wallingford during the night. Henry Blois recaps as a personal observation not as a mere chronicler but someone at the heart of events and greatly affected by them: *but never have I read of another woman so luckily rescued from so many mortal foes and from the threat of dangers so great; the truth being that she went from the Castle of Arundel uninjured through the midst of her enemies and escaped without scathe from the midst of the Londoners when they were assailing her, and her only, in mighty wrath, then stole away alone, in wondrous fashion, from the rout of Winchester, when almost all her men were cut off; and then, when she left besieged Oxford, came away, as has been said, safe and sound.*

It is ironic that originally Henry Blois set out to create a precedent that would have made it more acceptable to receive Matilda as queen when he had initially composed his pseudo-history which became the skeleton upon which was hung the flesh of all editions of HRB i.e. Henry’s pseudo-history was the pre-cursor to the *Primary Historia* found at Bec which became the First Variant in 1144 and the Vulgate in 1155. The irony is that now he is

---

242 As we have covered, at Cirencester in 1141 the Empress and Robert, Earl of Gloucester, built a motte and bailey castle near the Abbey church and in 1142 Stephen found it virtually undefended and attacked. He captured the inhabitants and Castle with the rampart and stockade and burnt it to its foundation.

243 Until scholars understand the evolution of HRB and its chronology there can be little furtherance in understanding why and when the prophecies were inserted in it and thus expose Henry Blois’ further interpolations into DA and GR and Arthur’s introduction at Glastonbury…. which eventually leads to an understanding of the *Matter of Britain.* Of course, this is a process of re-educating scholarship to the extent of the fraud. But, without understanding first that GS is written by Henry Blois, it makes it all the more difficult to
her arch enemy and that he is commenting on her ability to escape his brother’s attempts to capture her, considering at one time he had totally accepted her natural right of accession. A further irony is that two of the situations i.e. the escape from Arundel and the orderly withdrawal from London were directly due to Henry’s manipulations.

The GS continues with Stephen capturing Wareham where Robert of Gloucester was still actively countering Stephen. Stephen then strengthens Wilton castle, the object being of preventing the Earl’s raids through the counties. The Bishop of Winchester also came with a strong body of troops to aid his enterprise, and barons who had been summoned from every part of England had either accompanied the King on his arrival or were flocking in to him with all the reinforcements they could raise and were expected to appear shortly. When this was clear to the Earl of Gloucester on the information of trusty messengers he sent at once for all his chief confederates and came to Wilton to fight the King. And when the King, arraying his army in squadrons on both flanks for battle at close quarters, advanced from the town to meet him, the Earl in soldierly fashion, carefully divided those he had brought with him into three bodies of men closely packed together and heavily charging his opponents with the greatest resolution compelled the King to give ground, and if he had not, with the Bishop of Winchester, sought safety in flight with all speed, he would most disgracefully have fallen into enemy hands a second time.

It is not by coincidence that every time we know the Bishop of Winchester is present, eyewitness detail always abounds. By now the reader should be convinced that the GS was written by Henry Blois.... the same man who gives us the same battle detail describing Arthur’s escapades in Autun and elsewhere in the HRB. It is clear that an author relating an incident does not normally inject incidental detail such as the number of bodies of men and the fact they were ‘closely packed together’ unless these details mean something to the author with the visualisation in mind. Henry Blois is a military strategist always commenting on stratagems and fortifications in the GS. The books on wars in classical history which he has evidently read in aiding the composition of HRB, betray his personal biases and interests and special areas of expertise in GS. The author’s accept that the guile and inventiveness of Henry Blois is how the Matter of Britain came into being. Uncovering secretive authorship in GS becomes vital, as it can be easily understood to be from Henry’s hand, but it also obviates Henry’s subtlety in the reality.
concern for the Church is also brought up on numerous occasions and the quotes from the bible are disbursed throughout the GS.

As the King and Henry have retreated from Wilton: the Earl, since fortune favoured him so auspiciously, pursued the King’s men with spirit into the town and its churches as they sought safe refuges in their rout, and by throwing firebrands everywhere well throughout the town made the day full of lamentation in all manner of cruelty, it being clear to all that everyone was raging most terribly with pillage and the sword, violence and arson, both against the wretched citizens and against the King's men who were discovered. What was cause for greater grief, smashing the doors in utter savagery, they plundered the holy nunnery of the mother of God and St. Etheldreda the virgin and of the virgins living there under vows, and in shameless contempt for religion bound and dragged out those who had gone within for safety. And indeed, though it seems just to deal harshly with our enemies and to mete to them in return with the same measure wherewith they have meted to us, yet the Earl of Gloucester and his supporters are to be blamed in the highest degree and particularly censured for rash presumption, because they not only violated a church, that most familiar refuge in all ages from men's lives and for the oppressed, but also with swords unsheathed dragged from the altar and delivered over to captivity those who had fled within in the hope of safety and preservation.

Henry, getting caught up in affairs relating to the burning of the churches, goes on to elaborate the bitter judgement meted out on the instigators (by God's judgement).... relating how or when they died shortly afterward. Our author surely is extremely well informed and has the viewpoint of a strong believer in God's actions against the wicked, but also a peculiar interest in the political and strategic episodes he relates; even relating to Wilton as the ‘master-key’ of the Kingdom. When our mystery author feels he has named too many incidentals he has to curb himself; otherwise such specific detail does not seemingly come from a simple chronicler, but from a bishop Knight.... who of course is deeply involved with the events in the Kingdom. I should labour to insert a great many details about them in the present work were it not that I should seem to cause weariness to my readers and wander away from my subject.

The GS continues on with the state of affairs in the southwest until we reach one of Henry Blois’ arch enemies William de Pont de l’Arche who was
a most loyal supporter of Henry Ist and who initially had prevented Henry Blois from entering the Treasury at Winchester.

Next William de Pont de l’Arche, a man utterly loyal, as has been said, to King Henry and his descendants, picked a very serious quarrel with the King’s brother, the Bishop of Winchester. But as the Bishop, with a very strong body of troops, always offered a firm and most resolute resistance to him and baffled all his attempts not only by force but by wise judgement, he wrote asking his lady, the Countess of Anjou, to send a very large number of knights to his aid and a leader and champion to command them who was skilled in the art of war. On receiving his request they were extremely delighted, whether because they thought that the Bishop’s power could be more easily tamed through him or that their own cause had been notably strengthened, inasmuch as he was not only considered reliable and utterly loyal to those he favoured but also was abundantly supplied with money and wealth. So they sent Robert Fitz Hildebrand, a man of low birth in deed but also of tried military qualities, and, what disgraces and sullies the prime and the fame of soldiers, he was likewise a lustful man, drunken and unchaste. On arriving with a fine body of Knights he obtained a most cordial reception, because extremely intimate with William, and could go in and out of this Castle as he liked.

The Castle is Portchester which belonged to his wife who was a daughter of Robert Mauduit. (See appendix 3). The reader may have noticed, just in the extracts provided here, that there is barely a mention of Henry without his wisdom being stated. Henry is more piqued throughout the GS when his brother Stephen, Matilda, or others do not take his advice i.e. he wants events to transpire as he envisages them. Henry knows that he is a wily strategist but is puffed up in that the opposition think they have sent an equal adversary, but in Henry’s mind the adversary is of low birth. If Portchester castle, which is perched next to the sea, was indeed assailed by Henry, it would explain his allusion in the Vita, where: Porchester shall see its broken walls in its harbour until a rich man with the tooth of a wolf shall restore it. It would also explain why tradition attaches the building of Portchester to Henry Blois.

We arrive at Chapter 78 in GS where Henry Blois gives a general analysis of the state of affairs throughout England concerning the starvation and mutilation and pillaging that prevailed. Mostly, he is concerned with the ransacking of church properties and the general mayhem caused by
lawlessness. This is something that would normally concern a chronicler of the deeds of Stephen. However, it seems highly specified to the military knight and bishop and not the sort of résumé that any other churchman (as our supposed anonymous author is recognised to be) would apportion the amount of space given to it in the GS. Henry's world is the state of the Kingdom.

After a long catalogue of tragedy, the GS text continues: And as things so lamentable and wretched to look upon and such an utterly shameful tragedy of woe being openly performed all over England, so also was report of them brought everywhere to the ears of the Bishops. But they, cowering in most dastardly fear, bent like a reed shaken by the wind, since their salt had no savour, they did not rise up to resist or set themselves as a wall before the house of Israel. For they should have met wise men in the flesh with the sword of God's word, which devours flesh and to the sons of Belial, who were swooping with fury on the goods of the church and tearing the Lord's tunic into small pieces had left it everywhere tattered and rent asunder, they should bravely have presented the countenance of Jeremiah and the horned forehead of Moses. For they are represented by the pillars that hold up God's house, by the small lions that support Solomon's famous Laver, by the bases that hold up the table of the showbread, for the reason that the church, which really is and is called the house of God, which also is signified by the laver, because there the filth of sin is washed off in many ways, which likewise is figured by the table, because there the food of eternal life is set forth, should not only be held up and strengthened by them, but also always be bravely and impregnably defended from its enemies. On the contrary, while plunderers, as has many times been revealed, were everywhere pillaging the property of the churches, some bishops, made sluggish and abject by fear of them, either gave way or lukewarmly and feebly passed a sentence of excommunication that was soon to be revoked; others (but it was not a task for bishops) filled their castles full of provisions and stocks of arms, Knights, and archers, and though they were supposed to be warding off the evildoers who were plundering the goods of the church showed themselves always more cruel and more merciless than those very evildoers in oppressing their neighbours and plundering their goods. Likewise the bishops, the bishops themselves, though I am ashamed to say it, not indeed all but a great many out of the whole number, girt with swords and wearing magnificent suits of armour, rode on horseback with the haughtiest destroyers of the country and took their share
of the spoil; knights captured through the fortune of war; or any rich men they met, they handed over to bonds and torments; and though they themselves were the source and cause of this monstrous crime and outrage they will want to ascribe such impiety not to themselves but to their knights. And to say nothing of the others at the moment, it is unfitting to censure all alike, report openly proclaimed that the Bishop of Winchester, Lincoln and Chester were more eagerly devoted than the others to pursuits so irreligious.

Henry Blois in his obvious justifications for his actions, sets his audience straight; that under these circumstances which prevailed in the Anarchy, it was justifiable, even brave, to be a Knight Bishop, to protect the Church. All this, while giving a ‘high-toned’ monologue of how he perceived the Church’s inherited status from Solomon’s temple.

By now, anyone reading the GS will have established it was written by a high ranked churchman. This could be the only deduction of any reader and it is certainly the deduction proclaimed by modern scholarship. Logically, looking back.... too many details connect Henry Blois to the authorship. So, in Henry’s mind he thinks at this stage, he should concern himself with dispelling the scent of authorship which is riddled throughout the GS. A definitive deflection is needed, especially as he has offered justification for a bishop knight’s actions.

So, he implicates himself as one of the worst offenders of what contemporaries openly accuse him of. The facts cannot be hidden. The rest of the apologia stands.... and it is at this point he inserts this criticism of himself to finally dissuade any curious inquirer to the authorship of the GS.

The GS now relates separate episodes which took place around the country concerning several individuals. Miles of Gloucester needs money, so he ravages the churches under his lordship, but the Bishop of Hereford along with the other clergy stand up to him by excommunicating him. They carried out no service or buried any bodies until the last farthing which had been plundered was restored. Henry Blois at last has the satisfaction of relating his arch enemies death in a hunting accident on Christmas eve; his death struck a good number of rich men with considerably greater fear of encroaching so precipitously on church property afterwards, and made the rest of the bishops in England bolder in their subsequent resistance to the abandoned recklessness of the rich.
We also know Henry Blois was involved as Gilbert Foliot described the same events from a different point of view in a letter to Henry.244

Geoffrey de Mandeville a man alike, remarkable for the ability of his shrewd mind and admired for the firmness of his unbending courage in adversity and his excellence in the art of war. If we did not know this was Henry Blois speaking it would seem very strange how a churchman author is so taken by architectural fortifications, a man’s courage and ability in war and of course his social standing. Anyway, Geoffrey de Mandeville appears to have risen too high and the Barons (read Henry) plotted against him. Certain persons appeared who openly accused Geoffrey of laying a treasonable plot against the King.

He was arrested at St Albans. This as I have related it came to pass at St Albans. We know from this statement that Henry Blois was here, but the Walden abbey chronicle only relates that Geoffrey was arrested by guards at the door. However, Henry a benefactor did donate a Jewel to St Albans and the Golden Book of St Albans has Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, holding a crozier and ring pictured on it. So the King brought Geoffrey to London under very close guard and made ready to hang him if he did not handover the tower and the castles he had built with wondrous toil and skill.

Stephen lets Geoffrey go once his objective is gained and Geoffrey instantly rebels again. At last, Geoffrey is put to death at great glee to our author, excommunicated and un-absolved and as guilty of sacrilege he could not be put in the earth. Henry loves a sticky end and to see God’s Judgement on his enemies.

Next, we hear of the Earl of Chester bringing the lands and possessions of the church under his lordship as though he enjoyed a bishop’s authority. The GS moves on to Robert of Gloucester and his sons prevailing over the southwest. William of Dover who had originally refused entry to Stephen just before his reign was supported by Robert of Gloucester as he set up at Cricklade and harassed the castle at Malmesbury and Oxford, building three castles nearby. Our author has a good handle on events throughout the country. Don’t forget our other author Geoffrey of Monmouth (if he were a real person) would now be in a situation of being harassed by his supposed patron at Oxford. Malmesbury was being besieged by the Earl, so the King sent forces to resupply them. Robert of Gloucester decides to
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gather a large army including the Welsh ‘savages’ and take on the King. Henry Blois, we can adduce by the detail remarked on in the GS is present throughout these events.

To hide his identity, Henry Blois, usually uses the term ‘Barons’ as in those that surround the King. He obviously as the narrator is present on-site: So the barons who had accompanied the King, hearing that such and numerous swarm of foes had gathered to menace them and alarmed at the untamed savagery of Welsh and likewise the Bristol irregulars whom the Earl of Gloucester, in a host of astonishing size was leading for their confusion, dropped wise counsel into the King’s ears, namely, that he should break up the siege for the time being and march his men to another place whither necessity called him; because to face an enemy in numbers beyond computation the force he had collected was quite inadequate, or because it was ill considered and extremely hazardous to expose a much smaller body of his Knights among such a mass of cut-throats on foot, especially as his own men were far from home and exhausted by the validity of the journey, whereas the enemy on the one hand, coming from their towns and castles in the neighbourhood, would join battle with all the greater resolution in as much as they were not worn out by a toilsome march and had only just left their own district. Therefore, they said, it was wise to give up the siege for the moment, lest the King should be overwhelmed by the fierce assault of his enemies and hampered by ill fortune should suffer losses among his men. The King took heed of this and acquiesced in the good advice of his Barons and hastily removing his whole force from that region he arrived unexpectedly at Winchcombe where Roger the new Earl of Hereford had built a Castle against his adherents.

This is Henry Blois as his brother’s military advisor relating all the strategic stratagems of a considered withdrawal just as he had done before. How is it that our bishop, if it is not Stephen’s brother, is so well informed of the counsel that the King accepts? How is our bishop even present, unless he is Henry Blois the Knight Bishop who is concerned, in the present company and able to relate these events from diary and memory? He obviously also rides with Stephen to Winchcombe and is able to give also an eyewitness account of events. We now should also fully accept Geoffrey of Monmouth’s seemingly irrational hate for the Welsh.

Finding that the Castle rose steeply on a very high mound and was surrounded by impregnable fortifications on every side, but that there was
only a small garrison for resistance (for they had fled on hearing of his sudden and unexpected arrival), he gave orders that the most vigorous men should arm themselves and make ready with all speed for the storming of the Castle, that some should advance shooting clouds of arrows, others should crawl up the mound, and everyone else should rush rapidly round the fortifications and throwing anything that came to hand. As the King and his men were striving with such spirit and energy to take the Castle, the besieged were quite unable to withstand the furious onslaught of so large a force, and at last they surrendered the Castle by agreement.

Henry and his brother Stephen are at Winchcombe and move to curb Hugh Bigod who was harassing the Kings forces in Gloucestershire where we hear the King remained in this region for some time.

The GS continues chapter 90 to 107 giving a running commentary on the turn of events as they unfold; of sieges and contretemps between Angevin and royalist forces from 1144 to 1147. We cannot cover all these episodes but our author is privy to court proceedings, how the King is faring and dealings with the enemy barons. Too much insightful detail is given with an overall coverage of events covering the period, that only someone close to the King and who had made notes of these events could recall them in such detail. We should assume that apart from any polemic or apologetic influence, the events recorded here are our most accurate chronicle for this period. Our author concerning himself with the plots of how barons try to undermine and entrap Stephen and it is assuredly Henry’s guile and advice that redeems him from many situations.

We then hear of the future King Henry being termed ‘the lawful heir’ and of his arrival in England with a small body of knights who travel to Cricklade and a castle held by the King which Henry calls ‘Burtana’. This is most probably a site in Purton just south of Cricklade with a manor house now presently on the site. The young Henry is repelled and his hired knights’ fall into sloth and idleness and with Henry Blois’ usual obfuscation of authorship, the GS relates: they abandoned the noble youth, their Lord and lawful heir to the Kingdom, with whom they had come, and at length all broke up and went away.

Now, a very strange event takes place in which Henry Blois (as he draws to an end of his GS account) tries to present his brother in a positive light: Overwhelmed, and with good cause, by the affliction of this disaster he (Duke Henry) appealed to his mother, but she herself was in want of money and
powerless to relieve his great need. He also appealed to his uncle, the Earl of Gloucester, but he, brooding like a miser over his moneybags, preferred to meet his own requirements only. As all in whom he trusted were failing him in his critical moment he finally, it was reported, sent envoys in secret to the King, as to a kinsman, and begged him in friendly and imploring terms to regard with pity the poverty that weighed upon him and hearken compassionately to one who was bound to him by close ties of relationship and well-disposed to him as far as it depended on himself. On receiving this message the King, who was ever full of pity and compassion, hearkened to the young man, and by sending money as had been asked, he gladly helped one whom, as his rival for the Kingship and utterly opposed to him, he should have deprived of any kind of aid. And so the King was blamed by some but acting not only unwisely, but even childishly, in giving money and so much support to one to whom he should have been implacably hostile, I think that what he did was more profound and more prudent, because the more kindly and humanely a man behaves to an enemy the feebler he makes him and the more he weakens him; and so he would not do evil to those who, in the Psalmist’s words, were rewarding evil unto him, but rather, as the apostle enjoins, so overcome evil for good that by good well bestowed upon his enemy he might heap coals of repentance and reformation upon his mind.

While posing in anonymity as a cleric, Henry Blois pretends he understands what must have been the final straw in Stephen’s naïve reaction to certain situations.... concerning a decision of Stephen to help the future Henry II financially. Henry Blois makes pretense of condoning such action as the clerical author of GS. Henry attempts to show Stephen in a Christian light, but the episode ties itself to events of similar noble actions such as releasing Matilda from Arundel and King David’s pardoning three times.

When Duke Henry arrived in England in 1147 at fourteen his uncle the duke of Gloucester had died or was near death. It is possible that Stephen gave him the money to return to Normandy and to pay off his entourage in good faith.

It does however, put a character stain on Henry Blois’ and Stephen’s arch enemy Robert duke of Gloucester even though he is long dead (when GS is written), and implies Henry Plantagenet as an unworthy inheritor. Maybe the message is that by Stephen’s good grace Henry II rules in England.... a
message the Bishop of Winchester, who had just had all his castles taken or
destroyed, would probably wish to convey.

In chapter 109 of the GS we hear of Eustace, Stephen’s son being
knighted. Henry Blois paid for Eustace’s pageant\(^{245}\) and pomp and you can
see these are the personalised words of accolade from a proud uncle: \emph{About
the same time the King, in the presence of the magnates, ceremonially girded
with the belt of knighthood his son Eustace, a young man of noble nature, and
after most bountifully endowing him with lands and possessions, and giving
him the special distinction of a most splendid retinue of Knights, advanced
him in rank to the dignity of Count. And Eustace himself, being, though
certainly young in years, settled character, eminent for soldiery qualities, and
notable for inborn merit, gained the highest honours of fame and glory at
every outset of his career as a knight. He showed himself extremely gentle and
courteous; everywhere he stretched forth a generous hand in cheerful
liberality; as he had a very great deal of his father’s disposition he could meet
men on a footing of equality or superiority as occasion required; in one place
he was entirely devoted to establishing pacts of peace, in another he
confronted his enemies sternly and invincibly. For on several occasions he
joined battle with the Earl of Chester and a number of others in such fashion,
and so shone with the magnificence of a glorious triumph, that what he did as
a mere stripling (for the down was not yet on his cheeks) won admiration
from men hardened to warfare.}

Eustace was only about 16 at the time he was knighted and it is a
personal observation of an uncle about the amount of facial hair he had at
the time. This is not the observation of a detached chronicler. The GS
continues straight on after praising Eustace to further exploits near
Gloucester and Woodchester as Stephen and Henry Blois try to eradicate
Angevin influence in the Gloucester area and southern Wales: \emph{And while the
son laboured most energetically to beat back the enemy in one part of the
King the father, in another, very often gained his accustomed guerdon of
success. The Castle called the ‘Castle of Wood’, whither enemies of all peace
and tranquillity had withdrawn and most severely ravaged all the
surrounding district, he took by storm, arriving unexpectedly, and by putting
in a garrison of his own men he obtained control of a very wide stretch of

\(^{245}\) John of Hexam, 27, ‘Upon Eustace his father conferred with dignity of knighthood with great pomp,
supported by the kindness and liberality of his brother Henry, Bishop of Winchester.
country. At this time also he by a splendid victory received the surrender of the Castle of Lidelea. This Castle belonged to the Bishop of Winchester, and he had it in that region to ward off various raids and plunderers and especially to protect the lands of his church, which he owned in the neighbourhood. But when one of the companions of Brien, a man very crafty and cunning in all deeds of evil, had taken it by a trick and stripped the bishop’s lands and possessions by grievous pillaging, the Bishop who was always wise in judgement and most vigourous in action, acted on his own behalf, gathered a mighty host, and with great energy built two castles in front of this one, and by garrisoning them adequately with knights and footmen reduced the besieged to the extremity of hunger. When the Earl of Gloucester, with three other earls and his whole army in countless numbers, had planned to bring in supplies of food for them and destroy the bishops Castles, the King, on being summoned by the Bishop, arrived suddenly, put the Earl and all his men to flight in panic, and when the Castle was surrendered to him, delivered it over to the Bishop.

Once Woodchester was secured by Stephen it seems Henry tried to retrieve his own castles in the region which were probably inherited/usurped after Roger of Salisbury’s demise. I would suggest that Lidelea is Kidwelly\textsuperscript{246} castle and there has been a scribal error of ‘L’ for ‘K’ in the original manuscript from which the present text is derived. The castle was held by Roger until his death, but tradition does not recount to whom it passed after his death. Henry took this opportunity to take back his castle from Brien Fitz Count who pillaged the region. Brien’s base would have been his castle as he held the Barony of Abergavenny. It is possible Henry did usurp or was given this castle by Stephen or even as stated he had other castles in the region to protect church lands in ‘that region’. Kidwelly is only about 10 miles from Gower mentioned at the beginning of the GS where I believe Henry was in 1136. It is possible more lands in Southern Wales were owned by Glastonbury abbey than is recorded (possibly donated recently by King Henry Ist) and that is Henry’s interest in ‘that region’. Certainly the Bishopric of Winchester owned much land in Wales. Henry Blois knows this region well as he describes the area as Linligwan in HRB. As can be seen throughout HRB, known places and people are given slightly different spellings to either affect ignorance or antiquity. Llanglydwen is what he

\textsuperscript{246}Brut y Tywysogion has Cydwelli ravaged in 1149 by Cadell son of Gruffudd.
means and it is only 15 miles inland from Kidwelly castle and Llansteffan Castle where the tide enters across the sands to look like a lake....there in the parts of Wales nigh the Severn, which the men of that country do call Linligwan, whereinto when the sea floweth it is received as into a whirlpit or swallow, in such wise as that the lake...247

The Castle of Lidelea in GS is Kidwelly and it is probably not by accident that Llansteffan Castle is named after Stephen. Llansteffan castle, Ystrad Meurug, the castle of Humphrey and the castle of Carmarthen were all burnt by Gruffudd in 1136.248 It was at this time while accompanying his brother or more probably representing Stephen (before the Anarchy) on excursions into Wales, when Henry Blois received his knowledge of the landscape of Southern Wales. Immediately Stephen gained the crown, the Welsh rebelled with an excursion into Norman held territory. They saw it as an opportunity to rid themselves of their Norman overlords since the ‘foreigners’ were at odds with each other due to Stephen having taken the crown instead of the Angevin Empress.

Henry’s description of Wales in GS starts at this date in the chronological ordering of GS.... and to my mind shows Henry is there on his brother’s account putting down Welsh rebellion with knights from Glastonbury and Winchester. Unfortunately much of the text in GS is missing which would have shown us that Henry’s knowledge of Wales was derived from this visit. This was how Henry was able to construct his Arthurian epic.... understanding the topography of Wales while adding the chivalric Arthur content onto an already written skeletal pseudo-history while in Normandy in 1137 and early part of 1138.

In William of Malmesbury’s ‘Antiquities’ it states abbot Herluin acquired land in Wales worth 10 pounds. Tatlock249 implies that Glastonbury had a grip over the Diocese of Llandaff prior to the monastic invasion of Southern Wales and perhaps Glastonbury lands were more extensive than is recorded. Tatlock does concede that ‘it would be a plausible guess that the propogandistic activities of both William and Caradoc were inspired in the

247 HRB IX, vii.
248 Brut y Tywysoignon

249 Caradoc of Llancarfan J. S. P. Tatlock Speculum Vol. 13, No. 2 (Apr., 1938), pp. 139-152
abbacy of that able prelate’ (referring to Henry Blois).... but in no way suspects him as the impersonator of Caradoc in authoring the *Life of Gildas*.

Tatlock, even more incredulously proposes that Caradoc contributed to the DA while at Glastonbury; he too believing the contemporeinity of Caradoc when Caradoc d.1129 as I will show shortly. But it is Ferdinand Lot who recognizes that it is the *Life of Gildas* which is the first component of the *Officine de Faux*. The DA, which Henry Blois certainly interpolated tells us that the island of Glastonbury was populated by one of twelve brothers.... a certain Glasteing who found his sow suckling ‘old church apples’ there. Apart from the sow having 8 feet, the relevance for the apples is to link *Pomorum* from *Insula Pomorum* of VM fame with Somerset and then link Glastonbury with Avalon. Interestingly the twelve brothers had several territories in Wales, one of which was Gower and the other Kidwelly. This is obviously not by coincidence!

While on the subject of Kidwelly.... the first wife of *Gruffud ap Rhys*, prince of Deheubarth and one of the leaders of the revolt against Norman rule, was said to have entered into combat along with her husband’s army which she had raised and is known to have been killed at Kidwelly. Her name was Gwenllian and it just so happens that ‘Geoffrey’ invented a Briton queen called Gwendoloena to lead the troops in HRB. Henry with a knights’ service from both Glastonbury and Winchester finds himself in southern Wales around Kidwelly and Gower (both mentioned in DA in the section which I show to have been interpolated by Henry Blois), where he comes into contact with *Gwenllian ferch Gruffydd*, who later, is the inspiration for the name of Arthur’s wife Guinevere. All of this adds to the supposition that *Lidelea* is Kidwelly and it was a castle which belonged to the Bishop of Winchester, who was also abbot of Glastonbury.... the same person who impersonated Caradoc and later interpolated DA to concur with his *Insula Pomorum* in VM and Avalon of HRB.

Anyway, to continue with the GS; Henry ‘summoned’ the King, which indicates after the recent events where they fought side by side they have obviously patched up their relationship. This rapprochement is indeed historical. Amazingly Robert of Gloucester was Henry and Stephen’s staunchest opponent since 1138, yet Henry does not record how Robert dies. We know it must have been quick because Henry Blois in his usual dubious fashion writes in the GS: *he came suddenly to his end and died at last in his hometown of Bristol without due profit from repentance, they say*. Yet Henry
while constructing the *Vita Merlini* and referring to Robert of Gloucester’s death: ‘*but shall die beneath the weapon of a King*’, seems to know more about the subject than ‘*they say*’. I would suggest that Henry had something specific in mind when he referred to the ‘weapon of the King’ in the prophecy in VM.

Next in GS, we hear of *Henry de Tracy* who Henry Blois has much respect for as he never changed allegiance from Stephen, even though at times Robert of Gloucester’s power was throughout the southwest. The next episode is where Earl Patrick takes one of Henry’s Castles: *About the same time Earl Patrick’s men seized by stealth the Castle called Downton, which belonged by right to Winchester Cathedral, a castle most plentifully stocked with provisions and accurately equipped for defence, and putting plunderers in it and men who laid hands on the property of others, by grievous ravages they stripped bare the whole district round about, raging in one place with pillage and violence, in another with fire and sword, everywhere with the utmost savagery against all. So the Bishop boldly taking up the weapons of the church’s warfare, smote those brutal plunderers of his possessions with the adamantine next sword of excommunication; and when thereby they were in no wise turned from the evil they had begun, but rather were confirmed in it and kept on doing still worse, he sent for his nephew Henry (whom we have since seen Bishop of Durham), opened his treasury for him and gave him most urgent instructions to make every effort to suppress them, since he himself was summoned to Rome. Henry for his part, calling to his aid a countless host, of Knights valorously checked his opponents, and by fortifying a Castle near to them and reducing the besieged to the extremity of hunger, at last compelled them to surrender the Castle.*

Henry’s Nephew is purposely and wrongly named to deflect suspicion of authorship. How does our author remember that it was the Bishop’s nephew who held his uncles position and the circumstance pertains to the bishop being called to Rome. Any way, it was *Hugh de Puiset*, Henry’s Nephew, who became Bishop of Durham. Is it not strange that the only mistake found in the text so far is the name of the author’s nephew? Any scholar would be misled into thinking the error excluded Henry’s authorship. John of Hexam confirms it was Hugh leading a force of knights in defence of the bishop of Winchester’s possessions.

The GS moves on to Matilda’s son Henry who, taking advice to be knighted, turns to his uncle David, King of Scotland, who duly bestows the
honour on Henry Plantagenet. He then joins with his uncle and raises York, but Stephen being forewarned, arrived there to disperse their army. Davis and Potter wrongly ascribe this as a ‘fourth flight’. What Henry Blois in the *Vita Merlini* and the GS is most annoyed about is that Stephen has met with David and on three occasions and made a deal with a person who does not keep his word. If it had been up to Henry Blois he would have dealt with David after the first deal was broken, not continue to let him go. In the *Vita Merlini*, Henry Blois is piqued by Stephen’s actions after the rout at Winchester i.e. letting David bribe himself out of the third situation where Stephen could have put an end to his resistance.

Henry has no respect for King David and knows that King David was only at Winchester because he had been promised Huntingdon, Northumbria and Cumberland in exchange for his support of Matilda. To mention this in the GS and to write a derogatory prophecy concerning him is a witness of Henry’s dislike for the man and shows the author of VM and GS both have the same pique at Stephen’s stupidity.

Davis and Potter for some reason think it relevant to comment that Earl Patrick being recognised as Earl must date the text after the treaty of Westminster in 1153. The fact that Hugh de Puiset became bishop of Durham in that year should be enough to establish that fact. Obviously, the book’s end goes to Stephen’s death in October 1154 and should already establish the text was written after that date. It is a weak notion that a chronicler could have followed and been privy to such in-depth insightful knowledge continuously over the 19 years that Davis and Potter would think the account written in contemporaneity.

The GS with all its detail could only be written by someone interested in the continual ebb and flow of the Anarchy, who was at times privy to information on both Royalist and Angevin courts, who was deeply interested in architecture and military strategy and who had the utmost regard for the wisdom of the bishop of Winchester and who knew of his movements and that of his brother and Eustace. The problem with modern scholars is that they are credulous of every line and do not read between them. Eradicate the obvious obfuscation of authorship by third party referrals and other devices…. and logically there is only one person who could be the author of GS.

Anyway, as the future King Henry II comes south toward Hereford, the King instructs Eustace to ambush him, but Matilda’s son evades him and
gets to Bristol. It is clear that all our author’s details of the movements are from family ties and it is doubtful whether any chronicler could sustain such personalised detail page after page unless he were the Bishop of Winchester. How does our author know Eustace went to Oxford after following Duke Henry to Bristol and then continued raids in Gloucestershire? How does our author know Stephen went up to York next to put down hostilities and returned to London with great treasure? How does he know of the Kings personal deliberations?

After acquiring much treasure in those regions he went back with great glory to London, and there, when some days had passed, he deliberated on the most effective means of shattering his opponents and the easiest way of checking the continual disorder that they fomented in the Kingdom. Different people gave advice of different sorts, but at last it seemed to him sound and judicious to attack the enemy everywhere, plunder and destroy all that was in their possession, set fire the crops and every other means of supporting human life, and let nothing remain anywhere, that under this duress reduced to the extremity of want, they might at last be compelled to yield and surrender.

Again our author elucidates the military advantages gained and lost throughout the whole country, recounting not only Eustace’s escapades, but also those of the King. Anyway, at chapter 116, the future King Henry (now termed ‘the lawful heir’) with annoying regularity, so that all readers are duped into thinking the author’s loyalties lie on his side…. takes himself off to Normandy to get assistance from his father where the Barons of Normandy, made submission to him with gladness and devotion as their lord and the lawful heir, and when after preparations, on very great scale, he had resolved to return to England to overthrow King Stephen, his father, the count of Anjou, came to his last days and made him the chief inheritor of all possessed.

Throughout the GS, Henry has no other way of seeing things but that events, whether good or bad, are directed by God and the lot of mankind may be either favoured or punished (usually for a recognisable sin). Therefore, we see Henry remarking on the fate of an arch-enemy accepting his good fortune as part of ordinary life: And though what had happened was in one regard a matter for grief and sorrow, above all because he had lost his father, yet it is astonishing how such great good fortune came to him so
suddenly in a moment that within a short time, without expecting it, he was called Duke of Normandy and count of Anjou.

The King of France thinking that his daughters were to inherit Aquitaine was annoyed that Eleanor of Aquitaine, had divorced Louis and married Matilda’s son Henry. So, Louis King of France takes up for Eustace against Duke Henry and there is severe struggle in Normandy. Our author is not only covering events throughout Britain, but also is informed and concerned for Eustace in Normandy.

We return in GS back to Stephen at Wallingford with the Londoners compelling the retreat of the Earl of Hereford. Here, our author knows of a duplicitous scheme of the Earl of Hereford. How, one must ask, is our author able to relay blow by blow events since 1135 in such chronological, detail, yet purposely avoiding dates? It can only be done with this amount of supporting detail by a diarist, who is personally more often than not on scene.... and when not present, is supplied with sufficient detail to fill in the gaps. We have witnessed how our author can supply the most intricate eyewitness detail, can skip the most important events because they don’t fit with his apologia and also pull together an overview of events should he have been in Rome. He then just takes up his next intricate episode and how it affects Henry Blois’ family.

The GS continues as Stephen sieges Worcester and Duke Henry lands in England. This leaves his brother to contend with the King of France and Eustace in Normandy. Then Duke Henry gains Malmesbury by the duplicity of the Earl of Hereford. After a couple more chapters of closely following the political intrigues of the various Barons and their changes of allegiance, and covering which castle was now under whose command, we arrive at Wallingford with the potential showdown that is to conclude the Anarchy. Henry Blois, we know is present, but as we can see by the descriptions, it is the same as many of the other eye witness accounts in GS because of Henry’s interested on-site details in strategic manoeuvres: when, behold, the Kings men, who on hearing of the Duke’s arrival had withdrawn to places where they could not be seen, though a few kept up a show of resistance in the outer part of the castle, burst out in small parties from different hiding places and made a gallant charge on those who had already climbed the mound and entered the outer part of the Castle....

Like so many other situations in the GS where we know Henry historically is present, the strategic events are described in more detail. As
Henry bemoans the native Britain’s constantly warring amongst themselves in the HRB; foreseeing the outcome of the two armies meeting as a potential needless total devastation, he finally advises Stephen to seek peace: And as the two armies, in all their warlike array, stood close to each other, with only a river between them, it was terrible and very dreadful to see so many thousands of armed men eager to join battle with drawn swords, determined, to the general prejudice of the Kingdom to kill their own relatives and kin. Wherefore the leading men of each army and those of deeper judgement were greatly grieved and shrank, on both sides, from a conflict that was not merely between fellow countrymen but meant the desolation of the whole Kingdom...

The terms of peace were obviously agreed at Wallingford where arms were laid down. But it is strange how the account is presented in the GS in that the peace is all down to Henry Blois where Stephen yielded to the advice of the Bishop of Winchester, seemingly at a time after the armies had left Wallingford and the Barons were still encouraging him to continue the struggle against Henry Plantagenet. I think the GS presents the account in this way to show that peace was eventually brought about by the peacemaker Henry Blois. Henry vainly describes himself and his importance in determining historical events in a self-written epitaph on the Meusan plates: lest England groan for it, since on him it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.

The reader should not forget also…. the face off at Wallingford is mystically referred to by Merlin as the ‘ford of the staff’ in the prophecies where both bishops negotiate the truce.

Henry of Huntingdon has captured the real portrayal of events at Wallingford: Meanwhile, Archbishop Theobald was deeply concerned in discussions with the King on the subject of making a peace treaty with the Duke. He had frequent conversations with the King in person, and with the Duke through intermediaries. He had as his helper Henry, Bishop of Winchester, who earlier had thrown the realm into grievous disorder, delivering the crown of the Kingdom to his brother Stephen, but now, seeing everything destroyed by robbery, fire, and slaughter, he was moved to repentance, and worked towards the ending of such evils through concord between the Princes.

The GS ends with Eustace’s annoyance at the peace accord which inevitably means that he will not inherit the Kingdom and his suspicious death shortly afterward which fortuitously meant a long lasting peace. The
last passage ends with the balanced chronicler’s joy in the beginning of a new era: *But at once he yielded to the advice of the Bishop of Winchester, who made himself a mediator between the Duke and the King for the establishment of peace, and consented to the Duke’s inheriting England after his death provided he himself, as long as he lived, retain the Majesty of the King’s lofty position. So it was arranged and firmly settled that arms should be finally laid down and peace restored everywhere in the Kingdom, the new castles demolished, the disinherited restored to their own, the laws and enactments made binding on all according to the ancient fashion. The Duke also willingly and gladly agreed to all that the clergy and barons had wisely arranged, and when at length he had destroyed very many castles that harmed the Kingdom, after doing homage to the King with all his followers, withdrew to Normandy. But after a very short time he returned to England with more happiness and glory, because the King, after he had reduced England to peace and taken the whole Kingdom into his hand, caught a slight fever and departed this life, and the Duke, returning gloriously to England, was crowned for sovereignty with all honour and the applause of all.*

The GS tries to infer that it was Henry Blois the peacemaker who brought the sides together at Wallingford, but at the death of Eustace on 17 August 1153 and the death of the King’s allies, the Earls of Northampton and Chester, (even if there was prevarication about submission before this time), the King eventually signed the Treaty of Winchester on the 6th of November 1153. The Treaty took into account a lengthy statement on the inheritance of William, Stephen’s younger son since Eustace had died suspiciously on 17 August 1153. Henry of Huntingdon does relate that Duke Henry was a little dissatisfied that certain castles were not being destroyed as arranged.

I have tried to show, by picking certain extracts from the GS, that the book could only reasonably have been written by Henry Blois. Although it matters little in the broader expanse of this expose, it does demonstrate the guile involved in secreting his authorship. Once we can understand the cleverness of Henry Blois as an established anonymous author, we may then attempt to show by what same craft he managed to fool all his contemporary readers into thinking it was a man called Geoffrey of Monmouth who wrote the History of the Kings of Britain and the prophecies of Merlin. I have demonstrated some crossovers between the *Vita Merlini* and the GS and how these points directly relate to Henry.
Since we have covered the Treaty of Winchester which takes into account Stephen’s son’s inheritance, obviously of great import for both Stephen and Henry Blois, I would posit by the terms referred to within it, one can assume it was drawn up at Winchester by Henry Blois himself. The treaty would have been kept at Winchester probably in the public records at the treasury. As well as Archbishop Theobald’s signature on the treaty is that of Henry Blois, Bishop of Winchester. Amongst other bishops, the last ‘inserted’ signature on the treaty is that of a certain Gaufriedus episcopus sancti Asaphi. I presume to define the difference…. that the Treaty of Wallingford, also known as the Treaty of Winchester, was a precursor to the finalized form of the treaty of Westminster after Eustace had died:

The Treaty of Westminster, 1153

Stephen, King of the English to the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, justices, sheriffs, barons and all his faithful subjects of England, greeting.

Know that I, King Stephen, have established Henry duke of Normandy as my successor in the Kingdom and as my heir by hereditary right, and that I have granted and confirmed to him and to his heirs the Kingdom of England. The duke, on account of this honour, grant and confirmation to him by me, had performed homage to me and has given me surety by oath, that he will be faithful to me and maintain my life and my honour to the best of his ability, according to the agreements discussed between us, which are contained in this charter. I have also given an oath of surety to the duke, that I shall keep his life and his honour to the best of my ability, and that I shall maintain him as my son and heir in everything possible and guard him as far as I can against all men.

Moreover my son William has done liege homage and given surety to the duke of Normandy. The duke has conceded to my son William, to hold of him. All the lands which I held before I obtained the Kingdom of England, in England, in Normandy, or in other places, and also whatever he has received with his daughter or the earl Warenne, in England, in Normandy, and whatever pertains to these honours. The duke gives full seisin to my son William and his men, who are of the honour of Warenne, of all lands, towns, boroughs and renders pertaining to that honour which he now has in his hands, and specifically the castles of Belencombe and Mortemer. However Reginald de Warenne many have custody of the said castles if he wishes, and give the duke hostage for them; if he does not wish to do this, others of the
liege men of the earl Warenne chosen by the duke shall have custody of them, giving hostages and guarantees of safe custody. The duke will return other castles pertaining to the county of Mortain to him [my son William] at my request when he is able to do so, receiving guarantees of safe custody and hostages. All the hostages will be returned to my son when the duke has the Kingdom of England. Also the duke has conceded to my son William the increment which I gave him, namely the castle and town of Norwich with 700 pounds worth of land, the render of Norwich being reckoned within the said 700 pounds, and the whole shire of Norfolk, excepting the lands belonging to churches bishops, Abbots and earls, and especially excepting eh third penny that makes High Bigod an earl, but saving and reserving royal justice in all things.

Also, the better to secure my gratitude and affection, the duke has given and conceded to him [my son William] whatever Richer de l’Aigle had in the honour of Pevensey, as well as the castle and town of Pevensey, and the service of Faramus, excepting the castle and town of Dover and what pertains to the honour of Dover.

The duke has confirmed the church of Faversham in all that pertains to it, and will, by the counsel of the holy church, and by my counsel, confirm other grants or restorations made by me to other churches.

In return for the honour I have done their lord, the earls and barons of the duke which have never been my men have done homage and sworn an oath to me, saving the agreements made between the duke and myself. The others, who have dome homage to me previously, have sworn fealty to me as their lord. And if the duke breaks his promises, they will cease entirely to serve him, until he puts right his errors. My son also, by the counsel of the holy church, will do likewise if the duke withdraws from these agreements.

My earls and barons have done liege homage to the duke, saving their fealty to me as long as I live and hold the Kingdom, and by a similar rule, they will entirely cease from serving me if I break my promises, until I rectify my errors. The citizens of the cities and the men of the castles which I have in my demesne by my order performed homage and have given surety to the duke, saving their fealty to me as long as I live and hold to the Kingdom. Those who have custody of the castle of Wallingford have done homage to me and have given me hostages for their fealty to me. By the counsel of the holy church I have given surety to the duke for my castles and strongholds so that on my death he may not incur any loss or damage to the Kingdom because of this.
the counsel of the holy church the Tower of London and the motte of Windsor have been given to Richard de Lacy to keep. But Richard has sworn in the hand of the Archbishop that after my death he will hand over these castles to the duke, and has given his son as hostage.

In the same way, by the counsel of the holy church, Roger de Bussy keeps the motte of Oxford and Jordan de Bussy the castle of Lincoln; they are the duke’s liege men, and have sworn and given hostages in the archbishop’s hand that on my death they will hand over the castles to the duke without any hindrance. The bishop of Winchester has pledged himself in the hand of the archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of the bishops, that on my death he will hand over to the duke the castle of Winchester and the stronghold of Southampton. If any of those who keep my strongholds prove contumacious or rebellious concerning castles which belong to the crown by common counsel the duke and I will constrain him until he is compelled to make amends to the satisfaction of both of us.

The archbishops, bishops and abbots of the Kingdom of England have at my command sworn an oath of fealty to the duke. Those made bishops or abbots henceforth in the Kingdom of England shall do the same. The archbishops and bishops on both sides have undertaken that if either of us departs from these agreements, they will visit him with ecclesiastical justice until he amends his errors and returns to his observance of the aforesaid compact. The duke’s mother, his wife, his brother and all his men whom he can involve in this have likewise given surety.

I shall act in the affairs of the Kingdom with the duke’s advice. I myself shall exercise royal justice in the whole Kingdom of England, both in the duke’s part and my own.
Chapter 6

Henry Blois as Geoffrey of Monmouth

As we have covered, the initial pseudo-history destined for Matilda which was the pre-cursor of the Primary Historia was finished whilst Henry Blois was in Normandy. There is no record as to where he spent nearly a year in Normandy but it would be no surprise if some time was spent at the abbey of Bec. The initial pseudo-history underwent a drastic change where Arthuriarna was added. Since Henry Blois had decided to throw caution to the wind and write under a nom de plume, there were probably many more embellishments added to the initial pseudo-history.

Modern scholars seem to think today’s Vulgate HRB is identical to what I have termed the Primary Historia found at Bec. The Primary Historia precedes what scholarship has termed the First Variant. In effect scholars need to understand that the First Variant is not a variant which followed the Vulgate version but in fact preceded it and was first published in 1144. The first time Primary Historia is referred to was when Henry of
Huntingdon accompanied the newly elected Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury on his way to Rome to collect his Pallium after being consecrated on January 8th 1139. William of Malmesbury ‘as far as he can remember’, recalls Henry Blois was appointed Legate on March 1st. If Theobald left in late January with Henry Huntingdon, it would take him the whole of February at least to get to Rome. It is known that Henry Blois was piqued at being overlooked for the position of archbishop.

What Huntingdon saw was not the Leiden manuscript but a first edition Primary Historia which excluded Merlin and his prophecies. Since Theobald of Bec had previously been the Abbot at Bec, shortly before his election, his reason for stopping over, on his way to Rome was to tide over, breaking his journey and to visit fellow brothers. It is here that Henry of Huntingdon, a canon of Lincoln and chronicler, one of Theobald’s entourage, receives and reads with astonishment, the book written by a certain Galfridus Artur, the first rendition of the name of Henry Blois’ phantom persona.

According to scholars like Crick, we are to believe that Gaufridus Artur as a ‘supposed’ Welshman from Monmouth, had a readership in Normandy in 1138. The book was as yet un-noticed by any contemporary in Britain. Huntingdon is an archdeacon with Alexander of Lincoln as patron and Huntingdon first published his Historia Anglorum, c.1129. Theobald, who had been abbot of Bec only a few months previously, has Huntingdon accompanying him as part of his suite. More strange is that Henry of Huntingdon’s patron, Bishop Alexander, who supposedly commissioned the prophecies of Merlin to be translated by ‘Geoffrey’, had not informed Henry of Huntingdon of either the prophesies or the HRB in which his name had supposedly appeared as a dedicatee. By Huntingdon’s own account he

---

250 Julia Crick has observed Henry of Huntingdon’s silence has been interpreted as incredulity. However, it does not explain why the persona of Merlin is thus expunged from EAW. The Primary Historia never had any mention of Merlin or his prophecies. The reason is simply because Henry Blois had not thought of the prophecies in 1138. Merlin and his prophecies were a later development. Crick’s belief that ‘Henry of Huntingdon failed to report the prophecies at all in the letter which he wrote to the Breton Warin’, I think is entirely erroneous…. implying it was a conscious decision by Huntingdon. It is evident the Primary Historia found at Bec significantly differed from the First Variant and Vulgate in storyline, even though we only have Huntingdon’s précis from which to divine the differences..

251 Prof. O.J. Padel understands this discrepancy: *Henry and Geoffrey lived within the same diocese in England, and they moved in the same circles; they even addressed the same person, Alexander Bishop of Lincoln (1123–48), in their respective works…. How, then, could Henry have been ignorant that Geoffrey was at work on his History, or (once it was completed) how could he not have heard of it before being shown a copy at Bec? This problem has been raised, though not solved…. It simply will not be solved until the scholars realise the*
was ‘amazed’ to find such an account of insular history as Huntingdon too
was a historian himself and the majority of the content he had never come
across before.

Julia Crick in her thesis on *dissemination and reception* of Geoffrey’s
HRB, like all previous Galfridian scholarship, assumes the *a priori*
acceptance that Geoffrey of Monmouth was a real person. It can only lead to
unfounded conclusions. Many commentators have based their deductions
on the various dedications found in HRB manuscripts and the presumption
that Geoffrey of Monmouth was Welsh. A new perspective needs to be
adopted.

To do this I have just shown the reader, that where the GS is concerned
the author is Henry Blois. The authorship is plainly to hide the deception of
presenting a glossed polemic of Henry’s place in history, an *apologia* for his
actions in the Anarchy and as a memorial for his brother written probably
on his return to England c.1158. I have also shown that the author of the VM
and its prophecies have a high incidence of similar attitude and material in
common with Henry Blois. Certain episodes parallel to events, where we
know from the GS, Henry was either heavily involved in, or at which he was
present. Contemporary historians even convey Henry Blois’ wily nature.

If there was one person who was in a position to carry out such an
authorial fraud creating the false persona of Geoffrey of Monmouth it
would be the most powerful man in Britain who ranks ‘the author before
everything’. There are two principles which need to be established at the
outset so that the pieces of the puzzle fall into place and we can work
toward a comprehensive solution to the Matter of Britain.

Firstly, there is no Geoffrey of Monmouth and secondly the Prophecies of
Merlin in HRB and their offshoots, such as those found in the VM and John
of Cornwall’s rendition, all derive from Henry Blois.

Tatlock understands that there is virtually not one episode in the HRB
that is not traceable or derived from some other source. The prophecies
were constructed in a different manner and for a specific purpose. They
substantiate the specious historicity found in the HRB by a method of
confirmation which is essentially that same fallacious history written
backwards. Their intent is to astound the audience by predictions that seem
dedications were written into Vulgate HRB after the dedicatees death. It was a device to back date the apparent
time HRB was first published to obscure authorship and lend credence to the prophecies.
accurate…. many of which are conveniently verifiable as they have come to fruition in the lifetime of those reading the prophecies; others seeming to have come true by the historical account found in HRB. As long as we know the author of HRB, we know the author of all the prophecies.

It is a coincidence that the first charter that ‘Galfrido Artur’ signs, relates to 1129, the same year, Henry Blois becomes Bishop of Winchester. The foundation charter of Oseney Abbey is a copy of the original foundation charter signed in 1129 and of the six or seven subsequent charters with the Galfridian name affixed which are found in cartularies, all could have had the name added to complete the façade of a fake persona.

These were all original charters kept at Oxford and Henry Blois, who we know was at Oxford on several occasions, added the Galfridus signatures to the various charters at the earliest in 1153 after Wallingford or just after the treaty of Winchester had been signed; or at the latest in 1158 when he returned from Clugny.

The HRB with the updated seditious prophecies might have been the catalyst to secure and hide a trail back to Henry and so ‘Geoffrey’ may even have been consigned to death retrospectively. The differentiated signatures were fraudulently applied in one sitting in a room where the charters were kept. What exactly Galfridus’ name contributes to the charters by comparison with the other traceable and relevant witnesses, in part adds to the reasoning in deducing that the charters are genuine.... but his name is irrelevant.

Given the content of the Primary Historia, it would certainly lead to ridicule if the Trojan history and Arthurian saga were found to be an invention of the Bishop of Winchester. The tongue in cheek name of Galfridi Arturi was hazarded upon as a pen name in the copy of HRB left at Bec. This is the name Huntingdon found attached to the copy at Bec. Geoffrey of Monmouth was the later appellation for the final Vulgate HRB which included the prophecies. The inspiration for his name GOM came from the signature of Ralph of Monmouth found on the same charters at Oxford he was intent on altering. We also see at a later date he even decides to include Walter as a patsy a signatory also to some of the charters.

What we do know is that in January 1139 a manuscript was seen at Bec, a precursor to Crick’s 76&77. The Leiden manuscript from Bec Abbey is a
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final Vulgate version which superseded the *Galfridus Arthur* version now lost (which I have termed the *Primary Historia*) ... most probably discarded as the Vulgate version was circulated by Henry Blois. Crick’s version purportedly written by Geoffrey or *Gaufri di Monimutensis* with a dedication to *Rodbertum comitem Claudiocestrie* differs from the name given by Henry of Huntingdon as *Galfridi Arturi*. Most commentators assume it was ‘Geoffrey’s’ fame and the inclusion of the heroic Arthur which warranted Huntingdon’s reference to *Galfridus Arthur*.

This assumption is wrong because ‘Geoffrey had no fame in 1139 and Huntingdon used the name because it was the author’s signed name in the *Primary Historia*.‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ as an appellation had not been considered as an authorial title until the later Vulgate HRB was published. As I have stated, *Galfridi Arturi* became Geoffrey of Monmouth.... inspired by Henry signing his name next to a Ralph of Monmouth. I want to make this clear; there was no Geoffrey of Monmouth before 1154. Huntingdon did not mention Walter the archdeacon or any dedication, and he did not know of the charters at Oxford or of an existing *Galfridus Arthur* with any reference to locate him. Crick’s 76 is entirely different from Huntingdon’s copy which he refers to in his letter to Warin (EAW).

Henry Blois presented known history in reverse as prophecy and he has done something similar in the publication of the HRB in presenting it as a book relevant to the dedicatees. Let me be clear about this also. The dedicatees were dead before the Vulgate version which includes their names was published. Henry Blois has also created Geoffrey as the bishop of Asaph, an author of rank. The bishop of Asaph was probably consigned to death before the Vulgate HRB (as we know it today) was published. This I believe was done for no other reason than to ensure posterity and his readers visualised a real credible person who had the social and moral standing of a bishop. A bishop would not invent a fallacious history nor could it be conceivable that a consecrated and attested bishop could be a hoaxer. There may indeed be another reason and this may be that the author of the prophecies and HRB is too obviously written by someone with a keen interest in the church.

Henry Blois by the invention of the colophon and its seeming effect of back-dating the Vulgate version to a time of contemporaneity with Caradog, Malmesbury and Huntingdon, is obviously responding to a pressure exerted by curiosity to find the author. If Henry could plant the paperwork to hoax
posterity, then no-one would ever know that the bishopric of Asaph did not exist at that time. Even if the bishopric did exist, no Anglo Norman could get near the place with the Welsh rebellion taking place.

In that part of Henry of Huntingdon’s work which covers the period up to the death of Henry Ist, Huntingdon tells us that in Wales at that time there were only three bishoprics, Bangor, Glamorgan and St David’s. There was no mention of Asaph or ‘Geoffrey’s’ predecessor, the supposed Gilbert. It is suspicious that both Gilbert and ‘Geoffrey’ were both consecrated in Lambeth by Archbishop Theobald, yet there is not one iota of a record of either of their deeds at Asaph. It is not until Gervaise records c.1188 that ‘Geoffrey’ was bishop of Asaph, that there actually was a bishopric.

Robert of Torigni’s attestation regarding Geoffrey of Monmouth becoming bishop was informed by Henry Blois himself on a visit to Mont St Michel in 1155 or on an earlier trip over to the continent. William Lloyd who was Dean of Bangor became Bishop of Asaph from 1680 to 1692. He was aware of Gervaise’s record but he is suspicious also of Geoffrey’s predecessor Gilbert: I conclude, that there was no bishop there at the time when our Jeffrey writ his history. It is very possible that so ignorant a ...... as he was, might not know there ever had been a Bishop of that See. And I dare say he was no prophet, though I believe as Nubrigensis (Newburgh) did, that he made those prophecies himself, which he fathered upon Merlin.

Modern scholarship is also aware that ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB is not a correct rendition of British history. It is obvious that Merlin’s prophecies are comprised in part of events concerning the Anarchy, and some prophecies are constituted retrospectively to concur with an already established bogus history mixed with known history found in HRB partially sourced from British annals. So, why does anyone give credence to the existence of Geoffrey when all is an apparent fraud?

Bishop Lloyd is confused as he believes ‘Geoffrey’ wrote the Vulgate HRB in 1138 and has not considered the dedications being a device which ‘backdated’ the Vulgate HRB. Retrospective dedication gives the appearance that HRB was written while the dedicatees were alive. Bishop Lloyd, much like modern scholars has not considered the power that the real author of HRB wielded in setting up a bishopric to corroborate Geoffrey’s phantom’s existence.

Bishop Lloyd is amazed at how ‘Geoffrey’ could follow a bogus Gilbert into the position of Bishop of Asaph: Yet I believe he could not foresee that
there would be a bishop of St Asaph within five years after, much less that he should be Bishop of that see within twelve years after the writing of his History.

Supposedly, Geoffrey became bishop elect of St Asaph and was ordained a priest at Westminster in mid-February 1152 and a week later in Lambeth he was consecrated by Archbishop Theobald, but there is no record of him ever visiting St Asaph. The accepted reason for there being no record of Geoffrey at his bishopric is that the Welsh rebellion prevented his arrival. I would posit that this is precisely the reason that Henry Blois chose such a venue.

Henry Blois had presented Geoffrey’s persona as being Welsh. Asaph was positioned in the rebellious North of Wales and none reading the Vulgate HRB first published in 1155 were going to care about the author if he was already dead. Like most, they assumed by the persons mentioned in the dedications that the book had been around for some time. However, Gilbert253 some time before 24th March 1152, and Geoffrey of Monmouth254 are both recorded as being consecrated in Lambeth which is suspicious in itself and nothing is known about either at Asaph. In Gilbert’s time it was still called the church of Llanelwy, after the Elwy River and thus it is very suspect that Geoffrey was the first ever to be called bishop of St. Asaph. There is absolutely no record of him after the faked ordination except of course his faked signature on the charters at Oxford and the treaty of Winchester.

Whoever followed ‘Geoffrey’ as bishop of Asaph seems spurious also, a certain ‘Richard’ seems to be another invention until another ‘Gilbert’ curiously left his see to become an abbot of Abingdon in 1165. He was removed from that office in 1175. There was no Anglo Norman presence and no-one with Anglo Norman interests could verify anything about St Asaph. It seems an ideal safe place for Henry Blois to create a bishopric for an aspiring writer c.1152. It is unlikely if anyone but Robert of Torigni was even informed of ‘Geoffrey’s’ bogus appointment on mainland Britain. To understand the sequence in which the HRB was composed, we need to understand that there was firstly a Primary Historia followed by what is now known as the First Variant version which was followed by the Vulgate
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version. The First Variant was updated and embellished from the *Primary Historia* and evolved. Its most significant update was the inclusion of Avalon as Arthur’s last resting place which was not mentioned by Huntingdon.

The First Variant was used for the purpose of gaining metropolitan status by Henry Blois in Rome in 1144. It contained limited prophecies and no dedications in its original form. Updated prophecies were at a later date added to the exemplar of the First Variant version after 1155. Also, the Vulgate version of HRB was never fully published with the updated prophecies until 1155. The method of dating used by scholars based on the dedications is futile. All the dedications are backdated so that the publication of Vulgate HRB is made to appear as being composed at an earlier date when the dedicatees were alive. As we can see there are no dedications in First Variant and none related to have been in *Primary Historia* by Huntingdon.

In the Bern MS 568 it has a dedication addressed to Robert of Gloucester. Robert is generally believed to have died in 1147 or even 1146 according to Gervaise. The Bern MS. includes the prophecies of Merlin and the dedication to Book VII in which Geoffrey speaks of Alexander as dead at the time he writes. The HRB can’t be dedicated to a living Robert of Gloucester if Alexander in the dedication was dead. Alexander died in 1148 the year after Robert. This should already have alerted the antenna to backdating for scholars.

Southwark, where Henry Blois had a palace, may be the reason he chose Lambeth for ‘Geoffrey’ to become a priest. Henry Blois at one stage has control over Theobald’s affairs at Canterbury and also was bishop of London for a time, so it was within his ability to fabricate the election of a bishop that would only sign one document of significance, (the Winchester charter). That document was drawn up and probably held by Henry at Winchester. ‘Geoffrey’s’ ‘profession’ as bishop still exists, but it still does not preclude the most powerful man in Britain carrying out a fraud to prevent himself being found out as the author of a book which has seditious prophecies in it by creating a fake persona.

---

255 Henry in effect administered the bishopric of London between 1138 and 1141. Henry Blois in his capacity of sub-dean was in effect the bishop of London as the see became vacant in 1160. He consecrated Thomas Becket as archbishop of Canterbury on 3rd June 1162 as Bishop of London. There was plenty of opportunity to carry out his fraud concerning the consecration of the Bishop of Asaph.
Henry could be accused of treason if his identity were discovered. Not only would he be ridiculed, but any contemporary would soon work out that he had vainly included himself in some of the prophecies of Merlin if he had not squewed the updated prophecies in the Vulgate version. It is because he was not discovered as the author of HRB that he went one stage further in promoting rebellion against Henry II.... now that the supposed author of HRB was dead. Nearly all the prophecies in the *Vita Merlini* have a high relevancy to Henry Blois and to contemporary events surrounding him. By the time Henry had covered his tracks ‘Geoffrey’ could be allowed to speak again. Henry could not be accused as the author of VM even though prophecies went up to 1157 as the book supposedly and ‘logically’, must have been written in the author’s lifetime. ‘Geoffrey’ supposedly died in 1154-5.

Robert of Torigni became the prior of Bec in 1149 but it was he who had originally showed the *Primary Historia* to Huntingdon. Huntingdon did make a copy from Bec of Geoffrey’s *Primary Historia*. He certainly made a précis of its contents which is now EAW.256

Most deductions are that Robert of Torigni was writing after 1152 when he relates that the new Bishop Geoffrey Arthur ‘had translated the history of the Kings of Britain from British into Latin’. The mere suggestion that Robert of Torigni, (a historian also), believes that ‘Geoffrey’ had translated the book from an original (which never existed) indicates two things. Firstly, we should be aware that Walter’s book was never mentioned in the First Variant version in 1144 (which is the successor to the *Primary Historia*). So Robert of Torigni must have been told by Henry Blois that it was a translation of a previous work and also informed of the bishop of Asaph’s death. The fact it was a supposed translation of a British book was not mentioned in EAW or First Variant; and any lucid person at the end of this discourse will know there certainly was no ‘book’. So I think because there are just two pieces of vital information passed to a historian of note and an acquaintance of Henry Blois and neither of those bits of information are true we can assume it came by way of Geoffrey directly.

Secondly, the information concerning Walter’s mysterious book could only come from Henry Blois who has recently fled the country avoiding

---

256 EAW. But this year, when I was on the way to Rome, to my amazement I discovered, at the abbey of Bec, a written account of those very matters.
Normandy on his way to Clugny in 1155. Any mention of Walter would certainly be dated after Walter’s death in 1151. It is only in conjunction with Walter that the ancient book is posited as the source from which HRB is translated and this is only mentioned in the Vulgate version. Alfred of Beverly does not mention the fact that the copy of Galfridus’ book is derived from a translation of Walter’s supposed British book. The fact that all the information in HRB supposedly came from a book lent to ‘Geoffrey’ by Walter does not appear before Walter’s death or before the Vulgate version was published. Alfred of Beverly did not use the Vulgate version as his source but a transitional copy without the GOM title given to it and a few quirks different from Vulgate HRB.

It is Henry Blois who has landed at Mont. St Michel and conveyed the news to Robert of Torigni himself (now abbot of Mont St Michel) in 1155. Robert of Torigni and Henry Blois were probably about the same age, acquainted, with similar interests and must have met previously in Normandy in 1137 and thereafter with Henry’s frequent trips to Rome and passing through Bec when Robert of Torigni was a monk there.

Henry Blois, after the council held by Henry II at Winchester in 1155, had fled shortly afterward from the southwest of England without the King’s permission (as all ports were being watched) and landed at Mont St Michel. This is the reason Robert of Torigni is aware of not only the bogus elevation of Galfridus to bishop, but also of the bishop’s recent demise. If the grandson of William the conqueror told Robert that the author of the book he had seen at Bec had become bishop of Asaph why would Robert not believe him.

Henry may have told him that the bishop of Asaph was dead. It may be that the death of the fictitious bishop was not published abroad until Henry’s return to England. The point being that Robert of Torigni and Henry knew each other and if Henry had said that ‘Geoffrey’ had been consecrated Bishop of Asaph in 1152 it would be taken on good authority.

Robert of Torigni, is understandably disconcerted by ‘Geoffrey’s’ account, and is happy to make use of Huntingdon’s précis to escape the evident pitfalls of having to piece together extracts from the chronicles of Eusebius and Jerome with Geoffrey’s rendition of historical events. A copy of Huntingdon’s letter to Warin is in Robert’s possession in which flatteringly Huntingdon’s name is mentioned as being the discoverer of the
Bec HRB (Primary Historia)....referred to in terms of being a most studious searcher after and collector of books both sacred and profane.

Henry Blois also passes on verbally, news of the formerly known Galfridus Arthur (now better known as Geoffrey of Monmouth) and the spurious election of Geoffrey to a non-existent bishopric. Robert of Torigni writes in his prologue: 'But, for that meseemeth it is unbecoming to make addition of aught extraneous unto the writings of men of so high authority, to wit, Eusebius and Jerome, yet natheless, for the satisfaction of the curious, will I add unto this prologue a letter of Archdeacon Henry, wherein he doth briefly enumerate all the Kings of the Britons from Brutus as far as Cadwallo, who was the last of the puissant Kings of the Britons and was father of Cadwallader whom Bede calleth Cedwalla. This epistle, as will be found therein, the said Henry did excerpt at Bec, where I offered him the use of a copy of the whole history of the Britons when he was on his way to Rome.'

Robert of Torigni goes on to explain the scope of his own history from Julius Cæsar to the death of Henry Ist in 1135, while acknowledging his indebtedness to the History of Henry of Huntingdon. Robert of Torigni derives information in other parts of his chronicle from Huntingdon’s history which is not in Warin’s letter. If we consider that Huntingdon died in 1154 and consider that the Merlin prophecies have an intricate relation to Arthur in the Vulgate prophecies, does it not seem strange that Huntingdon does not mention Merlin in later editions of his chronicle regardless of his omission of mentioning him in EAW?

If, as scholars believe, the Vulgate version of HRB, which Huntingdon had initially seen at Bec had been inclusive of prophetia....why is there no mention of Merlin in Huntingdon’s later redactions of his history. Especially, if the Vulgate had been widely read and distributed in the public domain between 1138-1154. It is not understood by most commentators that Merlin was a later addition after the Primary Historia had existed without prophecies or any mention of Merlin. It is possible Merlin and the early set of prophecies existed in the First Variant in 1144, but these prophecies were later corrected to the updated version from HRB, but without the dedication which only existed in the Vulgate after Alexander had died.

If one considers that First Variant was designed for a papal glance I would not think that Henry Blois had spliced the prophecies into the Historia. They were probably separate but I think part of the package of convincing evidence because of the prophecies predicting Metropolitan
change. What is definite is that the splice would have been difficult without the Alexander preamble and he was still alive. So no prophecies in HRB until Alexander had died in 1148. I think it was here that the original *Libellus Merlini* prophecies got updated to a point. There was an evolving of prophecies and HRB up to the last edition c.1155, which is the common Vulgate rendition we have today which was copied by Henry with backdated dedications.

We should note the change in storyline concerning Merlin and *Stanheng*. Neither Robert of Torigni nor Henry of Huntingdon makes mention of Merlin which also implies (even though Robert is recounting EAW) that the *prophetia* and *Historia + Arthuriad* were not combined until later. It seems to me that Robert of Torigni, whose quote under the year 1152 in the Bern MS that *'Geoffrey Arthur, who had translated the History of the Kings of the Britons out of the British into Latin, is made Bishop of St. Asaph in North Wales'* has been informed of this fictitious event and the most likely candidate to promote such a falsity is Henry Blois. As we have already speculated, Henry Blois probably does not plant the evidence of Geoffrey's death or promote the composition of the book of Llandaff until after his return to England in 1158.

Most commentators have assumed that the prophecies of Merlin preceded Henry Ist death because an extract of the Merlin prophecies was found in Orderic Vitalis' *Historia Ecclesiastica* and they have deduced that there was a separate *Libellus Merlini*. This theory was refuted by Tatloc: ‘since there is no evidence or antecedent probability for an earlier version of the prophecies, and since all the evidence in Ordericus points to the use of Nennius, Bede and Geoffrey's complete HRB, the soundest conclusion is that Ordericus used the prophecies of Merlin merely as found in the HRB and there is no ground for believing in an earlier version’.

Tatlock's deduction concerning Orderic's use of Vulgate HRB is correct. The one thing he has not considered is that the whole section in Orderic's work is an interpolation by Henry Blois who wrote Vulgate HRB.

However, the fact that Abbot Suger had a copy of the first set of *prophetia* i.e. the *Libellus Merlini*, is indicative of the existence of prophecies separate from HRB (he does not mention it) which were later to be included in First Variant. The only extant exemplar of First Variant had its prophecies up dated which now form the present four versions. For example, the ‘sixth’ in Ireland prediction could not have been known prior
to 1151 (when Suger died) and does not exist in Suger’s excerpt from the prophecies.

However, as is evident and noted by Orderic’s editor Auguste le Prévost, Orderic’s book XII was written in 1136-7. It would mean Orderic saw a _Primary Historia_ before it was written (if we wish to counteract Tatlock’s insistence that Orderic sourced his list of Kings from it). But then we need to explain the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ in Orderic’s report (which we know can only post date the discussion on the invasion of Ireland held at the council in Winchester in 1155 just before Henry went into self imposed exile).

The entire chapter XLVII in book XII is evidently an interpolation by Henry Blois himself after 1155. The signs are evident if one is not to be duped by his interpolation. Tatlock, however, is only trying to prove that there was no separate _Libellus Merlini_ and that the interpolated passage came from the _Historia_. Tatlock believed that _Historia_ and _prophetia_ were at that time always spliced together as do most commentators. This position is largely maintained by scholars because they have not understood that the prophecies did not exist in _Primary Historia_ and as for the prophecies presence in the First Variant version did not originally exist as the updated set found in Vulgate HRB when the First Variant was first composed in 1144.

The First Variant contained just those prophecies which made up the _Libellus Merlini_. All four First Variant manuscripts come from one exemplar which have had the updated version of the prophecies added which can only be after 1155 as they also include the ‘sixth in Ireland’ prophecy. Modern scholarship’s assumption is even more flawed in the fact that they consider the Vulgate version a pre-cursor of the First Variant.

Tatlock, does however, point out that the thirteen books of Orderic’s history were not written in the same order that they stand and Orderic also made various insertions himself, but Orderic died in 1142 and Henry Blois (the inventor of the prophecies) could not have known of a sixth king i.e. Henry II. He would certainly not have guessed Henry II plans to invade Ireland at this date as the Anarchy was still to play out for another 10 years. In the same Book VII in which we find the Merlin insertion, Orderic retrospectively writes about Adeliza of Louvain: _and the queen was crowned by the ministrations of the priesthood. She adorned the court and Kingdom for fifteen years, but though richly endowed in other respects, to this day she has borne the King no child._
Adeliza was married to Henry Ist in 1121. This would indicate this part of the book was written in 1136, if we were to add on the 15 years. Henry Blois has inserted the Merlin passage at an *à propos* place so that the prophecies give the impression of foretelling events still in the future based on the chronology of Orderic’s history. This is achieved by placing the prophecies in book XII at a chronological contemporaneous period before Henry Ist death.

If we needed to allow Tatlock’s theory, concerning kings; Henry wrote the list of kings anyway. It does not detract from the fact that we even have the *Primary Historia* in 1139, 30 miles from St Evroult where Orderic was composing his History.... but he could not possibly have news of the ‘sixth in Ireland’ until after 1155. The insertion of the Merlin passage into Orderic was essential for Henry Blois. It is the earliest confirmable evidence which substantiates a vaticinatory nature to the Merlin prophecies. The prophecies are added to a section in Orderic which implies Henry Ist is still alive; so I will cover the entire section in detail in a moment.

Tatlock, like most commentators is duped by the seeming veracity of the dedications in Vulgate HRB, which logically indicate the time parameters in which the Vulgate HRB was first published.

No commentators have allowed for fraud on a grand scale and most commentators have excluded this as an option, yet most recognize the actual work of HRB and the prophetical musings of Merlin and Ganieda as a fraud. All have been misled by Henry Blois in a convincing portrayal of a parochial and struggling ‘Geoffrey’. One obvious ploy was to write a dedication to one’s arch-enemy flattering him, calling Robert of Gloucester ‘another Henry’ (King). Henry Blois was Robert of Gloucester's enemy throughout the Anarchy, so not one person would suspect his authorship after lauding praise on Robert of Gloucester. Only one First Variant edition is dedicated to Robert, but that addition will certainly have transpired after his death as the dedication is not expanded as in HRB.

The point of the dedications in the Vulgate version of HRB was to backdate the work to avoid Henry Blois been discovered as the author. Where the Merlin prophecies are concerned, it gave the aura of accurate prescience.... predicting some events which had already recently transpired in the Anarchy. Funnily enough, it is R.S Loomis’s observation that is ironic: *Robert died in 1147 and Alexander in 1148 and thereafter a dedication to*
either would have no point. It is for this exact reason in logic that Henry Blois carried out such a ploy.

Henry Blois had composed an earlier set of prophecies which were passed to his friend Abbot Suger c.1144-5. These were then added to First Variant. At a later date these early prophecies must have been substituted for the later version found in the Vulgate edition of prophecies. The John of Cornwall edition of prophecies which we shall discuss at length uses the same fictional dedication method as HRB and was written by Henry himself around the same time the VM was written c.1156-7. The JC version goes even further in its seditious content than the Vulgate HRB prophecies or the VM prophecies.

It is the interpolation into Orderic which has convinced researchers of Merlin’s predictive powers. Much stead has been put in the Merlin passage in Orderic, as to dating the prophecies of Merlin, since Orderic died in 1142. The main thing to hold in mind is that the prophecies of Merlin are in no way prophetic, but are the invention of one man writing history retrospectively. Henry Blois was certainly not a prophet! The next thing to understand is that the dedications in all their forms have no bearing on the dating of the HRB.

Dedicating the HRB to Waleran, Stephen or Robert is bound to help circulate the book in court or gain credence in clerical circles as a worthy read, but the dedicatees names were primarily used as a gambit to pretend that the Vulgate HRB was in circulation earlier than it actually was. The same argument holds for the colophon concerning the contemporaneity of Caradoc, Malmesbury and Huntingdon. Only a few copies of HRB existed prior to 1155 in which there were no dedications (maybe the unexpanded dedication to Robert found in the Exeter version of First Variant), but it must be understood by the reader that the various dedications found in the Vulgate HRB were not included until all dedicatees were dead.

The most common dedication found in the various manuscripts is to Robert of Gloucester alone. The dedication below to both Stephen and Robert was composed after both of their deaths even though it has the standard retro device to confute the reader: the issue of my book now made public. Many commentators believe the Vulgate HRB was written in 1136-7

---

257 Arthurian literature in the middle ages. R.S. Loomis p.81
at the only time Stephen and Robert the two dedicatees were not against each other.... or marginally later as Robert’s conditional oath of allegiance to Stephen was formally renounced in 1138. The dedication adds importance to the HRB in showing that the most noble were accountable for its patronage, production and interest. However, the dedications are a farce. The *Primary Historia* was not complete until the first half of 1138 and we know Huntingdon would have remarked on the dedications if there had been any.

'Unto this little work of mine, therefore, do thou, Stephen, King of England, show favour in such sort that with thee for teacher and adviser it may be held to have sprung not from the poor little fountain of Geoffrey of Monmouth, but from thine own sea of knowledge, and to savour of thy salt, so that it may be said to be thine offspring—thine, whose uncle was Henry the illustrious King of England, whom philosophy hath nurtured in the liberal arts, whom thine own inborn prowess of knighthood hath called unto the command of our armies, and whom the island of Britain doth now in these our days hail with heart-felt affection, as if in thee she had been vouchsafed a second Henry. Do thou, also, Robert, Earl of Gloucester, our other pillar of the realm, lend thine assistance that, under the combined direction of ye both, the issue of my book now made public may shine forth in an even fairer light. For thee, unto whom was sire that same most renowned King Henry, hath thy mother, Philosophy, taken unto her bosom and indoctrinated thee in the subtleties of her sciences and afterward directed thee unto the camps of Kings that thou mightest achieve renown in knightly exercises, wherein, valiantly surpassing thy comrades-in-arms, thou hast learnt to stand forth as a terror unto thine enemies and under thy father’s auspices as a protection unto thine own people. Being, therefore, as thou art, the trusty protection of them that are thine own, receive myself, thy prophet-bard, and this my book, issued for thine own delectation, under thy protection, so that lying at mine ease beneath the guardianship of so far-spreading a tree, I may be able to pipe my lays upon the reed of mine own muse in safe security even in the face of the envious and the wicked.'

It is a ruse that these dedications had any truth to them, that Geoffrey would refer to Robert as thou thyself art offspring of the illustrious Henry, *King of the English* in one dedication and again as above use the same reference to Stephen being a second Henry when the dedication is to both of them.
The whole point of this particular dedication is artifice, to date the work before 1138. Contemporaries would be well aware that the dedication indicates a date before the Anarchy if it is to Stephen and Robert and this date (ante 1138) would add credence to many of the prophecies. Why indeed, before the *Primary Historia* was even discovered at Bec, would ‘Geoffrey’ need security in the face of the envious and wicked? This is a Freudian slip by Henry in that it is the reason behind the dedication. This dedication is composed post 1155 because people are getting suspicious and Henry Blois needs to distance the updated seditious prophecies fabricated by himself.

In a separate dedication to Robert of Gloucester alone, Henry Blois is reacting to suspicions by others that the whole historicity of HRB is dubious; therefore he reacts by giving his history credence by establishing a source: *Now, whilst, I was thinking upon such matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, a man learned not only in the art of eloquence, but in the histories of foreign lands, offered me a certain most ancient book in the British language.* This as we shall cover shortly expands into creating the Gaimar epilogue.

There is no-one more likely to possess such a copy of a Stephen dedicated HRB and who could produce it for propagation in any of his scriptoriums than Henry of Blois. Henry could claim it had come from Stephen’s effects after his death.

There is not one shred of evidence which shows that the Vulgate HRB with any dedication is in the public domain before 1155. Alexander of Lincoln died February 1148. Scholars are duped into believing that the dedication to Alexander is real because of the abrupt way in which Geoffrey beaks off the HRB purely at Alexander’s request. This is how he wishes his audience to perceive the action. The Alexander dedication is obviously not in the First Variant produced in 1144 as Alexander is still alive.

In reality, Henry Blois is just inserting or splicing his prophecies into the HRB which he had initially concocted to affect the political climate: *I had not come so far as this place of my history, when by reason of the much talk that was made about Merlin my contemporaries did on every side press me to make public an edition of his prophecies, and more especially Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln.]*

There were no contemporaries pressing ‘Geoffrey’ because ‘Geoffrey’ never existed. The only pressing factor was certain people trying to find out
who had written this book as no-one could locate Galfridus Arthur, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth' or the Bishop of Asaph.

These prophecies which existed as a separate body were then updated to the moment of inclusion in the Vulgate HRB but did exist in a separate *libellus Merlini* prior to 1150. We know no-one was pressing Henry Blois to publish. Instead he introduced into circulation versions of the prophecies up to the point in time of composition of the Vulgate and we can witness this by the ‘exclusion’ of the prophecy about the ‘sixth in Ireland’ in the copy of Merlin’s prophecies he had passed to his friend abbot Suger. The discussion had not yet transpired at court in Winchester in 1155.

Henry knows his ‘fifth’ in his royal numbering system (Matilda), who he assigns no action under that number, (yet specifies she was not anointed in one prophecy) has been superseded in his numbering system by the sixth. It would be fairly obvious that the numbering system in the early *libellus* edition of prophecies only went to ‘four’.

This ‘Sixth’ (on its own) could easily be predicted after the treaty of Wallingford in the summer of 1153. As we have discussed, the council which debated the invasion of Ireland did not happen until 1155, immediately before Henry left for Clugny. The fact that the reference to the invasion of Ireland occurs in the *Chronicle of Clugny* xxxviii and attests to the fact that knowledge of this conference was known at Clugny indicates the source of such knowledge is Henry Blois. Also, *Peter the Venerable* travelled to Clugny with Henry’s transferable wealth and Henry Blois followed soon after the court meeting by way of Mont St. Michel. It would have been at this court held at Winchester that Henry Blois was ordered to surrender his castles to King Henry II. Henry Blois understood the power dynamic was shifting against him. Rather than comply, he fled to Cluny and thereby the Irish information is referenced in their chronicle. As Robert of Torigni dates this Irish discussion to Christmas 1155, he also would have

---

258 The *Laudabiliter* was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland.

259 As we covered already Adrian IV published the Papal Bull *Laudabiliter*, which was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland and apply the Gregorian reforms. We have established that Henry Blois knew of this intention to invade and published the prophecy concerning the ‘sixth’ as vaticinatory prophecy. Henry thought the invasion was expected imminently. The Normans did eventually invade Ireland, but not until 1 May 1169 long after the *Vita Merlini* and HRB prophecies were written. It was not until the 18 October 1171, however, (two months after Henry Blois’ death)
heard this most probably from Henry Blois who landed at the island where
Robert of Torigni was newly established as Abbot.

At this time the fraudulent news was conveyed that Geoffrey Arthur who
had translated the history of the Kings of Britain from British into Latin, as
stated in Robert’s chronicle, was now Bishop of Asaph. Most commentators
believe it was general knowledge, but there is no other record of it in
Britain except that which was planted by Henry Blois i.e. no contemporary
chronicler until Gervaise makes any record of our Bishop of Asaph. Henry’s
subtlety must not be underestimated and must be taken into account.

Robert of Torigni took it upon himself to publish an edition of *Sigebert’s
Chronicon* within which he interpolated accounts of the Dukes and bishops
of Normandy which were, at the time of publishing, also the Kings of
England; those that reigned after Bede’s time up until 1150. Since Robert
referred to Galfridus Arthur rather than Geoffrey of Monmouth we might
also assume he has not seen a Vulgate version with dedications. Don’t forget
he was the one who introduced the *Primary Historia* to Huntingdon while
passing through Bec.

Robert of Torigni of Torigni in his preface says that ‘*Sigebert mentions
not one King of Britain but Aurelius Ambrosius*’ which must be derived from
Bede; all the rest are from Geoffrey. Robert of Torigni was happy to make
known the letter to Warin from Huntingdon by publishing it in his
chronicle as it was Robert who discovered the *Primary Historia* to
Huntingdon in the first place. Robert’s reason for publishing the letter was
to make known the high standing to which Huntingdon refers to Robert in
the letter: *a most studious searcher after and collector of books both sacred
and profane*. Both Huntingdon and Robert are apparently not incredulous
to Geoffrey’s history and include ‘Geoffrey’s’ fabulations in their own Histories. Incredibly neither ever discuss how come the book was found at

that Henry II landed an army in Waterford. Initially the topic was discussed at the court in Winchester by Henry
II as he was hoping to give Ireland to William his younger brother, making him King. The plans were abandoned
when their mother, the Empress Matilda, objected.

Henry Blois had to wait four years from the time he wrote the prophecy concerning the ‘Sixth and the Irish
invasion’ until a partial realization of Merlin’s prediction became fact when a small band of Norman Knight’s
arrived in 1161. However, the vaticinatory vision in the VM (which differs in HRB) *The sixth shall overthrow the
Irish and their walls, and pious and prudent shall renew the people and the cities*, was based upon what Henry
Blois understood in the *Laudabiliter* and were going to be the implementations of Gregorian reform within
Ireland which were proposed at Winchester at Michaelmas in 1155.
Bec in the first place. Obviously put in the Library by Henry during his time in Normandy.

It can be asserted that Robert of Torigni would definitely have read the ‘ex-prophetia’ *Primary Historia* at Bec and would be eager to hear of the news about the author of that book. The question is whether Henry Blois created Geoffrey of Monmouth’s persona in the Vulgate HRB prior to ‘Geoffrey’s’ fictional death. Certainly, Alfred of Beverley does not refer to a ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ specifically.

Henry Blois’ ploy, as we will uncover later in the propagation of Grail literature, is that he journeys to locations, continental and insular to spread different propaganda that only later collides. So, notice of ‘Geoffrey’s’ death, as we have already mentioned, was probably established in England on his return in 1158.

John of Cornwall’s translation of the Merlin prophecies for Robert Waleran, Bishop of Exeter who died in March 1155 was fabricated after that date by Henry Blois and certainly does not establish a primary source from which both ‘Geoffrey’ and John worked. It was Henry Blois’ intention that posterity should believe that the Merlin prophecies might be Cornish, falsely establishing a Celtic source in antiquity. These prophecies were composed as a propaganda exercise. Since Robert Waleran was a personal friend of Henry Blois, it is not difficult to understand (with the usual retro-dating he employs), how Henry Blois makes it appear as if the Bishop of Exeter possessed the Cornish version of prophecies before his death.

Henry Blois managed to interpolate Orderic’s work with the chapter on the Merlin prophecies. He could have retrieved Orderic original history as Henry has passed by the abbey of St Evroult, in which was found Orderic’s manuscript…. any time after 1143 when Orderid died. This is not a silly speculation because there are only three copies reaching the present era which indicates that for some reason its proliferation was stifled at the time ‘Geoffrey’s’ work was propagating through the monastic system which by contrast we presently have 215 copies. Henry is on the way to Rome that year to secure the Pallium for his Nephew William, who Henry has elevated to Archbishop of York. Henry Blois on previous trips to Rome, probably had conversations with Orderic about his history being a fellow monk and interested in history.
Henry Blois is of royal blood and arguably the most powerful man in England and renowned in Normandy. While breaking his journey and tiding over at St Evroult, he hears of Orderic’s death. He asks the abbot to borrow the manuscripts as yet unduplicated since Orderic’s death. He promises to return them on his return Journey. He obviously does not since the prophecy about the ‘sixth in Ireland’ is included. Therefore the interpolation must ante-date the Winchester council of 1155.

Henry understands any historian’s works endure. Henry thus interpolates one small passage concerning Merlin’s prophecies in the appropriate section of Orderic in book XII. To most observers, given the surrounding material, it appears that the prophecies must date prior to Henry I’s death. Henry Blois, clever as always, leaves out the one prophecy concerning Henry I’s death from an already extant block of prophecies he has composed earlier.

The Prophecy concerning the death of Henry I is too highly specific and if employed makes the rest of the prophecies too obviously fraudulent to an audience that know the details of Henry I’s burial. By leaving it out, it appears that the block of prophecies were truly made before the King’s death. Some scholars actually think that because this particular prophecy was left out of Orderic that it must be a late insertion. Again they have it the wrong way round. It is left out because Henry wishes to show this block predates Henry I’s death; which in itself proves the point that the whole insertion is a Henry Blois interpolation.

The missing prophecy concerning the King’s body parts, is in the Vulgate prophecies. This has also added credence to the prophetic powers of Merlin in that commentators now believe the interpolation to be a genuine part of Orderic’s work. They have considered the prophecy which is not included in Orderic’s work concerning the body parts to have been inserted by a subsequent interpolator in the Vulgate version. Not so! Henry when he interpolated Orderic’s work left it out on purpose.

I know I labour this point, but it is most critical in dating the prophecies (see appendix 14). Henry Blois could not be able to predict the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ until after 1155. Not only is the prophecy highly specific, but it obeys Henry Blois’ numbering system found in Vulgate version and VM and it could only exist after two events; the death of Stephen (before which, the *libellus* numbering only went to four) and the said council in which the invasion of Ireland was discussed.
When this evidence is added to the fact that the record of these events is recorded at Clugny where Henry fled after the council at Winchester, it provides a strong case for the ‘Sixth in Ireland prophecy’ only existing post 29th September 1155. Because this is one of the prophecies found in Orderic’s work it is obvious that the interpolation must post date the council at Winchester. We must not be fooled by Henry Blois’ cleverness inserting the Merlin passage in Orderic’s book XII. I will go through the whole Orderic interpolation shortly, but the main accusation against me in pointing out these inserts by Henry Blois into other authors manuscripts is thought by some to be too prevalent. My accusation is that I appear as a type of conspiracy fiend who garners anything that counteracts my evidential support of Henry Blois as an Arch interpolator by simply stating it must be an interpolation. In the case of Orderic it is simply a couple of folio’s inserted.

Anyway, Leo iusticiae is Henry’s vaticinatory name for his uncle King Henry Ist of whom he cleverly speaks in the Orderic insertion in the present tense.... as if still alive. In the interpolation into Orderic, King Henry Ist is cleverly posited as ‘awaiting his divinely ordained but uncertain destiny’. Really!! Which other chroniclers, assuming the death of a king is a natural event, would string this sentence together? Only an interpolater wishing to establish that King Henry is still alive at the date of writing

Henry Blois in reality was at odds with the HRB dedicatees, Waleran and Robert. Robert of Gloucester became a permanent enemy from the time he and others had convinced Stephen to free the occupants at Exeter castle. Robert then went to Normandy and returned as the leader of the Angevin cause. Waleran was different in the fact that he was on Stephen’s side to begin with, but Henry Blois was wildly jealous of the sway the Beaumont twins had sway over his brother. Henry blamed Waleran and his twin brother for planting doubt in Stephen’s mind which led to the arrest of Roger Bishop of Salisbury, one of the main causes of the Anarchy.

Henry of Blois dislikes Waleran so much that he refers to him as the Dragon of Worcester in the prophecies was married to Matilda de Blois, daughter of King Stephen. In 1141 Waleran gave up the struggle alongside

---

260 Robert of Torigni: At Winchester about the time of Michaelmas in 1155, Henry II holds a council with his nobles to discuss the conquest of Ireland which he seems to have desired to give his younger brother William on terms of homage.

261 HRB VII, iv
Stephen as his Norman lands were being taken over by the invading Angevin army. He surrendered to the Empress Matilda and so in Henry's mind was a traitor.

As I have mentioned, the single manuscript with Stephen and Robert as dedicatees is simply a devise used by Henry Blois to predate the HRB to 1136-8. What supplicant author vying for a patron’s approval dedicates his work to patrons who are at war with each other? The evidence for dating of Vulgate is found in the updated version of the prophecies and not through the bogus dedications.

We can assume (considering references to metropolitan) that the very first version of First Variant which was presented to papal authorities had the prophetia presented with it. This assumption is made on the basis that the copy which we have today would have entailed too much reworking of the body of the text to have included the Merlin Prophecies as an addition. One could speculate that only subsequently the prophecies were added to the First Variant version and then the prophecies were updated later. There are so many possible scenarios. We can see how the evolved First Variant found its way to Beverley. We know the First Variant ante-dates the Vulgate as it was used by Henry in 1144; but if the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ prophecy is included in any version, it certainly post-dates 1155.

There is still nothing to prove that the HRB and Prophetia have been spliced by 1147 because Alfred of Beverley’s work was finished after this date. Suger, abbot of St Denis was a friend of Henry Blois. Henry and Suger were both scholars, historians, and passionate about architecture. Abbot Suger, wrote a panegyric on Louis VI, Le Gros in his Vita Ludovici regis around 1150. In the manuscript he gives an extract from the prophecies beginning at The Lion of Justice... and ending at, Mount Aravias, as found in as a clump in Vulgate HRB. Orderic’s interpolated passage which post-dates these prophecies is the first supposed reference to Merlin apart from Alfred of Beverley’s mention of him. Abbot Suger must have been presented a copy of the libellus Merlini by Henry Blois. The gullible abbot Suger, refers to Merlin as ‘veracious’ and says that not one word of the prophecy has proved untrue. One would assume he has no idea the prophecies were constructed by his friend.

262 However, it would be strange that the prophecies which speak of Metropolitans were not used in First variant.
263 See note 4, ‘venerable brother and dearest friend Suger Abbot of St Denis’.
Henry Blois finished the *Primary Historia* in 1138 and left a copy of it at Bec while he was in Normandy.\(^{264}\) The *Primary Historia* at Bec did not contain the prophecies of Merlin. There is no contrary evidence to this position and in fact all the evidence points to confirming this statement. However, scholars believe that the *Primary Historia* (i.e. that book found at Bec from which EAW is derived) is the same as the Vulgate. This position has led them to believe the prophecies existed in the Bec version. The Bec version is plainly a first edition and this can be easily established by storyline variance in the summary of Geoffrey’s history found in Huntingdon’s letter to Warin.

Henry of Huntingdon’s and Warin’s correspondence shows no mention of Merlin in 1139. Tatlock puts this down to Huntingdon’s uneasiness as a Christian, being unable to mention supernatural prophecies; but this does not explain the occurrence of Arthur’s different speech and the ‘Breton hope’ of Arthur’s return found in EAW and other substantial story line differences. Logically if the *Primary Historia* had included the prophecies, Alexander who was patron to Henry of Huntingdon would surely have been mentioned in the letter to Warin because of Alexander’s influence in having the prophecies translated. There was no dedication to Alexander in the version at Bec because there were no prophecies attached.\(^{265}\) Huntingdon has not informed Warin of the prophecies or mentioned Merlin simply because Alexander has nothing to do with the *Primary Historia*.

Alexander’s name as dedicatee in the Vulgate HRB was simply a device employed to explain the introduction of the prophecies which were not in the first redaction. Huntingdon of course is ignorant of his patron’s supposed commissioning of the translation of the prophecies. There is not a comment, then or subsequently. Henry of Huntingdon would never have an

\(^{264}\) The GS written by Henry Blois: *When the King had learnt more fully that these things were happening in Normandy, He sent envoys across the sea (for he could not go there so quickly himself on account of the heavy burden of pressing affairs).* It was Henry Blois as Stephen’s envoy who left for Normandy in lent that year. If the pages of GS which immediately follow were not missing, we might have read an account of the affairs in Normandy.

\(^{265}\) Michael Curley p.49, is duped by Henry Blois’ illusion: *Given such a milieu, Geoffrey probably would not have concocted the story of Bishop Alexander’s urging him to provide a translation of the prophecies and then gone on to publish a dedicatory epistle containing such a lie. As soon as retrospective dedications and a late publication of Vulgate HRB is considered, Curley’s point is negated.*
opportunity to comment on the dedication to Alexander because Huntingdon died in 1154 and the Alexander dedication was not included until the updated prophecies were added to Vulgate HRB the next year.

You would think Alfred of Beverley might have mentioned Alexander c.1150. If the Primary Historia had a dedication to Robert of Gloucester, this fact is also not mentioned by Alfred of Beverley or Huntingdon. Neither is the name of the Archdeacon Walter mentioned. Huntingdon had no way to track how this wondrous volume came into existence in Normandy. Henry Blois must have secretively deposited it at Bec in the library to be discovered after he returned to England or nonchalantly said it was from some Welsh author called Galfridus Arthur. I believe the book was just discovered after Henry’s visit. Henry Blois could create any story since there were no references in the book except to a certain Galfridus Artur as author.

Alexander was dead before the updated prophecies and their dedication were added to the Vulgate HRB and so was Huntingdon. It is impossible to say when the prophecies were added to First Variant but knowing first variant was produced as evidence to papal authorities and knowing the prophecies were advocating a futuristic metropolitan at Winchester it is hard to say if they were conjoined or still separated. If they were... the splice concerning the Alexander preamble certainly was not in Alfred of Beverley’s copy c.1147-50.

No-one knew where to find ‘Geoffrey’ to ask about the old book he had translated and by the time Walter is mentioned in the Vulgate post 1155, Walter had been dead four years. Surely an intelligent mind like Huntingdon’s would have mentioned either Merlin or his Patron bishop Alexander in the dedication or even Walter.... if any of their names had existed in the Primary Historia. Tatlock puts Huntingdon’s uneasiness as a Christian as an excuse for the omission of the mention of Merlin. Tatlock’s view is that the Primary Historia (copy found at Bec) was synonymous with Vulgate HRB, without mentioning the obvious differences in story line detail witnessed in EAW.

There is no evidence to the contrary to oppose my view that the dedications are all late additions and this devise of backdating used by Henry Blois is prevalent in that he does the same with Caradoc and other manuscripts. Neither should we consider the evidence provided in the epilogue of L’estoire des Engleis concerning Walter in Geffrei Gaimar’s
account as having any bearing on the dating of the Vulgate HRB.... or to the veracity that HRB was a translation of the ‘Good book of Oxford’. I will cover this shortly, but the Gaimar epilogue is a fantastic ploy designed to mislead posterity and is again just a small insert of a couple of folios

*L'estoire des Bretons* was never written contrary to what we are led to believe. Henry attaches his fabricated epilogue to the *L'estoire des Engleis* which was genuinely written by Gaimar. There will be readers who doubt that one man could get up to so much tampering with manuscripts and that I am a conspiracy theorist gone mad. One must understand that firstly Henry was laying a false trail to preserve his anonymity, people like Henry II were looking for the author of the updated seditious prophecies. Secondly he enjoyed leaving to posterity what he had created: a near fairy-tale history of the British Isles. The prophecy of Melkin was extant in the era that Henry Blois was at Glastonbury and was a major influence on the way our three genres under investigation inter-relate. Once this fact is uncovered in progression, the reader will then understand why it is so necessary now to plough through such seemingly innocuous detail concerning Henry Blois as author of HRB. The passage in Orderic’s book XII on the prophecies can only be a genuine part of Orderic’s work if one believes the prophecies are truly vaticinatory. This is not a tenable position!

Abbot Suger must have had a first edition of the *prophetia* judging by the content of the block of prophecies he comments on. But Suger, who died in 1151, did not mention the HRB as being part of the work that embodied the prophecies. The most important fact which pertains to Suger in this instance is that he did not quote the prophecy which involved the Sixth (i.e. Henry II) in Ireland. How could he?

A preliminary version of the prophecies could have been part of the First Variant version which was employed for the purpose of obtaining metropolitan status for Winchester in 1144 at Rome. We can assume they were employed to that end based on the fact that the metropolitan of Winchester is foreseen (before the sense of the prophecy was twisted). Also, it was prophesied that it would lose its episcopal/metropolitan see (which intonates that it must have historically had one to lose) or maybe this was added while Henry was in Clugny. But, the loss of a metropolitan would more likely have been included to influence Rome.

We know the First Variant was designed to lean toward a clerical audience and obviously the main body of text infers that Winchester had a
monastery and a bishop long before Augustine’s arrival. This should be taken into account with the fact that the author of HRB ignores Canterbury, while understanding Henry’s enmity with Canterbury which we will cover later when discussing Eadmer’s letter and Henry’s enmity with Theobald of Bec.

Commentators have been duped by Henry Blois’ fraud. Henry makes pretence to stop halfway through his Vulgate HRB (at a place where the Merlinian insertion has been made at the historical point of Vortigern in contrast to the Primary Historia) to accommodate Alexander’s supposed request. The insertion is based loosely on Nennius’ template of the boy Ambrosius before introducing the prophetia. One can see the original pseudo-history had the Arthuriad spliced on to it in the Primary Historia at the same point. This is indicated by Huntingdon’s portrayal of an relatively ‘unexpanded’ Arthurian epic given the relative space apportioned to it in the précis. The Arthuriad was added to the initial pseudo history (intended for Matilda and King Henry) after Henry had been to Wales and was not part of the original pseudo history.

Henry uses the same point at a later date to splice in the prophetia which splits Arthuriana from the pseudo-history and Henry cleverly contrives this insert by reason of having been compelled by Alexander. Henry also pretends in the VM to be looking for more positive recognition from Robert de Chesney as patron than he had received from Alexander previously giving the impression of seeking advancement.

The picture painted which forms the persona of ‘Geoffrey’ is so thoroughly covered and contrived that we must understand Henry’s determination in creating a bogus history which has no attachment to his name as author. We must also consider the pressures which caused him not only to add the contrivance of Walter and his book, providing HRB with a credible provenance for its material. Also, Henry’s thoroughness is seen in his effort to compose Gaimar’s epilogue. Henry Blois employs Robert de Chesney in VM because it appears that his patronage is continuous in the

\[266 \text{ See Appendix 36.}\]

\[267 \text{ VM prologue: Therefore may you favour my attempt, and see fit to look upon the poet with better auspices than did that other whom you have just succeeded.}\]
same bishopric.\textsuperscript{268} It makes no difference that Robert de Chesney lived until 1166 as the VM was published on the continent\textsuperscript{269} and ‘Geoffrey’ was already supposedly dead. If Robert de Chesney did see a copy he would assume ‘Geoffrey’ had died before presenting it to him. Perhaps and more likely the dedication in VM was added after 1166 as Henry lived until 1171.

The dedications are worthless as a method of dating the text as Crick attempts to do. In reality Henry Blois needed no patron but financed his own distribution of HRB. It is no wonder that the Vulgate HRB proliferated so quickly. Henry could have copies made by any of the many scriptoriums over which he had control and distribute copies to monasteries as a presentation. He could distribute copies feigning nonchalance at the content by passing off HRB as an interesting read.

The dedications are a ruse and make no difference to the dating of the Vulgate HRB but rather by their absence in First Variant and no mention of them in EAW’s précis of \textit{Primary Historia}....add credence to the position that the Vulgate edition came out last.

The most frequent dedication is to his arch-enemy Robert of Gloucester; the surest way to deflect any suspicion of authorship. Robert died in 1147 so any contemporary would think the Vulgate HRB is at least eight years old in 1155 (the real publication date). ‘Geoffrey’ could not be located (for obvious reasons) plus he was supposedly dead when his book became widely read. It was only c.1153 when Henry Blois started laying a paper trail that implied Geoffrey had lived and was a real person. It was not common knowledge that there was a Bishop of Asaph and no-body cared if there was. Before anybody knew ‘Geoffrey’ was a bishop.... he had been consigned to death.

The question as to why there is no comment from any of the dedicatees or comment about such dedications defies normal referencing by chroniclers if the book had been in the public domain since 1136 as modern scholars believe. The reason no one really pursued the trail is that the trail was laid retrospectively and it is impossible to find someone who does not exist.

The version found at Beverley which Alfred uses arrived there through the family contact of Hugh de Puiset Nephew of Henry Blois. The

\textsuperscript{268} In the charters that Henry signed at Oxford one is co-signed with Robert de Chesney which helps the illusion. Curley p 49

\textsuperscript{269} VM is where Marie of France, Countess of Champagne in her \textit{lais} gets her idea of an island, \textit{very dim and very fair, known as Avalon}, which is not given any description in HRB.
prophecies and the HRB are not referred to together until the copy that Alfred recycles from is passed around among the monks there. Why is it that Huntingdon’s third and last edition of Historia Anglorum in 1154 still makes no mention of Merlin even though he discovered the Primary Historia 15 years ago? You would think that a man who was ‘astonished’ to find what could be a bogus history (when he first set eyes on it) would certainly relate that his patron’s endeavours had brought the prophecies of Merlin to be added into this book. If the Historia were so widely read… why is Alfred from 1139 when the Primary Historia is discovered up… until c.1150-1 the first to mention HRB and Merlin together? Why is it only Alfred, who, (by his account probably had a copy in 1147), was the only writer who comments on HRB; as scholars believe…. if HRB was circulated so widely? The simple fact is that it was not!

Alfred wrote the first Latin chronicle to incorporate extracts from HRB into its narrative fabric, but it was not based on the Vulgate version as Alfred does not refer to ‘Geoffrey’ but calls him Britannicus. Alfred knows the author is bogus, naming himself as Galfridus Artur. So, Alfred just refers to him as Britannicus rather than using the obviously bogus surname of Artur. Alfred’s work includes an unadulterated copy of Huntingdon’s EAW.

Who would have the effrontery to inform three insular historians, William of Malmesbury d.1143 and Henry of Huntingdon d.1154 and Caradoc of Lancialfan (probably died c. 1129), to be silent as to the Kings of the Britons, seeing that they have not that fictional ancient book by which ‘Geoffrey’s’ authority is established. Who in their right mind would consider the HRB a translation of another book; where it is so obvious that the prophetia and VM are partly designed to bolster its erroneous historicity?

The historian’s that ‘Geoffrey’ is supposedly addressing are low born in Henry’s eyes and probably considered by him as plodding chroniclers. One of them would have made comment if they were alive to do so…. even to a haughty bishop of Asaph. This epilogue/colophon, found in a few MSS, has been understood by commentators as a reaction to criticism regarding the veracity of the HRB. Some commentators have determined a later date of publication for the MSS which have this inclusion.

Again, it is purely a devise which procures contemporaneity with the historians mentioned just as Henry employs the same device with the dedicatees. This is mainly designed to counteract the new seditious
prophecies in the updated Vulgate. It is only modern scholars who do not recognise the contrived dis-ingenueniness that Caradoc is Geoffrey’s ‘contemporary’

Caradoc was already dead c1130. Henry had assumed his name to write the *Life of Gildas* in 1139-40; being evidenced by the Modena Archivolt.\(^{270}\) William of Malmesbury died in 1143 without comment and never mentioned the *life of Gildas*. Henry Blois turns his hand briefly to compose the *Life of Gildas*; probably while the construction of the *Primary Historia* was in progress or just after. This is before Henry turned his hand to interpolating GR3 and DA which only transpired after William of Malmesbury’s death in 1143. Scholars are duped by Henry’s interpolations into GR3 and DA. William may have known of Caradoc.

It would be astounding if Huntingdon made no comment from 1139 until 1154 concerning the addition of the Merlin prophecies if they had been combined early in that era and the work was widely published (especially as one of those named in the colophon). If ‘Geoffrey’ was an Oxford canon or Bishop of Asaph…. someone other than Robert of Torigni would have mentioned his position in Britain. Especially, considering the contentious and totally novel content concerning insular British history! Some critic would have wanted to verify the source i.e. Walter’s ancient book. The simple reason no one comments is because no one can until much later. Newburgh works out that the prophecies have been altered (from the initial *Libellus Merlini*), but may be referring to the VM alterations

The illusion created where the author is now dead…. and so are the dedicatees (and especially Walter), is a masterstroke in retrospective publication and deflection of scrutiny. We are left with the impression that the Vulgate HRB came into the public domain 15 years before it actually did. It is only later that Gerald of Wales and Newburgh comment years afterward.

The reader may recall that in a previous letter, written in 1135 to another friend called Walter, (not Warin), Huntingdon, when referring to Winchester and its two previous Bishops, writes: *In their seat is occupied by Henry, the King’s sons, who promises to exhibit a monstrous spectacle,*

\(^{270}\) See chapter 13
Henry of Huntingdon, who is a serious historian, does not like Henry Blois because he sees Henry as architect of Stephen’s usurpation of the crown: *He had as his helper Henry, Bishop of Winchester, who earlier had thrown the realm into grievous disorder, delivering the crown of the Kingdom to his brother Stephen*...\(^{272}\)

We have already covered that William of Malmesbury not only slighted Henry’s father, but also let the world know just how duplicitous Henry was in HN. It is not surprising therefore that both historians are seemingly dismissed with disdain. It made no difference anyway because both Malmesbury and Huntingdon were dead when the colophon in HRB was added. There could be no challenge to Henry’s offhanded disdain for their authority as historians. Caradoc is only mentioned with these two others because it is made to appear as if Caradoc continues Geoffrey’s History from the point where he left off.

It is plain that the writer of the HRB and *Vita Merlini*, as we have previously commented, is versed in the classics. Therefore, anyone undertaking such a venture as the composition of HRB is knowledgeable about history. But, to recall all the various sources and make voluminous conflatory connections would require an immense memory bordering on the photographic. We also witness Henry’s ability to construct chronologies with names that mirror possible history. Henry of Huntingdon in 1128 had not formed a dislike for the newly installed Abbot of Glastonbury because he had not at that point helped his brother Stephen usurp the crown. So, it is worth mentioning again that Huntingdon relates a rather strange anecdotal episode concerning King Henry Ist while in Normandy in 1128: *while King Henry abode there he made enquiries concerning the origin and progress of the reign of the Franks; upon which someone present who was not ill informed* (uneducated) *thus replied:*

*Most powerful King, the Franks like most European nations sprung from the Trojans. For Antenor and his followers becoming fugitive's after the fall of Troy, founded the city on the borders of Pannoia called Siccambria. After the death of Antenor, these people set up two of their chiefs as governors*  

---

\(^{271}\) Henry of Huntingdon V, 15  
\(^{272}\) Henry of Huntingdon IV, 37
whose names were Turgotum and Franctionem, from whom the Franks derive their name. After their deaths, Marcomirius was elected: he was the father of Faramond, the first King of the Franks. King Faramond was the father of Clovis the long-haired, from whence the Frank Kings were called ‘long-haired’.

On the death of Clovis he was succeeded by Merové from whom the Frank Kings were called Merovignians. Merové begat Childeric; Childeric, Clovis, who was baptised by St. Remi; Clovis, Clothaire; Clothaire, Chilperic; Chilperic, Clothaire II; Clothaire II begat Dagobert, a King of great renown and much beloved; Dagobert begat Clovis II. Clovis had three sons by his pious Queen Bathilde, viz Clothaire, Childeric, and Theoderic; King Theoderic begat Childeberht; Childeberht Dagobert II, Dagobert, Theoderick II; Theoderic, Clothaire III, the last King of this line. Hilderic the next King, received the tonsure, and was shut up in a monastery. In another line, Osbert was the father of Arnold, my daughter of King Clothaire; Arnold begat St Arnulf who was afterwards Bishop of Metz; St Arnulf, Anchises; Anchises, Pepin, the Mayor of the palace, Pepin, Charles Martel, Charles, King Pepin; King Pepin, Charles the Great, the Emperor, a bright star, which eclipsed the last year of all his predecessors and all his posterity; Charles begat Lewis the Emperor; Lewis the Emperor, Charles the Bald, Charles, King Lewis, father of Charles the Simple; Charles the Simple, Lewis II; Lewis, Lothaire; Lothaire, Lewis, the last King of this line. On the death of Lewis, the Frank nobles chose for their King, Hugh, who was the son of Hugh the Great. Hugh begat pious King Robert. Robert had three sons, Hugh, the beloved Duke; Henry, most clement King; and Robert, Duke of Burgundy. Henry begat King Philip, who ultimately became a monk, and Hugh the great, who in the holy wars joined the other princes of Europe, and rescue Jerusalem from the infidels in the year of our Lord 1095. Philip was the father of Louis, the King at present reigning. If he trod in the footsteps of his warlike ancestors, you, Oh King, would not rest so safely in his dominions. After this King Henry withdrew into Normandy.  

There is good reason to suspect that it is Henry Blois reciting the above, showing off his acumen to his uncle. Firstly, this is a genealogy which Henry would have learnt on his father’s side. We should not forget his relationship to King Henry was through his mother. Henry Blois is the King’s nephew, a rising star…. probably in his early to mid-twenties, son of

---

Adela the King’s sister.... of noble origin, grandson of William the conqueror, son of the Count of Troyes

Henry had recently gained repute for putting in order a great monastery. Is Huntingdon the historian miffed or jealous that ‘someone’ of such high breeding, impeccably educated, born to prosper, can recount the names of the Frankish Kings in chronological order with such ease? Huntingdon is supposedly the historian. My point is that Henry Blois is with his uncle as part of Knight’s service from Glastonbury.... as a new and promising knight attending as a favoured Nephew. It is a coincidence that our Leiden manuscript from Bec is the only one to have a brief history of the Frankish Kings beginning with ‘Antenor et alii profugi’. ‘Antenor’ is not found with any other HRB manuscript. It also contains, incidentally, Crick’s F-redaction of the Gesta Normannorum Ducum, a chronicle originally created by William of Jumièges to which, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni extended the volumes to include history up until Henry Ist.

Henry Blois’ brother Stephen is recorded in Normandy in 1128 with King Henry at the time of Henry’s proposed Frankish recital.... so why not his younger brother with knights from Glastonbury? It certainly sounds like Henry Blois.... because like the HRB, it is wildly inaccurate, but has all the right sounding names.

Again, we see Henry’s penchant for eponym’s so widely peppered throughout HRB. Henry Blois, from Royal descent would have studied Blois and Frankish history while a student at Clugny and might have developed delusions concerning Troy and his own genealogy. Henry’s father was numbered Stephen II, Count of Troyes. Troyes is not far from the towns of Autun, Langres, Avallon, and Clugny, all of them in the region of Blois.

As the ‘someone’ in Huntingdon’s account states, there certainly was an existing tradition that the European people were descended from ancient Troy. Therefore, it is not too unreasonable to suggest that Henry growing up at Clugny researched the history of the Franks and was able to relate a chronological sequence, even if it were partly fabricated. Did he not do exactly that for the Kings of Britain in the HRB? It seems as if Huntingdon’s ‘someone’ ....the one who divulges the account, is in fact Henry Blois. Henry’s thought process for instigating the composition of the HRB started while he worked at Glastonbury with William of Malmesbury in 1126-9, but we shall get to that soon
Let us return to look briefly at the letter to Warin related by Robert of Torigni: 'Here beginneth the epistle of Henry the Archdeacon unto Warin as concerning the Kings of the Britons. ‘Thou dost ask of me, Warin the Briton, courteous man as thou art, and witty withal, wherefore, in telling the story of our country, I should have begun with the times of Julius Cæsar and omitted those most flourishing reigns that were betwixt Brute and the days of Julius? Mine answer is that albeit I have many a time and oft made enquiry as to those ages, yet never have I found none that could tell me, nor no book wherein was written aught about them. Even thus in the illimitable succession of years doth the destruction of oblivion overshadow and extinguish the glory of mortality! Howbeit, in this very year, which is the eleven hundred and thirty-ninth from the Incarnation of our Lord, when I was journeying to Rome with Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Bec, where the said Archbishop had formerly been Abbot, to my amazement I found the written record of these events. For there I met with Robert of Torigni, a monk of that place, a most studious searcher after and collector of books both sacred and profane. He, when he had questioned me as to the plan of the History of the Kings of the English issued by me, and had eagerly heard what I had to say in answer, offered unto me a book to read as concerning those Kings of the Britons who held our island before the English. These extracts therefrom, my best-beloved, I do therefore send unto thee, albeit they be of the briefest, as becometh a mere friendly letter.’

Huntingdon then follows with a précis of the earlier chapters, in which Huntingdon quotes the two first lines of Brute’s prayer to Diana and the first four of her response. Condensing as he goes towards the end and showing no marked interest in Arthur. Huntingdon relates the more romantic episodes in the first part at disproportionate length concerning Brutus, Leir, Belinus and Brennus, Arthgallo and Elidurus, Androgeus.

The fact that Henry of Huntingdon saw a copy of what I have termed the Primary Historia, a pre-cursor to both First Variant and Vulgate HRB which records differences in storyline by comparison with First Variant and Vulgate HRB.... is the evidence for assuming HRB was an evolving work. Primary Historia was not widely read and few copies were made. Any that existed were superseded by Vulgate. Even though, understanding it was constrained by brevity, Henry of Huntingdon’s précis rearranges material at times indicating that Primary Historia is a different edition from First Variant and Vulgate; and there are significant changes in actions and
anecdotes and the spelling of names unaccountable as transcription error.\textsuperscript{274} \textit{Primary Historia} was as different as First Variant was from Vulgate.

To prevent Brutus’s landing, the giant natives of Albion wade out into the sea, rather than the conventional landing at Totnes noted in HRB. Lucrinus is shot in a battle by his wife Gondolovea herself. The Saxons in Arthur's time destroy ‘Caerleon on the Severn’ and the beast that eats Morvid is sent from hell, which is not in the Vulgate that we know. King of the Bretons, Budicius brought up Constans and Aurelius Ambrosius in Huntingdon’s rendition. In the Vulgate HRB Budicius brings up Utherpendragon and Aurelius Ambrosius, not Constans. Witelinus, archbishop of London becomes Guithelinus in HRB where he is termed \textit{Metropolitanus}. This in effect witnesses Henry Blois’ enmity with Canterbury and Theobald by implying that before Augustine, London was already a metropolitan. More importantly the development of storyline is evidenced in the evolution of HRB relative to events concerning Henry Blois.

One can witness between the \textit{Primary Historia} in 1138 to the First Variant in 1144 a difference in storyline where three archbishops (archflamens and metropolitans are referred to where they surely would have been mentioned (both absent in EAW) by Huntingdon, if they had been noted in the original \textit{Primary Historia}. There is also the appearance of Phagan and Deruvian which surely would have been noted by Huntingdon\textsuperscript{275} as this was the first time he would have come across their names as the proselytisers of Britain. This becomes a crucial point when we look at how the First Variant was employed by Henry Blois at Rome in his pursuit of metropolitan status.

Huntingdon must have loved this book. Huntingdon himself describes Stonehenge in his \textit{Historia Anglorum}, first published c.1129, as one of the four wonders of England, before having read the \textit{Primary Historia} at Bec. Undoubtedly, Henry Blois had read Huntingdon’s work in the process of constructing his initial pseudo-history for Matilda.

\textsuperscript{274} Historia Anglorum, Diana Greenway, p.558-583

\textsuperscript{275} Henry of Huntingdon wrote: During the reign, Eleutherius being the pontiff who governed the Roman Church, Lucius the British King implored him by letter to take measures for his conversion to Christianity. His embassy was successful and the Britons retained the Faith they received inviolate and undisturbed until the time of Diocletian. If Phagan and Deruvian had been mentioned in the \textit{Primary Historia}, surely Huntingdon would have mentioned their names.
To find Uther Pendragon had erected Stonehenge must have been puzzling for Huntingdon. But, note again my proposition that Merlin was not mentioned in *Primary Historia*. It is only later that ‘Geoffrey’ (not Galfridus) decides that Merlin erected Stonehenge. It seems that, at the introduction of Merlin, (after the *Primary Historia* at Bec had been found) the most mystifying object on the British landscape was then accounted to Merlin having erected it; not as Galfridus Arthur had previously composed (before ‘Geoffrey’ had even invented Merlin).

It is no wonder that Henry introduces giants with the abundance of megaliths across the British landscape. In Huntingdon’s summary of the book he read we can see what was originally in the *Primary Historia*: ‘Uter Pendragon, that is, Dragon’s head, a most excellent youth, the son of Aurelius, brought from Ireland the Dance of Giants (giants circle) which is now called Stanhenges’. We can witness Henry’s conflated construction here and his clever introduction of Merlin based on Nennius’ boy Ambrosius who is perhaps purposefully conflated from Ambrosius Aurelianus; one of the few people that Gildas identifies by name in his sermon *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*.... and the only hero named from the 5th century.

Basically, Henry had posited the son of Aurelius as having brought the Giants Dance from Ireland in the *Primary Historia*. Latterly when introducing Merlin in First Variant as a character before the *prophetia* Henry calls him Ambrosius (surname) as he conflated Merlin on Nennius’ passage (shown in appendix 36).... where Ambrosius is named rather than Utherpendragon as Henry had previously recorded in *Primary Historia*. Also in Huntingdon’s précis, Pascent, the son of Vortigern, had Aurelius poisoned.

Huntingdon is hardly going to trifle in making up these differences. He has read them as they exist.... he was not revising the details. Modern scholars would have us believe that Huntingdon saw a version of Vulgate HRB as we know it today. It is Gaufridus Artur, who then becomes ‘Geoffrey’ who then becomes Bishop of Asaph, AKA Henry Blois who makes the changes as part of an evolution of HRB in later editions. The *Allobroges*

---

276 Henry Of Huntingdon writes: *The second is at Stonehenge, where stones of extraordinary dimensions are raised as columns and others are fixed above, like lintels of immense portals and no one has been able to discover by what mechanism such vast masses of stone were elevated nor for what purpose they were designed. If Merlin had been mentioned in the Primary Historia EAW would have included Merlin’s name. But Geoffrey tells us later on how the stones arrive and what they were for to counter Huntingdon’s inquiry.*
of the later version are the Senones; Brennius is Brennus "the supreme of men, the glory of the brave, the eternal star of Britain"; Tenuantius is Themantius, and a few other names are differently spelt just as we find in the VM by comparison with the HRB.

Henry’s invention of Merlin, where he weaves him into HRB at some period after the appearance of the Primary Historia probably transpired after the release of the Libellus Merlini. This was introduced into or to exist alongside First Variant because of the need to insert the first edition of prophecies which now concern themselves with aspects of metropolitan status in ancient Britain and the predictive reinstatement of two metropolitans were not necessary while Henry was legate. At the same time, other pertinent storyline changes occur such as the invention of Avalon which is not mentioned in the Primary Historia either.

Why does Huntingdon not include Merlin the prophet’s name?... at least if not the prophecies themselves? The answer is simple. Henry Blois had not conceived of Merlin’s prophecies in 1137-38. The break in the Vulgate HRB where Henry Blois inserts the dedication to Alexander and the prophetia is so obviously not a break in an ongoing work as is portrayed by ‘Geoffrey.’ It is a clumsy insertion which would have required editing to the First Variant so that Merlin became spliced into the story. Is it not strange that Arthur and Merlin never meet? I would suggest the reason for this was that editing was not extensive but mainly constituted an insertion. The splice is again made where originally Henry had added Arthuriana to the original pseudo-history. The Alexander dedication (not in First Variant) shows Henry Blois’ genius ploy of backdating the spliced Vulgate HRB.... so that the prophecies appeared to have been in the book prior to some of the events they pretend to predict. That ‘Geoffrey’ had been a Bishop in a location few Anglo Normans had any interest in and the fact that ‘Geoffrey’ was already dead when the Vulgate edition is widely published, prevents any sensorial retribution. This is why none appears amongst his contemporaries and only later by commentators such as Giraldus and Newburgh.

If Huntingdon had really read the Vulgate HRB in 1139.... why would he not mention the marvellous prediction of King Stephen as ‘four’ and the astonishment that the actions of ‘five’ (which was Matilda) were undisclosed and a future ‘Sixth’ King was going to invade Ireland. All of this was highly relevant because he surely would have been able to recognise the first three Kings. Huntingdon had written accounts about them in his
own history. To see that the predictions were true about them would have fascinated him.

Huntingdon simply never saw the prophecies in 1139, never saw his patrons name attached to them.... and the *prophetia* was not part of the *Primary Historia*. Why if his patron commissioned such a translation on the *prophetia* is it ignored as part of his exposé to Warin? Why, instead, would Huntingdon invent a new storyline with Uther Pendragon filling Merlin’s shoes? Some scholars have attempted to implicate Huntingdon’s invention of his own variation of storyline by implying he was addressing a fictitious person rather than a real Breton called Warin to justify the epistolary form of the piece. This is scholastic rationalisation. In the brief reference to Arthur’s wounds and how he fell (with no mention of Avalon) he says in reference to Warin: *But the Bretons, your ancestors, refuse to believe that he died.* Huntingdon is writing to a friend being as informative as such a brief précis allows. But, to not mention Merlin is a gross oversight.... if indeed Merlin and his *prophetia* were included in the *Primary Historia*, given Huntingdon’s relation to Alexander and the fact that the Anarchy was about to take place. All of this had been predicted and was easily understood from the prophecies. Not even Huntingdon would misunderstand that the ‘eagle’ pertained to Matilda of the broken covenant and she had just had her third child.

Huntingdon would be negligent in not mentioning this prophecy as it affected everyone in Britain. It is not as if he did not know where mount Aravius was either as he was just about to pass through that range on his way to Rome with Theobald and his suite. All evidence shows Merlin and his prophecies were not in the Bec copy in 1139.... but still scholars assume the book which Robert of Torigini handed Huntingdon was that which we know today as the Vulgate version.

It is because of this precarious assumption, so many subsequent deductions become inaccurate. Don’t forget also that Robert of Torigini says

---

277 In Arthurian Literature XV edited by Prof. James P. Carley, Felicity Riddy, we are informed by our Arthurian experts (by Watkin): *in 1138 Geoffrey of Monmouth had already said that Arthur was taken to the Isle of Avalon to be healed* p.81. This is incorrect as EAW does not mention Avalon. Watkin assumes that what I have termed the *Primary Historia* (i.e. that book found at Bec), is synonymous with the Vulgate.
Henry actually ‘extracted’ it at Bec, so it is not as if he was working from memory to create EAW. The simple fact is that Huntingdon did not see the fully evolved Vulgate HRB with updated prophecies, but a *Primary Historia*, which, because of its lack of copies, has not survived as an exemplar of HRB. In fact it would be a useful exercise to unscramble what seems to me to be three or four sets of prophecies from the first in the *Libellus Merlini* and between HRB and VM (excluding JC’s version) because it is plain in the following sets an icon is being used in one prophecy then the same icon differently in another set changing the sense, but what has bemused those even interested is that the icons have remained the same and Henry has shuffled the pack and only certain make sense at any given time. The squishing process can only be divined when you know at what period and for what reason they were written.

It is from the *Primary Historia* that the First Variant evolved to become the Vulgate not vice versa. Huntingdon would not presume to have the artistic licence of a *conteur*. He is a recognised historian. It was Merlin in a specific episode who brought the Giants Dance to Britain in our version of HRB. This is not confusion on Huntingdon’s part, but reflects an evolving introduction of Merlin into the story line after the copy found at Bec.

The answers of Lear’s three daughters also vary from our HRB. Thus Goneril is made to say: *Beneath the moon that marketh the boundaries betwixt things mutable and things eternal, nought is there that can ever be so much unto me;* and Regan: *My love for thee is more precious than all riches, and all things desirable are as nought in comparison therewithal.* Cordelia, the only sister named, gives her answer: *So much as thou hast, so much art thou worth, and so much do I love thee,* without any preface to soften the bluntness of her speech. The moral of the tale is thus rendered: *accordingly, hence hath been derived the saying, ”Things moderately said are ever the more to be appreciated.”*

Huntingdon is an accurate chronicler of events and not an inventor of fiction. It is impossible to have the many discrepancies without assuming a different version. At the siege of Lincoln a Keldricus arrives with a countless English host only to be thwarted by the arrival from Brittany of Hoelus, son of Arthur’s sister and Budicius and the siege of Lincoln was dispersed by agreement. In HRB it is Cheldricus at the siege of Lindocoliam instead of the more obvious *Lincoliam* and the siege ends in great slaughter, not concord.
Most poignantly of all, Huntingdon provides a speech by Arthur which relates to the ‘Britons hope’ of Arthur’s return as well as having just reminded Warin about the Breton’s refusal to believe Arthur is dead. What is important is that Huntingdon follows on to say and they (the Bretons) traditionally await his return.\textsuperscript{278} This ‘hope’ of the Bretons is the very reason that when Henry Blois first concocts the story of the Chivalric Arthur, no place of burial is given nor suggestion that Arthur arrives on Avalon mortally wounded.\textsuperscript{279} Nor is it overtly stated that he died. This perpetuates an already existent folk belief, which, for no other reason, Huntingdon makes plain is current and traditionally held. Most importantly of all is that it shows the progression and evolution between \textit{Primary Historia} and the First Variant, in that, \textit{Insula Avalonis} is then mentioned in First Variant.

Now, if the name had been present in \textit{Primary Historia} it also would have been mentioned by Huntingdon,... if not only because it would be the first location to search. One could verify and prevent any further rumour of an Arthurian return. Anyhow, this ‘hope’ and Arthur’s legendary status was prevalent among the Celts as is alluded to by William of Malmesbury in his \textit{GR1}\textsuperscript{280} and was genuinely part of insular Brythonic/Celtic zeitgeist at the time.

The critical point which shows Huntingdon has read a different version from our Vulgate HRB is highlighted in this next extract from the letter to Warin: ‘When he was about to cross over the Alps, an envoy said unto him, "Modred, your nephew, has put your crown upon his own head with the assistance of Keldricus, King of the English, and has taken your wife unto himself". Arthur, thereupon, boiling over with wondrous rage, returning into England, conquered Modred in battle, and after pursuing him as far as into Cornwall, with a few men fell upon him in the midst of many, and when he saw that he could not turn back said, "Comrades, let us sell our death dear. I, for my part, will smite off the head of my nephew and my betrayer, after

\textsuperscript{278}\textit{Historia Anglorum}. Diane Greenway. P. 589 c.9.
\textsuperscript{279}In a later chapter (32) concerning the death of Arthur found in a First Variant version we see an initial proposition that: although it was not bringing an immediate death, nevertheless boded ill for the near future, which allows for the arrival on Avalon. However, in this version known as \textit{Vera Historia de morte Arthuri}, Arthur is actually killed by a spear. Now you can’t fake a grave in Avalon if King Arthur isn’t dead. The beauty about the \textit{Vera Historia de morte Arthuri} is that Arthur is dead or is he? This is Henry’s work in an evolved First Variant even locating a possible grave near St Mary’s church.
\textsuperscript{280}\textit{Gesta Regum Anglorum}. Thompson and Winterbottom. P.27 8.2. This Arthur is the hero of many wild tales among the Britons even in our own day, but assuredly deserves to be the subject of reliable history rather than of false and dreaming fable.
which death will be a delight unto me." Thus spake he, and hewing a way for himself with his sword through the press, dragged Modred by the helmet into the midst of his own men and cut through his mailed neck as through a straw. Nonetheless, as he went, and as he did the deed, so many wounds did he receive that he fell, albeit that his kinsmen the Britons deny that he is dead, and do even yet solemnly await his coming again. He was, indeed, the very first man of his time in warlike prowess, bounty and wit.'

It is Henry Blois' changing circumstances between 1138 and 1158 which ties the evidence together as his agenda alters after the death of his brother. Why, for example, are there three different accounts of Arthur's demise; one in the version above in the Primary Historia another in HRB and another in VM. It evidences one of Henry Blois' secondary designs behind writing the version involving Avalon.... and then while at Clugny after 1155 semantically transforming that same Island through linguistic contortions and misdirection in the Vita Merlini to establish a previously geographically unknown location of Avalon.... to locate it at Glastonbury as Insula Pomorum.

The complimentary fictions (corroborative evidences) which bolster this transformation and translocation of Avalon are by Henry's hand in DA. To avoid digression here, Henry Blois' supporting evidence which is unfolded in DA, through several clever devices, will be dealt with in progression.

Henry Huntingdon then wraps up his epistle: 'These, then, my best-beloved Warin the Briton, are in brief that which I did promise you, whereof, if you desire to read the whole at length, make diligent enquiry after the great book of Galfridi Arturi which I found at the Abbey of Le Bec, wherein you may find the aforesaid treated with sufficient fullness and clearness. Fare thee well!'

The enquiry which Warin makes to Huntingdon (previously) is, why did he (Huntingdon) start his history with Caesar rather than with the Trojan Brutus? We know by his reply that Huntingdon had searched but found nothing. The question to Huntingdon was specifically about insular history.... so Warin was aware of Nennius's account of Brutus.²⁸¹ Certainly

²⁸¹Nennius’ material about Brutus would indicate such a history existed prior to Geoffreya. Nennius starts his history by saying: ‘the Island of Britain derives its name from Brutus a Roman Consul rather than a Trojan’. He also states that ‘We have obtained this information respecting the original inhabitants of Britain from ancient tradition. The Britons were thus called from Brutus: Brutus was the son of Hisicion’. This history by Nennius’ admission was written in the 838 year of our Lords incarnation and in the 24th year of Mervin, King of the’ Britons’. The story of Brutus thus, precedes Geoffreya’s account by three hundred years.... if we are to believe no
‘someone’ knew of the Frankish descendants from Troy, so ‘Geoffrey’s’ invention was not a totally new fictitious historical fabrication that was new to Huntingdon or Warin. Henry of Huntingdon, as we have discussed, does not like Henry Blois and as a slight to him, refers to him as ‘someone’ in the incident I mentioned earlier with King Henry I. In his letter to Walter (not Warin) in Huntingdon’s pontifications ‘on contempt for the world’, he says about the bishops of Winchester and Henry Blois, as I have previously related “now there sits in their place Henry, (of Blois), nephew of King Henry, who will be a new kind of monster, composed part pure and part corrupt, I mean part monk and part knight.”

The point is that the reference to Henry Blois written to Walter by Henry Huntingdon is obviously soon after Henry’s appointment to Winchester. Huntingdon is relating to a friend the prospect of what might become of Henry Blois. It is an ominous prediction, perceived through a trait or character defect that Huntingdon has observed first hand in the ambitious Henry Blois. It may have been written before Stephen became King because of the reference to King Henry Ist. So, why is Henry of Huntingdon referring to Henry Blois as part Knight, if the Anarchy has not started as yet unless it alludes to his time at Epernon where he refers to Henry Blois as ‘someone’. It seems fair to suppose that Huntingdon witnessed Henry Blois’ demonstration of ‘educated’ genius in his recital of the History of the Franks from Troy. He was there as an eyewitness to make the character prediction based on what he had witnessed of Henry Blois.

Huntingdon knows Henry Ist is staying at Epernon in Normandy for eight days as safely as if he were in his Kingdom.\textsuperscript{282} Huntingdon’s pique is somewhat of professional jealousy. Huntingdon’s observation as to Henry’s character, it is not so far from the mark. If it had not been for Henry Blois’ position, (already established in Britain as Bishop of Winchester), it seems unlikely that Stephen would have been crowned within three weeks of interpolation has taken place in Nennius. He also says ‘the Saxons were received by Vortigern, four hundred and forty seven years after the passion of Christ’ and other similar material that Geoffrey professed to have found in his fictitious book using all the insular annals as source material. There are problems with Nennius as Newell discusses but my suspicion of interpolation into Nennius is that I believe (and it is clearly attested) that it is Henry Blois as the main promoter of the misunderstanding that the Nennius MS was written by Gildas as he even includes this in his interpolation into Orderic.

\textsuperscript{282}\textit{Historia Anglorum}. Diane Greenway. P. 479 chap 38
Henry Ist death. Henry Blois is not without guile and Huntingdon’s assessment is real. He even states a similar attitude about Henry much later in life as we have seen when relating about Theobald of Bec: *He had as his helper Henry, bishop of Winchester, who earlier had thrown the realm into grievous disorder, delivering the crown of the Kingdom to his brother Stephen, but now seeing everything destroyed by robbery, fire and slaughter, he was moved to repentance...*  

The only reason I have laboured this point is that, if we consider Henry Blois’ implication in the Trojan-Frankish recital; it is just another piece of the puzzle which fits as an able composer of HRB which features Brutus. William of Malmesbury has not accepted the Brutus story.  

It is doubtful that William of Malmesbury ever saw a copy of the *Primary Historia* and certainly never saw the First Variant as that was used in conjunction with the first interpolations into Malmesbury’s DA and GR3 as part of the case Henry presents at Rome.... to show that a metropolitan had long existed in southern England prior to Augustine’s arrival.  

Concerning the colophon, in HRB, Henry Blois (or ‘Geoffrey’) had conceded that he would hand over as continuator, in the matter of writing the Saxon’s history to William of Malmesbury. It was already written!!! But just to confirm that which I postulated above about the relationship between Blois and Huntingdon.... ‘Geoffrey’ is not so kind to Henry of Huntingdon and he is singled out for abuse. As I have covered, all three were dead when the colophon in Vulgate HRB was added, so no umbrage was felt by Huntingdon, but the return insult was conveyed to posterity. This would never have been written with dismissive condescension to two very well connected and sincere historians when they were living.... especially by an unimportant prior in Oxford. The point is that even if the bishop of Asaph were real and signed the treaty of Winchester (which he did not in reality) as co-signatory with Henry Blois.... ‘Geoffrey’ is hardly

---

283 *Historia Anglorum*, Henry of Huntingdon, X, 37, p. 771
284 GR. I 68.3
285 *I hand over in the matter of writing unto Karadoc of Llancarvan, my contemporary, as do I those of the Saxons unto William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon, whom I bid be silent as to the Kings of the Britons, seeing that they have not that book.*
going to dismissively consign to silence with such effrontery, the historian who has Bishop Alexander\textsuperscript{286} as patron also.

Essentially the Vulgate colophon is an artful display which retro-dates the HRB. It is artful in confirming the source book as if indirectly. Henry Blois would have seen Huntingdon’s references to the bishop of Winchester. This fact should be taken into consideration and understood by the reader, as Henry Blois’ partial catalyst for setting out his own subtle *apologia* in GS. As we have covered, Henry becomes a much nobler Henry of Winchester for posterity, softening his own character and excusing/rationalising his deeds in the GS.

Both Malmesbury and Huntingdon had left a negative impression for posterity concerning Henry Blois in their writings. For a man of such vanity who knew that future historians would judge by what chroniclers have recorded, this was essential to rectify. But, one can see from ‘Geoffrey’s tone he cares little for Malmesbury or Huntingdon.

Huntingdon relates an account of Brutus from the *Primary Historia* to Warin. The brief passage which Huntingdon relates in his *Historia Anglorum* about Arthur’s twelve battles comes from the Vatican recension of Nennius, but in Huntingdon’s history there is no mention of the Brutus material or Troy. An odd turn of events, since he had read Henry’s *Primary Historia* in 1139, but makes no addition into the *Historia Anglorum* in his final recension mentioning Troy.

\textsuperscript{286} It is indicative of scholarships loss of direction where Michael Curley in his book on Geoffrey states: *we puzzle over the eagerness of a sophisticated and worldly Norman administrator such as bishop Alexander of Lincoln to possess a collection of Merlin’s prophecies*. Why would not someone intelligent enough to realise that the prophecies validating false historicity in HRB and both known to be written by ‘Geoffrey’ could not see the Introduction of Alexander is only a splice mechanism; and this had to be after Alexander was dead otherwise it would be found to be a lie. Same with Walter!!!!
Chapter 7

The Interpolation into Orderic’s book XII

The point of insertion into Orderic’s history of Henry Blois’ Merlin prophecies comes just after another short episode in Orderic’s work which tells us of Duke Robert, while imprisoned at Cardiff. Supposedly the Duke sees into the future like a prophet and sees the death of his son in the ‘White Ship’ incident. He says: ‘Alas! My son is dead’. Orderic then tells us that no messenger could have informed the Duke beforehand, averring the miraculous foresight of the Duke. Orderic Vitalis ends the account with the death of the imprisoned Duke ‘six years afterward’ which also sways the reader’s interpretation of the dating of the Merlin passage i.e. twenty years before Henry Blois’ prediction of Henry II invasion of Ireland, which as we know can only be subsequent to 1155.

The entire chapter XLVII in book XII is evidently an interpolation that Henry Blois has spliced into Orderic’s Chronicle. The choice of insertion is *apropos* because one of the prophecies speaks of the Duke’s son’s death in the ‘White Ship’ incident along with Henry I son and heir. The Duke’s capacity as a seer in this passage where the sliced interpolation occurs conditions the reader of Orderic to that chronological date and thus sets up the Merlin passage to be accepted as part of the chronicle. The cleverness of
Henry Blois is in placing the interpolated Merlin prophecies in a chronological annal, so that it appears to have been written while Henry Ist was alive by saying: *I may therefore be allowed to introduce in this work some of his predictions which appear to relate to the present era.*

It is worth looking at the entire chapter XLVII as a whole because this is the one chapter which has duped scholars into believing in the veracity of the prophecies in that they believe the passage was genuinely written by Orderic while alive in the time of King Henry Ist: *See how the prophecy of Ambrosius Merlin, delivered in the time of Vortigern, King of Britain was clearly fulfilled in many instances during a period of 600 years. I may therefore be allowed to introduce in this work some of his predictions which appear to relate to the present era.* Merlin was contemporary with St Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre. He twice crossed over to England in the time of the Emperor Valentinian, and, disputing against Pelagius and his disciples, who cavilled at the doctrine of divine grace, confuted the heretics by many miracles wrought in the name of the Lord. Then, after devoutly celebrating the feast of Easter, he fought against the Anglo-Saxons, who being pagans waged war against the Christian Britons; and prevailing more by his prayers than his arms, routed the heathen host with an army of newly baptised in the faith, *he himself shouting alleluia during the battle*[^287]. Should anyone desire to learn more of these events and the fortunes of the Britons, he should peruse the books of Gildas the British historian, and Bede the English writer, in which the reader will find allusive narrative of the acts of Vortimer and his brothers with those of the valiant Arthur, who fought twelve battles against the English.

We are told that Merlin showed Vortigern a pond in the middle of the floor, and in the pond two vessels, and in the vessel's attendant folded up, and in the tent two worms, one of which was white and the other red. The worms grew very fast and becoming dragons, fought desperately with each other. At last, the red dragon conquered and drove the white dragon to the margin of the pond. The King beholding these things, with the Britons, was sorely distressed and wept. Merlin, being then interrogated by the astonished spectators, explained in the spirit of prophecy that the pond in the middle of the floor signified the world; the two vessels, the British isles; the tent, the towns and

[^287]: This sentence alone confirms that the Vita Merlini had already been composed before the interpolation into Orderic.
villages of Britain, the seats of human habitation; by the two worms were meant the British and English people, who should harass each other by turns in fierce conflicts, until the **bloody Saxons, who are designated by the red dragon**, had driven into Cornwall, and to the shores of the ocean, the Britons, who are figured by the white dragon, because they were arrayed in white at the baptismal font from the times of King Lucius, and pope Eleutherius.

The **prophet also predicted the course of events which would occur in future ages** in the islands of the north, and reduced his prophecy to writing in allegorical language. Having spoken of the Germanic worm and the **decimation of Neustria**, which was fulfilled in Alfred, brother of Edward, the son of King Ethelred and his companions at Guilford; he made predictions concerning the revolutions of the present age, and the troublesome vicissitudes of affairs, to the following effect: — I will include that which follows shortly.

We know the interpolation is post 1155 because of the Sixth in Ireland prophecy and the fact someone is contorting the wording so that the prophecies appear to have been extant while Henry Ist was still alive. Here in the preamble Henry is annulling the accusation and derision from the critics that the prophecies are recently invented. The fact that questions were being raised also about Merlin being an incubus and prophesying by the Devil is counteracted above in Merlin’s connection to Christianity... *disputing against Pelagius and his disciples*.

For those who were sceptical of the prophecies in VM and the updates into the Vulgate which could only have been written post 1155... one wonders who has added the ‘decimation of Neustria’ now Henry II is on the throne. This prophecy was not in the earlier *Libellus* when his brother Stephen was king and was not a prophecy that Henry would have entertained while his brother was alive. ‘Germanic worms’ were mentioned in the original version of prophecies, but the ‘decimation of Neustria’ has appeared since Henry II has come to power and some are suspicious. When Henry, in the latter half of 1157, realises the Celtic rebellion is not going to come to fruition, he tries ambiguously to connect his prophecies intended to cause sedition back to the time of Alfred feigning comprehension and true purport of the prophecy by saying it was already fulfilled and we are given an erroneous trail to follow by an innocent chronicler who has misinterpreted the obvious.
Another piece of evidence I will show further on (unequivocally) is that the persona\textsuperscript{288} of King Lucius as presented by Geoffrey, as a British king, is entirely Henry Blois’ invention in HRB. Therefore, we can establish the Merlin passage in Orderic is definitively an interpolation by Henry Blois. The passage could not have been written by Orderic at the time thought by scholars because \textit{Primary Historia} was only finished in 1138. Lucius only features as a fabricated persona in First Variant from 1144 (as part of the association with Eleutherius); Orderic died in 1142 and one cannot have the ‘Sixth’ in Ireland prophecy…..so it must postdate 1155 anyway.

After this brief account of events, Orderic then goes on to quote nearly verbatim the prophecies which I will follow with shortly. King Lucius as presented in HRB as a King in Britain is entirely the invention of Henry Blois. ‘Geoffrey’ in HRB employs him as a splice in chronology based upon Bede’s mistake and the bogus King Lucius is again employed in DA.

The interpolator has purposefully changed the colour of the dragons in the opposite from that presented in the HRB (and Nennius). ‘\textit{bloody Saxons, who are designated by the red dragon’}. It is such an obvious mistake that is meant to imply that it is an inconsequential muddle of the chronicler (Orderic)…. and therefore, could not be an interpolation by the very man who wrote’ \textit{the White Dragon is indicative of the Saxons’} in the HRB…. who had it the same way round as the serpents which are presented in Nennius. (see appendix 36) An accidental mistake one might think, but don’t forget Henry Blois in the GS mis-names his own Nephew as the future Bishop of Durham purposefully to hide his identity as author as well as a few petty deprecations concerning himself.

We should also be aware that Henry Blois in the Orderic interpolation employs a gambit found in HRB, where he accredits certain facts to a historian like Gildas. But what he refers to is not found in Gildas, i.e. he is trying to establish fact where none exists. Now, why do we see ‘Orderic’ in this interpolation employing the very same tactic? It is because the writer of the Merlin interpolation into Orderic is Henry Blois. Orderic mentions Guortemirus and his brothers and Arthur; along with his twelve battles as all appearing in Gildas-Nennius and Bede. Henry knows the battles are not

---

\textsuperscript{288} ‘Geoffrey’ expands upon a mistake made by Bede. It is this purposeful link to King Lucius that Orderic supposedly makes with Merlin which indicates it must be the inventor of Merlin at work who is interpolating Orderic.
in Bede and yet are in Nennius. He uses the same ploy in HRB several times. It is hardly likely that Orderic would assert such a thing.

It is Henry establishing corroborative sources, especially by propagating the work of Nennius under the name of the respected Gildas. This is evidenced in that we next learn that the Saxons drove the Britons into Cornwall. This is neither in Nennius or Bede but in the HRB. Also the named princes in Orderic’s interpolated passage are scattered through Nennius and Bede, if one can pick them out. Yet in Geoffrey’s HRB all ten princes exist in the same order as Orderic has them. We may conclude, given the evidence, Henry Blois is the interpolator into Orderic with one aim in mind: To make it appear as if Orderic had the ‘Sixth’ in Ireland prophecy mixed with those that were in the earlier *Libellus Merlini* .... giving the impression that all the prophecies in Orderic’s book XII were extant before Henry Ist died. Even though it is admitted that Orderic did not write his book chronologically the passage feigns to be written before december 1135. This cannot be accepted, as Henry would only have written the prophecy concerning the ‘Sixth’ once he knew his brother was dead to purposefully unseat the man who had relieved his of his castles and power; also, only when Henry was appraised of the intention to invade Ireland in 1155.

Scholars genuinely believe that in the twelfth century certain chroniclers (Geoffrey being the prime candidate) thought that the authorship of the work of Nennius was wrongly apportioned to Gildas. Let me state for the record one absolute certainty. The person responsible for propagating and copying Nennius’ work and citing the author as Gildas is Henry Blois. Gildas is put in direct association with Arthur in *Life of Gildas* which we know was written by Henry. So it is imperative to understand that neither Bede nor Gildas mention Arthur by name; and by implicating Nennius’ work as Gildas’, Henry establishes his own historicity for HRB’s chivalric Arthur. This foisting of Nennius’ work on Gildas occurs several times in HRB and it is not a mistake but a deliberate ruse to add credence to a Manuscript that lists Arthur’s battles. (This is why I just leave Nennius to stand as it is... because I think it genuinely speaks to Arthur the Warlord). Gildas was never at Glastonbury and it is Henry Blois who posits that he was at Glastonbury abbey in interpolations into GR3 and DA to concur with the episode where Gildas is said to have been present at Glastonbury in *Life of Gildas*. 
Make no mistake that Nennius’ work is by Nennius and much of the inspiration of ‘Geoffrey’ is derived from Nennius. Nennius was a genuine work which bears witness to Arthur (the un-chivalric) and it also has Vortigern and two serpents from which Henry is witnessed to have used as a template for the splice into HRB, for the preamble to the prophecies (see appendix 36). Nennius does not mention Merlin in connection with these serpents. This is entirely a case of Henry’s muses which have inspired ‘Geoffrey’ to aver that Merlin’s surname is Ambrosius.

The author of HRB is keen that we should accept Gildas as the real author of Nennius and so here (in the passage above) in Orderic, the same polemical gambit is played. But also the author of chapter XLVII of Orderic would have us believe that Merlin too was mentioned by this book supposedly written by Gildas. So this paragraph, shown below has exactly the same polemic as ‘Geoffrey’ and the reason for this is that Henry Blois wants posterity to believe Gildas referred to Arthur and Merlin and Gildas was even present at the concocted episode of Guinevere’s kidnap found in Henry Blois’s composed version of Life of Gildas.

Should anyone desire to learn more of these events and the fortunes of the Britons, he should peruse the books of Gildas the British historian, and Bede the English writer, in which the reader will find allusive narrative of the acts of Vortimer and his brothers with those of the valiant Arthur, who fought twelve battles against the English. We are told that Merlin showed Vortigern a pond in the middle of the floor, and in the pond two vessels.

The intention of Henry Blois by citing the historians ‘allusive narrative’ and naming Vortigern is to make the reader believe that Gildas and Bede did allude to Merlin. They did not!!! Nennius records the passage which was the inspiration for Geoffrey involving the boy Ambrosius but he does not mention Merlin. Now we understand why Henry is keen on having Nennius thought of as a work composed by Gildas the Wise.

Orderic’s passage leads to the mention of King Lucius and Eleutherius. Although Eleutherius is mentioned first in the Liber Pontificalis and thereafter in Bede and in Nennius, we can only touch on this at the moment, because later, we will discover that King Lucius has been given an entirely fictitious role in HRB. This same connection with Eleutherius has been contorted so that King Lucius becomes thereafter indelibly associated with the two preachers Phagan and Deruvian once they become included in First Variant. What is not surprising is that Henry Blois as the interpolator
of the Merlin passage in Orderic further confirms the fable about King Lucius that he established in HRB.

The name of Lucius has been used again when interpolated into William of Malmesbury’s DA by Henry who has made the missionaries Phagan and Deruvian (another concoction from HRB), sent by Pope Eleutherius, to be the discoverers’ of an already established Glastonbury church. Nobody had heard of the preachers prior to First Variant HRB. It is Henry Blois’ device to connect them to Eleutherius and by extension King Lucius. All this will become clear as regards Phagan and Deruvian when we cover this subject in the chapters on William of Malmesbury’s GR3 and DA. This is Henry Blois’ most elaborate conflation and invention and it is not by coincidence that the propaganda is set to conflate and corroborate in the interpolation in Orderic’s chapter XLVII as in the HRB: Their names and acts are to be found recorded in the book that Gildas wrote as concerning the victory of Aurelius Ambrosius.289

It would be silly to think that the man who wrote the life of Gildas is not the same man who tells us Gildas wrote Nennius. One can see Henry Blois is up to the same thing in HRB: Whence afterward a contention arose betwixt him and his brother Nennius, who took it ill that he should be minded to do away the name of Troy in his own country. But since Gildas, the historian, hath treated of this contention at sufficient length...

This author of the HRB and ‘coincidentally’ in Orderic is admonishing us to read Gildas. Why would he do this? Of course to ensure that his readers think Nennius is written by Gildas. Of course Gildas’ De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae does not mention Troy. The Nennius manuscript is an important source for Henry’s inspiration in HRB. It is the only work apart from a few saints’ lives and the Annals Cambriæ (and in Henry’s own bogus Life of Gildas) which mentions Arthur. Nennius has no historical traceable provenance, but because he mentions Arthur and because Henry has written the life of Gildas (which puts Gildas in direct contact with Arthur at Glastonbury), Henry Blois wants his audience to confuse Nennius’ work as that written by Gildas.

Gildas’ genuine work De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae does not mention Arthur or King Lucius. But the author of the life of Gildas, and the two interpolated manuscripts of Malmesbury’s DA and GR3 concerning

289 HRB IV.xx
Lucius is by the same person (Henry) who wrote the HRB and interpolated Orderic’s passage on Merlin. It is not surprising therefore to see the same propaganda in all.

Five of the seven explicit quotations from Gildas in Geoffrey’s work are fraudulent i.e. Gildas did not say what is being posited by ‘Geoffrey’. But, ‘Geoffrey’ does quote Gildas in HRB without citing him as a reference. Geoffrey thus employs a famous name to stamp credibility on his contortions, conflations and inventions. Henry only respects Gildas without giving the Nennius historian credit for what parts of his work he used as inspiration. Yet Henry tries his best to bring their names in association with each other in HRB causing confusion for posterity. Another thing which shows the Orderic passage on the Merlin prophecies is an interpolation is that supposedly we are to believe they were present in the time of Henry Ist as part of book XII, chronologically providing precience for Merlin’s predictions.

So, how is it that Guortegirnus and the Britons are moved to tears where no such thing happens in Nennius and yet coincidentally there is a likeness in the HRB where Merlin hysterically bursts into tears before beginning the prophecies?

To grasp the fraud which Henry Blois has perpetrated, one has to understand that at that era if one had the intent, a person as powerful as Henry, evidently could concoct his own History. Especially given the situation where his renown gave him access to so many annals such as Orderic’s and William’s where he was the one who had copies made of their work after he had interpolated them. Much of this effort is because of the seditious prophecies he released in 1155 and King Henry II would want to know who was releasing these seditious prophecies.

I think now the reader can see why it was so imperative to create the three most important interpolations, Gaimar’s epilogue, the colophon which speaks to historians in Vulgate HRB and the interpolation into Orderic. Those three small insertions would take just folio insertions yet change and backdate affairs. If you add to that Robert of Torigni’s mention of the bishop of Asaph and the small bit of paper alluding to ‘Goeffrey’s’ elevation to bishop, and scribble on 7 extant charters, Henry has totally fooled every scholar and comtemporary looking for the elusive ‘Geoffrey’.

This is exactly what Henry Blois has set out to do: to propagate a synthesis of his various agendas throughout his long life at the forefront of
power. This in effect is exemplified by the contents of the first thirty four chapters of DA. The fact that Henry Blois had the capability and the volition to interpolate and reproduce so many manuscripts is one way an investigator can make sense of the salad of material he has left behind. It is only when political events and the motivation behind the various interpolations become clear, that Henry Blois is witnessed at centre stage at every turn.

Once one understands that Henry Blois wrote the Prophecies of Merlin one can see he sets out purposely to confuse his readers by changing the form of the prophecies as witnessed in the differences between the Orderic interpolation, the original prophecies which Suger would have received, and those written in the Vulgate HRB. Henry then further 'squewes' the original purport of some prophecies in the later VM as his agenda has changed. Add to this ‘salad’ of material, John of Cornwall’s rendition of prophecies, (also crafted by Henry Blois) .... it leaves little that can be relied upon. The accusation against what I have divined as material interpolated by Henry will always be dismissed by scholars because their in depth analysis of our three genres remains devoid of context and usually treated as unconnected to the other genres of study.

Thrown into this mix is Henry Blois’ interpolations in the first 34 chapters of DA and version B interpolations of William of Malmesbury's GR3. If we add to this invention of history that we find in HRB, Henry Blois leaves no investigator any chance of resolving any of this clutter because he also impersonates Wace and relates his work as if it were the same as Gaimar’s brut.

The reader may think that the conspiracy theories have gone too far already, but to complicate matters further: Henry then composes the primordial Grail literature which again commences a whole new body of corroborative Arthurian literature which is then expanded upon by others such as Chrétien and Robert. All will become clear as we cover each subject to reveal Henry Blois' involvement.

It would not be untenable for Henry Blois to be accused of interpolating the original MS by Nennius. However, to me this seems doubtful as it is the one main text which corroborated the existence of Arthur as warlord and existing in genuine History. It would hardly be credible to argue that it is Henry Blois who is the instigator of the change of authorship from Nennius to Gildas if indeed he had gone to the effort of interpolating the book of
Nennius. Nennius’ work definitely existed at an earlier date than Geoffrey’s HRB. Henry may have first come across the Nennius manuscript at Chartres. Nennius maybe a patchwork compilation, but the Arthurian section in it is Henry’s anchor point. All he wishes us to believe is that it was composed by Gildas as some manuscripts in his era did not have the Nennius name attached.

He is so keen to assign Nennius to Gildas in HRB, VM, and the Orderic interpolation that we can only assume it was not a general misunderstanding by medieval chroniclers as modern scholars believe. It was rather a deliberate attempt to brand the work of Nennius as that of Gildas.

What is a Nennius’ manuscript doing at Chartres? In the Durham Cathedral Library MS B.2.35 we find the Nennius edition attributed to Gildas but ‘coincidentally’ the manuscript of the Life of Gildas by Caradog of Llancarfan is part of the Gildas-Nennius manuscript. Henry’s sister Agnes had a son Hugh de Puiset who had been archdeacon in the see of Winchester, before Henry promoted him to the position of Bishop of Durham and is probably the link to Durham and the reason the scripts were combined.

Without the relevant section in Nennius’ history, Henry would have no foundation as an Arthurian source except a brief mention in Annales Cambriae upon which to establish his chivalric Arthur. The Gildas and Bede references are only by association with Ambrosius Aurelianus the Briton resistance leader which ‘Geoffrey’ purposefully conflates with Arthur’s existence. The fact that Huntingdon was unperturbed about Arthur as an invention when writing to Warin means he was acquainted with the Arthur in Nennius and the ‘Hope’ of the Briton’s as he relates. Huntingdon himself draws on other parts of Nennius and refers to ‘the famed Arthur’ in the letter to Warin. What troubles me is that after Huntingdon’s description of Arthur’s twelve battles in his last redaction of his chronicle he says: These battles and battle-fields are described by Gildas the historian. Gildas did not

---

290 Newell. Problems with Nennius.
291 Henry writing as Geoffrey even has the audacity to conflate Merlin by calling his surname Ambrosius. Gildas says: Ambrosius Aurelianus, a modest man, who of all the Roman nation was then alone in the confusion of this troubled period by chance left alive’.
mention Arthur, only Aurelianus and Badon; so has Henry of Huntingdon used the Gildas-Nennius manuscript which I believe has had its author changed to appear to be written by Gildas? If mention of Arthur was in the first 1129 edition of Huntingdon’s history, this would seem unlikely that we can accuse Henry Blois of the authorial name change. But Huntingdon included Arthur in his history after 1139 in a later redaction.

We cannot reliably say if Nennius has been altered but it is obvious through the construction, pasting and rearranging of Nennius versions, it could not have been written by Gildas.

However, on balance, it is best to leave the evidence in *Nennius* as it stands as we cannot know with certainty if or when interpolation occurred. Elsewhere Henry Blois’ authorial hand is a lot more obvious.

Anachronistically, in ‘Geoffrey’s’ account, it is Nennius who fought Julius Caesar. Does Nennius invent Arthur’s battle locations as none are identifiable today? Nennius also advocates a heritage from Troy and this particular provenance was of Frankish origin as we have covered.

If we know Henry Blois is ‘Geoffrey’ and it was ‘Geoffrey’ who embellished the Trojan heritage which Huntingdon had not heard about in 1139; why did Huntingdon write to Warin stating he had not heard this early history if he had read Nennius. We know the HRB Arthurian escapade is a fantastic concoction and my purpose in this investigation is to highlight certain manuscripts which Henry Blois has a personal identifiable attachment to.

However, going back to the Orderic insertion, it is King Lucius’ historically fictitious request for which, Eleutherius sends two missionaries, Fuganus and Duvianus (an entirely fictitious episode invented by ‘Geoffrey’) who then turn up at Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ St Patrick Charter.... which is the main reason the Eleutherius episode is corroborated and highlighted in the Orderic passage by Henry.

Orderic never mentions Bede or Gildas before in his books, so it makes one suspicious that also Nennius material (just as it is in HRB) is being established as material derived from Gildas. Henry, posing as Caradoc wrote the *life of Gildas* where Arthuriana and Glastonburyana are woven into a completely concocted text based on the format found in the *life of Cadoc*. The conflation and cross referencing of various tracts is hard to unpick. As we saw earlier, Henry even has Taliesin returning from Brittany.
where he took instruction from Gildas in the *VM*. It is the incremental corroboration from the various interpolated manuscripts which has left scholarship a minefield of false connections to stumble through.

Again we must remember that apart from this passage, Orderic does not cite Bede or Gildas yet is here witnessed promoting Nennius as Gildas. Tatlock rightly states that the order of the Kings, given in the interpolated chapter of Orderic are in the order of the HRB rather than Bede or Nennius, but in neither of those authors works are the Britons driven into Cornwall as in HRB. Our impostor of Orderic cleverly portrays in this passage the appearance that the particular events he is portraying come from three sources; Bede, Gildas, and the Merlin prophecies with no mention of the HRB.

Why, if Orderic has read the HRB (obviated by the list of Kings) is there no other information derived from it? It is this point which confirms along with the others that it was not Orderic who wrote this passage. Henry knew the order of Kings!!! Orderic, like Henry Huntingdon, would be very interested in the HRB and it is likely would have related to another part of it in his work.... if indeed HRB had been widely published as is commonly thought.

As Orderic died in 1142 (long before Vulgate was published) it cannot be established whether he saw HRB in any redaction. But definitely the author of the Orderic interpolation had. However, Henry Blois would deem it necessary not to mention HRB material, as his intention is to show in the Orderic passage these prophecies existed before Henry Ist died.... when *primary historia* was not even published. It is for this specific reason Henry avoids the only prophecy which is so highly specific and seems dubious vaticinatory material concerning Henry I body parts.

Even the incredulous would not believe a sixth century seer is going to randomly see into the future, the gruesome details of separating Henry’s Uncle’s entrails from its body. *Woe unto thee, Neustria, for the brain of the Lion shall be poured forth upon thee; and with mangled limbs shall he be thrust forth of his native soil.*

I am sure that that this particular prophecy was in the early *Libellus Merlini* which found its way into the updated Vulgate prophecies which
included events in the Anarchy. Scholarship of course sees the body part\textsuperscript{292} prophecy as a later insertion into the HRB prophecies; because it is omitted in Orderics set of prophecies which by comparison to the prophecies in HRB.... it is included in this same clump which also derive from the early \textit{Libellus Merlini}.

Some commentators have reasoned that because it is the only missing prophecy in Orderic’s work from a mirrored block of prophecies found in the HRB, this prophecy concerning the embalming process of Henry I must be a later interpolation into the same set in HRB. It has surely been omitted from Orderic by Henry because it is the only prophecy which tells of the gruesome disposing of his Uncle’s remains and the whole point of this interpolation was that it was supposed to bolster the perception that King Henry was alive when Orderic wrote this. One should consider the outcome of deleting this prophecy in Orderic, because it has had the desired effect in lending credibility to the rest of the prophecies for scholars in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, but it would have been very silly to have included it as it obviously speaks of Henry Ist death and to the sceptical would be positive proof that it was written after his death.

Are we really so stupid to believe the prophet Merlin predicts the birth of Matilda’s third child, the very circumstance which allows Henry Blois to install his brother as King....and it just so happens, coincidentally, that Merlin’s prophecies are published in that era.

As Tatlock shows, the author of the Merlin insertion into Orderic’s work is more than acquainted with the HRB, but many commentators prior to Tatlock’s proof based their deductions of the existence of an entirely separate \textit{Libellus Merlini} on the testimony of Orderic. Their assumption was that a \textit{Libellus Merlini} existed in Henry Ist reign as is portrayed in the Henry’s interpolation itself. It is the main intention of the interpolation i.e. the prophecies supposedly existed before their predictions came to pass and they came from Merlin...not ‘Geoffrey’ independent of HRB (HRB not being mentioned). It had to be as it was not supposedly published. But Henry

\textsuperscript{292} King Henry Ist (the lion in both HRB and VM) died on 1 December 1135. Henry’s uncle’s corpse was taken to Rouen accompanied by the barons, where it was embalmed; his entrails were buried locally at Port-du-Salut Abbey in Normandy, and the body preserved in salt was taken on to England, where it was interred at Reading Abbey. Henry of Huntingdon, tells us a man named Ewan was paid a large reward to sever the King’s head with an axe. Therefore, as the supposed prophecy states his soft tissue (brain included) was buried in Normandy and his mangled limbs (the body), was buried in England (thrust from his native shore) i.e. Normandy.
Blois wrote HRB and that is Tatlock’s conundrum...simply trusting that Orderic’s work has not been interpolated.

Logically, if the Merlin prophecies already existed in Latin while King Henry Ist was alive (as the contrivance in the Orderic interpolation establishes) why is bishop Alexander halting ‘Geoffrey’s’ work.... insisting a translation be made and especially when scholars assume c.1136-38? Again there were no prophecies in Primary Historia because Huntingdon has not heard of Galfridus Arthur a cleric supposedly from Oxford to whom Bishop Alexander is patron also along with Huntingdon. So, as I have maintained Alexander’s association to the prophecies transpired after his death in 1148.

If a Latin copy of Merlin’s prophecies exists as scholars insist based on Orderic’s testimony what is John of Cornwall doing translating them into Latin for the Bishop of Exeter. Come to that...in reality what are bishop’s doing paying any attention to the Merlin prophecies.

If there is any work that could be called the Libellus Merlini, it is an early set of prophecies. But they must have been written by Henry Blois and circulated separately from the Primary Historia. This would have been the set of prophecies which Henry’s friend abbot Suger commented upon. If there is any one specific addition to the early prophecies possessed by Suger it would have to be the allusion to the ‘sixth’ throwing down the walls of Ireland. This, as we have explained, can only be dependent on a sixth (Henry II).... and his wish to provide his brother William lands in Ireland as discussed at the Winchester council held in 1155. There is nothing in the rest of this block of prophecies in the insertion into Orderic or the same section in HRB prophecies which takes us to a date further than 1139. Henry, as the pope’s legate, is the ‘shadow of the helmeted man’ in 1139.

What we can conclude then is that there was an earlier Libellus Merlini which circulated separately before being spliced as an updated version of the prophecies as found in the Vulgate version of HRB and may have existed in a primary form in the First Variant in 1144. However, because the prophecies in the First Variant are seen to be today the updated (corrected) version we must conclude they have been added to an exemplar of the First Variant from which the other four copies are derived.

Let us get back to the interpolated passage in Orderic and just briefly deal with a few of the prophecies themselves. There are a few differences from Vulgate HRB: A people shall come over, in timber and in coats of iron
who shall execute vengeance for iniquity. It shall restore the ancient inhabitants to their homes, and the ruin of the strangers shall be made manifest. Their germs shall be eradicated out of our gardens, and the remains of that race shall be decimated; they shall bear the yoke of perpetual servitude, and shall tear their mother with ploughs and harrows. Two dragons shall succeed, one of whom shall be slain by the darts of malice, and the other shall perish under the shadow of a name. A lion of justice shall succeed, whose roar shall cause the towns of France, and the dragons of the island to tremble. In his days gold shall be extorted from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall be scattered abroad by the hoofs of lowing kine. The men with crisped locks shall wear clothes of various textures and colours, and their exterior shall betoken their interior. The feet of lurchers shall be struck oft. The beasts of chase shall be undisturbed. Humanity shall mourn over the punishment. The tokens of commerce shall be cut in sunder, and the halves shall be round. The rapacious kites shall perish, and the teeth of wolves be blunted. The lion's whelps shall be transformed into sea-fishes and his eagle shall build her nest on the Aravian Mountains. Venedocia shall be red with a mother's blood, and the house of Corineus shall slay six brethren. The island shall be bathed in the tears of night, and hence the people shall be incited to all sorts of villainies.

The men of after times shall aspire to soar aloft, and new men shall rise to favour and eminence. Piety shall be turned by the impious to the injury of those who possess it. Armed therefore with the teeth of the bear, it shall transcend the summits of the mountains and the shade of the helmed warrior. Albany shall be roused to fury, and calling in those who dwell by her side shall give herself up to the shedding of blood. A bit forged on the Amorican sea shall be put into its jaws; but the eagle that severs the bond shall devour it, and shall exult in making her nest for the third time. The whelps of the roaring lion shall awake, and leaving the forests, shall hunt under the walls of towns. They shall make a great carnage among all who resist, and tear out the tongues of bulls. The necks of the lions shall be loaded with chains, and ancient times be renewed. After that, from the first to the fourth, from the fourth to the third, from the third to the second, the thumb shall be smeared with oil. The sixth shall throw down the walls of Ireland,' and convert the woods into an open country. He shall reduce the several portions to one, and shall be crowned with the lion's head. He shall restore the places of the saints through the
country, and fix pastors in convenient situations. He shall invest two cities with palls, and confer virgin gifts on virgins. He shall therefore obtain by his merits the favour of the Thunderer, and shall be crowned among the blessed. There shall arise from him a pest, which shall penetrate everywhere, and threaten ruin to his own nation. Through it Neustria shall lose both islands, and be shorn of her former dignity. Then the citizens shall return to the island."

Before we look at the prophecies above from Orderic I just want to show the reader what I mean by a splice and squewing and re-shuffle. Previous to the addition of the seditious prophecies in the evolved first variant or early Vulgate the order appears as such to the point I have indicated above where the body part prophecy is removed. Thus now Henry before when he referred to himself as the wolf, now becomes the bear in the late Orderic interpolation because people are getting suspicious of Henry Blois as all the prophecies focus around him. So this brief section from HRB: The island shall be drenched in nightly tears, whence all men shall be provoked unto all things. Woe unto thee, Neustria, for the brain of the Lion shall be poured forth upon thee; and with mangled limbs shall he be thrust forth of his native soil. (This is not included in orderic) They that come after shall strive to outsoar the highest, but the favour of the newcomers shall be exalted. Piety shall do hurt unto him that doth possess through impiety until he shall have clad him in his father. Wherefore, girdled about with the teeth of wolves, shall he climb over the heights of the mountains and the shadow of him that weareth a helmet. The icon has changed because he is trying to distance himself from positions previously where he could be easily recognised.

Henry Blois posing as Orderic Vitalis, uses the discovery of the dragons, as told by Nennius; in a folded tent in two jars in the pool amid the pavement, details mostly not in the HRB. The people coming over are the Norman’s in their coats of mail, but, as adopted throughout the prophecies,

---

293 Henry of Huntingdon, VIII. Meanwhile, the remains of King Henry unburied in Normandy; for he died on the 1st of December, 1135. His corpse was carried to Rouen, where his bowels, with his brain and eyes, were deposited. The body being slashed by knives, and copiously sprinkled with salt was sewn up in ox hides to prevent the ill effluvia, which so tainted the air as to be pestilential to the bystanders.

294 HRB VII, iii
the descriptions are presented as if the seer were seeing images; all part of Henry’s deception. *It shall restore the ancient inhabitants to their homes, and the ruin of the strangers shall be made manifest.*

As I have discussed, the inspiration to include the prophecies came from Henry Blois’ having read Cicero of whom he admits in his self-professed epitaph, he aspires to outshine. The principle is exactly what Quintus says: ‘**what nation or what state disregards the prophecies of soothsayers, or of interpreters of prodigies**’. There were other influences and source material such as corroborating historical detail from Welsh poetry which Henry also employs in the composition of the prophecies (especially in VM). Henry employs the tone of Biblical prophecy at times as a template.

‘Geoffrey’ as we know had read the Roman *Oracula Sibyllina* which contains animal symbolism and probably the *Sibyl Tiburtina* with utterances such as: *Then will arise a King of the Greeks whose name is Constans,* which also may have inspired his tone. Similarly the nine globes in the vision are nine generations, and we can see ‘Geoffrey’s’ or rather Merlin’s six Kings (or JC’s seven) being employed as the numbered Kings in the prophecies. Few commentators have allowed that ‘Geoffrey’ may well have been influenced by such continental prophecies such as the 8th century *Vision of Childeric* which identifies Clovis as the lion and Dagobert as the bear and unicorn; using similar animal symbolism to the Merlin prophecies. Henry Blois, therefore, would have been more acquainted with this continental material unlike a Welsh Geoffrey of Monmouth (if he had ever existed). Clugny possessed one of the most extensive libraries on the continent and may well have had in its collection the *Vision of Childeric*. Other continental influences not normally considered in the conventional premise of an exclusively Welsh or insular ‘Geoffrey’ may be the *Anchorite Vision* where similarly to Merlin’s insular garden, a vision of a fair meadow exists where Normandy, full of flowers (churches) are protected by

---

295 'Geoffrey’ is extremely clever in the way that he indicates major decisions of state are often made by consulting the oracles. When Cadwallader, contemplated defeat, he consulted Alan, whether or not he should abandon his Kingdom to the Saxons, as the angels voice had advised him, or could the answer be found in prophecy. Supposedly he consults the prophecies of the Sibyl, the Prophecy of the Eagle, and the Prophecies of Merlinus Ambrosius to find the answer. In reality, in the seventh century when Alan is supposed to have consulted them only the prophecies of the Sibyl existed. The Prophecy of the Eagle, attributed to Merlinus Sylvester and the Prophecies of Merlin were both concoctions of Henry Blois but he in effect establishes their authenticity to the reader by referring to them historically.

296 Fredegar, Chronicle III, c.12

297 Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, bk.V c.10
a wild horse (William the Bastard) and where the cattle are the enemies of Normandy and the Heifer is Robert Curthose.

Obviously, the prophecies of the Eagle that did prophesy at Shaftesbury, was a similar prophecy to which Geoffrey’s contemporary audience was acquainted with. Other influences may come from the Vision of the five Beasts where animals such as a tawny wolf, a white horse, a black hog, a grey wolf, a flame coloured dog all represent Kings. Henry Blois’ melange of nonsense in the Merlin prophecies does in fact have a source base for its construction and it was the same author who composed HRB; where also, nearly every episode can be traced to a source or is based on a pattern.

Where astrology is concerned, what Tatlock terms a ‘Götterdammerung’ is plainly vaticinatory ‘hodge podge’, the tone of which may be constituted from anywhere and probably have no meaning to Henry himself. It is merely an affected form of astrology which feigns future predictions that are currently unknown and are therefore unclear as they are unspecific.... purely because Henry did not posses prophetic powers.

Henry Blois may even have been inspired by Herodotus’ : an Eagle will nest in rocks and bring forth a strong and brutal Lion... We should not so much concern ourselves in the methodology or template which Henry Blois uses, but be more concerned with his own agenda chronologically as this dictates the content of the prophecies. ‘Geoffrey’ depicts Merlin Caledonius as a star-gazing sage, deriving knowledge of future events by observing the heavens from his mansion of seventy windows.... which ostensibly shows Merlin’s powers of prediction is based in astrology and hence the ‘Götterdammerung’.

---

298 HRB XII, xviii
299 Neus Archiv, 37, p.600
300 Herodotus. V, 92
301 The astrological salad of skimble skamble seems to start with what could have been an anagram of Blois in Stilbon. Possibly he changed the t for an h. giving HN.BLOIS. Henry’s vision of the utopian Arcadia of antiquity could well be envisaged by himself as the primary shepherd as indicated in the John of Cornwall scenario of a returning ‘adopted son’ to rule over the united Britons after they have unseated Henry II and the Norman foreigners: "Stilbon of Arcady shall change his shield, and the helmet of Mars shall call unto Venus. The helmet of Mars shall cast a shadow, and the rage of Mercury shall overpass all bounds. Iron Orion shall bare his sword. Phoebus of the ocean shall torment his clouds. Jupiter shall trespass beyond his appointed bounds, and Venus forsake the way that hath been ordained unto her. The malignity of Saturn the star shall fall upon the earth with rain of heaven, and shall slay mankind as it were with a crooked sickle. . . . The tail of the Scorpion shall breed lightnings, and the Crab fall at strife with the Sun. The Virgin shall forget her maiden shame, and climb up on the back of the Sagittary. The chariot of the Moon shall disturb the Zodiac, and the Pleiades shall burst into tears and lamentations."
I would estimate the first set of prophecies were released by Henry Blois c. 1139-1143. They in effect comprise the main body of the updated version found in today’s Vulgate HRB. The sense of some have been squewed because we are looking at seditious prophecies also and some new added to those early one’s which constituted the *Libellus Merlini*. These were then followed by the VM prophecies and again in the same period 1155-58 by John of Cornwall’s translation of the supposedly British/Cornish book of prophecies.

The agenda for the original set when Stephen was alive was to affect the political climate so that Henry and his brother were received not as offspring from Norman conquerors, but as saviours like a returning Arthur. Henry adapted some of the prophecies with a twist so that they had the appearance of being the same as the original set he had put out for consistency’s sake but when the metropolitan became an issue these were added also

The reader of the prophecies is deluded into thinking that if the prophecies written in the sixth century which correctly predict things that we know transpired (because they are historically recorded in HRB).... then we must conclude that the HRB is not a pseudo-history. It was mainly Tatlock’s work which shows clearly that ‘Geoffrey’s’ account is a constructed fabrication, but still some modern scholars view the prophecies as credible. This is mainly because of Henry’s clever move to splice in Welsh bardic material in VM.

So, to pick up after that brief digression.... the prophecy above, as I explained earlier, Henry Blois sees the reintroduction of the Normans as eradicating the Saxon germ; and they genetically (the Normans), as the ancient inhabitants are the Britons returned. They are returning home to the ruin of the strangers (Saxons) as the prophecy above implies. This is Henry’s political polemic while his brother is still alive. The purport of some of the prophecies where positivity is applied to the Norman eradication of the Saxons were written while Stephen lived. This was supposed to promote an attitude of acceptance and acquiescence of Norman rule among the populace. This sometimes applied to Normans and the emigrated Bretons through proximity. Where there is negativity toward the Normans, we know Henry Blois’ brother is dead and he wishes the ‘predict and effect’ mechanism of the prophecies to unseat Henry II.
Two dragons shall succeed, one of whom shall be slain by the darts of malice, and the other shall perish under the shadow of a name.

As I covered this same block of Merlin prophecies in HRB earlier.... many here are repeated which I shall skip over because their elucidation is the same as previously.

Orderic’s interpolated passage of Merlin prophecies carries on similarly as the same block found in Vulgate HRB:

Piety shall be turned by the impious to the injury of those who possess it. Armed therefore with the teeth of the bear, it shall transcend the summits of the mountains and the shade of the helmed warrior.

The Latin here is so obtuse that even Orderic’s editor has trouble following the sense. It has been vastly chopped down and subtly changed since the publishing of the prophecies in Vulgate HRB.

The HRB is still not much clearer until one knows it is Henry Blois that is constructing the prophecy. ‘They that come after shall strive to outsoar the highest, but the favour of the newcomers shall be exalted. Piety shall do hurt unto him that doth possess through impiety until he shall have clad him in his father. Wherefore, girdled about with the teeth of wolves, shall he climb over the heights of the mountains and the shadow of him that weareth a helmet’.

‘They that come after’ are Henry and his brother (following the body part prophecy) and at the time of the construction of the early Libellus Merlini prophecies, Henry viewed what he and his brother would accomplish as newcomers would ‘outsoar’ any previous reign. He refers to his brother’s piety which should be understood as ‘sense of honour’ (chivalry). Stephen’s sense of honour which is made plain by Henry in the GS was another reason for the continuation of the Anarchy rather than dealing mercilessly with opponents. Stephen making a deal with David, King of Scotland, a prime example as I already covered. The reference to ‘possession through impiety’ is obviously the allusion to the usurpation of the crown. The fact that Henry mentions Stephen being clad in his father might suppose this sentence was added after Stephen’s death or have a church meaning or relates to William the Conqueror.

The bear is usually a Wolf. As explained earlier, it relates directly to Henry Blois himself as the Bishop of Winchester and the popes Legate. (See appendix 12). Again we get the sense of what I covered previously about the Alps being metaphorically synonymous with Rome. Henry’s climbing over
the mountains is his trip to Rome to see the ‘Helmeted man’, the pope. The ‘shadow’ allusion is just his phony vaticinatory way of speaking through Merlin, but the sense is that his legateship and its power is derived from the pope.

_The whelps of the roaring lion shall awake, and leaving the forests, shall hunt under the walls of towns. They shall make a great carnage among all who resist, and tear out the tongues of bulls._

This is a tricky one to decipher. The allusion is to the keen hunting practice of Norman Kings who hunted in the forests as I referred to earlier. The lion’s whelps are now besieging towns such as Exeter, Bristol, Oxford to name but a few. The ‘whelps’ are William the conqueror’s offspring of which Stephen and Henry both were. The carnage is the Anarchy.

The ‘whelps’ could refer to Henry and his brother or William Rufus and Duke Robert. Leaving the forests and hunting under the walls of towns seems likely to refer to Stephen besieging towns in the Anarchy. Henry of Huntingdon records that after banishing _Baldwin de Redvers_, from England: _Elated by these successes, the King went to him at Brampton, which is about a mile distant from Huntingdon and there he held pleas of the forests with his barons; that is, concerning their woods and hunting, in violation of his promise and vow to God and the people._

_The sixth shall throw down the walls of Ireland_, can only relate to Henry II and must date after 1155. It is for this reason we can deduce the interpolation into Orderic’s work was made not only after King Henry Ist death (as he was the third) but after 1155. This would essentially have to take into account Matilda as the ‘fifth’ not being anointed and knowing it was Henry II’s intention to invade Ireland.

_He shall reduce the several portions to one, and shall be crowned with the lion’s head. He shall restore the places of the saints through the country, and fix pastors in convenient situations._ This is a reference also to Ireland in assuming Henry II brother William will become king as discussed at the Council at Winchester. Restoring the places of the saints refers to St Patrick. The fixing of Pastors is the point of the invasion as far as pope Adrian IV is concerned where his Papal Bull _Laudabiliter_ gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland and apply the Gregorian reforms,
He shall invest two cities with palls, and confer virgin gifts on virgins. He shall therefore obtain by his merits the favour of the Thunderer, and shall be crowned among the blest.

Many have thought that the two cities referred to are the new bishoprics set up by Henry Ist, Ely in 1109, and Carlisle in 1133. This may be the case or it may be Henry Blois’ hope that Winchester and St David’s gain Metropolitan status. As we know from Henry Blois’ personal efforts, he tried on more than one occasion to have the see of Winchester created as a separate Metropolitan, so that he would not be subject to Canterbury. He also promoted St David’s cause in the HRB for his friend Bernard. He saw the power wielded by Roman Canterbury as having usurped the old Briton church and brought into subjection by papal control. It is for this reason in the HRB, St David’s acts as a polemic for his cause and he stresses Dubricius and Caerlelon as the example before the advent of the Roman church and Augustine.

Henry Blois’ main point is always to infer that the Briton church was established independent of Roman Canterbury. This is vastly apparent in Henry’s interpolations in DA. Part of the inspiration for writing the polemical view that is clearly outlined in the HRB, may have been formulated as he delved into the history of Glastonbury after having found the charter which donated Ineswitrin to Glastonbury. This charter which obviously existed, formed for the most part the evidence Henry Blois needed for his proof of Antiquity regarding Glastonbury. This is a lengthy subject which we are working toward which unlocks the reasoning behind the various interpolations in DA.

Because Joseph is posited as buried in Britain in the Melkin prophecy one might assume an earlier possible apostolic foundation in Joseph. The Eleutherius episode mentioned by Bede has little bearing on the truth of what is said to have transpired when it comes to early foundation myths. The Eleutherius episode may have stemmed from propaganda purposely put out by the Roman church which denied primacy for the Briton Church. The Vatican actually may have caused Bede’s mistake. Bede himself recounts that he actually went to Rome to see that nothing he had written

---

302 The case in point adequately exposes Henry Blois’ bias in that the celebrated massacre at Bangor found in Bede is wholly taken by ‘Geoffrey’ and changed so that the prayers of the monks which were for the British army are in the version found in the Historia, due to their refusing subjection to Augustine.
had caused offence. Roman Christianity was a monopoly that was not to be shared with the Britons.

What I am implying is that the mistake by Bede, where he makes Lucius a British King, could have been inspired by Rome, as this would indicate that any church in Britain is an offshoot of Rome. Gildas did not mention Lucius’s request (prior to Augustine) and Bede mentions it afterward. So, it is possible that it might be Roman inspired propaganda based on a misinterpretation of Liber Pontificalis. Again, I will have to deal with this in the chapter on GR.

However, it is for this reason I believe Chapter 29 of the Acts of the Apostles at a very early stage was eradicated from the New Testament as it bore testimony of St Paul’s visit to Britain. If it was not Aristbulous or Philip who proselytised Britain, maybe the first Christian (or believer that Jesus was the Messiah) was Joseph of Arimathea. I shall cover this aspect also in progression because it is evident by the end of this exposé that Joseph’s remains are still in Britain undiscovered.

Again, returning back to the Orderic interpolation, which could only have been written after Henry II was on the throne, because King Henry II is the ‘pest’ in the new updated version which incites rebellion.

*There shall arise from him a pest, which shall penetrate everywhere, and threaten ruin to his own nation. Through it Neustria shall lose both islands, and be shorn of her former dignity. Then the citizens shall return to the island.*

The pest is more probably a lynx (following the iconography of cats of the Leo’s), but Henry is predicting the end of Norman domination because he is hoping by influencing events by his Merlin prophecy the Celts are going to unseat Henry II. What needs to be understood by the reader (and once we cover the JC prophecies, it becomes abundantly clear) is that Henry Blois in exile at Clugny was doing his best to incite rebellion against Henry II by feigning that Merlin had seen a Celtic rebellion against the Norman’s.

No such state as Neustria existed of course in Merlin’s day. Henry is stirring Celtic discontent by citing Conan and Cadwallader to rebel against Henry II after which Norman rule will end and Henry Blois will rule. Many have thought this prophecy is derived from the *Armes Prydein*, (which it was in the original Libellus), but as usual Henry twists this Brythonic
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prediction by Myrddin of the Celtic resurgence against the Saxons which now applies to the Normans.... and coincidentally the names are relevant still to the Breton and Welsh leaders. In the *Armes Prydein* it mentions *Aber Peryddon* which is linked to the next verse in the Vulgate prophecies which is directly linked to Henry Blois as the *old man, snowy white, who sits upon a snow-white horse, shall turn aside the river of Pereiron and with a white staff shall measure out a mill thereon.*

Even though the section of the HRB prophecies related in Orderic is not exactly mirrored, it tends to show that it is the initiator of the prophecies writing Orderic’s interpolated passage as it was surely written after 1155 and if these had come from the earlier Merlin prophecies (which could not have been prior to Henry Ist death), they certainly could not have foreseen the ‘Sixth’ invading Ireland.

So the discrepancies between the Vulgate version and Orderic prophecies are therefore thought to be caused by the existence of an earlier *Libellus Merlini*. Since Orderic died 1142 the *libellus* version is supposed to have existed at the time Orderic is thought to have written the passage. It is not a case of Orderic mis-copying the prophecies but the originator of them changing them at will while interpolating Orderic. If Orderic just copied them they would not differ in form from HRB. So, where many researchers have thought the *Libellus Merlini* or book of Merlin which Orderic says he is quoting from (supposedly written between 1120 and 1135), based upon a reference to Henry Ist as being King of England i.e. still alive; this view can no longer be accepted that Merlin was indeed a prognosticator..... because the ‘Sixth’ prophecy post dates 1155. There was at this stage no ‘Sixth’ or Henry II, not forgetting the first set had only evolved to the ‘fourth’ as I implied previously.

Commentators have believed the veracity of the Merlin prophecies because the interpolation occurs in the Orderic chronicle at the right point chronologically. Also Henry Blois adds for good measure: *until the times of Henry and Griffyth, who in the uncertainty of their lot are still expecting...* which establishes in a bone fide chronicle of history that the prophecies look as though they pre-exist Henry Ist death.

Let us not be duped by such sophistry. We would have to be very gullible to believe not only can the originator of the passage see past the fourth and the fifth, but produce an accurate prediction that the ‘Sixth’ will go to Ireland. How does Merlin’s focus arrive in the precise era of Henry
Blois and how is it that his prophecies corroborate the bogus pseudo-history found in HRB. The prophecies nearly all connect to Henry and his interests and matter which affect him and his family?

Henry simply inserted the interpolation after 1155 into a copy of Orderic and had it copied. Henry was under serious pressure to show that the prophecies pre-existed the events they supposedly predicted. The obvious solution was to include a passage on them in a reliable chronicle.

Crick is duped believing that the passage in Orderic was written by Orderic: *the Prophecies provoked the kind of intellectual and political responses logged by Orderic: they offered reassurance, solace, historical exegesis, intellectual stimulus, on the one hand, and political direction on the other. Such conclusions are provisional, of course:*

At least there is the understanding of the prophecies role in political direction. Of course the conclusion can only be provisional, for without grasping that Orderic’s passage is an interpolation…. how can Crick settle the conundrum of prophecies transpiring as recognised events supposedly predicted by Merlin even after Orderic’s death in 1142. She would have to believe Merlin is a genuine prognosticato. Of ’s eighty five copies of the separate prophetia ….a study should be carried out to see how many are missing the (allowing for corrections) prophecy which appeals to the Celts to rebel against Henry II and also how many are missing the Sixth in Ireland. If they are missing, we can assume these copies are earlier than 1155. Only then will she get a clearer picture of what icons are sqewed to further hide Henry’s authorship; when initially he had been pleased that people would recognise the prophecy spoke of him. Post 1155 sceptics plus the king himself were now asking questions and Henry is distancing himself from obvious references to him.

In the interpolation into Orderic Henry substantiates for posterity the date of the prophecies while feigning to interpret and add commentary as the Merlin interpolation into Orderic’s work continues:
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304 What annoys me about the experts is that Crick writes: Geoffrey’s intentions remain buried in his work…. The reaction of the immediate audience for which it was intended is unknown etc. etc. And yet if you put forward what Geoffrey’s intentions were and even offer the solution to who the HRB in its rawest form was intended for; the evidence will be ignored like someone going through the motions of searching for a needle in a haystack with their eyes shut, yet ‘occupationally’ not wanting to find it.
I have made these short extracts from Merlin's book and offer them to the studious who are not acquainted with it. Some of his prophecies I have traced to events now past, and, if I mistake not, more of them will be verified in the experience of posterity either with joy or sorrow. Persons acquainted with history will easily understand the words of Merlin, when they recollect what happened under Hengist and Catigirn, Pascent and Arthur, Ethilbert and Edwin, Oswald and Oswy, Cedwal and Alfred, and other princes both English and British, until the times of Henry and Griffyth, who in the uncertainty of their lot are still expecting; what may befall them in the ineffable dispensations of Divine Providence. For instance, it is as clear as light to the intelligent reader, that Merlin is speaking; of the two sons of William, when he says: "Two Dragons shall succeed," meaning libertine and fierce princes, "one of whom," that is William Rufus, "shall be slain by the darts of malice," namely by an arrow in hunting, "the other," that is duke Robert, "shall perish in the shadows of a dungeon, retaining only his former title," that of duke. "The lion of justice shall succeed, which refers to Henry," at whose roar the towers of France and the Island dragons shall tremble; because in wealth and power he transcends all who reigned in England before him. In the same manner, the wise can clearly decipher the rest. I might say more in explanation, if I undertook to write a commentary on Merlin, but leaving this; I resume the course of my narrative, and shall faithfully relate the events which have occurred in my own time.

I hope the reader appreciates the sophistry of Henry Blois attempting to decipher his own prophecies. He uses the same ploy in John of Cornwall's prophecies by writing an interpretive commentary. For me, Henry's brilliance is in establishing fact for the reader that he wishes them to deduce themselves.... without having to state it overtly himself. There is no better example than the sentence in which he specifically intends us to understand the prophecies existed in the era in which King Henry Ist was alive and still expecting what fate might have in store for the King by positing: Henry and Griffyth, who in the uncertainty of their lot are still expecting; what may befall them... yet, few of his readers would be happy with the prediction of a Norman down fall: more of them will be verified in the experience of posterity either with joy or sorrow.

How very fortuitous for posterity that Orderic dates the prophecies to Henry I era by implying what fate still had in store for the King. Logically,
the only conclusion for scholars such as Crick, is that Merlin was indeed able to see into the future as not only did he see a sixth King, but Merlin accurately predicted that the said sixth King would invade Ireland. Such conclusions are provisional, of course until the passage is understood to be an interpolation. But scholars are like church fathers unchanging and blindly following log held beliefs rather remaining ignorant than trying to find the truth.... and look out anyone who goes against dogma.

The Vulgate redaction of the HRB (with its updated prophecies included) was published in 1155. So, many of the hopes and predictions that were posited as prophecy by ‘Merlin’ in the *libellus Merlini* could not be changed as they were in the same form that Abbot Suger (and no doubt others who are unrecorded) had witnessed. But, as we have seen, it was vital for Henry Blois (posing as Merlin) to establish that it was not an author who composed the prophecies in the Geoffrey era after the historical events had transpired. For this reason the Orderic interpolation is so important.

Even though Bishop Alexander died in 1148, the inclusion of the Alexander dedication in HRB did not occur until after 1155 as Henry of Huntingdon who dies in 1154 never once comments on his patron’s affiliation with the prophecies and Alfred of Beverley c.1147-50 does not mention the part Alexander supposedly played in having the prophecies translated.

Waleran de Beaumont, Count of Meulan died in 1166 and if he knew of the HRB and saw a copy dedicated to himself with Robert, he was probably as bemused as most are today. As we have touched on already, Waleran was 1st Earl of Worcester and is mentioned by Henry in the Merlin Prophecies as are many other items and people that have piqued him: *Against him shall rise up the Dragon of Worcester.*

Waleran of Meulan, the lay patron of Bec, put his own man Theobald as Archbishop in England. It is mainly because of this Henry Blois detested him. Waleran and his twin brother, Robert, Earl of Leicester, were Henry's chief rivals for Stephen's favour. At the Battle of Lincoln in 1141 Waleran was one of the royalist earls who fled when they saw that the battle was lost resulting in Stephen’s capture. Straight afterward Waleran gave up the fight on Stephen’s side against the Angevin cause as his Norman lands were being taken over by the invading Angevin army. He surrendered to the Empress Matilda and so in Henry’s mind was a traitor. As we have stated,
the single manuscript with the Stephen and Robert dedications is simply a devise used by Henry Blois to predate the HRB to 1136.

The dedication to Waleran de Beaumont, Count of Meulan in no way helps the dating of the HRB as is thought by commentators. As long as we know Henry is the author there is nothing to counter a position that the dedication was only added to a copy after Waleran’s death as Henry lived another five years. Henry does not like Waleran because it was Waleran who instigated the arrest of the Bishops. Also he dislikes him for the bad advice Waleran offered his brother. The GS states: *The Count of Meulan and those other adherents of the King who were on terms of the closest intimacy with him, indignant at the splendid pomp of the bishops...*

As for Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, Henry probably did know him because Stephen’s base was at Oxford in the early Anarchy. However, Henry certainly knew of his death in 1151 and his name was employed to put flesh on the bones of Geoffrey of Monmouth i.e. having a provenance in and around Oxford, because Henry had also randomly signed some charters there in the name of Galfridus Artur, (along with those previously signed by Walter) just after the pact at Wallingford.

Although Walter was already dead, the ruse created the aura of previous publication just like the use of the dedicatees and provided a relationship to someone who had known of ‘Geoffrey’. Henry had connected a real person that ‘Geoffrey’ could be linked to who was probably known for his interest in antiquities. This link carried out the vital function of being the person who supplied the book that the whole HRB was supposedly translated from. Walter died in 1151, so his name (like the dedicatees) was included into the Vulgate HRB after his death. He was not mentioned in the First Variant used at Rome in 1144 and 1149.

At this early date Henry had not even assigned his authorship to the pseudonym of Geoffrey of Monmouth and still used *Gaufridus Artur*.... and had not yet added the various signatures to the charters kept at Oxford Castle which now carry Galfridus’ name. Henry very cleverly also presumes again on Walter’s name in his concocted epilogue attributed to Gaimar. Gaimar did write *L’estoire des Engles* but did not write the epilogue and certainly there was never any tract called *L’estoire des Bretons* ever written. It is a clever ploy, but we shall get to that shortly.
What might have happened if Stephen had lived concerning ‘Geoffrey’, we can only speculate, but soon after Stephen’s death, Henry saw fit to end Geoffrey’s life in 1154-5 while still producing the VM which posterity can only assume by logic was written in Geoffrey’s life time. The problem Henry had is that he could only add so much and squeeze only so much of the previous set of prophecies attributed to Merlin found in the separate *Libellus Merlini*. These were added to and updated when they were spliced into the Vulgate HRB as far as possible so that they still resembled the prophecies in the original *Libellus Merlini*.

Certainly, the ‘prophetical’ harangue for the Scots, Cornish, Welsh and Breton’s to unite was Henry’s addition after his brother’s death to incite rebellion against Henry II. The invention of the VM which essentially has so much padding in it, as we have covered, was put together to complete Henry’s look backwards at events in the Anarchy by employing Ganieda as the new source, but his main intent was the hope that the Celts would rebel. His secondary agenda also started to germinate as we see Avalon’s first association through *Insula Pomorum*.

I think the reception and credibility of the VM was not received without suspicion as certain of the previous prophecies and icons were twisted to apply to events that occurred later in the Anarchy and some of them were startlingly obvious.

Suspicions were probably raised when the intelligence of a few readers at court reflected upon how it was that a seer in the sixth century saw history only as events which had occurred to which the annals related and specifically correlated with history as related in HRB. Also unrealistically, the prophecies largely referred to the contemporary reader’s era, and had a deluge of detail concerning the Anarchy. This mass of detail about things recently transpired was counterbalanced by the meaningless Götterdammerung extravaganza which had the appearance of future events. Rydberg\(^{305}\) showed that the source of the Götterdammerung was an adapted passage of Lucan’s Pharsalia.

The end of the prophecies, of course, had to be highly unspecific, as Henry’s powers of prophecy only enabled him to predict (in reality) past events…. and so, all prophecies which made any sense, were of those events which had already transpired. Henry tried to apportion the prophecies
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equally spread about the Danes and Saxons and the Norman invasion and the state of the Church and the Anarchy of recent times. At times, even highly specific references were represented such as Portchester castle being rebuilt by Henry Blois. But, our seer knew if the prophecies did not potentially give the air of looking into the future for all of time he would be discovered as a fake. Hence the reasoning behind fabricating the Götterdämmerung!!

Tatlock noticed that Geoffrey was ‘at pains to make the city of Winchester prominent and exalted’. Henry Blois requested metropolitan status for Winchester and this was mentioned along with the fact that one of Arthur’s dragons was supposedly left in the Cathedral at Winchester etc. This all goes to indicate there are too many commonalities with Henry Blois. This is without all the evidence we have yet to cover!! The fact that Henry Blois impersonates Wace and then introduces the round table which is now in the Great Hall at Winchester.... is just one of many coincidences that need further scrutiny. We shall get to the bottom of this in progression.
Chapter 8

William of Newburgh

William Newburgh, wrote his Historia rerum Anglicarum or Historia de rebus Anglica, ‘A History of English Affairs’. He is often regarded as a writer of some critical acumen, in no small part because of his preface in which he denounces Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Gesta Britonum for its ‘impudent fabrications’. He makes the argument that Bede would have mentioned Arthur if the Chivalric King Arthur had existed, and he points out Geoffrey’s ‘errors’, including the presence of Kingdoms and archbishops unknown to history.

William of Newburgh’s work ends rather abruptly in 1198, when presumably, he died in that year. But, he was at the height of his career when the HRB blossomed in the years after 1155 and he ardently criticizes it. His preface shows his annoyance at ‘Geoffrey’s’ disregard for history in treating it in such an incredible way: ‘... a writer in our times has started up and invented the most ridiculous fictions concerning them (the Britons) ... having given, in a Latin version, the fabulous exploits of Arthur (drawn from the traditional fictions of the Britons, with additions of his own), and endeavoured to dignify them with the name of authentic history; moreover, he has unscrupulously promulgated the mendacious predictions of one Merlin, as if they were genuine prophecies, corroborated by indubitable truth, to which also he has himself considerably added during the process of translating them into Latin... no one but a person ignorant of ancient history, when he meets with that book which he calls the History of the Britons, can for a moment doubt how impertinently and impudently he falsifies in every respect... Since, therefore, the ancient historians make not the slightest mention of these matters, it is plain that whatever this man
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published of Arthur and of Merlin are mendacious fictions, invented to gratify the curiosity of the undiscerning... Therefore, let Bede, of whose wisdom and integrity none can doubt, possess our unbounded confidence, and let this fabler, with his fictions, be instantly rejected by all.”

This attack was reason enough to kill off the fictitious ‘Geoffrey’, but what it points out is that Chivalric Arthur and the Merlin character are an invention. William Newburgh could not even refer to ‘Geoffrey’ by name but as whatever this man. However, the sentence: to which also he has himself considerably added during the process of translating them into Latin, throws up a few questions.

The difference between what was an early release of prophecies c.1139-43 and those found in the vulgate HRB c.1155 must have been the allusion to which William thought ‘Geoffrey’ had expanded upon (hence the need for the interpolation into Orderic). William believed there was an already extant set of ancient prophecies, which, as I have covered, Henry squewed to form the updated 1155 edition found in the Vulgate version of HRB. Yet Newburgh is wise enough to realise that the Merlin character is not real: he has unscrupulously promulgated the mendacious predictions of one Merlin, as if they were genuine prophecies. What amazes me most is that because the prophecies of Merlin corroborate the faux-history written in HRB, it is obvious that whoever invented the prophecies must have invented the contents of history in HRB. Yet even Newburgh or Gerald do not state this fact overtly. Newburgh may have believed there was a brittonic set of prophecies i.e. why he writes the process of translating them into Latin.

One could speculate; did Newburgh mean by ‘addition’.... the new publication of Vita Merlini? To me this seems doubtful as he is referencing the History of the Britons and the sense would more likely fit the earlier set of prophecies in the Libellus Merlini which did not include references to the latter part of the Anarchy or the rally of the Celts to rebellion and only went as far as predictions up to the fourth King while Stephen was alive. Yet it is difficult to see how he does not believe in the character of Merlin and yet accept his prophecies were translated from the British tongue to Latin.

Robert de Chesney, the dedicatee of the VM died December 1166. When did William Newburgh write his preface? Did Robert De Chesney ever see the VM or was the dedication added subsequently? There are too many scenarios to divulge and for little profit by doing so. It is obvious that Henry Blois is using a standard format. Wait until someone is dead before
employing their name to back date the publication and no-one can corroborate their patronage after their death. For this reason, in my opinion, the Waleran dedication of Vulgate is post 1166 and probably the same goes for Robert de Chesney with the VM. However, the VM could have existed without dedication as the two Merlin's were known as early as 1160.

What seems fairly certain, given the obvious ire shown by William Newburgh, is that, William will have tried to locate Geoffrey to see if he existed. It appears to me that Newburgh knew ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ was a *nom de plume* by the time he wrote his preface, and refers to the author as ‘a writer’ and ‘this man’. William is not going to add to the fraud by broadening the exposure of a name for which no man can be found. Rather than lending anymore credibility to the invention of ‘Geoffrey’, he denounces the history and the prophecies as a pack of lies. One could speculate that ‘in our times’ might mean that Newburgh suspected the author was still alive when he wrote his preface.

Maybe William Newburgh from Bridlington in Yorkshire would not know of the spurious signature additions of Galfridus Arthur in Oxford.... even if he had gone in pursuit of the ancient book to Oxford. If Newburgh did ever find out that Geoffrey became a fictitious Bishop of Asaph, one might affirm that he would have exposed that. However, it would have made little difference, as ‘Geoffrey’ had passed his expiration date in 1155. Even these details of ‘Geoffrey’s’ death are derived from an unreliable document which commentators have suspected was written by ‘Geoffrey’.

Henry Blois, as we covered, also oversaw the London bishopric for a time and would have had access at a later date through acquaintances or position. He would have been able to plant a false ‘profession’ of Geoffrey’s and fake a record of ordination and consecration. Theobald of Bec died in 1161, ten years before Henry, so this particular fraud may not have been carried out until then. It is impossible to search out the sequence of events. However, Henry Blois does make one error which has led the scholastic community to think that one of the Oxford charters is a fake. Henry Blois added the name of his fictitious *Gaefridus electus sancti Asaphi* to a document without paying attention to chronology regarding Walter’s successor Robert Foliot, Archdeacon of Oxford.
Chapter 9

The Oxford charters of Gaufridus Artur

The Vulgate HRB version which has the name ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ attached is a stroke of genius. The ‘wily’ Henry Blois sees a certain ‘Ralf of Monmouth’ on some existing charters while in the scriptorium at Oxford and since he has based his Arthurian epic in Wales, he decides to witness with him (and Archdeacon Walter) as if they were acquaintances. It does not seem silly to suggest that it is from seeing the name *Raldolfo de Monmuta* on an extant charter that Henry derives his inspiration for his invented persona’s heritage from Monmouth. *Galfridus Artur* was the composer of the *Primary Historia* as witnessed by Huntingdon, not *Galfridus Monemutensis*. To veil his authorship, Henry makes the pretence of being a Briton.

No-one was ever going to find the author of HRB. Certain critics of HRB and the prophecies looked for an author and thus the elaborate trail of corroborative evidence which was planted by Henry Blois. My suggestion of the sequence of events is that Henry Blois signed the oxford charters in 1153 after Wallingford and only attached his Geoffrey of Monmouth appellation to the Vulgate and not the First Variant. Henry may have established the bishop of Asaph before inventing the *nom de plume* Geoffrey of Monmouth if (as I have suggested) all the charters were signed at one time while Henry sat in a room at Oxford in 1153.

It might seem rational to suppose that the Oxford charters coincide chronologically with Huntingdon’s reference to *Galfri Arthuri*, and a real
person exists. This is definitively not the case! What are the chances that a Welshman from the Welsh Marches has the name of the King on which the hope of the Briton’s rested and coincidentally is the one who writes a fabulous history about him? Commentators have thought it is a patronymic or even a ‘nickname’ based on Galfridus’ renown. It is a certain fact that Geoffrey was not renowned when Huntingdon discovered his text. Henry Blois chose the Galfridus Artur *nom de plume* long before he scribbled his signature on a few already completed charters at Oxford in 1153-4. It would also be a near impossible chance (which confirms for us the improbable coincidence); if our Galfridus Arthur was capable enough to construct a book and was the one person with a name of the chivalric hero.... who just happened to be the star of the book he had been given by Walter and miraculously he was able to translate. In other words it would be one almighty coincidence if the figure of Arthur (for whom the Britons held hope of his return) just happened to be the HRB author’s name anyway (remembering he could not have been renowned before 1139).

So, if it is a concocted name and a fabricated story.... why are modern scholars slow not to see it as a pseudonym of a concocted persona designed to hide the real identity of the author. So, if the real author didn’t exist ....How could the bishop of Asaph? This idiocy is excused by scholars by informing us it is ‘Geoffrey’s’ prolific fame from which a nick name has been derived. There was no fame in 1139! Why would Huntingdon be ‘amazed’ at finding the book if his own patron had not mentioned the fame of Galfridus Artur?

Henry Blois, sat in a scriptorium or some such room at Oxford where records and scrolls were held and picked random charters from a shelf which would put Galfridus in Oxford at asset time as a real person and returned the charters with varied additional signatures.

There are seven charters signed which pertained to the neighbourhood of Oxford with the Galfridus signature affixed. These are thought by most scholars to have been signed for the purpose of witnessing the pertinent transaction; all in a period covering 22 years from 1129 – 1151.
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308 Even William of Newburgh writes: *This man is called Geoffrey, and his other name is Arthur, because he has taken up the fables about Arthur from the old, British figments, has added to them himself.... However, ‘Geoffrey’ had no renown in 1138 when the book was finished and left at Bec and in 1139 when Huntingdon saw the book and subsequently in EAW named the author of *Primary Historia* as Galfridus Artur.*
R.S Loomis like all the other previous ‘Arthurian scholars’ pronounces
on these grounds: ‘During these years 1129-51 he wrote the works by which
he is known’. This is conjecture as all the charters were signed at one time
while Henry was in attendance at a meeting in 1153-4 at Oxford Castle as
we shall cover shortly.

In the first charter, the foundation charter of Osney abbey, Henry inserts
a signature as Galfrido Artur. There are a handful of witnesses both clerks
and knights who witness the charter also, but the charter today is a copy
and the other charters are found in other cartularies.... so we cannot see
where the name is inserted, but Waltero archidiacono is also a signatory. Is
it not a strange fact that we know the First Variant stems from 1144 and
1149\textsuperscript{309} where there is no mention of ‘Walter’ or ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’.

We can conclude the inspiration for the ‘Monmouth’ appellation was
derived from Henry having seen Ralph’s provenance on the charters at
Oxford. The inclusion of Walter’s name as the provider of the source book
as put forward by ‘Geoffrey’ in the Vulgate HRB was also inspired in the
Vulgate (which followed First Variant) and followed the signing by Henry
Blois of the extant charters at Oxford. These charters already had their
signatures thereon and Henry was just adding the Galfridus signature.

That Walter was an antiquary may only be attested by Henry (in
Gaimar’s epilogue or HRB) so we cannot definitively say that the reference
to him as the supplier of the book is based on his interest in things
antiquarian and was a genuine fact. It may just be because Walter’s name
was also on the charters that Henry had chosen to lead a false trail by using
his name. The fact that Osney was founded in 1129 has little bearing upon
when the Gaufridus signature was applied. This is simply a case of retro-
interpolation of a signature into an extant charter long after Huntingdon
had witnessed the name (Galfridus Arthur) as attached to the Primary
Historia in 1139.

A second charter at St John’s Oxford, in which Robert D’ Oilly confirms to
the secular cannons of St George’s in the Castle at Oxford, gifts of land at
Wilton has the slightly different assignation of Galfrido Arthur spelt with an
‘h’, but the name Waltero archidiacono is the same as it is a genuine
signature. This is probably from the same period because it has Robert
D’Oilly’s earlier seal on it.

\textsuperscript{309} This will be covered in a later chapter on the First Variant version.
There is also a deed recorded in the Godstow Cartulary, in which Walter the Archdeacon grants to Godstow an exemption from some arch-diaconal payments. The witnesses are Robert Bishop of Exeter and others; but why, if Bishop Robert has met the great ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’, does he then commission John of Cornwall to translate the prophecies of Merlin from British into Latin sometime around 1149-50, (twenty years after the Godstow deed)…. if indeed ‘Geoffrey’, (a person supposedly standing in the same room), has already carried out such a feat…. and people like Orderic have them in Latin supposedly in 1134.

Less than a third of John of Cornwall’s verse prophecies match with the HRB prophecies of Merlin. We will get to this variance shortly as the John of Cornwall version of the prophecies also was constructed by Henry Blois around 1156-7. Again, the fact that the Bishop of Exeter is dead has no bearing on the JC commission or its prologue. The same device of backdating a work (by citing a dedicatee) is used as that which is evident in the HRB.

It is in this second charter in which bishop Robert signs his name, that we come across for the first time a certain Rad. Monumuta signature. It would seem reasonable to assume that it is the close association with this name, along with Galfridus’, which has convinced commentators (amongst evidences provided by the Book of Llandaff) that ‘Geoffrey’ was genuinely from Monmouth i.e. he had a friend called Ralph, also from the environs.

The area of Southern Wales after Henry Ist time and especially during Stephen’s early reign was in constant turmoil from incursions by the Welsh against Norman fortifications. Henry Blois undoubtedly knew this area and had witnessed the Roman remains at Caerleon and had located Nennius’ synonymous City of Legions there. At the start of GS, much of the action takes place in Southern Wales. Matilda’s brother was Duke of Gloucester who was Henry and Stephen’s arch enemy, along with Miles of Gloucester, 1st Earl of Hereford and his son Roger. Gloucester and Hereford were both places within a twenty mile radius of Monmouth and Woodchester and Caerleon.

I think that Henry Blois did know this area, especially if we have identified his castle at Kidwelly. Henry based his Arthurian escapade in this area and thus, when he saw Ralph of Monmouth’s name (in the charter) he decided in his Vulgate HRB edition to name himself as Geoffrey of Monmouth (Galfridus Monemutensis). He had referred to himself originally
as Galfridus Arturus, the writer of the first edition Historia Brittonum or as I have named it: Primary Historia. Alfred of Beverley only refers to Galfridus as Britannicus, yet rather than this meaning the ‘Welshman’ it probably means not of Saxon (English) or Norman stock but Celtic/Briton. One would certainly get that impression from the contents of the prophetia and HRB. But it is only in the Vulgate version that the Monmouth appellation is added where ‘Geoffrey’ hails from Monmouth and the Vulgate is titled Historia Regum Britanniae.

Rad. de Monumuta signs his name.... and just after we see Henry has promoted his bogus persona. He signs as mag. Galf. Arturus. Five different ways of signing one’s name is probably Henry Blois’ way of giving the illusory appearance of a gap of time between each signature. Who has this many permutations to one name: Galfredo Artur, Galfredo Arthur, Galfredo Artour, Galfredo Arturo; and must have signed the Primary Historia as Galfridus Arturus. What is his function at Oxford, and why, (when he supposedly becomes bishop elect or bishop itself), does he require a name change dropping the ‘L’ to Gaufridus. If one were to be cynical, it seems a pointless exercise being Bishop of Asaph and staying in Oxford.

A coincidence is that the writer of the De mirabilibus urbis Romae, is a certain Magister Gregorius which, as I will show shortly, was also written by Henry Blois.

The dating of the deed is not important, but is dated to 1139, because in the charter which precedes it in the Cartulary, Bishop Alexander states that the grant which Archdeacon Walter made at the abbey of Godstow was made in the presence of King Stephen.

Now around the same date, again in the same cartulary is a grant of land in Shillingford signed by Archdeacon Walter with Radulfo de Monumuta and above his name is inserted Galfrido Arturo.

In the four charters to date, one man has spelt his name four different ways. This is a ploy of variation in spelling used in the HRB and the Vita. It pretends a time span between signing or in the case of HRB and VM, time has corrupted the spelling.

In 1139, when Stephen and his court are arresting bishops in Oxford in the presence of Henry Blois, at that time, there is a statement in the same cartulary by Archdeacon Walter that when the church of St. Giles, Oxford was founded, he agreed that his Villains (rustici) in Walton should pay their tithes to the new church. When, in 1139, it became the property of
Godstow, Walter, in the statement renewed his permission; again, witnessed by Radulfo de Monmuta. Why is ‘Geoffrey’s’ surname, (if it was his patronymic), spelt five different ways. If it is a nickname and transposed onto his persona by public renown, why if he is scribbling his own signature and it is a real nickname, does he find it necessary to have different forms of it.

Also in the Godstow cartulary is a grant of land in Knolle by a certain ‘Richard Labanc’, but Henry Blois, keeping track of his fraudulent illusion’s chronological sequence and continuing the pretense that ‘Geoffrey’s’ aspiring ambition is coming to fruition; signs his name as Gaufridus episcopus sancti Asaphi; again, along with a signature of Walter Oxenefordie archdiaconus. Walter died in 1151 and in the Bittlesden Cartulary there is a charter dated ‘the feast of Remigus (12 May) 1151 and it is attested by Robert Foliot, Archdeacon of Oxford. Robert Foliot had already succeeded Walter by this date; so ‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed friend Walter is definitely dead. So how is it, Henry Blois, (as he signs as ‘Geoffrey’) was now bishop of Asaph? This is not possible.... if we believed any of these signatures reflect a living bishop of Asaph.

The answer might be that Henry Blois, after Walter’s death, forgets the exact date that Walter died and signs as if Galfrido Arthur had attained his ambition. The problem is that the fictitious ‘Geoffrey’ did not get elected until the 24th February 1152.... so how could he be signing alongside a dead person if the signature was from real extant ‘Geoffrey’! Modern scholars’ rationalization is that they now believe the charter is a fake. Rather, I would say it is down to the fact that Henry has added the bishop’s name inadvertently forgetting the chronological sequence of when Walter died and when Henry himself had bogusly ‘elected’ Geoffrey as Bishop of Asaph.

Henry Blois was fraudulently applying the signatures after the fact because how could a supposed already ordained ‘bishop of Asaph’ apply his signature alongside a Walter that died in 1151 when he only became bishop in 1152. The charter concerning land in Knolle is too inconsequential to be a fake as the scholars have proposed. The answer is not that the original charter is a fraud or any of the other six charters; but the signature of ‘Geoffrey’ has been added after the fact. Henry Blois has not considered accurately the date of Walter’s death to coincide with Theobald’s fictitious ordination. It is Henry Blois’ promotion of ‘Geoffrey’ to ‘Bishop’ which is the
chronological error, not the charter itself. It just helps to support the point that Henry is inserting Galfridian signatures into extant charters.

Normally with this kind of discrepancy one assumes a fraudulent charter as most scholars have divined, but a Mr. W. Farrer is at pains to clear up the conundrum by showing us that ‘Episcopus’ could be used for one who was only ‘bishop-elect’. This is not a good solution in this case; as there is a charter of Bishop Robert de Chesney in the Thame cartulary upon which Henry Blois bogusly signs as *mag. Gaufridus electus sancti Asaphi*, alongside a *Rob. Oxonefordie archidiaconus*. The point being that, (as in this charter), if Henry were going to sign as ‘bishop elect’ to imply Geoffrey’s status, he would have written it as he meant it; just as he had done before. The other point already mentioned is that the charter deed is of such little consequence…. it is hardly a prudent fraud for monetary gain and therefore can not be deemed a forgery itself.

The last, but most important, charter puts Henry Blois at the scene of the fraud. It would be a strange quirk of fate, given the evidence so far, if the witness, *Galfrido* and the bishop of Winchester, signing the same document, were not one and the same. ‘Geoffrey’s’ name appears in the form *Galfrido de S. Asaph episcopo* on the treaty of Winchester.\[^{310}\]

As we know, a temporary truce was reached at Wallingford in July on the banks of the Thames as described in the GS and highlighted as a predicted episode in the Merlin prophecies.\[^{311}\] Eustace, Stephen’s son, was annoyed that a deal had been struck, as the Treaty of Winchester essentially removed the crown from his reach. A formal agreement between Stephen and Henry Fitz Empress as the future Henry II was drawn up at Winchester. The probability is that, Henry Blois, as one of the negotiators with Theobald, composed the terms of the document. In the later Treaty of Westminster an undue proportion of it was concerning William King Stephen’s other son’ inheritance, as Eustace had already (suspiciously) died.

Henry, as we saw earlier had an uncle’s affection for Eustace; evidenced by paying for the pomp of his knighthood. Eustace had a sudden and

---


\[^{311}\] *Two Kings shall encounter in nigh combat over the Lioness at the ford of the staff.*
suspicious death on the 17 August 1153, a month after the truce at Wallingford. The Treaty of Wallingford was initially the agreement. Later at Winchester Henry would have drawn up a treaty with Eustace’s interests at heart. After his death the treaty of Westminster was signed in November 1153. Henry Blois, in whose possession the treaty was probably left for good keeping.... signed on ‘Bishop Geoffrey’s’ behalf for the last time. There was no Geoffrey!!!

There is no other bishop of that era where no deed or record exists on any document or in any Cartulary. Our bishop of Asaph is a ghost and more specifically there is no mention of him in Asaph. This has always been put down to the impossibility of ‘Geoffrey’ being able to carry out his duties at Asaph due to the Welsh rebellion. Because of the war, Henry chose the location of St Asaph as part of his illusion which could not be verified. As we have already discussed, there was no bishopric at St Asaph at that time.

‘Geoffrey’ was fictitiously consecrated at Westminster because the bishop of London had just died and Henry was temporary custodian of the see. If the Bishop of Asaph was a man of such repute, supposedly having come to the attention of the most powerful people in the country, it is a bit strange that no-one knows where he is buried. The only person who had the opportunity to carry out this fraud is Henry Blois. We should not forget concerning Geoffrey’s authorship of HRB.... Arthur’s continental battle scene involving Autun and Langres.... and the fact it is in Blois territory.... and next to Clugny along with the town of Avallon.

Henry Blois had already lied on such a large scale re-writing British history in HRB, so what difference would it make to sign a fake name as a witness to some documents and create a persona to hide his authorship....especially if he was ever uncovered as the inventor of the seditious prophecies. Much of the success of the HRB would depend upon the ability to propagate copies and we know Henry had charge over several scriptoriums. There seems little doubt to the authorship of the VM being by the same person that wrote the prophecies in Vulgate HRB. The content of the prophecies is so highly relevant to Henry himself. The GS, by its descriptions puts Henry on location where the relevant prophecies are detailed.

Our only evidence that the Bishop of Asaph existed in any sort of reality comes from Gervaise of Canterbury. In his Opera Historica, Gervasii Cantuariensis relates: Obit Robertus Episcopus Londonensis. Septimo
kalendas Martii sacravit, Theodaldus Cantuariensis archiepiscopus apud Lambethem Galfridium electum Sancti Asaph, astantibus et cooperantibus Willelmo Norwicensi, et Walterio Rofensi.312

'Robert bishop of London died. On the seventh kalends of March (i.e. 23 March) Theobald archbishop of Canterbury consecrated at Lambeth Geoffrey as bishop-elect of St Asaph, with the help and attendance of William of Norwich and Walter of Rouen.'

‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed consecration (as above) was attended and helped by a certain Willelmo Norwicensi, William from Norwich and a Walterio Rofensi, Walter from (Rouen) Rochester? Whoever they were is inconsequential.... as no-one records their names again and.... by late 1154 or 1155 they were probably dead if they ever did exist in reality.

In 1153 the enmity between Theobald of Bec and Henry Blois had dissipated. They had been the negotiators of the peace settlement at Wallingford. It is not unreasonable to suggest that Henry after having concocted a profession and consecration document for the bishop of Asaph while at Canterbury (at a future date), deposited them amongst records.

Gervaise records 25 years after the event in 1188, amongst a plethora of other material, the extract provided above. The Bishop of London died and we know Henry oversaw the see for a time while Stephen was alive. Geoffrey of Monmouth was supposedly ordained at Westminster on Saturday 16th of February 1152 and consecrated on Sunday the 24th of February a week later. These dates being endorsed on the fake profession.313 It would not be tentative to suggest that Gilbert, Geoffrey’s predecessor at Asaph, is also fictitious as nothing is known of him either.

Apart from the two witnesses and supposedly Theobald of Bec.... no one ever met Geoffrey in person. The witnesses to the oxford charters never met him either. How could a living bishop sign next to a dead Walter? One would think if ‘Geoffrey’ were at the signing of the Treaty of Winchester he would emerge on documentation somewhere or by comment of his having been present somewhere. If he were not in Asaph.... where was he?

Apart from Newburgh, only one other contemporary comments on ‘Geoffrey’s’ work. Giraldus Cambrensis was also unconvinced by the
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veracity of ‘Geoffrey's’ HRB. He recounts in his *Itinerarium Cambriae* the experience of a man called *Meilerius* possessed by demons and who could pick out false passages in a book: ‘If the evil spirits oppressed him too much, the Gospel of St John was placed on his bosom, when, like birds, they immediately vanished; but when the book was removed, and the History of the Britons by 'Geoffrey Arthur' was substituted in its place, they instantly reappeared in greater numbers, and remained a longer time than usual on his body and on the book’.

By the time Giraldus Cambrensis wrote this, Henry Blois was dead, but we should not forget Henry Blois was Giraldus’ patron. It would be safe to assume Henry Blois would have surreptitiously substantiated verbally various parts of ‘Geoffrey’s’ false history of Arthur. Giraldus may have been informed of the interpolated propaganda contents of DA before Henry Blois death. I shall deal with this point later in chapter 27.

It is interesting that Gerald, like Huntingdon, refers to ‘Geoffrey’ as 'Geoffrey Arthur' not Geoffrey of Monmouth and this form of reference to Geoffrey may well stem from interaction with the bishop of Winchester himself as this might be how he referred to ‘Geoffrey’.

As the venerable statesman, Henry Blois had become patron to Gerald and Gerald quoted Merlin prophecies often, but Gerald would never have suspected Henry Blois as author of HRB or prophecies. Gerald’s hope of metropolitan for St David’s could well have been encouraged by Henry Blois after Bernard’s passing.

Scholarship has long been suspicious of Geoffrey’s part authorship of the book of Llandaff where corroborative evidence is supplied for the HRB. The same goes for Caradoc of Llancarfan’s so called Gwentian Brut or *Brut y Tywysogion*; the same supposed author of the *Life of Gildas*. Henry Blois, as I will be show in progression is the author of the *Life of Gildas*. Henry impersonates Caradoc after his death, even though he pointedly steers us away from this possibility by proclaiming through ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ that Caradoc is ‘Geoffrey’s’ contemporary.

Henry had vast resources and could pay or commission works by Welsh monks. Geoffrey who might have been suspected of such a propaganda exercise was thought to be dead. It is certainly Henry Blois who has interpolated the Book of Llandaff with so much ‘coincidental’ corroborative detail.
Henry Blois’ mode of infiltrating his propaganda into the public domain to secret his authorship takes many forms:

1) Sometimes he invents a persona as he did with Geoffrey of Monmouth and constructs fictitious intimate material as found in HRB and VM whereby he appears to aspire to rank.

2) Henry Blois may invent an author as he does with Magister Gregorius the author of *De mirabilibus urbis Romae*, which involves his interest and fascination with the bronze horseman which he includes in the HRB and prophecies, but also shows his fascination with statuary and architecture and Rome.

3) He sometimes interpolates existing work and inserts his own propaganda as we see with the book of Llandaff.

4) He may use an existing author’s name who has expired and wholly composes his propaganda under their name as we witness in Caradoc of Llancarfan’s *life of Gildas*.

5) He will take another’s work such as William of Malmesbury’s *Antiquititates* and interpolate it. This method was used to best advantage as that book was specifically dedicated to Henry Blois. Henry probably had the only original monograph copy. Henry also interpolates a copy of William of Malmesbury’s GR (version B) with a few details concerning Glastonbury. The interpolations in DA and GR by Henry Blois act to confirm that William believed certain things which sometimes he categorically contradicts elsewhere in his other works. It is only when Henry’s evolving agenda is elucidated that we can date and confirm the reasoning behind the interpolations.

6) Henry Blois also is known to have started the rumour concerning Dunstan’s remains at Glastonbury which we shall cover when investigating Eadmer’s letter.

7) He invents spurious contemporaneity in antiquity for authors, feigning eyewitness accounts through a certain Turkill in the *De Inventione*, where the ‘holy cross’ was brought from Montacute to Waltham, where Henry Blois just happens to be Dean.

8) Henry may be the one who would have us believe Nennius’s original account was written by Gildas, but this is speculative on my part. The supposition is that he did this as he knew the manuscript was a patchwork of older works attributed to Nennius but did not know if there were other copies extant. *Nennius, who took it ill that he should be minded to do away*
the name of Troy in his own country. But since Gildas, the historian, hath treated of this contention at sufficient length\(^{314}\)... yet we know Gildas did not mention it; and we know ‘Geoffrey’ has read Nennius.

9) Henry impersonates Gaimar who had already written *L’estoire des Engles*. This is very useful to him as he starts with the pretext of having written a previous volume of a French version of ‘Geoffrey’s’ Historia, the supposed *L’estoire des Bretons: Heretofore in the former book, if you remember it, you have heard how perfectly Constantine held the dominion after Arthur*. This happens to be non-existent and no-one else refers to it.... but he pretends *L’Estoire des Engles* is a continuation of a previous volume put out by Gaimar called *L’estoire des Bretons*. The reasoning, I believe, (apart from the fact that Henry wrote the *Roman de Brut*) for implicating that such a volume had been written is that Henry had initially stated that HRB was a translation of a British book. Later as pressure came to bear in substantiating that this book existed it became a book *ex Britannicus*.... now understood as Walter’s book having originated from Brittany. Henry provides the only substantiation for Walter’s very ancient book in the famed ‘Gaimar’s epilogue’, the very basis which the HRB relies on for its credibility. It is such an easy illusion to carry out after Gaimar’s death and Henry even has the cheek to state: *So that at Winchester, in the cathedral, there is the true history of the Kings*. Henry Blois interpolates Gaimar’s *L’estoire des Engles* also while having it copied which will be covered in a later chapter.

10) Henry also impersonates Wace who wrote *Roman de Rou*. Henry, writes a French version of the HRB called *Roman de Brut* started before 1155 in rhymed vernacular and he uses the First Variant Version at the beginning of *Roman de Brut* as the template upon which he versifies. This dates *Roman de Brut*’ start of composition by Henry Blois before Vulgate was finished. Henry adds new detail, writing as Wace in the *Roman de Brut*, concerning the ‘round table’ which was not in the HRB. Henry employs his usual obfuscatory technique because he does not include the Merlin prophecies and says “*I am not willing to translate his book, because I do not know how to interpret it. I would say nothing that was not exactly as I said.*” We should not forget Alfred of Beverley had said the prophecies were ‘too
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long to go into’... so omits them also. I will cover Henry’s impersonation of Wace by authoring the Roman de Brut in a later chapter.

Henry sums up the hope of the Britons impersonating Wace and feigns recalling what Merlin had predicted of Arthur: *So the chronicle speaks sooth, Arthur himself was wounded in his body to the death. He caused him to be borne to Avalon for the searching of his hurts. He is yet in Avalon, awaited of the Britons; for as they say and deem he will return from whence he went and live again. Master Wace, the writer of this book, cannot add more to this matter of his end than was spoken by Merlin the prophet. Merlin said of Arthur, if I read rightly, that his end should be hidden in doubtfulness. The prophet spoke truly. Men have ever doubted, and, as I am persuaded, will always doubt whether he liveth or is dead. Arthur bade that he should be carried to Avalon in this hope in the year 642 of the Incarnation.*

If one remembers in HRB, Henry had written: *The house of Romulus shall dread the fierceness of his prowess and doubtful shall be his end...* which in itself shows it is Henry Blois inventing the prophecies and corroborating his own bogus continental Arthurian campaign in HRB. ‘Master Wace the writer of this book’ (who hopes to interpret rightly) implants his name so ridiculously in the text it smacks of the epitaph on the leaden cross pointing out that Glastonbury is Avalon. The gambit seems to have fooled most scholars.

11) Lastly, and most cleverly of all, Henry Blois propagates Grail literature through his Nephew’s wives and in other ways which fits his post 1158 agenda in converting Glastonbury to the Island of Avalon. An Anagram of Henry Blois’ name in the "Elucidation" is prefixed to the rhymed version of Percival le Gallois under the name of Master Blihis, which someone has mistaken ‘Monsieur’ for Monsieur Blois. How this name is associated with the primary sources of Grail literature is discussed in progression.

All of these methods of propaganda will be discussed later, along with his most successful work, the propagation of the Perlesvau and the Joseph of Arimathea material found in Robert de Boron’s work. Once this is understood, it unlocks much of the bewilderment in connecting the issues between Arthurian legend, Glastonburiana and their connection with Grail literature. Once we find out the culprit who has invented the material that comprises *The Matter of Britain* we are then in a better position to assess
from where the source material came and fathom which parts are based in reality.
Chapter 10

Abbot Suger

Abbot Suger built a church in the nascent Gothic style at St Denis. Suger wrote extensively on the construction of the abbey in *Liber de Rebus in Administratione sua Gestis*, *Libellus Alter de Consecratione Ecclesiae Sancti Dionysii*, and *Ordinatio* and was also a keen historian and moved in influential circles being a *confidant* of the French Kings, Louis VI and Louis VII. Not only was abbot Suger friends with Henry, they had similar interests, in architecture and history and both were central to power politics and correspondence between them is shown in note 4. We can only assume that Henry gave Suger a copy of an early version of his *Libellus Merlini*, but Suger’s gullible attitude toward Merlin is noteworthy and may have been affected by Henry Blois’ own ‘insightful commendation’ when presenting the copy to him. While writing about *Louis le Gros* and Henry Ist, Suger interjects a few comments on extracts taken from the *Libellus Merlini*:

‘At that time, it so befell that Henry, King of the English, had come into the parts of the Normans, a right valiant man renowned alike in peace and war, whose excellency, admired and famous throughout well-nigh the universal world, Merlin, that marvellous observer and recorder of the continuous course of events amongst the English, rustic prophet though he be, doth with no less elegance than truth extol with exceeding honour; for, bursting forth abruptly, as hath ever been the wont of seers, in his praise, he thus up-lifteth his prophetic voice: "The Lion of Justice," saith he, "shall succeed, at whose
roaring shall tremble the towers of Gaul and the Dragons of the Island. In his
days shall gold be wrung from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall flow
from the hooves of them that low. They whose hair is crisped and curled shall
array themselves in parti-coloured fleeces, and the garment without shall
betoken that which is within. The feet of them that bark shall be cropped
short. The wild deer shall have peace, but humanity shall suffer the dole. The
shape of commerce shall be cloven in twain; the half shall become round. The
ravening of kites shall perish, and the teeth of wolves be blunted. The Lion's
whelps shall be transformed into fishes of the sea, and his Eagle shall build
her nest upon (over) the mount Aravium."

Just to indicate to the reader how Henry twisted these prophecies over
time, notice there is no mention of a ‘third’ nesting. Another indication
which would define some of Crick’s eighty five copies of the prophetia as
deriving from the early versions would be to see which omit mention of the
‘third nesting’. Suger’s copy would have been part of Henry’s initial set of
prophecies and we should note they are close to those interpolated into
‘Orderic’s’ section. However, unlike Orderic’s there is no mention of a ‘sixth’
in Ireland. So let us not think that Orderic’s section which purposefully
mirrors the content of the real *Libellus Merlini* as found in that which Suger
recounts is contemporaneous in content with a prophecy which predicts
Henry II in Ireland. Since the Eagle is included, it dates to around 1139-43
given that there is no mention of material in the Anarchy which is present
in the Vulgate set of updated prophecies and further extended in the VM
and also found in the prophecies supposedly translated by John of
Cornwall.

It is interesting, the amount of fervent support such a sober and
influential man lends to the credibility of Henry’s concoction. One may
speculate Suger’s view may have been influenced by Henry’s
commendation: ‘The whole compass of this prediction, so weighty and so
ancient, fits in so exactly with the strenuous character of the person indicated
and his administration of the realm, that not one single iota, not one single
word can be regarded as inconsistent with the precise applicability thereof.
For even from this which is said at the end about the Lion’s whelps it is
abundantly manifest that the prophecy hath proven true, seeing that his sons
and daughters were shipwrecked, and being devoured of the fishes of the sea
were physically transformed into them. The aforesaid King Henry, therefore,
happily succeeding his brother William, as soon as he had by the counsel of
experienced men and upright, ordered the realm of England to their liking according to the rule of their ancient Kings, and in order to secure their goodwill had confirmed by oath the ancient customs of the realm, made for the haven of his Norman duchy, and, relying on the help of the King of the French, bringeth back order to the land, restoreth the laws and imposeth peace upon compulsion, promising robbers nought less than the tearing out of their eyes or stark hanging, gallows-high. Presently, therefore, under the strokes and stress of these and the like promises, and stricken, moreover, by their frequent fulfilment, for any man can be profuse in promises, the land is dumb at sight of him, and the Normans, in whose fierce Dansker blood is no peace, keep peace against their will, thereby again verifying the words of the rustic prophet. For the ravening of kites doth perish, and the teeth of wolves are blunted when neither gentle nor simple durst presume to pillage or plunder save by stealth. And when he saith that at the roaring of the Lion of Justice the towers of Gaul and the Dragons of the Island shall tremble, he intimateth this, that well-nigh all the towers and whatsoever castles were strongest in Normandy, which is part of Gaul, he did cause to be either levelled with the ground, or otherwise subdued unto his will either by settling men of his own therein, or, if they were destroyed, by confiscating their revenues to his own treasury. The Island Dragons also did tremble when none of the nobles of England, whosoever they might be, durst even grumble during his whole administration. In his days was gold wrung by him out of the lily, that is, from the religious of good odour, and from the nettle, that is from the stinging seculars; his intent being that as he was a profit unto all, so also should all do service unto himself. For safer it is that all should have one to defend them against all, than for all to perish through one man for lack of such a defender. Silver flowed from the hooves of them that low when the strength of the castle safeguarded the plenty of the grange, and the plenty of the grange assured abundance of silver in the well-filled coffers.’

Note that the Abbot does not care to elucidate on Montem Aravium. Henry’s cryptic allusion to the Empress seems to have been indecipherable to the contemporary audience. Maybe this is why Henry needed to add the ‘third nesting’ in the Vulgate set to obviate the Eagle was the Empress. Yet strangely enough Wace knows exactly what it means, but we will get to that later.

Abbot Suger selects these prophecies as an exemplar bearing directly on the subject he is writing about i.e. (Henry Ist).... interpreting some as
evidence that Merlin’s words have come to fruition. The ‘Sixth in Ireland’ prediction is not part of this block of prophecies but is found in the Vulgate HRB and VM in the same clump, but naturally that particular prophecy could not be part of the prophecies before Suger’s death. If only Suger (writing c.1147) had said by what means or from whom he had received these prophecies or Robert of Torigni had stated from whom Bec had obtained a copy of the Primary Historia, we could then probably make one more connection back to Henry Blois.
Chapter 11

Alfred of Beverley

Another contemporary writer is also fascinated by the Galfridus’ Historia. Alfred of Beverley is a contemporary chronicler in the time the Primary Historia existed as a separate book from the Libellus Merlini. Since we know the First Variant was employed in pursuing the goal of obtaining a metropolitan for Winchester we might conclude that prophecies which predict such a future state may well have been added in the interim to bolster Henry’s case at Rome i.e. between 1139 and 1144 the early prophecies were included into the version known as the First Variant.

Alfred was ‘sacrist of the church of Beverley’. He speaks of himself in the preface to his book as contemporary with the removal of the Flemings from the north of England to Rhos in Dyfed around 1110-2. Alfred also says that he compiled his chronicle ‘when the church was silent, owing to the number of persons excommunicated under the decree of the council of London.’ He says that his interest in history in general was first sparked off by reading Galfridus’ Historia Britonum. One must assume since he relates to the prophecies but omits to comment on them saying they are ‘too long’ that he has an evolved First Variant edition with a set of early libellus Merlini prophecies spliced in.

Scholars seem to think Alfred recycled Geoffrey’s work from a Vulgate copy not an evolving First Variant. They say that Alfred relates to episodes exclusively found in the Vulgate version only. If this is a fact, I suggest that
the Vulgate was evolving from the *Primary Historia* and First Variant between 1147-51, when Alfred relates to Geoffrey’s work.

Alfred admits: ‘neither the Roman nor the English historians record anything about the illustrious Arthur, although he did such remarkable deeds with such skill and valour, not only in Britain against the pagans, but also in Gaul against the Romans’. He too, questions if the Ambrosius Aurelius in Bede was the same as ‘Geoffrey’s’ Ambrosius. Alfred wrote his chronicle entitled *Annales sive Historia de gestis regum Britanniae*, which begins with Brutus. His title informs us *ad annum 1129* and so incorporates the history of England down to 1129.

A second book or follow on takes us up to the death of Henry Ist. Some commentators think Alfred put pen to paper c. 1143 based on Hardy’s work. Our interest in the work is really only to establish that it was not written in 1143 as many commentators have thought, but it was published at the earliest after the end of 1147 and more probably in 1150-51 as Offler and Raine have concluded. Many previous commentators have concluded the earlier date because Alfred relates that he wrote in an era of enforced idleness and thus refers to the legatine council held in 1143. The splicing of the early *prophetia* into the version known as First Variant was not composed before 1144 and may indeed not have been spliced at this stage.

The importance of this is that the prophecies of Merlin were not in the *Primary Historia* as Huntingdon unintentionally reveals; yet they had been spliced into a First Variant or a precursor edition before the finalized Vulgate. In Alfred’s account he does not mention dedicatees, which, since much of his history is recycled from Geoffrey’s work one might think it an oversight. However, since we know the dedicatees in the finalized Vulgate, HRB are not employed until after their deaths (and Walter is not mentioned either by Alfred) we know he is not using a finalized Vulgate version. Although Alfred omits the prophecies he does not mention Bishop Alexander either but this is obviously because the copy he has must have been composed before Alexander’s death.

The Galfridus edition of HRB arrived at Beverley through William Fitz Herbert or Hugh de Puiset, both Henry’s nephews. We may conclude Beverley would have obtained the version from either of these relations of Henry. We know that when the archbishop was deposed in favour of the
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[^315]: *Historia Ecclesiastica*, i 16
Cistercian Murdac in 1147, William Fitz Herbert stayed with Henry at Winchester for some considerable time in-between 1147-53. Also during that period Hugh de Puiset had fled to Beverley. It would not be logical to think the provenance of the Galfridus edition at Beverley found its way there by any other route than through Henry’s nephews since so few copies of HRB were in circulation at that time. Henry Blois had assisted Hugh’s ecclesiastical career and Hugh held the office of treasurer of York for a number of years, which led him into conflict with the Cistercian Murdac.

This opinion of course runs contrary to modern Scholar’s views which is based upon the presumption that the Vulgate HRB was widely distributed at this time because they, un-discerningly, ‘lay aside’ the discrepancies in storyline related in EAW and its reduced Arthuriana and account Alfred’s reasons for the same as a scepticism. Scholars make ridiculous rationalisations for Huntingdon having not mentioned Merlin or his prophecies. They aver that the Bec copy and all copies were synonymous with the Vulgate and First Variant did not precede the Vulgate version. First Variant is the copy of HRB designed to aid Henry Blois in obtaining Metropolitan status. Speeches are more pious and a theme of divine retribution pervades, avoiding any stance which might annoy a Roman or Papal audience or be found to be blatantly incorrect regarding historicity found in continental or Roman annals. Biblical allusions abound in speeches and narrative in the Variant; pleasing to a papal audience. Another feature of the Variant Version is the tendency to tone down or to omit altogether certain unpleasant details. The conversation between Bedwer, Arthur’s butler and the nurse of Helen, Hoel’s niece, at the latter’s grave mound on Mont St. Michel, What Henry truly achieves is the assimilation of Chronicled histories from various sources into a form of literature through his muses.

Once Henry Blois has finished with his metropolitan agenda we can witness more anti roman sentiment in Vulgate with additional Briton pride witnessed in rousing speech.

---

316 One sure way of determining this (providing one can accept *le roman de Brut* having been authored by Henry Blois) is that Wace’s version would hardly commence following the First Variant and finish by mirroring the Vulgate if Vulgate had appeared first.
Alfred has an abridged or evolved First Variant in which Alfred refers to Stonehenge twice. The first is recycled from Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum*, where Henry provides an architectural description of the stones and provides the earliest use of the term ‘Stonehenge’. Geoffrey knew the HA well and borrowed the name from HA recycling Huntingdon’s name ‘Stonehenge’. What is interesting though and concurs with EAW’s synopsis of *Primary Historia* account is the evolving nature of HRB. In Alfred’s second reference to Stonehenge recycled from the HRB and the description of the burial of Constantine, next to Uther Pendragon, in the stone circle; Alfred omits entirely Geoffrey’s account of the transportation by Merlin of the giants’ ring from Ireland and their erection. Alfred mentions Merlin on numerous occasions but he presents a substantially moderated, scaled back version compared with Vulgate HRB. His omission of the transportation of the giants’ ring is an example of this similarity to the un-evolved *Primary Historia*. Alfred omits the prophecies of Merlin but does note their existence simply remarking that they are too long to report here. This may indicate that the PM was still not yet attached to the evolving HRB found at Beverley. Given that Alexander died in 1148 and we understand the book may have arrived in York c.1146-47 and we can see that Alexander is used as the splice in Vulgate for the PM it may be that Alfred’s references to Merlin were from HRB narrative and not because of their inclusion in the text. The PM and the Primary Historia were two separate works put out by Henry Blois. The splicing of the two books using Alexander as the impetus to translate the prophecies only probably occurred after Alexander’s death. The Variant is devoid of personal detail found in prefatory accounts regarding ‘Geoffrey’ simply because a Welsh Galfridus Arthurus was the author and at this stage c.1144 no one in particular was too concerned. The early PM *Libellus* was distributed quietly and acted as an aid and complement to HRB’s historicity. However, fortuitously once spliced, the prophecies designed to corroborate the historicity of HRB were now found in the same volume. Hoel’s speech like many others had not yet been
developed where he compliments Henry Blois alter ego on his ‘Tullian dew of eloquence’.317

Most modern scholars assume that EAW’s relatively modest treatment of Arthur and its omission of Merlin entirely influence Alfred in his History not realising that the Primary Historia evolved into First Variant and Alfred’s copy had evolved from Primary Historia. If this is not understood, researchers still think that Alfred is openly sceptical of the ‘Arthurania’ by its reduction in his History and that Alfred moderates his portrayal of Merlin by comparison with the expanded Vulgate. The simple fact is that Vulgate had not been developed fully or published until 1155. Before this a compressed less detailed evolving Variant existed.

Alfred of Beverley repeats what Britannicus says about Merlin, i.e. the account of the young Merlin delivering the story about the two dragons fighting, but Alfred does not include any of the ‘Prophetiae’ but has heard of them. It is not a certainty that Alfred’s copy had the prophecies spliced in. We don’t not know if he would have mentioned them if they were not. But certainly there was no prefatory blurb concerning Alexander, so my guess is that Alfred only mentioned the prophecies because they were known to be authored by Merlin and the Libellus Merlini account which circulated in Alfred’s day he had read, but was not going to divert from recycling Galfridus’ historia.

Another example of the unexpanded evolving version of Merlin is Alfred’s reduction of Geoffrey’s entire detailed story in Vulgate of Merlin’s powers of illusion allowing Uther Pendragon to take on the appearance of Duke Gorlois of Cornwall and sleep with his wife Yegerna when Arthur is conceived to the briefest mention. Concerning the story of Leir and his daughters, Alfred provides a highly condensed abbreviation of this story in his account, taken from the First Variant. His treatment is far more concise

317 Henry Blois on the Mosan plates compares his stature in terms of legacy to that of Cicero.
than that of Huntingdon’s précis which I think can be put down to the papal audience for which First Variant was designed.

To modern scholars Huntingdon seemingly devotes more time and attention to this story of Leir in EAW than he does to the Arthurania. Alfred’s recycling of comparative Arthuriana found in Vulgate is obviously reduced because it is not yet developed. Wright’s category H constitutes a huge expansion on the Variant of about 50 additional chapters of narrative and speech. This is positive development in Vulgate and cannot be accounted as reductive in a proposed late Variant. ‘Geoffrey’ in these chapters spices up Vulgate with harangues and Battle scenes and generally throws caution to the wind where historicity is concerned while having held much closer in the Variant version to accounts known in continental, British, and Roman annals. Henry Blois actually shoots himself in the foot by adhering in the Variant to Bede too closely by repeating that the British population first migrated from Armorica which contradicts his Trojan foundation; but he then corrects this discrepancy later as Wace intoning that Amorica was the last location of continental adventures before arriving at Totnes.

Again, this proposition of a late Variant would never be considered if the differences in EAW had been taken into account and early researchers had not subconsciously assumed that a Vulgate version was that which was found by Torigni and passed to Huntingdon in 1139.

Alfred in his preface says that others around him had already read Geoffrey’s Historia and their mouths were full of his narrations. Alfred was by his own admission accounted an ignoramus (notam rusticitatis incurrebat) for being a stranger to Geoffrey’s work c.1149-50 by the other monks. We can gauge that the book arrived c.1147 through either of the author’s nephews and Alfred recycled c.1150-51. Alfred witnessed charters in favour of the town of Beverley, the nearby religious houses at Bridlington, Warter, and Watton, and Rufford, between 1135 and 1154, but probably died about 1157, when a certain Robert attests as sacrist of Beverley.
The point is that, when Alfred says: ‘when the church was silent, owing to the number of persons excommunicated under the decree of the council of London’... he is not referring to the time of the council in London but what was agreed ‘at’ the council regarding ex-communication. The time that Alfred says he was composing his book must be after 1147 and up until the time Henry Murdac died in 1153. The reason for concluding this time span for Alfred’s publication is again linked to affairs concerning Henry Blois and his brother Stephen.

The poor state of the church at Beverley, which Alfred refers to, was a direct result of events which took place at York. William Fitz Herbert, as we covered earlier, was the son of Henry Blois’ sister and was Archbishop of York (twice); before and after the appointment of Henry Murdac. William of Newburgh records that William Fitz Herbert is ‘received with honour’ (put up) by Henry Blois at Winchester until re-established at York after Murdac’s death. King Stephen and Henry Blois helped secure Fitz Herbert’s election to York after a number of candidates had failed to secure papal confirmation.

Fitz Herbert faced opposition from the Cistercians who, after the election of the Cistercian Pope Eugene III, managed to have the archbishop deposed. Henry Murdac was a personal friend of the pope himself who was at Tiers at the time and thus consecrated Murdac as the new archbishop of York, on 7 December 1147... effectively replacing Fitz Herbert.

However, York’s cathedral chapter and King Stephen refused to acknowledge Murdac’s appointment and Stephen imposed a fine on the town of Beverley for harbouring Murdac. In retaliation, Murdac excommunicated Hugh de Puiset (who later became Bishop of Durham), another (appointed) Nephew of Henry and Stephen who was at the time Treasurer of York, and laid the city under interdict. Hugh de Puiset, in return, excommunicated the Archbishop Murdac and ordered church services to be conducted as usual. In this he was supported by Eustace, son of Stephen.

John of Hexam relates that Hugh de Puiset fled to Beverley where even when Prince Eustace requested Hugh’s return to his see, he refused.... and probably also went to his uncle at Winchester. This era of church politics, (testing Rome’s power to appoint bishops), is the era in which Alfred refers
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318 William of Newburgh, Cap XVIII.1
to ‘when the church was silent’ i.e. when normal services were interrupted because numerous clergy were excommunicated. From this we may surmise that Alfred had an evolved First Variant (because there are still no dedicatees). We will return to Alfred’s work when we compare it to the First Variant in a later Chapter but we can assume that there are not the amount of copies floating about the monastic system at that time which scholars seem to assume, based upon their dating assumptions derived by the dedicatees lifespans. The copy at Beverly was rare and it arrived there through a Nephew of Henry Blois.

Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx in North Yorkshire, author of Speculum charitatis (The Mirror of Charity), reportedly written at the request of Bernard of Clairvaux, Henry Blois’ nemesis, contains a dialogue between the author and his novice. The novice confesses in this exchange to being less moved to tears by pious readings than by fictitious tales of ‘somebody named Arcturus’. Later Aelred brands these tales as fabulae et mendacia, but the novice nor Aelred mention Merlin.

One would think that these could only be ‘Geoffrey’s’ fabulous tales and not something anecdotal which can be accountable as having been found in manuscripts of ‘saints lives’ or Nennius or Lambert of St Omer concerning Arthur. The reason I mention this is because Powicke’s study of Aelred reveals he wrote this in 1141-2 while novice master at Rievaulx and we should not forget Henry’s nephew William was installed in York in January 1141 (although not consecrated until September 1143). What this shows is that in the middle of the Anarchy, an abbot in Yorkshire only three years (or so) after the Bec copy was found, may have been reading Geoffrey’s Primary Historia (ex-prophetia). Now in terms of propagation we must look to Henry Blois who has passed a copy to his Nephew, as the Primary Historia was not in wide circulation at this early date.

319The contention between Bernard and Henry Blois started over the Oxford Charter of Liberties in 1136 where Henry Blois managed to reassert the sovereignty of the Celtic church in England. Bernard’s reforms were nullified for a time. The Oxford charter retained power for monastic Abbots over Bishops; thus limiting Vatican appointed Bishops to presiding exclusively over Vatican business in England. The charter effectively guaranteed autonomy for the Abbots. The Cluniac’s were not anti-papal but recognised that the papacy was starting to interfere with their institutions and Henry Blois, his mother and brother, all held Cluniac values. Ultimately, the Beaumont twins, siding with Clairvaux’s aims persuaded King Stephen to abandon Henry’s advice against the Papacy. Henry was essentially displaced in 1138 as archbishop of Canterbury on the advice of the Beaumont’s said he was becoming too powerful. To all intents and purposes it was a papal plot to undermine Henry Blois so Roman power would not be reduced and Bishops would retain their power. This of course led to the mistrust between the Bishop of Salisbury which we covered earlier.
In other words; what Aelred’s novice has read cannot be a First Variant version which we know was only compiled after William of Malmesbury had died and for the express purpose in adding evidence toward the case Henry Blois put forward in Rome in 1144 to obtain metropolitan status for southern England. Tatlock is drawing the wrong conclusion in assuming the finalized Vulgate HRB was in full circulation when he understands that it was Walter Espec who had passed this copy on to Aelred. Tatlock’s theory is largely based upon Gaimar’s epilogue and the fact that Rievaulx was near to Walter’s estate of Helmesley and also the fact that Aelred gives a good description of Walter at the Battle of Standard.

The fact that Walter Espec was buried at Rievaulx aids Tatlock’s deduction. Tatlock reckons that Aelred’s is the first reference to HRB before 1147 and the ‘earliest proof of divulgation of the Historia in England,’ (which obviously is assumed as the date when Alfred obtained his copy). But Tatlock’s date is based upon Walter Espec having received a copy of Geoffrey’s HRB from Robert of Gloucester who died in 1147. The name of Robert of Gloucester as dedicatee was not employed until after his death and it is highly unlikely he ever saw any version of HRB as Henry Blois was essentially at war with him until his death. So, Tatlock’s proposition should be ignored. There is nothing in the novice’s tears to indicate they could not come from the same version recounted in EAW i.e. the Primary Historia. Certainly the story of King Lear, Helena’s rape by a giant, even the nostalgia of a once chivalric Briton would be enough to bring the soft hearted novice to tears.

Tatlock has been duped by the misinformation inserted in Gaimar’s epilogue in L’estoire des Engles. Gaimar’s epilogue is vital in misleading posterity into believing Henry’s assertions that the ‘good book’ provided by Archdeacon Walter really existed, as posited in the Vulgate HRB.

The four written sources Gaimar refers to are Walter Espec's book, the ‘Good book of Oxford’, the Winchester history, and an English book from Washingborough; all mentioned for a specific reason polemically. It is my supposition that Walter Espec’s name is included in the epilogue because in 1132 when Henry Blois had met Walter Espec he had handed him a copy of his pseudo-history (destined originally for Matilda) and he subsequently was trying to confuse us and contemporaneity by inventing Gaimar’s epilogue.... and the provenance of Walter’s book (by the invention of L’estoire des Bretons which no-one has ever seen). I can see no other reason
for the inclusion of the name Walter Espec except to confuse by muddling all the versions.

Henry Blois had met Walter Espec when he signed a Charter with King Henry Ist granting permission to build Rievaulx abbey. We will return to Gaimar later, but more importantly to Alfred of Beverley’s use of an evolved First Variant version because contrary to scholarships belief, First Variant most emphatically preceded Vulgate and Alfred mentions no dedicatees or Walter. If Henry Blois had come up with the invention to introduce Walter to provide a provenance for Geoffrey’s work at the time Alfred was recycling ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB.... Alfred would surely have included this information.

Apart from Huntingdon there is only Abbot Suger and Alfred of Beverley’s work from which we can deduce ‘Geoffrey’s evolution’ of HRB before 1155 (with Aielred’s anecdote). Orderic’s interpolation we can dismiss because this contains the Sixth in Ireland prophecy. Suger does not mention the ‘Sixth in Ireland’, so has an early edition of the prophecies. There would appear no reason to think that Alfred knew the prophecies from any other source than from the evolved First Variant of the separated *Libellus*. The omission of the prophecies (and his mention of them) occurs at the point in the text where they appear in the First Variant and Vulgate. Alfred clearly knew of the prophecies, before stating that they were too long to go into. However, we can be certain that even if Alfred had discussed the prophecies there would have been no mention of the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ as it had not been discussed until 1155. There would have been no incitement to insurrection by the Celts either in the prophecies that Alfred had read, as Stephen was still King.

As far as I can figure out from when Huntingdon wrote his letter to Warin c.1140 until Alfred’s report c.1150-51.... there is still the omission of the account of the transportation of the giants ring. We will never know what the prophecies contained as Alfred said they were too long to include in his comment of *Britannicus*’ work.

However, another example of Henry introducing and developing Merlin could be said to be witnessed in Alfred’s reduction of Geoffrey’s entire detailed story of Merlin’s powers of illusion allowing Uther Pendragon to
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320 With the mention of Walter Espec in Gaimar’s epilogue it is likely that he had a copy of the original *Faux-History* which was later to become the material for the *Primary Historia.*
take on the appearance of Duke Gorlois of Cornwall and sleep with his wife Yegerna (whereby Arthur is conceived) to the briefest mention.

‘Geoffrey’ refers to Avalon twice in the Vulgate HRB. The first is to describe Arthur’s sword. Alfred, in his reworking of the passage concerning Caliburnus, where it is forged in the island of Avalon in Vulgate HRB of 1155 omits mention of the island. This is possibly another reflection of Henry having evolved the importance of Avalon. Henry in the First Variant had not fully developed his coalescing of material around establishing Avalon at Glastonbury. When Alfred describes the passage found in HRB where the mortally wounded Arthur is being taken to the island of Avalon to have his wounds tended, Alfred recycles this passage and here mentions Avalon, but significantly, omits the ambiguous word *letaliter* ‘mortally wounded’ which indicates that, like Huntingdon’s account, it is left open to accommodate the ‘hope of the Britons’. It could however just be a reductive recycling.

This may indicate that Henry Blois has not yet decided to plant the body of Arthur at Glastonbury, but it definitely shows he has come up with the ’Mythical Island’.... but his muses have not fully developed the potential of Avalon. Alfred refers to Stonehenge twice in his history. The first is recycled from Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum* – where Huntingdon provides an architectural description of the stones and provides the earliest use of the term ‘Stonehenge’ that survives. It must have seemed strange to Huntingdon discovering the *Primary Historia* at Bec because Henry Blois posing as *Galfridus* used the HA as a source for *Primary Historia* and almost certainly borrowed the name from that source.

‘Geoffrey’s’ Vulgate story of Merlin’s transportation of the stones from Ireland recycles Huntingdon’s name for the circle as ‘Stonehenge’. The evidence showing that the character and actions of Merlin is developed over time is that Alfred’s second reference to Stonehenge is recycled from the evolving First Variant which he is using. He uses the description of the burial of Constantine, successor of King Arthur, ‘next to’ Uther Pendragon. Since Alfred is not using (a finalised) Vulgate, he is not aware of Geoffrey’s further developed account of the transportation by Merlin of the giants’ ring from Ireland.

Alfred mentions Merlin on numerous occasions in book five of his History, but he presents a substantially understated and underdeveloped version compared to Vulgate HRB; quite obviously because he has a copy of
a developing First Variant. We must assume that the prophecies that Alfred saw were from the *Libellus Merlini* and not the updated set now attached to the extant First Variant copies.

Since Beverley is only 25 miles from York, I think that the version found its way to Alfred through William Fitz Herbert. Bernard of Clairvaux, the Cistercian who hated Henry Blois exerted all his influence to ensure Fitz Herbert's suspension. The fact that Beverley was under York's authority would suggest how such a rare volume at this stage was in circulation. Alfred's references to the name 'Geoffrey' are nil, but are still of very singular manner. He never uses the options of naming Geoffrey as Gaufridus Artur, or Gaufridus Monemutensis. He always uses the term 'Britannicus'. Some commentators may take Alfred's *Britannicus* reference to mean Celt or even Welshman assuming Alfred's reference is based upon the author having situated Arthur in Wales. Alfred's dismissal of the author's personal name may indicate a scepticism of his existence in reality. Alfred comes across as sceptical of 'Geoffrey's' work, but still very interested in its contents. I think even Alfred could work out that the Author has the same name as the protagonist is going a bit too far and it is an assumed name.

In 1147-8, when William Fitz Herbert had been suspended and the monks at Beverley had 'all' read the *Historia* before Alfred, Henry Blois had not come up with the name Geoffrey of Monmouth.\(^\text{321}\) Britannicus as an appellation at this stage may not be based upon *pudibundus Brito*... a reference to Geoffrey himself as 'an unabashed Briton' in the Vulgate version. This was probably only introduced in a revision of the prologue to the *prophetia* in the Vulgate version. Logically, (as long as we accept the back dating of Vulgate occurred) the prologue to the prophecies could not have been written until Alexander died in 1148. The *pudibundus Brito*
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\(^{321}\) The name, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry Blois only introduces after 1153, when he has signed the charters as *Galfrikus Arthur* at Oxford and seen and imitated Ralph’s provenance. No twelfth-century chronicler more frequently refers in a historical text to 'Geoffrey' than does Alfred, but he does so by referring to him as *Britannicus*. If Alfred dismissed the *Gaufridus Arthur* appellation as an improbable pseudonym... then why would he not once mention Geoffrey of Monmouth... if his name existed with the text? The simple answer is... the name of Geoffrey did not exist in 1151 at the completion of Alfred’s work.
reference logically disqualifies Henry Blois as author (as a purposeful misdirection). By 1155 when Vulgate was published ‘Geoffrey is dead’. Anyone trying to trace Geoffrey would not be looking for someone of Norman heritage..... as intended!!

As an indication that the history was talked about (at least at Beverley) Alfred remarks: anyone not acquainted with the History of the Kings of Britain puts himself down as uncultivated.

Huntingdon’s omission in EAW of the three archflamens when mentioning Eleutherius’ missionaries only gets introduced into the storyline of First Variant when Henry Blois was in pursuit of metropolitan in 1144 just after Malmesbury’s death.

Alfred had a copy of an evolving First Variant because Alfred notes by name Faganus and Dunianus sent by Pope Eleutherius where they were distinctly not mentioned in EAW. The preachers were not mentioned either by Malmesbury in any of his works, except those interpolated by Henry.

These two very important figures were not included in Primary Historia. What may be a fair speculation, given that we can see an apostolic foundation for Glastonbury would have formed the basis for pope Lucius’ decision to grant metropolitan to Henry.... is that the composition of the St Patrick charter followed that decision. As I shall cover later in the chapter on DA, the St Patrick charter was included in DA for the 1149 request for metropolitan status. Therefore Alfred and the monks at Beverley c.1148 had the most recent recension of Henry Blois’s evolving HRB which most likely he had originally passed to Henry’s Nephew. But, this is also the time when Henry was steadily evolving the Vulgate HRB.
There are two enamel plaques in the British Museum which were made in the Meuse valley in modern day Belgium, with a very high degree of skill, from copper alloy and enamel. These are semi-circular dished plaques usually referred to as the Mosan plaques. On one of these plaques, Henry of Blois is depicted prostrating himself, offering what looks to be a very large book and underneath described by a Latin inscription as HENRICVS EPISCOP ('Henry the bishop').
On the other, there are two angels depicted protruding from the clouds, both swinging fragrant censors indicating the benevolence from heaven upon mankind. One of the angels is holding a golden chalice. Both have further inscriptions in Latin running along the borders of the plaques. They describe a gift to God and a donor on whom England depends for stability and a statement implying that there is nothing greater than an ‘Author’.

When the plaques came to the British Museum in 1852, the plaques were joined together, and had been previously sold as an alms dish. However, it was clear that this was not their original state or intended purpose. Henry Blois’ name is chronicled in connection with four episodes in which crosses play a large part. It is my belief that these plaques may have been attached to a cross on or above an altar. The reason for thinking this is that, as seen in the figure, they are indented in a convex form with fixing holes to mount top and bottom of an object. It would seem, the most likely place they would fit is top and bottom on the sculpted ends of a wooden vertical upright of a cross. There may well have been similar plates made for the horizontal ends of the crossbeam, but the wording if in the same design would have been difficult to read as the present ones have the script upright, as long as one plate is placed at the top and the other at the bottom.

Some commentators have posited that the plates comprise Henry’s own text for celebrating his time as Legate. What is written does not to me seem a personal statement regarding his time as ‘papal legate’. The sense of the words do not correlate to a middle aged Henry as the expiration of Henry's legatine commission was in September 1143. Nor would it be apparent at this stage that the peace of England was within his power. This would seem to me to be an ornament to be affixed to across to remind future generations of Henry, like a perpetually viewed epitaph.
One might suppose that Henry is depicted holding the Winchester Bible, presented in supplication.... the largest illustrated Bible ever produced. This is a huge folio edition standing nearly three feet in height commissioned by Henry himself and is still on display at Winchester, although it was never fully finished because of Henry’s death. His production of the Winchester Psalter, also known as the *Blois Psalter* is another art work sponsored by Henry and given the workmanship of the sumptuous decorated initials of the Bible, it was made at great expense. Henry was an appreciator of art in all forms and I believe that Henry, as he passed through Flanders, commissioned these plates on the way to Rome and may well have picked them up on one of his many journeys through there.
The plates are of a specific artful skill practiced at Meuse and would not be of Insular origin. Let there be no mistake that such an artful object, so skilfully made, which refers to Henry in such laudatory terms that I think they can only have been commissioned by himself to perpetuate a lasting memory of him. It panders to his innate narcissistic vanity which sees his place in the world as pivotal. Also as we have seen in the GS *apologia* Henry Blois wishes his memorial of himself to be recorded reverentially in perpetuity as good…. and his contribution to the world as of high worth.

Henry may well have made at least 7-10 trips to Rome, but a particular trip is documented by letter where Henry seeks clear passage through Flanders. If one disembarked in Flanders rather than Normandy one would pass by Meuse on the way to Rome where these particular craftsmen were found who were adept in enamelling.

However, abbot Suger, (the same as had an early copy of the prophecies of Merlin) to whom the letter is written, died in 1151, so it might seem a little premature to be thinking of one’s own epitaph to future generations.

The Meusan plates could have been commissioned on any of the several trips to Rome. On the first plate, where Henry is prostrate and where HENRICUS EPISCOP is inscribed within the scene, the border inscription reads:

> + ARS AVRO GEMMISQ (UE) PRIOR, PRIOR OMNIBVS AVTOR. DONA DAT HENRICVS VIVVS IN ERE DEO, MENTE PAREM MVSI (ET) MARCO VOCE PRIOREM. FAME VIRIS, MORES CONCILIANT SUPERIS.

The usual translation goes: *Art comes before gold and gems, the author before everything. Henry, alive in bronze, gives gifts to god. Henry, whose fame commends him to men, whose character commends him to the heavens, a man equal in mind to the muses and in eloquence higher than Marcus. (Marcus Tullius Cicero.)*

Art is above gold and gems, but an ‘author’ before everything. The word author in no way substitutes in meaning for a fabricator of Art but specifically relates to the composer of a book. We can see the object which he presents is a book. Some have translated this as: *Art ranks above gold and gems; the maker ranks above the work*. If this were the potential
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meaning a host of other words would apply such as fabricator, artificer, maker etc. If the word AVTOR had the meaning of ‘maker’, why would the purport of the rest of the epitaph refer to the greatest and most renowned Roman author? The eloquence referred to is a comparison with the way Cicero wrote and spoke. Henry is plain in what he says of the enduring word…. as he has read books of events a thousand years old and it is this point that he makes. The author is above transitory art and acquired wealth as his words endure through generations.

Marcus Tullius Cicero wrote on a wide range of subjects, but the substance of his thoughts on politics, law, philosophy etc. have been responsible for the attitudes of others which lived subsequently. Henry has certainly read Cicero’s vast output, but his own vanity states that his work compares with Cicero’s. Cicero is arguably the most famous thinker of the ancient world. This is an odd autobiographical statement when no written work is evident except Henry Blois’s Libellus.

Yet Henry’s work is not so much voluminous in what is ascribed to him. Scholars will never accept that Henry has written so many manuscripts assigned to others. This is just the point of him laying bare how he is most emphatically (in his own eyes) by his output comparable with Cicero. Henry did author volumes and interpolate texts to build an authorial edifice. The tales he left behind on the European tapestry of Grail lore, Arthuriana and Glastonburyana. Henry has had a greater impact on the European stage than anything Cicero ever wrote. Henry was a scholar and left behind an array of material in one form or another. I am trying to show as we proceed through the evidence what may be ascribed to his output. William of Malmesbury in the unadulterated section of DA writes: This man, of illustrious birth, is also distinguished in his knowledge of letters...

Henry was very eloquent as several chroniclers attest in different instances. Henry thought he had a mind equal to the muses and eloquence greater than Cicero. If Muses are accounted as the inspiration of man’s thoughts, we need only look at HRB to see Henry’s mind is equal to the classical muses.

Why would Henry Blois accredit so much that is desirable to the person of an author? In plain speak, one can see it is the expression of an accolade or personal self-acclaim – an aspiration of worth. More importantly, if Henry realised that the written word left to posterity is far more desirable or greater than riches or of higher worth than the manufacture of any kind
of art form, architectural work or Jewels; what evidence is there that he, likening himself to Cicero, has also left works to posterity?

What works could be accountable in his own mind that ranks him comparable with Cicero? The HRB was the world’s first ‘best seller’ and anyone who was anyone had read it. Grail literature has given generations pleasure.

The Meusan plates were surely commissioned by Henry Blois himself and transported back to Winchester after a continental journey to Rome. There is no evidence that anyone else ever suspected Henry’s authorship of several works. Therefore the very words would be redundant or senseless in the context of another having designed the epitaph in memoriam of Henry. Even if his image is that of a venerable statesman at best.... where is there any connection whatsoever to things literary for a comparison with Cicero as an author?

Henry Blois eloquence is recorded in GS at the legatine council and thereafter at the court in Winchester where his sophistry is picked up by William of Malmesbury, but his greatest speech in HRB is his retort to Lucius Hiberius’s presumption of tribute to Rome. Henry formulates a great speech of defiance from the mouth of Arthur in front of his barons. It is this which inspires Hoel to say: *For so exactly hath thy provident forethought anticipated our desire, and with such Tullian dew of eloquence hast thou besprinkled it withal.*

Let there be no question that Henry Blois’ epitaph was written by himself and the Meusan plates were manufactured by his design. It is the bold statement that the ‘author is before everything’ which is baffling if Henry Blois left nothing authored by him. If he wrote nothing, why would he compare himself with Cicero? More importantly, why if he held this view that a great literary work has more value than the more commonly accepted material artefacts which are lusted after by mankind generally.... why would he hold such a view, when it has no basis in reality?

It is this logical sequence of questions and suppositions which point to the authorship of a great work paralleled or surpassing that of any of the works of Cicero in the mind of the ‘author’ who commissioned the epitaph. Certainly HRB is a work which aspires to such greatness and to the ignorant has the stamp of authority.... without pretension, which is the mark of a
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great work. No other person could be responsible for the wording on the Meusan plates. No-one else has any idea of Henry Blois’ authorship of a hugely successful work or who was the primordial promulgator of Grail Literature in the Guise of Master Blehis but he himself; and no-one else would know of his aspirations.

Henry has two founts for his self-image and vanity; one which is witnessed here, stems from his immense learning, the other from his high birth. Not only is he seeking his place in history, but he actually attempts to establish his own version of it. What must be understood about Henry Blois is how he wishes to be perceived by posterity and his understanding of how history is transferred into posterity; but did he really think his fame and character would commend him to the heavens?

Henry has vainly composed his own ‘living’ epitaph. Much like the GS acts as an *apologia* for his actions, couched as a memorial to his brother he is already adorning the memory of himself to posterity. The GS’s ulterior motive is to paint a glossed image of himself for posterity. The HRB however, changes the way posterity sees or understands itself. The composition of HRB is a vain action, although unpretentious in its high Latin style it pretends to pass itself off as credible history. Henry through his learning has understood how a place in history is attained by great men and is passed down by chroniclers.

History usually only records the deeds of Kings; and therefore Henry uses Stephen’s acts (GS) to implant a record of his own deeds. This is so that History may account him as a great and influential man and his own name is recorded in the dust of History. The substance of man is conveyed into posterity through forms such as buildings or artworks and it is Henry’s preoccupation with making his mark in history (which is dictated by his own vanity) which ultimately led him to construct the Vulgate HRB.

I cannot think of any literary work which has had such an enduring effect on any nation (disregarding the religions), than the ‘History of the Kings of Britain’; its Arthuriana and the subsequent Grail legends.... all derived from Henry. This man has studied the classical philosophers and orators which is evident from the sources used in the construction of HRB. His rousing speeches put in the mouths of others, polished in style, rhetorical with their balance and oratorical questions are highly sophisticated.... reworking the speeches of great men from antiquity and grafting them into the mouths of the heroes of the HRB. When Arthur has
given his reply to the Romans regarding the non-payment of tribute, Hoel commends Arthur’s speech with the words ‘your speech, adorned as it was with Ciceronian eloquence, has anticipated exactly what we all think’.

If the reader now understands that the GS was written as an apologia for Henry’s actions and understands Henry’s vanity; portraying himself as a pious and venerable man who did great deeds for England…. one should understand that a poem written about him was written by himself for posterity, (See note 5). In this same poem we can understand from a small extract how he perceives himself: He was the Cicero of our time, son of the generous stock of Kings, gem of parents and he was a glory of the world, the summit of religion. The guide of the Kingdom, the defence and hope of the powerful; staff of the weak and lover of covenants of peace. Rome, head of the world, rich in foreign treasures has been made wealthier by his gift.

Rome was certainly rich in treasure and Henry Blois itemizes some of these in his book written under the pseudonym of Master Gregorius which I shall cover shortly, but how it has been made richer by him is debatable. Anyway, there is little doubt that another would have written such flattering words about Henry and we can assume, like the epitaph on the Meusian plates, the words are his own.

In Greek Mythology, poetry and literature, Muses were thought to be the goddesses of the inspiration of that literature. A mountain in the region in Boeotia, celebrated in Greek mythology, where two springs sacred to the Muses were located are reminiscent of the Vita Merlini’s land of Boeotia where it is said to have two fountains; the one makes the drinker forgetful, the other makes them remember. However in the Vita Merlini we have an example of where both Cicero and the Muses, (or at least the land of Boeotia) betray Henry’s mental associations as both muses and Cicero are mentioned on the plaque by Henry Blois together. Henry’s underlying considerations and ponderings likewise are derived from insight and inspiration which is a necessary precursor to eloquence, which he himself was blessed with like Cicero.

Henry betrays himself as the author of the VM through this previous thought pattern i.e. through his association of muses and Boeotia, with Cicero. In the dedication of the Vita Merlini, Geoffrey calls upon the Muses and compares himself (in false self-deprecation) to Orpheus and a group of Augustan epic poets: Thus I should wish to embrace you with a worthy song, but I am not able to, even if Orpheus and Camerinus and Macer and Marius
and Rabirius of the great voice altogether would sing with my mouth while the Muses accompanied me.

The reference to the poets Camerinus and Rabirius could be derived from a passage in Ovid’s ‘Letters from Pontus’, (mostly unknown) but for Ovid’s mention of them. Henry, as we will discover in a discussion of the HRB itself, must have a photographic memory, as many of the classical tracts which he quotes from, or from which he draws inspiration, would have been found on the continent while he was at Clugny, but certainly not at Glastonbury, where his pseudo-history was initially started. Henry’s mind needed classical manuscripts to feed it along with chronicles to provide the epic ‘literature of British history’ that we have in the Vulgate HRB today.

Griscom makes a certain point which involves ‘Geoffrey’s’ photographic memory and concerns information found at Glastonbury that he could not understand its provenance: Geoffrey could not have invented such a mass of material. Nor have ‘expanded’ the meagre entries of nennius, the AC, or Gildas and Bede into stories, incidents of which are found nowhere else, but which are substantiated by archealogical research. Griscom then gives the example of ‘Pascentius’ son of Vortigern who invited the Saxons into England as allies against the Picts and the Scots and how ‘Geoffrey relates the he went to Ireland to obtain assistance where he was well received. Griscom is fascinated that six miles north of Cork at Ballybank there is a stone inscribed in ogham characters, which is deciphered to read ‘Ailella maqi Vorrtigurn’, while another at Knockaboy, county Waterford bears the single ogham name Vortigurn. Then Griscom says ‘No other record of this King having any connection with Ireland outside of Geoffrey’s account is known’. Griscom then says Geoffrey must have had some native account behind it. What Griscom does not realise is that the muniments of Glastonbury that William of Malmesbury and obviously Henry Blois perused were extensive c.1126-33. This fact which ‘Geoffrey’ expands upon with his muses would obviously have derived from Irish pilgrims as seen in author ‘B’s Life of Dunstan’ that Irish pilgrims as well as other crowds of the faithful had a great veneration for Glastonbury. It should also never be forgotten that in this period at Glastonbury in Henry’s youth while
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325 We do not know where Henry stayed in Normandy in 1137-8 but it is likely he resided at times in a monastic house and possibly even Bec.
constructing the pseudo-historia Henry was very personable (as William confirms) with all the monks and they would have been Irish and Welsh and Breton amongst others.

It is examples like this and the fact that Welsh bardic material is also known by ‘Geoffrey’ that leads scholars to add credence to a source book especially after Henry Blois’ interpolation known as Gaimar’s Epilogue. Essentially all researchers have underestimated Henry Blois’ genius and the fact he had a photographic memory.

One last comment on this first plaque is about the inscription: *Henry, alive in bronze, gives gifts to god.*

The plates were a copper alloy but different from bronze, but how is the word ‘alive’ relevant? It is my belief, (which is purely conjecture), Henry had planned some brass effigy of himself so that posterity would be reminded of him. I would even hazard that it was along the lines of Cadwallo’s bronze. This image, (unlike most episodes or icons of the HRB which can be traced to a previous source), came directly from Henry’s mind.... as there is no reference to any such embalming within brass elsewhere in classical literature: *The Britons embalmed his body with balsams and sweet-scented condiments, and set it with marvellous art within a brazen image cast to the measure of his stature. This image, moreover, in armour of wondrous beauty and craftsmanship, they set upon a brazen horse above the West Gate of London in token of the victory I have spoken of, and as a terror unto the Saxons.*

This bronze statue will become more relevant to the reader when we cover Gregorius’ study of the bronze horseman Marcus Aurelius in Rome. It is my belief also that on Henry’s first trip to Rome to pick up his pallium, he was so struck by the Horseman (supposedly Marcus Aurelius) outside the Vatican that it was the inspiration for Cadwallo’s embalmed bronze.

What with the Anarchy followed by his self-imposed exile, I expect Henry envisaged many projects that never came to fruition. I have a strong belief that Henry was going to produce one of the pair of Dragons (banners) which Arthur used and it was going to appear at Winchester
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327 The Legendary history of Britain J. S. P. Tatlock p. 38 seems to think that Harold’s Dragon may be at Winchester and this is what ‘Geoffrey’ is constructing his storyline upon i.e. about the two dragons fabricari by Arthur. It is not beyond reasonable conjecture that William the conqueror, Henry Blois Grandfather, put the
just as David’s sapphire appeared at Glastonbury. We might suggest that as an heirloom Harold’s dragon banner became the fictional other half of the Arthur banners.328

On the second plaque, where two censing angels are emerging from the clouds, the border has inscribed on it: + MVNERA GRATA DEO PREMISSVS Verna fīgvrat. Angelvs ad celvm rapiat post dona datorem; ne tamen acceleret ne svscītet angliā lvctvs, cvi pxa vel bellvm motvsve qviesve per illum.

The aforementioned slave shapes gifts pleasing to God. May the angel take the giver to Heaven after his gifts, but not just yet, lest England groan for it, since on him it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.

The aforementioned is ‘Henricus episcop’. ‘May the Angels take him to Heaven after he has given his gifts’, indicates that Henry firmly believes he is part of the divine plan, and his part is important. The angels sprinkling their heavenly aroma upon men, is how Henry Blois sees the world; all of mankind in a giant drama coordinated in a heavenly script. Henry hopes his actions on earth are in accordance with those in heaven and asks a little more time to sort things out.

I hope now the reader sees how complex Henry Blois is; vain enough to think it is through him that England’s war or peace depends. The contradiction is that he is a resolute believer and yet a manipulative liar i.e. a split personality.329 If I am correct in my interpretation of the prophecies in the VM concerning Cadwalladr and Conan we can see why at this later

captured dragon portrayed in the Bayeaux tapestry at Winchester. Tatlock posits that ‘Geoffrey’ might have seen it there. It seems relatively certain that Henry Blois would not incorporate it in the storyline of First Variant if it did not exist in his day.

328 In the seventeenth century Henry Blois’ unadorned slab of Purbeck marble was removed to expose his bones buried before the high altar in Winchester Cathedral. It is reported that a chalice was discovered along with some fragments of textiles including fine silks and braids with brocading of a very high quality. It would not surprise me if indeed this was the cup which was promulgated as the Grail cup and the textile was the remains of a disintegrated banner, considering that Henry was well accustomed and could foresee the opening of graves by posterity!!!

329 Dom David Knowles, The Monastic Order in England: Henry of Blois, though not precisely a complex character.... for throughout all his activities there is the same stamp of energy and directness of purpose... was certainly a man of many sided qualities. Without knowledge of Henry’s authorship of HRB few scholars have any real idea of Henry Blois’ true character. Voss’s montage of his character of course omits his authorial prowess and split personality.
stage in life he still thinks the state of war and peace in England are dependent upon his actions.

Henry hopes in the inscription (which is indicative it was written by him) for a longer sojourn on earth and hopes his lifespan is extended before death arrives; but not too quickly, not before England is roused up from its struggle, since on him it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.

In the wording on the Meusan plaques, there is a correlation to authorship. These plates are commissioned so that in memoriam his ‘persona’ does not slip into obscurity. The Meusan plates must have been made after Stephen’s death to even consider an epitaph. But at this stage the interpretation of certain prophecies that incite rebellion ring true in the plaques prophetic overtones in that war and peace in England are dependent upon him.
Chapter 13

Henry Blois and the Modena Archivolt

The sculpture on the Duomo di Modena Cathedral in Modena in northern Italy has puzzled Arthurian scholars for years. An entrance to the Cathedral known by Arthurian aficionado’s as the ‘Modena Archivolt’ is the earliest representation of an Arthurian theme in monumental sculpture. The abduction of Guinevere is a very popular element of the Arthurian legend, first appearing in written form in Caradoc of Llancarfan's Life of Gildas. As I maintain and will show in progression, the Life of Gildas was written by Henry Blois. There are three points initially to Henry Blois’ impersonation of Caradoc of Llancarfan which lead to his composition of Caradoc of Llancarfan's Life of Gildas. The first is to settle a contention regarding the antiquity of Glastonbury in a spat between Canterbury and Glastonbury. In the text of William of Malmesbury’s GR and DA there are two references which put Gildas at Glastonbury. Gildas is supposed to have written his De Excido there. These references are both interpolations (which I shall show in later chapters), but by employing the name of Gildas, it helps Glastonbury abbey establish its position in antiquity in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The second reason for concocting the Life of Gildas may have to do with land claims made by Henry Blois. In the fictional account of Life of Gildas, undisclosed land is given to Glastonbury. After Gildas acts as peacemaker between Arthur and King Melvas, he obtains promises of reverence and obedience and assurances against future violation of the abbey or its lands.

There is no mendacious design behind Gildas’ work of history and it would seem to be written by someone in the sixth century (who flourished in the year of our Lord 546) under that name. Gildas leaves no clue to where he wrote the book or where he came from. His connection with Glastonbury is entirely concocted by Henry Blois’ interpolations into DA, GR3 and the invention of Life of Gildas.
Much of Caradoc's *Life of Gildas* is based upon and formatted from the genuine *Life of St Cadoc*. St Cadoc's story first appears in a *Vita Cadoci* written shortly before 1086 by Lifris of Llancarfan. The Cadoc legend, written long before Henry Blois depicts Arthur in HRB as a chivalric hero, is a depiction of a saint's life where Arthur is portrayed as wilful and inflamed with love for a certain Gwladys. He is also depicted with his friends Kai and Bedwir. There are many commonalities to the Cadoc legend and the concocted *Life of Gildas* story where Arthur helps kidnap Gwladys; and there is a King Maelgon who reigned over all Britain and other similarities.

The inspiration for the story line for the kidnap of Guinevere depicted on the Modena Archivolt may well have derived from two sources to form the composite story as found in the *Life of Gildas*. Firstly, a steward of Cadocus' convent had his daughter carried off by King Maelgwn's tax gatherers: *a certain King, of the name of Maelgon, reigned over all Britain, who sent some of his young men to the region of Gwynllwg, that they might there receive tribute. Who coming to the house of the steward of Cadoc, seized his very beautiful daughter, and took her away with them.*

Secondly it may well be based upon on an escapade concerning a woman called Nest by which Henry Blois's uncle King Henry Ist bore an illegitimate son in the person of Henry Fitz Henry. *Nest ferch Rhys* or Helen of Wales was the only legitimate daughter of *Rhys ap Tewdwr*, King of south Wales. It is not clear if the illegitimate child was born in or out of wedlock, but Nest was known to be highly sexed and had many lovers and the King eventually married Nest to Gerald Fitz Walter of Windsor. A certain Tarquin of Wales however, was informed of her at a feast in 1109 and entered her castle and carried her off.

Anyway, we may speculate that these are the composite germs of the Guinevere abduction episode. Scholars have been ingenious in their reasoning as to how the engravings appeared on the Modena archivolt. Tatlock is bemused by the archivolt for its undisputed early date: *While most of the names of course are due to the Arthur tradition, there is nothing highly individual about a man and woman in a castle...the names may even have been added later to an imaginary scene, perhaps when the portal was reconstructed by someone who had heard or read some romance.*

The proposition and suggestion is contrived by Tatlock. Geoffrey and Caradoc are excluded in Tatlock's rationalization. It would be an astounding coincidence given Arthur's garb in the engraving, if the carving was
matched to Artus de Bretania and the names added later as Tatlock suggests. When the composer of both the Arthuriad and the *Life of Gildas* are found to be one and the same, we can easily deduce it was commissioned by Henry sometime after 1138 when Henry Blois was bishop of Winchester, probably on one of the many excursions to Rome.

The most probable time it was commissioned is in 1139 when Henry became legate just after the discovery of his *Primary Historia* at Bec by Huntingdon. The suggestion is that Henry passed through Modena and that Henry arrived in Rome soon after.

On the north portal, known commonly as the *Porta della Pescheria*, the archivolt and lintel are carved in high relief with secular scenes with an Arthurian episode that appears in the supposed Caradoc of Llancarfan’s, *Life of St. Gildas*. It also is mentioned in Chrétien de Troyes’ *The Knight of the Cart* and Ulrich von Zatzikhoven’s *Lanzelet*.

The fact that it is in a work by Chrétien becomes highly relevant much later when we discover that the court of Champagne is listening to Grail stories told by a ‘Master Blihis’. It is not by coincidence that Henry Blois is closely related to Marie of France, Chrétien’s patron. The point right now is that it is the ‘kidnap of Guinevere’ episode which is closely connected
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with Glastonbury, long before the famed discovery of Arthur at Glastonbury in 1189-91 which dislocates most scholars’ theories that Arthur’s connection to Glastonbury was established by the unveiling of his grave at that location.

What has puzzled commentators is that the construction of the cathedral began in 1099, but the sculpture depicting the Arthurian scene can be dated between 1130 and 1140. Loomis\textsuperscript{332} is simply wrong dating this 1099-1120 based on the fact that the edifice was consecrated in 1106. The Modena cathedral was not finished until 1140.

Commentators have envisaged a real Geoffrey of Monmouth who was geographically remote from Modena as the originator of the chivalric Arthurian legend, so the archivolt has presented a conundrum as to how this scene appears here one year after the discovery at Bec of the \textit{Primary Historia} and the legend portrayed was related by Caradoc about King Arthur. Many theories have been posited such as a pre-existing tradition of Arthur in Brittany (which there was) which has somehow spread to Modena (which it had not).

The simple answer is that, Henry Blois, a wealthy Bishop traveller, on his way to Rome c.1140, commissioned the Arthurian depiction to be engraved on the archivolt to concur with an account he had fraudulently composed in the \textit{Life of Gildas} which puts King Arthur at Glastonbury. The \textit{Life of Gildas} adds credence to the chivalric Arthur legend Henry had concocted in HRB, but Henry made a point of not mentioning Glastonbury in HRB.

Henry Blois had a contretemps with Canterbury over the antiquity of Glastonbury brought about by Osbern’s accusation. This is in fact the main reason for commissioning Malmesbury’s DA and has much to do with Eadmer’s letter which I shall cover in depth later. To prove his point, Henry assumed the name of Caradoc and wrote the \textit{Life of Gildas}; in which proof was provided for the abbey’s antiquity by Gildas’s association with the abbey. (Gildas was of known dateable antiquity).

A pertinent point here is that we know for certain Caradoc is dead already because if not, Henry would not be impersonating him as the author. As I show later on in the chapter on Caradoc, he dies c1129 so it

\textsuperscript{332} Arthurian literature in the middle ages R.S Loomis p.60
makes a clear mockery out of the colophon found in certain copies of HRB that suggest he was ‘Geoffrey’s’ contemporary.

What is confusing to most commentators is that the abduction episode first appears in the *Life of Gildas* but does not feature in HRB. There is of course no Merlin on the archivolt either as the sculpture was finished before Henry Blois had invented Merlin as part of HRB. Merlin never had contact with Arthur in HRB and Merlin did not even get mentioned in Huntingdon’s précis of the *Primary Historia*.

In the VM and HRB and in the insertion into Orderic already discussed, it is Henry who is witnessed to promote the belief that Gildas is accounted as the author of the work ascribed to Nennius. It is Henry Blois who promotes Nennius as Gildas with purposeful intention because Gildas is thenceforth connected to Glastonbury through Henry Blois’ own impersonation of Caradoc. The rationale behind the polemic is that if it were Gildas who references Arthur, rather than the obscure Nennius, then it would lend more credibility to Henry’s depiction of the chivalric Arthur in HRB. Scholars have suggested Gildas as the writer of Nennius is a common medieval misrepresentation. What is obvious is that Henry tries to link the chivalric Arthur of HRB to the *Ambrosius Aurelianus* of Gildas.

What I do want to stress to the reader is the purposeful confusion which Henry Blois injects, by including Caradoc’s name in the inscriptions on the archivolt. This same Caradoc features in his own romance called the *life of Caradoc* included in the first continuation of Chrétien de Troyes’s *Perceval, le Conte du Graal* c.1160 by Wauchier.

Caradoc is supposedly the writer of the book in which the ‘abduction of Guinevere’ is found and the intention might possibly be that the person who commissioned the engraving wanted posterity to conflate ‘Carrado’ with Caradoc Duke of Cornwall from the HRB and with the supposed authors name from which the tale comes. Conflation, confusion and the anachronisms of characters is Henry Blois’ ‘Modus operandi’. What probably transpired is that Caradoc was known to have written a life of Gildas and left the only copy at Glastonbury where Henry Blois added to it. This would then show that even a tract written before 1129 (Caradoc died) bore witness to Gildas’ and Arthur’s association with Glastonbury. However, Malmesbury did not mention the tract in the unadulterated part of DA, so maybe Henry Blois composed the whole tract using the *Life of Cadoc* as a template.
The action depicted on the archivolt centres on a moated stone castle with a blank shield hung on the wall. The depicted castle is stone with wooden external fortifications; a woman named Winlogee looking very sad with a downturned mouth is in a tower with a man named Mardoc. A man with a pick axe defends the tower and appears to some commentators to be named Burmaltus. The name more probably applies to the last of the three horsemen on the left and Burmaltus is confederate with Arthur and synonymous with Bedwir in the Vita Cadoci. On the other side a horseman exits named Carrado to repel the attackers. All the men on horses are in Norman garb except Arthur who is in a kilt. The tower is besieged by Artus de Bretania and Isdernus, while the other knight, identified as Carrado, is confederate with Mardoc. Mardoc is the Melvas in the faux Caradoc Life of Gildas (the Maelgon of Lifris’ account) and is battling three knights whose inscriptions are Galvaginus, Galvariun, and Che. Obviously, Artus is King Arthur, and Winlogee is Guenevere; Che is Kay; Galvaginus might be Gawain, and Carrado is Caradoc or Caradoc the Duke of Cornwall.

Istdernus who is not immediately identifiable, may just be Isidore, from whom, we know, Henry Blois derived much of his nature material from the Etymologiae (supposedly expounded by Merlin and Taliesin) in the VM. We could speculate that by including Isidore in the inscription, it now dates the scene back to the early six hundreds by the inclusion of a datable and historical figure. The rationale behind Henry’s devise is that if Isidore and Gildas are seen to be connected to Arthur, then this automatically would substantiate Arthur in antiquity.

Galvariun might be Galahad; although scholars would naturally assume he is of the later Lancelot–Grail cycle and unknown at this date, but it should not be forgotten Henry was the composer of Perlesvaus. Until one understands that it is Henry Blois who first proliferates and propagates Grail material on the continent, most commentators are unable to grasp there is only one original source. Mardoc may be Mordred or Melwas. Caradoc’s Life of Gildas is central to connecting Gildas to Arthur which not only provides authority for the abduction episode but also places the episode in historical terms by relation to Gildas. The life of Gildas not only
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333 Tatlock equates Gawain with Walwen. William of Malmesbury says that in the reign of William II the enormous grave of Walwen, worthy nephew of Arthur on the sister’s side, was discovered in Ros in Wales. He had reigned in the part of Britain still called Walweitha and had been driven out by Hengistus’ kin; but Arthur’s grave has never been found whence old foolish lies return again. p.206
links Gildas to Glastonbury but also Arthur. This episode in stone on the archivolt links the Grail heroes through Caradoc's *Life of Gildas* to Glastonbury as this is where the action supposedly takes place in Carradoc's account.

We might suggest *Burmaltus* is Barinthus, who, after the battle of Camlann, navigated a wounded Arthur to *Insula Pomorum* in the VM. As we are able to date the Modena inscription to c.1140 we can see that there is already intent to build the Arthurian link to Glastonbury as the kidnap episode supposedly transpires there. Yet by contrast, Glastonbury is not once mentioned in *HRB*. The sculpting of the archivolt scene would have been commissioned just after Henry wrote the *Life of Gildas*. As we have covered, Henry terminates his *HRB* where Caradoc's *Brut y Tywysogion* picks up. We also know that Henry Blois makes overtures in the Vulgate *HRB* colophon to make it seem as if the *Brut y Tywysogion* follows on from *HRB*, when in reality, Caradoc is not a contemporary of ‘Geoffrey’ but is already dead when the *Primary Historia* was written.... and long before the appearance of the Vulgate *HRB* and its colophon.

At the time the Modena archivolt was sculpted, there certainly was no thought of writing a *Vita Merlini* and in 1139 Merlin was separate from *HRB* (as his *Libellus Merlini* was probably envisioned), not yet even included in the *Primary Historia*. However, Isidore's name (if I am correct in *Isdernus*) was inscribed on the archivolt long before the VM was written. Henry Blois has an innate capacity to conflate and confuse historical events to seem plausible history. He writes under the name Caradog of Llancarfan in his version of the *Vita Gildae*: *'He [Gildas] arrived at Glastonbury during the time that King Melwas reigned in the summer country ...it was besieged by the tyrant, Arthur, with an innumerable host on account that his wife, Gwenhwyfar, whom the aforesaid wicked King [Melwas] had violated and carried off, bringing her there for protection, owing to the invulnerable position's protection due to the thicketed fortifications of reeds, rivers and marshes. The rebellious King had searched for his queen throughout the course of one year and at last heard that she resided there. Whereupon he roused the armies of the whole of Cornwall and Devon and war was prepared between the enemies. When he heard this, the abbot of Glastonbury, attended by the clergy and Gildas the Wise, stepped in between the contending armies and peacefully advised his King, Melwas, to restore the ravished lady.*
And so, she who was to be restored was restored in peace and good will. When these things had been done, the two Kings gave to the abbot the gift of many domains.'

At this early stage of secretive authorship, Henry plants corroborative material which formed part of a fabricated tale, initially put in place to counteract the antagonism from Canterbury and to corroborate the personage of his created chivalric Arthur in the Primary Historia. Some commentators may now conclude (now that they are appraised of Henry Blois’ authorship of the Life of Gildas) that since Life of Gildas was composed in response to Osbern’s accusation (in effect to establish the antiquity of Glastonbury) the manuscript may have been written prior to Primary Historia and therefore is the explanation of Henry’s omission of any mention of Glastonbury in HRB. This may well be the case…. as the last paragraph is definitely an addition to the work to coincide with a later agenda of Henry’s post 1143 (after William of Malmesbury’s death) which establishes the 601 charter of Ineswitrin to appear to pertain to the island of Glastonbury.

As we shall understand in progression, the Life of Gildas along with the Ineswitrin charter of 601AD mentioned by William of Mamesbury plays a large part in this investigation. The etymological explanation of Ineswitrin being the old name for Glastonbury is in an additional paragraph made later in 1144 by Henry to his version of the Life of Gildas, because at that time, he was presenting the 601 charter to papal authorities as a genuine proof of antiquity of an ‘old church’ at Glastonbury.

In the ‘Dialogue of Arthur and Gwenhwyfar’ discussed by Evan Jones,

Melwas is from Ines Witrin originally. Gwenhwyfar says: "I have seen a man of moderate size at Arthur’s long table in Devon dealing out wine to his friends."

In the chapters on the DA and GR we will discover just how important the island of Ineswitrin is and its relevance to Glastonbury, because of the existence of the 601 charter. What I can say definitively is that the above poem post-dates Henry Blois. With Henry’s fraud involved and his ability to impersonate and backdate, it has been impossible to find the reason behind such a plethora of material which correlates with an obviously bogus history as presented in the HRB and the interpolated part of DA. It is only

See note 7
when one understands Henry Blois’ input, that the whole enigma can be deconstructed.

The tale of ‘Carrado of the Dolorous Tower’ for instance is an example of the myriad of crossover material. The answer would be that ‘Carrado of the Dolorous Tower’ is derived from Henry Blois’ Life of Gildas version of the abduction of Guinevere but must be viewed as a descendant of the engraving on the Modena Archivolt as Carrado is not mentioned in Life of Gildas.

Henry Blois impersonates Caradoc after he died and while travelling to Rome passes through Modena and witnesses the architecture of the new cathedral in construction. He speaks to whoever is overseeing the project and offers to pay for some of the decoration. Why would anyone deny a bishop and someone from such a high noble family from procuring his folly; especially if he is contributing to the beautification of the structure? Henry decides to include the name of the person he has impersonated as the author of Life of Gildas and leaves other instructions concerning names and features to be included in the engraving after a sojourn en route to or from Rome.

In the interpolations in DA, Henry reaffirms the story of Melvas which he initially had composed in the Life of Gildas and commissioned on the Modena Archivolt. In the Life of Gildas, we are told Gildas wrote his history while at Glastonbury. Gildas is corroborated as being at Glastonbury and even buried there…. according to Henry’s interpolations into William’s DA. The real problem which arises from this is….in reality Gildas did not have anything to do with Glastonbury. He is only connected by the concocted works of Henry. William of Malmesbury of course does not even mention the work of Caradoc. Another reason for the composition of Life of Gildas is that when responding to Osbern’s accusation by writing The life of St Dunstan, William of Malmesbury had not gone far enough in establishing (embellishing) the abbey’s antiquity in DA. Malmesbury in DA also had only shown a proof of antiquity to the year 601 by the charter which gave Ineswitrin to the ‘Old Church’. Henry wanted a more archaic provenance.

At the extreme right of the archivolt, we see two figures labelled Galvariun and Che. The odd thing about them is that they do not seem to be ready for a fight carrying their lances over their shoulders.
This is probably just a strange coincidence, but Henry Blois’ father who was Count of Blois, Count of Chartres and Count of Troyes, has on his seal a very similar image of a Norman knight with his lance over his shoulder which nearly replicates the Modena depiction.

Arthur is shown in what would have been thought to be old British warrior dress based upon what the Scots or Welsh might have worn i.e. a kilt. Arthur is depicted as having a beard. Coincidentally, Henry Blois was castigated at times for wearing his beard too long. This may tie into one of the strangest episodes in the HRB: For this Ritho had fashioned him a furred cloak of the beards of the Kings he had slain, and he had bidden Arthur
heedfully to flay off his beard... Whoever commissioned the Archivolt was cognisant that Arthur had a beard.

I will show that the Life of Gildas has many parallels with the Vita Cadoci i.e. the Vita Cadoci supplies some of the inconsequential ‘filler’ material which comprises padding for the Life of Gildas and it pads out Henry Blois’ main thrust in writing the book which is strictly propagandist toward Glastonbury and in corroborating the person of Gildas and his association with Arthur in antiquity.

Finally, the lintel carvings include a cross, birds, animals, and a man riding a hippocamp. According to Eratosthenes (and noted by Strabo) the temple at Helike in the coastal plain of Achaea was submerged by the sea, but it was dedicated to Poseidon Helikonios, (the Poseidon of Helicon) and the sacred spring of Boeotian Helikon we came across earlier. When an earthquake suddenly submerged the city, the temple's bronze Poseidon accompanied by figures of hippocamps continued to snag fishermen’s nets. Hippocamps are rare in sculpture and even rarer in medieval carving. Yet, whoever commissioned this wanted one and had read the classics. It would seem likely that Henry Blois had read Eratosthenes. It was Eratosthenes who endeavoured to fix the dates of the chief literary and political events from the conquest of Troy. Of course, nearly the same feat is carried out by ‘Geoffrey’ in the construction of the HRB. Also on the lintel are the birds from Isidore’s Etymologiae. We can deduce that through the content in the VM and the archivolt’s ‘Isdurnus’ inscription, that Henry had also read Isidore.

It is safe to conclude the archivolt was commissioned by Henry Blois yet no-one suspected a Bishop as an inveterate fabricator of tales. It will become clear to the reader the motives behind presenting Gildas at Glastonbury and the reasoning behind the etymological addition concerning Ineswitrin into the last paragraph of the Life of Gildas when we cover this material further on.
Chapter 14

The 601 A.D. charter regarding Ineswitrin and Glastonbury

Few commentators have broached the subject of Ineswitrin and the provenance of its name. There is a general acceptance that it is the old name for Glastonbury. The only reason that scholars do not understand that this assumption is incorrect.... is because they have not understood Ineswitrin’s connection and importance to the propaganda which Henry Blois has interpolated into William of Malmesbury’s GR and DA.

The name of Ineswitrin is found in the GR, DA, and the life of Gildas. There is no prior instance of the name of Ineswitrin in connection with Glastonbury in any previous manuscripts prior to the early twelfth century. In the GR and DA, both (in their unadulterated forms) composed by William of Malmesbury, the name Ineswitrin appears in connection with a charter which informs us of the grant of an estate with the name of Ineswitrin to the ‘old church’ at Glastonbury. Initially, the original DA, before Henry Blois added his interpolations (which comprise the most part of the first 34 chapters of DA), the manuscript started (at chapter 35) with the opening chapter evidencing the 601 charter. This was the earliest evidence William of Malmesbury could find extant at the Abbey when he searched their records.

In the Life of Gildas, it unequivocally states that Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin. The statement has no validity and therefore indicates that whoever wrote Life of Gildas has the same agenda as the person wishing to pass off the charter as applicable to an estate called Ineswitrin located at Glastonbury.
The reason that this statement is vital as corroborative evidence, is that it accords with the name in the charter of the estate of Ineswitrin donated by a Devonian King to the Old church at Glastonbury. Martin Grimmer\textsuperscript{335} comments on the point that \textit{British monasteries and other ecclesiastical sites are thought to have provided a foundation for West Saxon establishments, with the British Celtic communities in some fashion metamorphosing into West Saxon Roman houses}. Grimmer questions the assumption that I think largely stems from Geoffrey of Monmouth's presentation of the early Celtic Church in HRB and there is no certain record except of some early Celtic saints' lives. Yet this point is relevant in that if Geoffrey of Monmouth is Henry Blois.... how is it that Henry has envisaged this pre Augustine ecclesiastical Celtic backdrop in which the Arthurian panoply exists? Henry's view I believe, is based upon what documents he came across while abbot of Glastonbury. For the moment, it is Ineswitrin, the island of Avalon and Avalon's supposed synonymy with Glastonbury that bring us to the subject of this 601 charter and its relevance as to why Henry Blois composed the short tract of the \textit{Life of Gildas} in the first place and then added the last paragraph.

In William of Malmesbury's unadulterated \textit{De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie}, the 601 charter begins the whole DA account with grants to Glastonbury. This logically would be the first place to start i.e. with the oldest surviving record. William's commission and reason for producing the \textit{De antiquitate Glastonie} was to counter a claim made by Osbern of Canterbury that Glastonbury's foundation only occurred in the mid-tenth century and St Dunstan was the first abbot of Glastonbury.

This conflict had arisen because Glastonbury monks had claimed that Dunstan was buried in the Church at Glastonbury and in reality Canterbury monks knew he was buried at Canterbury. Therefore, Henry employed William of Malmesbury to produce a tract which, in essence, validated Glastonbury's antiquity. Part of this proof of antiquity was based upon the 601 charter and the circumstantial evidence it provides. Another relevant point which was indicated by the date of the charter was that a religious house at Glastonbury existed before Augustine's arrival and negates the commonly held assumption that Augustine (who became the first

\textsuperscript{335}Martin Grimmer. \textit{The Early History of Glastonbury Abbey: A Hypothesis Regarding the 'British Charter'}.}
Archbishop of Canterbury in the year 597) was the "Apostle to the English" and a founder of the English Church.

Coincidentally, ‘Geoffrey’ expresses the same commonly held belief in his bogus Prophecies of Merlin. *Afterward Rome shall bring God back through the medium of a monk*..... The obvious intonation is that Christianity existed in Britain before it fell away (as Gildas makes plain) and therefore Augustine could not be founder....and therefore primacy (Henry’s main concern) should not be awarded to Canterbury.

The 601 A.D. charter in effect was a proof which indicated that even at that date, the church at Glastonbury was termed ‘old’ and therefore evidenced a pre-existence of the British (Celtic) church before Augustine’s arrival. This is entirely obvious through the works of Gildas; but the dispute was specifically about the antiquity of Glastonbury. The DA, as I have posited already, was interpolated by Henry Blois himself and this practice continued after his death in the same book.

So, I will cover the analysis of the exclusively Glastonbury record of DA (version B) in a later chapter. The DA, which in effect was an instantaneous cartulary (and treated like one thereafter), is thought to have been originally written c.1129-34. However, it was interpolated ‘for the first time’ immediately after William’s death in 1143 by Henry Blois.

Since the relevance of Ineswitrin336 is only corroborated in the *Life of Gildas* which is written by Henry Blois and the DA is grossly interpolated by him, I will state for the record now, that DA was written prior to 1134.337 The Henry Blois interpolations into the DA were started post 1143. The main body of *Life of Gildas* may well have been composed after the 1134 date of the presentation of DA to Henry, but the last additional paragraph of *Life of Gildas* is probably post 1143 as it ties in with Henry’s agenda for Metropolitan where it is employed as corroborative evidence to uphold Henry’s position in presenting Yniswitrin as an estate on Glastonbury.

To construct an initial edifice, an architect is necessary. Once the building stands and the architect is dead, additions to the edifice can still be added by subsequent generations. Henry Blois has built his literary edifice in secret on the back of various authors, one of which was William of

---

336 John Scott DA I, pp. 44-45; 5, pp. 52-53; 9, pp. 56-57; 88-89, pp. 140-41;
337 The DA refers to Henry as brother of Theobald, not the more likely King Stephen.
Malmesbury. The Arthurian legacy and the Grail legends are built upon the foundations of Henry's own HRB through a fictitious 'Geoffrey'.

Why it was necessary for Ineswitrin to be established as the earlier appellation of Glastonbury is the puzzle I hope to clarify. Certainly the most ingenious etymology has been used to establish this as a fact. It is entirely misleading and inaccurate to assume the location of Ineswitrin and the donation of the Island estate by a Devonian King applies to an estate or parcel of land existing as part of Glastonbury Island itself.

It is only Henry Blois’ statement in the *Life of Gildas* which is reiterated in DA which transforms Ineswitrin into an estate near to Glastonbury. We are led to believe it is the old name for Glastonbury. In reality the name applies to an island in Devon and the reason for this purposeful translocation lies squarely with Henry Blois. The answer lies in the fact that the *Ynis* or the ‘Ines’ part of the name denotes an Island. We know from the vivid description in the Dunstan author B manuscript, Glastonbury was an Island c.1000AD.

The 601 charter represents a genuine donation of an island estate to the Church at Glastonbury on a genuinely extant charter at the time Malmesbury searched Glastonbury’s records. The 601 charter, drawn up by a Bishop Mauuron, records a grant to the 'old church' made by a King of Dumnonia of five ‘cassates’ at *Ineswitrin* at the request of Abbot Worgret. William of Malmesbury supposedly records the donation as follows: *On the estate of Ynswitrin, given to Glastonbury at the time the English were converted to the faith. In 601 AD the King of Dumnonia granted five cassates on the estate called Ineswitrin to the old church on the petition of Abbot Worgret. I, Bishop Mauuron wrote this charter. I, Worgret, abbot of that place, have subscribed. The age of the document prevents us knowing who the King was, yet it can be presumed that he was British because he referred to Glastonbury in his own tongue as Yneswitrin which, as we know, was the British name. But Abbot Worgret, whose name smacks of British barbarism, was succeeded by Lademund and he by Bregored. The dates of their rule are obscure but their names and ranks can clearly be seen in a painting to be found near the altar in the greater church. Berthwald succeeded Bregored.*

Grimmer’s suspicions are that the date of the charter is wrong based upon the term *anno Dominae*. He dates the charter for other reasons to the 670’s in line with the establishment of Wessex rather than 601 which was
obviously the date expressed on the charter. Yet to me this ties in perfectly with the second Saxon incursion into the south west c.590.

Yet the paschal tables used by priests to find the date for Easter by their nature began at the incarnation. Dionysius Exiguus had already invented this as a dating system c.500 A.D. This charter is the one piece of evidence upon which Glastonbury stakes its foundation, in a proof that it was founded prior to Canterbury. Therefore the charter itself would have been under scrutiny. Although the charter appears only in the later B & C stemma versions of William of Malmesbury’s GR, it does not follow that it was not genuine because GR1 was written before William spent time searching the records at Glastonbury. Many of the other Glastonbury additions to version C & B of GR will be elucidated in a later chapter specifically on the GR. The 601 charter plays a large part in unfolding what transpired regarding Ineswitrin and why its phony etymology was added to the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas* by Henry Blois. There is no reason to doubt the charter and its date is genuine.

William was accustomed to seeing old charters. William (or Henry Blois interpolating) bears witness to the charter’s antiquity when he updates his GR3 with other additions he had gleaned in the interim since production of GR1. Why would someone perpetrating a fraud have a Dumnonian King as donor? Why choose a place called Ineswitrin which no-one has heard of as the object of the grant if it were a 12th century invention. If it were really archaic and it was a genuine charter from the 670’s, why perpetrate the fraud by applying a date of 601AD which is after Augustine’s arrival.

There can be no reason why a Saxon house which used to be a ‘Briton/Celtic’ church would change a date of donation from a Devonian King. There was no charter evidence relating to the years between 601 and 670 at Glastonbury, but a picture that William of Malmesbury had seen by the altar led him to record three names of Abbots in the intervening 70 year period and relate that they were British. If there were these abbots, why is Grimmer so insistent that the 601 charter is of later date? If his suspicion of fraud is purely based on the *Anno Dominae* term, there is not much previous charter evidence for comparison upon which to base such a dismissal of the date on a seemingly flimsy premise. So, let us leave the date at 601, remembering that this is the very charter to be scrutinized by detractors at Canterbury (or whoever at Rome later) who presume a case of Roman primacy in an Augustinian foundation. The reader will understand
as we progress that the charter was also to be produced in evidence at Rome in Henry’s case for Metropolitan.

The supposition that the charter was manufactured to lend weight to the claim for Glastonbury’s antiquity might be tenable if the Island did not exist in Devon and did not coincide with the precise position to which Melkin’s geometrical prophecy locates. Again, if we understand that Henry Blois has substituted the name of an island called Ineswitrin in Melkin’s prophecy for his own invented name of *Insula Avallonis* posited in HRB, all will become clear by the end of this exposé.

Avallon’s name only (not the rest of the prophecy of Melkin) is fictitious. Avallon is Henry’s invention based upon the name of a town in the region of Blois. It would be a remarkable coincidence that Melkin’s instructions in the prophecy mark precisely the spot which locates an island in Devon… when it just so happened also, that a supposedly faked charter is witness to an Island being donated to Glastonbury by a Devonian King.

The interpretation of the charter is not straightforward because of Henry Blois’ bogus and misleading etymology in *life of Gildas*. William at the time of writing (in his own words) in no way intonates that Ineswitrin is at Glastonbury. Everything which points to the supposition that Ineswitrin (as a location) is an estate at or near Glastonbury is an interpolation into DA or false information supplied by Henry Blois in *Life of Gildas* or GR updated. Caradoc’s etymological explanation was then adopted by Gerald of Wales.

The reader will understand in a later chapter once we get to that point… that Gerald has seen and read DA (for the most part in its current form) prior to Arthur’s disinterment.

Edwards assesses the 601 charter as probably genuine and also sees no motive for forgery. William obviously believed the charter itself to be representative of Glastonbury’s antiquity and in no way infers in any work (of his pen) that Ineswitrin is an estate on the Island of Glastonbury. In his account in the GR, he makes the observation that Glastonbury must be an ancient foundation as ‘even then (it) was called OldChurch’. William portrays that the poor condition of the document caused the King’s name to be illegible. William says: *The age of the document prevents us knowing who*

---

338 *De principis instructione* 1.20 (c.1193-95), and *Speculum Ecclesiae* 11.8-10 (c.1216).
340 William of Malmesbury’s VD ii (written after the body of DA) does not mention Ineswitrin.
the King was. Where it is stated that the writer of the charter is British because he referred to Glastonbury in his own tongue as Yneswitrin which, as we know, was the British name... this is an interpolation by Henry Blois which concurs with what he had written in Life of Gildas.

William knew Ineswitrin was a British name for an island somewhere but it is Henry Blois’ interpolation which infers the name is synonymous with Glastonbury. In no other document is it found that Ineswitrin was the old name for Glastonbury prior to Henry Blois’ interpolations. How could it be when it applies to an Island in Devon?

William’s statement that the Island of Ineswitrin was given to Glastonbury at the time the English were converted to the faith is based upon the commonly held belief that the real faith i.e. Roman, only arrived at the time of Augustine. This incidentally adds credence to the fact that the 601 date is firmly believed by William. The apparently mistaken date of A.D. 610, which also references the conversion of the English which is found in the GR C version must be a dyslexic misprint because it states: 'that is, in the fifth year of the coming of the blessed Augustine'. William is implying that a church existed at Glastonbury. At the time of the donation, it was already old.

In reference to the contention with Canterbury, it is being spelled out, ‘Glastonbury already had an old church before the founder of yours (Canterbury) arrived on English shores’.

William, while living at Glastonbury, would have become very sympathetic to the views of Glastonbury monks and took on the task to counteract the rivalry against Canterbury. William’s disgust (as a prodigy of Roman religion) for anything prior to Augustine’s time is evident in his reference to Abbot Worgret. Martin Grimmer’s exposé on this 601 charter is revealing, but he does not understand Henry Blois’ role or reasoning behind the motive in having the audience of Life of Gildas believe Ineswitrin was a previous appellation for Glastonbury. Yet even he states that though: Ineswitrin looks like a British name, it cannot securely be contended that it was the pre-Saxon name for Glastonbury. The possibility exists, rather, that Ineswitrin was the name of an estate, as it is in fact called in the charter, that was later erroneously taken to be the early name for Glastonbury, perhaps because the actual origin, identification, and location of the grant was forgotten. This is in part true.
The knowledge of this Island had faded into obscurity, since the charter was deposited in the scriptorium or chest of old documents which William was going through. It would have fallen into obscurity as a consequence of the change from a Briton to a West Saxon house. However, it was not by accident Ineswitrin was posited as the old name for Glastonbury. The relevance to this donation is intricately linked to the prophecy of Melkin. We should discount any notion that Melkin’s prophecy was a late invention as attested by Carley et al. They are simply quite wrong and have no evidence to back up this false a priori. It is simply a position taken by modern scholars on the assumption that Insula Avallonis was a name of the Island about which Melkin’s prophecy referred. The name on the Melkin Prophecy originally was Ineswitrin as will be shown in progression.

Henry Blois certainly had no idea of where the island of Ineswitrin was located, but I will cover later how and where his search for its location was carried out (in two places). Henry was apprised of the Island of Witrin’s genuine existence because he knew the charter was genuine. It was Henry Blois who eventually substituted the name of Ineswitrin for Avalon in the extant Melkin’s prophecy (recycled by JG) to fit with Henry Blois’ later (post 1158) agenda.

This point becomes self-evident as we progress through the following chapters. However, Grimmer, attempting to enlighten us on the Ineswitrin conundrum follows on with: Nor for that matter does Ineswitrin even have to be an estate which is located within Somerset. This opens up the possibility of Ineswitrin being situated further west in territory in Devon or Cornwall still under the control of a British King.

The King of Dumnonia would only be able to grant land within his own territory, which locates Inis Witrin somewhere in Devon or Cornwall, the old Dumnonia. There seems to be no obvious reason why the name Dumnonia would have been interpolated into the charter, especially if the charter was a fraud and the intent was to provide proof of antiquity for Glastonbury. Instead it adds credence to the unequivocal position that Ynis Witrin really was an island location in Dumnonia and someone is trying (through interpolation) to make us think otherwise.

Grimmer also states that William’s: assertion that the donor was the ‘King of Dumnonia’ (‘rex Domnonie’), which he presumably made because that was what he found on the document from which he was working. This is a fairly explicit statement of the charter’s origin. Finally Grimmer concludes: As has
been shown, there is no contemporaneous evidence suggesting that Ineswitrin was the name for Glastonbury, rather than the name of an estate granted to Glastonbury. Grimmer has deduced this from evidence supplied by William’s attestation to what he saw in the charter. Henry Blois’ etymological addition to the last paragraph of the *Life of Gildas* is added later to a script (he had already written) so that none could accuse Glastonbury of having a grant (which proved its antiquity) pertaining to an unidentifiable location.

The inconsistency of logic is: if Glastonbury was an Island as described in Dunstan ‘B’, the ‘old church’ and any monastic house attached to it would be considered as ‘Glastonbury’; so why is Glastonbury, if it is an island, receiving by donation a part of itself i.e. the ‘island of Witrin’... on which the old church is located. Logically, Ineswitrin and the island entity of Glastonbury and its old Church cannot be one and the same, but must be separate Islands. It was the synchronicity of both Ineswitrin being an island and the fact that the ‘old church’ existed on an island which made the illusion (by which Henry Blois attempts to mislead his audience) all the more plausible. The purposeful etymological transformation concocted in the *Life of Gildas* concerning Ineswitrin was added by Henry Blois to a manuscript already wholly composed by himself. Thereafter, all and sundry accepted Ineswitrin as the old name for Glastonbury.

At the end of the *Life of Gildas*, between an ‘amen’ and a verse colophon proclaiming the authorship of Caradoc, there is the postscript, stating that: "Glastonbury was of old called Ynysgutrin and is still called so by native Britons." It is this ‘postscript’ and the cleverly inserted ‘g’ gutrin (made of glass) in the etymology which misleads us all to ‘Glass Island’ in further bogus etymology.

To think Henry Blois is not ‘Geoffrey’, or to think that Henry Blois is not impersonating Caradoc as the writer of the *Life of Gildas* would be the same as denying that Henry Blois is not Master Blihis or Bliho-Bleheris, and believing what is stated in HRB that Caradoc is a contemporary of ‘Geoffrey’. The facts which connect Henry Blois to Caradoc are on the archivolt. Gildas’ entirely fictitious connection to Glastonbury found in *Life of Gildas* is the common denominator: he could not remain there any longer: he left the island, embarked on board a small ship, and, in great grief, put in at Glastonia, at the time when King Melvas was reigning in the summer country. He was received with much welcome by the abbot of Glastonia, and
taught the brethren and the scattered people, sowing the precious seed of heavenly doctrine. It was there that he wrote the history of the Kings of Britain. Glastonia, that is, the glassy city, which took its name from glass, is a city that had its name originally in the British tongue. It was besieged by the tyrant Arthur with a countless multitude on account of his wife Gwenhwyfar, whom the aforesaid wicked King had violated and carried off, and brought there for protection, owing to the asylum afforded by the invulnerable position due to the fortifications of thickets of reed, river, and marsh.

William of Malmesbury’s ‘British tongue’ epithet in reference to the charter just alludes to the fact that Inis Witrin is old English, but in no way establishes the etymological truth between the supposed connection of ‘vitrea’ and the ‘Glass’ in Glastonbury. This subtle connection which is similar to some later etymological interpolations, are part of a persuasive polemic designed to synchronise what initially were contradictory and conflicting evidences.

The name Glastonbury, from the Anglo-Saxon period exists in charters from the reigns of the West Saxon King Ine (c.704) where it was termed ‘Glastingae’ and from Cuthred (c.744) as ‘Glastingei’. There are other early variations, ‘Glaestingabyrig’ and ‘Glaestingeberig’.

Glastonbury was never at any stage ‘well known’ as Inis Witrin, but had always been Glastonia, Glaesting, Glaesinbyrig, Glasteigbyrig and never Ynes gutrin, Insula Vitrea, Isle of Glass, Isle of Apples or the Fortunate Isle, before Henry Blois came to England. Most emphatically, no one had previously thought to establish Glastonbury as Avalon, Avalonia, or Insula Avallonis as this appellation is derived from the name of a town north of Clugny near to Arthur’s battle scene.... by Henry Blois the composer of HRB.

However, this brings us to the interesting question of ‘cassates’: *peticionem Worgret abbatis in quinque cassatis (superscript: id est hidis)* i.e. hides.

Even though William summarises this grant as follows: 'The King of Dumnonia gave five hides of land known as ‘Yneswitrin’ (*rex Domnonie

---

341 It is not by coincidence that the composer of the *Life of Gildas* would have us believe, just like ‘Geoffrey’ (and Orderic), that Nennius’ *Historia Brittonum* was written by Gildas.
dedit terram apellatam Yneswitherim v hidas’), the original word ascribed from the charter is ‘cassatis’.

If we consider first the original nature of the hide, the word ‘hida’ occurs in the laws of Ine, c. 690. Some have posited that the word is derived from ‘hydan’ - English “hut” to a certain measurement of land ‘a hide’, but there is nothing in the sources of Anglo-Saxon history to support this opinion nor is it probable that the word "hut" was used as a complimentary part of a whole estate. Coincidentally, Henry posing as ‘Geoffrey’.... who had obviously come across this problem while dealing with this 601 charter (and knowing that Henry Blois is the same person who loves to please in etymological explanations in HRB).... he writes: Hengist took a bull's hide, and wrought the same into a single thong throughout. He then compassed round with his thong a stony place that he had thought cunningly chosen, and within the space thus meted out did begin to build the castle that was afterwards called in British, Kaercorrei, but in Saxon, Thongceaster... There is absolutely no truth in this statement, but it just indicates that Henry can fabricate on any subject plausibly.

Bede, in his history, always uses the word ‘familia’ where in Anglo-Saxon we should expect to find hide; and in King Alfred's paraphrase of Bede the word ‘familia’ is commonly rendered hida, or by one of its allied forms, hiwisc or hiwscipe. For example— Singulae possesiones decern erant familiarum — waes thaes landes hundtwelftig hida; comparata possessione decern familiarum — gebohte tyn hida landes. And— Habens terram familiarum septem millium — is thaes landes seofen thusendo hida; donavit terram octoginta septem familiarum — sealde seofon & hundeahtig hida landes.

So, when Bede estimates the extent of Islands, his unit of measurement is still the family. Thus about the Island of Thanet he says: Tanatos insula non modica, id est magnitudinis juxta consuetudinem aestimationis familiarum sexcentarum — six hund hida, and of the Isle of Wight he gives, — Est antem mensura ejusdem insulae (juxta aestimationem Anglorum) mille ducentarum familiarum — twelf hund hida.

From these examples, we may gather that in the time of Bede, who died on Ascension Day 735AD, the value and extent of land was measured, not by its acreage nor by its material worth, but by the number of families it
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could maintain. Later, in England, it became a unit used in assessing land for liability to "geld", or land tax and the ‘hide’ lost its original meaning and became the basis of a tax system of assessment; but this was long after the Dumnonian charter.

Knowing William of Malmesbury’s resistance to the invention of material, we should assume that his inability to read the flourit of the Devonian King substantiates William was looking at the charter he was duly copying. If the charter were a fraud, doubtless the name of a King would have been provided on the charter. The evidence that William is actually eyeballing the charter is witnessed also by the personal form the two attesters using the word ‘I: ‘I, Mauron the bishop, wrote this charter. I, Worgret, abbot of the same place, have subscribed it.’

It would seem then it is William’s own interpretation that ‘Hides’ translates from the ‘Cassates’ term used on the document. Cassatis, derived from cottages i.e. cassa was interchanged with the word hides..., as the understood measurement in William’s day. Given the fact that both ‘cassates’ and ‘hides’ seem to be measurements of land, maybe the Island of Ineswitrin had five cottages located on it. I would suggest that the ‘five’ refers to dwellings on the island. This then throws light upon the King knowing exactly what he is donating. He is giving an Island (Inis) with the name Witrin with five cottages on itto Glastonbury.

In the next chapter we discuss the actual location of Ineswitrin as Burgh Island based upon two indisputable facts along with the rationale we have just covered. Ineswitrin without doubt becomes Melkin’s Island mentioned in the prophecy where Joseph of Arimathea is buried. Also I can state with certainty, it was Pytheas’ Island of Ictis. Strangely enough, five cottages on the Island would be about the right amount for a small fishing community based there in 601AD.

However, the reason that Glastonbury held a grant from a Dumnonian King and then lost interest in any monetary value that the island may have provided, would indicate the five families or cottages were just those of a small community on the island. The reason the Dumnonian King donated the Island to Glastonbury is not stated in the charter but the importance of what the island contained was hidden in the numerical and topographical
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puzzle which became known as ‘The Prophecy of Melkin’. This just happens to appear at Glastonbury also and I shall elucidate in the following pages that the prophecy of Melkin was extant in the time of Henry Blois.

Over time, and after the Saxon incursion, the connection was lost between the Island and the ‘old church’ until such time as William of Malmesbury found the charter in an old chest and Henry Blois produced the charter to provide evidence of antiquity for the abbey at Glastonbury. From this proof of antiquity i.e. what was written on the charter.... an opportunistic advantage was realised. ‘Ynis’ was indisputably understood as the Dumnonian, Celtic, Briton or pre-Saxon word for ‘Island’. Unquestionably author B refers to Glastonbury as an Island c.1000 AD.... So, to confuse Glastonbury with Ineswitrin is not a huge contortion for someone wishing to propagate such an understanding.... and is easily done with bogus etymology. The real problem is if the charter was to act as a proof to the sceptical for the early existence of a church at Glastonbury, surely someone questioning the charter’s genuineness would be asking: ‘where exactly is the place being donated’. Hence the need for the contrived etymology in Life of Gildas, as no-one at Glastonbury, five hundred years after the charter was signed, had any idea of the island’s location which was being donated.

William’s recognition of Dumnonia as Devon is seen in GR ‘in Dumnonia, now called Devonshire (Deuenescire)’, and again where he says 'Crediton is a small villa of Dumnonia, which is commonly called Devonshire'. In Gildas‘ De excidio Britanniae’, Dumnonia is included as one of the British Kingdoms and therefore William and Henry and any who contended the validity of the charter would have no problem accepting the reality of a King from Dumnonia. The problem was that they would think if the charter was genuine.... to what location in Devon does it apply? This is specifically why it was necessary to have corroborative evidence so that the charter appeared genuine (which it was)....but which stated Ineswitrin was a part of Glastonbury or even the old name for it and thereby the last paragraph was inserted in Life of Gildas (and later backed up by the interpolation of the St Patrick charter in DA).

William’s reference to Worgret’s abbacy 'of that place' ('eiusdem loci abbas'), indicates that, Worgret previously had been an abbot of Glastonbury. It must have been prior to the abbacy of Haerngils, for whom at least two charters survive from the 680’s. Haerngils appears at the head
of what appears as an abbatial list for Glastonbury, contained in an eleventh-century manuscript. This would further suggest Worgret’s abbacy must have been prior to the 680’s and thus adds weight to the date of 601 that William has ascribed to the charter.... as the charter was only recently discovered in the chest of old papers from which William was gathering evidence.

William in the employ of the monks at Glastonbury was commissioned to write ‘De antiquitate Glastonie’ so as to provide a document which validated Glastonbury’s antiquity. This acted to counter the claim made by Osbern of Canterbury that Glastonbury’s foundation only occurred more recently. The main discrepancy followed propaganda put out by Glastonbury that St. Dunstan’s relics resided at Glastonbury as opposed to Canterbury. Dunstan 909 –988 was an Abbot of Glastonbury Abbey, a Bishop of Worcester, a Bishop of London, and an Archbishop of Canterbury and later canonized as a saint. Dunstan’s remains were a valuable relic to possess in terms of alms and prestige. The DA in part was written to counteract Osbern’s denial of Glastonbury’s claim. Osbern in his Life of Dunstan had claimed that Dunstan was the first Abbot of Glastonbury, but the Monks at Glastonbury thought this to be untrue as evidence existed at the abbey which showed its monastic history went further back.

Osbern, when he was a little boy at Canterbury remembered that the Archbishop had removed the coffins of Dunstan and Elfege, in preparation for building the church. 50 years afterwards he testified to the reality of that translation of the corpses in order to confute the untrue assertions made by the monks of Glastonbury. The monks of Glastonbury claimed that during the sack of Canterbury by the Danes in 1012, Dunstan’s body had been carried for safety to their abbey. This story was disproved by Archbishop William Warham, who opened the tomb at Canterbury in 1508. Supposedly they found Dunstan's relics still to be there. But we shall see later on in progression that this erroneous rumour put out by Glastonbury which required a response in the form of Eadmer’s letter was perpetrated by Henry Blois.

In William’s DA, he gives two references to passages by author ‘B’s Life of Dunstan’ and in a passage following the statement that Dunstan's father took him as a boy to visit Glastonbury goes on to describe the place itself: ’There was within the realm of King Athelstan a certain Royal Island known locally from ancient times as Glastonbury. It spread wide with numerous
inlets, surrounded by lakes full of fish and by rivers suitable for human use and, what is more important, endowed by God with sacred gift. In that place at God’s command the first neophytes of Catholic law discovered an ancient church, built by no human skill as though prepared by heaven for the salvation of mankind. This church was consecrated to Christ and the holy Mary is mother, as God himself the architect of heaven, demonstrated by many miracles and wonderful mysteries. To this church they added another an oratory built of stone which they dedicated to Christ and to St Peter. Henceforth crowds of the faithful came from all around to worship and humbly dwell in that precious place on the island’.

The other relevant passage that William quotes from author ‘B’s Life of Dunstan’ is ‘that Irish pilgrims as well as other crowds of the faithful had a great veneration for Glastonbury particularly on account of the blessed Patrick the younger, who was said most happily to rest in the Lord there.

However, all this evidence apart, we can still know that the Island to which Melkin refers upon which Joseph of Arimathea is said to be buried was once known as ‘White Tin Island’ or Ineswitrin (as I shall uncover in progression). This is Joseph’s connection to the Island that Diodorus describes from Pytheas’ account which traded tin with the Phoenicians. Diodorus’ account by its description of Ictis fits Burgh Island and it is the geometry in the decrypted Melkin’s prophecy which also situates the island of Avalon precisely where Burgh Island is located.
The evidence concerning Arthur from the unadulterated British annals of Gildas and Bede concerns Ambrosius Aurelianus as a British warlord against the Saxons. In ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB the name Ambrosius Aurelianus is purposefully conflated with either Merlin or Arthur purely on the basis that this person in Bede and Gildas is carrying out a campaign against the Saxons which parallels Geoffrey’s fictional account of Arthur.

Many have suspected interpolation in Malmesbury’s GR and most recognise the first 34 chapters of DA are fraudulently interpolated. No scholar today recognises that the Matter of Britain stems from one architect. Most have accepted the mire of confusing evidence which exists around Arthur and Glastonbury myth as a haphazard coalescing from disparate sources in history. A state of bemusement exists because the British annals seem in part to corroborate what all commentators knew was a book of invention written by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Events and fictitious persons were corroborated in part by the DA, GR and the life of Gildas and the conflation and corroboration pervades our three genres. Modern scholars have not been able to separate fact from fiction.

Firstly, let us find how Henry Blois was able to perpetuate this myth. As we know, up until his brother Stephen died, he was the most powerful prelate in Britain with an endless resource of wealth. Winchester and Glastonbury were both under his control. Winchester hall was part of a palace in London and Henry ran his own judiciary and Jail. Glastonbury was the wealthiest institution in the land by quite a margin at the Norman invasion attested by Doomsday. Winchester was the seventh wealthiest religious house at the time of Domesday. Winchester could be considered the capital of the Old Saxon dynasty. Both Glastonbury and Winchester had some of the oldest records such as Bede, Gildas, and the Anglo-Saxon
Chronicle etc. with many of the lives of the saints, within their libraries. They also had one other vital key to ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ success which was scriptoriums with educated monks from around the country.

Tatlock, for the most part, set out how Geoffrey of Monmouth’s pseudo-history and fable of Arthur was put together. He recognises fraud and the invention of a pseudo-history in HRB.... parts of HRB being corroborated with names like Phagan and Deruvian in DA. Tatlock fails to see the connection in Henry Blois. He covers, like most other commentators, early Grail legend and the works of Chrétien de Troyes and Robert de Boron and fails to investigate how it is that the earliest forms of Grail literature are known to derive from Master Blehis. Scholarship has failed to recognise Henry Blois as the denominator because even when they recognise fraud little attention is given to motive.

‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB is where the chivalric Arthurian persona first appears, but Henry has fabricated his pseudo-history and Arthurian epic upon a background of history which sufficiently conflates and parallels events and personages within the British annals that his account seems to concur with history.

The portrayal of Arthur in the HRB is entirely of ‘Geoffrey’s’ imagination. However, there does seem strong evidence of a legendary Arthur which supports a previous oral tradition to which William of Malmesbury infers existed. There is previous evidence of Arthur’s name and reputation and the ‘hope’ of his return before ‘Geoffrey’s’ concoction. If the witness of the priests of Laon is anything to go by, where a recorded confrontation between the Cornish and one of Herman of Laon’s traveling party breaks out, concerning Arthur’s return; it would appear to corroborate such a zeitgeist.

This ‘hope of the Britons’ is conveyed in the De Miraculis S. Mariae Laudunensis whereby nine Laon canons travelling in Cornwall in 1113 to raise money for their church were shown Arthur’s ‘Chair’ and ‘Oven’ and were told they were in Arthur’s country. The account relates that the argument took place in Bodmin. It may be possible that the ‘hope’ of Arthur’s return was not specific to the Breton region and may well have been encountered by Henry on the continent. Tatlock says that: It is important to observe that while Geoffrey’s Historia has nothing avowedly of the Briton hope, the ambiguous way in which he disposes of Arthur, tacitly recognizes it. The ‘hope’ was recognized by Bretons according to
Huntingdon and if any mention of Avalon had been in the *Primary Historia*, one can be certain Huntingdon would have considered mentioning it; at least as part explanation which might have elucidated what actually happened to Arthur.

King Arthur on Avalon was a direct result of Henry’s possession of the Melkin prophecy which gave him the idea of putting Arthur on a mystical island. It was a later evolutionary element of HRB and was not mentioned in the first copy of *Primary Historia*, found at Bec. It is this ‘hope’ which is expressed in Huntingdon’s précis of the *Primary Historia* in his letter to Warin.

So, the death of Arthur, (if there was a tradition) remains a latent point and something ‘Geoffrey’ never wishes to contradict by leaving the possibility open when composing *Primary Historia* where the word *letaliter* ‘mortaly wounded’ is omitted. So as not to dash this tradition or hope, we are left unsure of Arthur’s fate in *Primary Historia*.

There is no mention of Avalon until the First Variant and Vulgate HRB where Arthur gave up the crown of Britain unto his kinsman Constantine. The inference is that he died.... but it is not explicitly stated. Again in the VM, he is delivered to the Fortunate isle to Morgan, where she said that health ‘could’ be restored to him, if he stayed with her for a long time and made use of her healing art. We know the VM was written in 1156-7 and ‘Geoffrey’ is still content to leave what happened to Arthur open-ended.

So, if there was this oral tradition concerning the hope of Arthur’s return, ‘Geoffrey’ was not going to contradict it.... but employ its force in propagating his book. However, what is not understood by modern scholars is that ‘Geoffrey’ did eventually consign Arthur to death as Henry Blois informed the world where to look for a planted grave in DA which only came into the public domain at his death. This becomes evident when we cover the DA later.

Rather than going over old ground, it should be understood that the concept of a chivalric Arthur in Wales is pure invention based upon Henry’s ability to supply a location where contradictory evidence was minimal. Caerleon had Roman remains and Henry Blois knew the lay of the land from his time in Wales in 1136 (as is seen in my discussion on GS). Also as ‘Geoffrey’ makes clear, he thinks the Welsh are the residue of the Britons in both HRB and the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas*. 
Henry Blois knows the two British annals of Gildas and Bede don’t mention Arthur. His opening sentence in the HRB: \textit{Often turning over in my own mind the many themes that might be subject-matter of a book, my thoughts would fall upon the plan of writing a history\textsuperscript{345} of the Kings of Britain, and in my musings thereupon, it seemed to me a marvel that, beyond such mention as Gildas and Bede have made of them in their luminous tractate, nought could I find as concerning the Kings that had dwelt in Britain before the Incarnation of Christ, nor nought even as concerning Arthur}.

Henry Blois knows there is no ‘chivalric’ Arthur in history and the Arthuriad is entirely concocted. As I have maintained, the Arthurian epic was spliced onto an already partially constructed pseudo-history. At the same point in the text in the First Variant he employs the Nennius scenario with Vortigern to make the crucial splice to introduce Merlin where initially he had spliced the Arthuriad onto the pseudo-history.

The splendour at court, the subject matter of Kings, the battle scenes, the knowledge of the continent, the political intrigue of the prophecies and their concern for Henry’s family and state affairs are all considered to be the concerns of a Welsh cannon living at Oxford by modern scholars.

‘Geoffrey’, when referring to the 28 bishops in the \textit{Primary Historia}, supposedly omits to mention the three arch bishops (a note surely to have been mentioned by Huntingdon, if mention of them had originally existed in the \textit{Primary Historia}). Henry did not omit them, but until such time it becomes useful to concoct the third metropolitan, the archflamens were not a feature. Henry Blois’ skill in oratory and rhetoric is evident and is witnessed in his subtle speech at Winchester recorded by Malemesbury. It is these skills throughout the HRB which he uses to graft such as Aurelius Ambrosius by association onto Arthur. \textit{Next they did betray Aurelius Ambrosius, unto whom, after vowing the most awful sacraments of allegiance, they gave poison as he sat at meat with them at a banquet. Next, they betrayed Arthur, when, casting aside the allegiance they owed him, they fought against him with his nephew Mordred.}

Aurelius Ambrosius is made to be Arthur’s uncle and he even marries Arthur’s sister. Henry Blois is associating as closely as possible the only

\textsuperscript{345}It is odd that no scholar remarks how fortuitous it was that Walter’s supposed book was given to him to be merely translated when just such a book covered the subject ‘Geoffrey’ wished to write about. To believe Walter’s book ever existed is fatuous. Scholars have been so easily duped by Henry’s interpolation into Geffrei Gaimar’s work with the production of the confusing epilogue.
verifiable character in Bede and Gildas who fought against the Saxons, with his fictitious chivalric Arthur. Henry even goes one stage further.... just before he introduces the prophecies, he informs us: *Merlin, that is also called Ambrosius*

Anyway, Henry’s most enduring invention was Avallon and this was confirmed to be located at Glastonbury by his greatest fraud which involved the planting of some bones in a grave and the construction of a leaden cross both to be found in the grave at some future date. The bogus cross fatuously informs the gravediggers what the location was named (back then) and who was in the grave. So someone knew it was going to be dug up one day.

The reader should not forget the name Avallon came from the town in the region of Blois just like Arthur’s continental battle scene at Autun was chosen from the same region of Blois. Without doubt Henry Blois is the inventor of Avalon and its only promoter in its translocation to Glastonbury. Henry Blois had not come up with the name of Avalon in connection with the place of Arthur’s last known location at the time he wrote the *Primary Historia*, otherwise Huntingdon would have mentioned it.... as it contradicted the fact that Bretons thought Arthur still alive. Huntingdon, at least would have given the location from where Arthur might return.

There is no mention of Avallon in the *Life of Gildas*. In 1144, Henry Blois’s agenda does not concern Avalon but Ineswitrin. He is trying to assert that Glastonbury is Ineswitrin so that the 601 charter stands up as a credible witness to Glastonbury’s antiquity. Tatlock is correct in thinking there was no previous connection between Arthur and Avalon prior to ‘Geoffrey’. Unfortunately he does not realise the inventor of Avalon is Henry Blois in the guise of ‘Geoffrey’.... who is the inventor of the chivalric Arthur persona. It is no coincidence Arthur was disinterred at Avalon and this just happens to be the place where Henry Blois was abbot for 45 years.

The main thrust of this investigation is the effect that the prophecy of Melkin had in determining many factors in the construction of both HRB and Grail stories. The confusion when unpeeling the layers of obfuscation in the ‘Matter of Britain’ is contained largely in one seemingly innocuous act: The changing of the name of Ineswitrin on the original prophecy of Melkin and substituting it for Henry Blois’ wholly invented *Insula Avallonis.*
There is no commentator who remarks on the subtlety found in *the Life of Gildas* which transposes Ineswitrin to Glastonbury simply because no motive is found to disbelieve it. Yet modern scholarship is aware that the life of Gildas is a fraudulent composition. The bogus etymology is credulously accepted: *Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin (made of glass). But after the coming of the English and the expulsion of the Britons, that is, the Welsh, it received a fresh name, Glastigberi, according to the formation of the first name, that is English glass, Latin vitrum, and beria a city; then Glastinberia, that is, the City of Glass. Caradoc of Nancarban's are the words; Who reads, may he correct; so wills the author.*

We also know the initial propagator of continental Arthuriana and Grail stories is Master Blihis. It is not difficult to understand therefore how the *Isle de Voirre* appears in continental literature. No-one questioned the implications of Henry’s bogus etymology in *Life of Gildas* and its bearing on providing a known location (at Glastonbury) for the old charter granted by a Devonian King. Modern scholars accept a fraudulent work without questioning the reliability or existence of the author. They have maintained this position based on the specious colophon in Vulgate HRB which states that Caradoc is contemporary with ‘Geoffrey’. Now I hope the reader not only sees clearly the extent to which Henry Blois goes to complete his illusion…. but also how necessary is this late addition of the colophon to the Vulgate HRB.

Without the 601 charter there was no physical proof upon which to base Glastonbury’s existence in antiquity prior to Augustine. For this reason alone, Ineswitrin is changed from a genuine island location in Devon to appear to be synonymous with a fictitious estate supposed to exist in the environs of Glastonbury.

Henry Blois was patron to Gerald of Wales until Henry’s death. Henry most surely persuaded and primed the impressionable Gerald of certain facts which Henry himself had invented. Gerald certainly understands his account of King Henry II invasion of Ireland as a prophetic history, a *historia vaticinalis* based upon the Sixth in Ireland prophecy.

There is evidence which supports that Gerald had also seen the DA. From Gerald’s *Liber de Principis instructione* c.1193 we get Henry Blois’ full propagandist viewpoint. *What is now known as Glastonbury was, in ancient*
times, called the Isle of Avalon. It is virtually an island, for it is completely surrounded by marshlands. In Welsh it is called Ynys Afallach, which means the Island of Apples and this fruit once grew in great abundance. After the Battle of Camlann, a noblewoman called Morgan, later the ruler and patroness of these parts as well as being a close blood-relation of King Arthur, carried him off to the island, now known as Glastonbury, so that his wounds could be cared for. Years ago the district had also been called Ynys Gutrin in Welsh, that is the Island of Glass, and from these words the invading Saxons later coined the place-name ‘Glastingebury’.

We shall get to how Gerald has complicated the issue of the discovery of Arthur’s body by saying it occurred in the reign Henry II (as opposed to Richard) and we will also get to the importance of the substitution of the name of a genuine island of Ineswitrin in the Melkin prophecy for the name of an invented mythical isle of Avalon when we cover the DA later on and show the proof of how this can be reliably established.

If Arthur was not dead, as the hope of the Britons suggested, Arthur must exist somewhere. Hence the invention of Insula Avallonis in an evolving HRB after the Primary Historia had been discovered at Bec. Knowing how ‘Geoffrey’ has a template or source for nearly every icon, personage and episode in HRB, the question should be: From where does ‘Geoffrey’ get his inspiration for the mystical island of Avalon? Where does the name come from?

No-one (not even Henry) knew where ‘Witrin’ island was located but Henry Blois had seen mention of Ineswitrin in two documents…. one pertaining to the prophecy of Melkin and the other in the 601 charter. The island of Ineswitrin’s actual existence as borne out by the Melkin prophecy (not the nomenclature of Avallon), is the basis for ‘Geoffrey’s’ inclusion of the fictitious Insula Avallonis in HRB.

The name served as a fabricated name to define a location where Arthur may have remained. In a way, the icon of a mythical island and a previously unheard of name served as an obscure locus from which Arthur might come in the scenario of the ‘Briton hope’ which pervaded in popular culture at the time.

Generally, before ‘Geoffrey’ the hope could have been conceived as Arthur biding his time before his return or even simply that he had not died. The fact that Arthur is connected to a mythical Island called Avalon is entirely of ‘Geoffrey’s’ making. Ferdinand Lot’s (my relation on my father’s
side) Avalon, a mysterious island in the western seas which was ruled in Celtic mythology by the God Avaloc is piffle.... since we know Henry has derived the name from the French town.

Henry Blois’ inspiration for the island and the name of it are derived from different sources, but are wholly compliant with the usual way Henry Blois has constructed the rest of the HRB.

The name of an Island came from the name of the town of Avallon in the region of Blois in Henry’s era (now in the Yonne department in Burgundy). The town of Avallon fell under the control of Henry’s brother Theobald. Aballo appears on the *Antonine Itinerary* and in the *Tabula Peutingeriana*. But by the time Henry wrote HRB the town was already referred to as Avallon.

The French town is near where Henry Blois sets Arthur’s continental battle scene.... as it is only 38 miles from Autun. It is also about the same distance from ‘Karitia’ (La Charité), where King Lear’s daughter lived with the King of the Franks. Henry Blois was born c.1101 and spent time as an oblate child at the Benedictine but Cluniac convent of *La Charité sur Loire* before going to Clugny.

I am sure it is not lost on the reader the implication that the kind hearted and helpful King of the Franks was based in the region controlled by the Counts of Blois. We may speculate also that King Lear’s story may be based upon the real life experience of the disgraced father of Henry Blois arriving home from the Crusades to find he was disowned by Henry Blois’ older brother’s and his wife Adela.

The story of Henry’s father’s return is strikingly similar. Henry’s father, who could only be likened to a King, being brought so low into dishonour is coincidentally close to King Lear’s predicament. The only difference is that Henry Blois when impersonating ‘Geoffrey’ has substituted daughters for sons. As we know, Stephen Etienne, Count of Blois died in battle in Ramelah after having returned to the east to redeem his honour. His wife Adela had pressured him to do so to regain the family honour.

However, the concept of the mysterious island was directly inspired by Melkin’s prophecy.... now the only extant part of Melkin’s work (if other works ever existed). The fact that the Grail is based on the ‘*duo fassula*’ and a body is awaiting discovery in the future on the island in Melkin’s prophecy should awaken the interest of scholars. The Melkin prophecy
cited the Island as Ineswitrin in its original form along with the 601 charter naming that island. We will understand the consequences and reasons for Henry Blois changing this name of Ineswitrin to Avalon on the prophecy of Melkin further on in progression.

The book\textsuperscript{346} or books which Melkin composed are no longer extant. It is the fact that what constitutes Melkin’s prophecy provided the inspiration for ‘Geoffrey’s’ ancient book which he maintains is his source for HRB. Certainly, no source book from which HRB might have been transliterated could possibly exist.... as the whole of HRB with its Merlin prophecies is a medieval composite.

Henry Blois is responsible for the name change of Ineswitin to \textit{Insula Avallonis} in the extant copy of the Melkin prophecy. It would be a remarkable coincidence if Melkin’s prophecy with its highly specific data (when the prophecy is decrypted) points out geometrically an island in Devon, was not the same as the Island in Devon donated to Glastonbury. What we can learn from this is that Henry in no way changed the wording in the original Melkin prophecy because he knew it was genuine.... and within its wording was encrypted the actual geographical location of Ineswitrin. Henry just inserted the name \textit{Insula Avallonis} instead of Ineswitrin because (as we shall see), his agenda had changed from wishing to portray Glastonbury as Ineswitrin in 1144 to portraying Glastonbury as Avalon post 1156 when he started the composition of VM.

Henry must have transcribed the extract (found in JG’s Cronica with the substituted Avalon) which constitutes Melkin’s prophecy in a work he had composed supposedly authored by Melkin.

The prophecy which initially pertained to the Island of Ineswitrin now pertains to Avalon and it is Henry Blois who is responsible for this change. This was the Island of which Melkin speaks in his prophecy, where Joseph of Arimathea was buried. Modern scholars have divined quite wrongly that the Melkin prophecy was composed c.1400 when JG mentions it.... recycling

\textsuperscript{346}John Leland in his \textit{Assertio Arturii} cited Melkin. He gives information from the extract he has seen of Melkin’s, stating that Melkin ‘celebrated the name of Gawain’ and that he ‘praised Arthur’. Leland cites a few anecdotes which he purportedly thought Melkin had written. I would suggest (given the relation of the prophecy of Melkin to Henry Blois), that it was Henry Blois who wrote the Arthurian anecdotes in a book. We know ‘Geoffrey’ is Henry Blois who invents the chivalric Arthur in HRB. It seems fair to assume also that there is no mention of Melkin in the DA interpolations by Henry Blois, because he has made a connection to Arthur and Avalon through the \textit{De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda} and \textit{Assertio Arturii}. This manuscript which Leland obviously saw is no longer extant but must have been written by Henry Blois.
information he had obtained from the imposter work of Melkin. Material on Arthur, as Bale and Pits imply, in a book thought to have been written by Melkin i.e. the book titled ‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’ was obviously written by Henry Blois. This I believe is where JC found the adulterated copy of the Melkin prophecy.

We might now understand the reasoning behind the connection between Joseph of Arimathea and Arthur in Grail literature. Although Henry did not mention Joseph in HRB, he used the mysterious island posited in the Melkin prophecy as a place (in a concocted episode) which has no basis in history.... to which Arthur was taken after the battle at Camblanus. The inspiration for the battle location is made to coincide with the Annales Cambriae: the strife of Camlann in which Arthur and Mordred fell... It is only later as the primordial author of Grail literature that Henry combines the Island where Joseph was in reality buried.... to form his motif for Grail literature using the same duo fassula found in the prophecy as a template for the Grail.

The real island of Ineswitrin was now made to coincided with the mythical island of Avallonis, the last place Henry describes Arthur was taken to in HRB. The Grail itself is inspired by Melkin’s duo fassula and its association with Joseph of Arimathea comes directly from the Prophecy of Melkin.

Contrary to how most scholars have rationalised the germs of the Matter of Britain, it was Melkin’s work which inspired Henry Blois to compose what were the beginnings of the Grail stories. It was certainly not Grail literature which inspired the invention or myth of Melkin and his prophecy as is deduced by scholars today. I will show in progression that not only the Melkin prophecy existed in Henry Blois’ era and that the mythical island in Melkin’s prophecy was originally called Ineswitrin and is a genuine location in Devon.

Melkin’s prophecy was obviously seen by Malmesbury. William, who was cautious, omits reference to a document which to him was unintelligible. One look at the obtuse Latin prophecy and William like modern Scholars are at a loss to understand it.

The Melkin prophecy appeared fraudulent as it mentioned Joseph of Arimathea’s sepulchre on the island of Ineswitrin. If Malmesbury had mentioned Joseph of Arimathea’s name in conjunction with Ineswitrin, it would have brought into suspicion the very charter which had the same
name of Ineswitrin on it.... on which the antiquity of Glastonbury rested. I hope the reader will understand now the reasoning behind the etymological contortion in *Life of Gildas* and how necessary it was to establishing an actual location for Ineswitrin, albeit at Glastonbury.

The charter was 500 years old when Malmesbury discovered it and no-one had the faintest idea where Ineswitrin was located.... and this would be ammunition for those who contested the genuineness of the charter i.e. those who were asserting Dunstan was the first abbot and Glastonbury; the very reason for commissioning the DA in the first instance.

William of Malmesbury must have seen the Melkin prophecy along with the 601 charter, but dismissed it as unintelligible. If it had not been seen by the inventive and inspirational mind of Henry Blois, it would have laid dormant on a dusty shelf in the scriptorium to be burnt at Glastonbury in the great fire in 1184. Instead it was included in a book about Arthur and the round table composed by Henry Blois written under the guise of Melkin. This is where J.G has sourced his version. Henry Blois has replaced the name Ineswitrin and substituted the name *Insula Avallonis* in the text of the original Melkin prophecy.

The point of this exposé is to consider the ramification of the discovery of a body on an island two thousand years after its burial. Up to the present era there is not one discipline in scholarship which covers the material which enables us to make an informed assessment of where the body of Joseph of Arimathea is buried.

We, should accept why there would be no early tradition regarding Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury, as logically, the Island in the Melkin prophecy (before Henry Blois’ era) had no connection with Glastonbury except that the island of Ineswitrin had been donated to Glastonbury under the name of Ineswitrin in the 601 Charter. This is the island where Joseph of Arimathea is buried today. But 500 years after the prophecy was constructed and left in the archives of Glastonbury, along with a charter confirming the donation of the Island to that monastic institution; Henry weaves what he finds as a puzzle into Grail legend and infiltrates its main icon of a mystical Island into Arthuriana in HRB as *Insula Avallonis*.

The fact that the 601 charter, the Prophecy of Melkin and possibly other works by Melkin witnessed by Leland are all found at Glastonbury should imply a possible connection between the three. We should also consider that once Melkin’s prophecy is decoded.... the instructional data found
within it direct us to an island in Devon which is Burgh Island (as we shall cover shortly) and to which Joseph of Arimathea would have association by way of his livelihood as a tin trader.

Not even Henry Blois knew what happened to the historical Arthur, the warlord recorded in some ‘saint’s lives’ and Nennius. William of Malmesbury in his unadulterated GR1 does not know where Arthur is buried. However, when Henry Blois’ GR3 interpolations were composed c.1143 no grave was yet manufactured at Glastonbury. Henry Blois develops the position that King Arthur is on this mythical island (or at least that was the last place he was posited to be), and links the ‘hope of the Britons’ to Arthur’s return with Melkin’s mysterious island.... where he has changed the name from Ineswitrin to Avalon. As a consequence of such an action, the Island, where (in the future) Melkin foretold of the discovery of the body of Joseph of Arimathea, is now looked upon as a mythical and non-existent location.

In reality it is not Arthur that is buried on the island in Devon which used to be known as Ineswitrin in 600AD.... but Joseph of Arimathea. But, through Henry’s efforts to convert Glastonbury into Avalon as part of his second agenda (witnessed in DA interpolations), Arthur is latterly discovered on Avalon (now at Glastonbury) where Henry had fabricated a grave to be found in the future.

‘Geoffrey’ is responsible for the name of Avallon (derived from the Burgundian town) and Henry obtains the mythical Island motif from the prophecy of Melkin. But the existence of Arthur’s island is make believe. However, the existence of Ineswitrin and what is buried on it is an entirely different matter. Joseph’s body on Burgh Island is the point of Melkin having left to posterity his set of directions. It is most probably the reasoning behind the Devonian King granting the Island to the Old Church at Glastonbury when the Saxons landed in Dumnonia.

As I have maintained and is perfectly evident, Huntingdon’s synopsis of HRB is somewhat different to Vulgate HRB in storyline. It is hardly likely that he would omit the Island of Avalon as the last place Arthur is seen as Huntingdon summarises for Warin what is found in the Primary Historia found at Bec: ‘Companions, let us put a high price on our deaths. I will now cut off the head of my Nephew and betrayer with my sword. After that death will be sweet’. Huntingdon’s ending says that Arthur took hold of Mordred’s
helmet and severed Mordred’s neck with one stroke of his sword, as if it were a head of corn. But he received so many wounds in so doing that he also fell. Straight after, Huntingdon continues on in EAW with no mention of Avalon: But the Bretons your, your ancestors, refuse to believe that he died. And they traditionally await his return. For in his day he was certainly supreme over all men in warfare, liberality and courtesy.347

The account ends without mention of one of the most significant icons in Vulgate HRB simply because Avalon was not recorded in the Primary Historia. If it had been Huntingdon most certainly would have mentioned it as he too is quizzical about what transpired with King Arthur.

‘Geoffrey’ made use of Huntingdon’s history in constructing HRB. Since Huntingdon died in 1154, logically, one would think, given his initial interest in Galfridus’s early Historia, he would at least have made mention of Merlin, who, modern scholars believe was mentioned in the Primary Historia. Huntingdon’s history had been in general circulation in the 16 years since he had first clapped eyes and commented on the Primary Historia to his friend Warin. So, it is inconceivable that Huntingdon could have ignored Merlin particularly when both authors (he and ‘Geoffrey’) shared a patron in Alexander.348 The fact is, the Primary Historia version was finished and deposited at Bec in the first half of 1138 by Henry Blois and the Alexander dedication was added post 1155 at the finalisation of the Vulgate version. Henry could not base Arthur in Wales without having any idea of its topography or where ruins existed.

To Huntingdon or Malmesbury, the colophon at the end of Vulgate HRB could present no offence, as they were both dead at the time of publication. The whole colophon is a ploy and could never fit (all things considered) even in the conventional sense in which scholars have understood an early publication date for Vulgate HRB. ‘Geoffrey’, supposedly still on the career ladder, before he was to become a fictitious bishop, would (if it were a genuine instruction in reality) not wish to inflame controversy with two well established and respected historians one of which supposedly had a patron in common. Some commentators who believe in an early publication date of HRB have assumed this instruction to two historians to be silent,

347 Historia Anglorum, Letter to Warin. Diane Greenway. P.581
348 It is obvious Galfridus did not seek patronage from Alexander but in the Vulgate (completed after 1155) and after Huntingdon’s death.... ‘Geoffrey’ now has the patronage of the recently dead Bishop Alexander.
must have appeared as insulting. Henry did not care as he held them both (in reality) in the same disdain and they certainly had no chance of countermanding his bogus instruction or reacting to his arrogant dismissal.

William of Malmesbury had not toed the line in writing what the monks at Glastonbury had been trying to induce him to include into DA; and Malmesbury had near enough accused Henry’s father in GP of being a liar. Henry Blois would probably have read Huntingdon’s letter to Walter, which, as we have covered, leaves no flattering character reference regarding Henry for posterity. In fact, Henry Blois must have looked on Huntingdon as a dullard using parts of ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Primary Historia* as credible History when he updated his redaction of his own history.

The point of the late colophon into the Vulgate HRB is to reiterate (before supposedly living historians) the fact that ‘Geoffrey’ had a source which they did not. All this, supposedly before Huntingdon had already used ‘Geoffrey’ as source material in the later redactions of his history.

The other point in producing the colophon, establishes that the colophon appealed to Malmesbury and Huntingdon while alive (i.e. it establishes that the book was written pre- 1143 when Malmesbury died). This in effect retro-dated the publication of the Vulgate HRB. This has the effect for instance, that Merlin’s prophecy about the ‘Sixth’ invading Ireland became seemingly and marvellously prophetic. The colophon also made it appear that Caradoc followed on from Geoffrey’s *Historia* rather than ‘Geoffrey’ terminated his account where Caradoc started. Additionally the colophon eradicates suspicion that the *Life of Gildas* had been written by someone posing as Caradoc who is dead. Caradoc is alive and well by what the colophon infers and logically must have been to have taken up ‘Geoffrey’s’ mantle.... or that is what we are led to believe.

This is the point of subtly stating that Caradoc is ‘contemporary’ (my fellow student) so that those who doubted the words found in the *life of Gildas* could not disprove them on the grounds that Caradoc’s name had been impersonated and argue that Caradoc was already dead when Vulgate appeared. In truth, all those supposedly contemporaneous people mentioned in the Vulgate version of HRB, Archdeacon Walter, Alexander, Robert of Gloucester, Stephen, Caradoc, Huntingdon and Malmesbury and ‘Geoffrey’ himself were all dead when the Vulgate appeared post 1155.

Crick’s solution to the colophon is: *we may surmise that Geoffrey first published the Historia without any reference to other historians, and that, not
until his published work was challenged, did he add in a later edition a renewed statement about his sources.

This is the perfect rationale for the colophon’s existence. However, Crick is entirely ignorant of the fact that in essence the Vulgate version (by such an avowal) is retro-dated. The colophon is a reaction to criticism of ‘Geoffrey’s sources as he covers a huge swathe of history previously unmentioned by earlier authors. It is ‘Geoffrey’s’ response to how such a mountain of material was divulged in the pretence of a translation from an old book. Yet this then had to be substantiated by Gaimar and so it went on. The colophon acts equally as a propagandist statement regarding the contemporaneity of Caradoc and his separate authorship of ‘Geoffrey’s’ continuation.... which, Caradoc’s work, once interpolated, further evidences and corroborated that which had been fabricated in HRB.

These are the finer points upon which the Blois fraud exists and which modern scholars have naïvely taken at face value. If Crick really considered the full implications.... does she really believe ‘Geoffrey ‘supplied the materials’ for Caradoc to obediently continue ‘Geoffrey’s’ work? Another boon to backdating, by pretending contemporaneity to Malmesbury (before 1143) also makes prophecy (which was supposedly in the same Vulgate book at that time....apparently!!!) appear more accurate. Nowhere is this more conclusive than in the Orderic interpolation! This is the subtlety of the inserted sentence summing up the section of prophecies in Orderic’s interpolation.... which is plainly devised to appear as having existed when King Henry Ist was alive. Henry’s interpolation into Orderic concerning the Merlin prophecies backdates the prophesies to before 1135.

Henry Blois went further in his propaganda and the insistence of ‘Geoffrey’s’ source being an ancient book long after he returned from Clugny in the invention of Gaimar’s epilogue which we will get to. We also have at the end of the chronicle called Brut Tysilio349 (another variant) the following statement: I, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, translated this Book from Welsh into Latin, and in my old age I translated it a second time from Latin into Welsh...

We must not forget Henry’s resources and the abundance of Welsh speaking Latin translators. Maybe Henry’s guile is more evident in trying to provide a further re-adjustment of the contemporaneity himself (Geoffrey)

349 Myvyrian Archaiology. vol. ii
and Caradoc in the said colophon enjoy: The princes who were afterwards successively over Wales, I committed to Caradog of Llancarvan; he was, my contemporary, and to him I left materials for writing that book. From henceforward the Kings of the English and their successors I committed to William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntington, to write about, but they were to leave the Welsh alone; for they do not possess that Welsh book, which Walter, archdeacon of Oxford, translated from Latin into Welsh; and he narrated truly and fully from the history of the aforesaid Welshmen'.

‘Geoffrey’ supposedly provides the materials to Caradoc. The one thing this implies is that not only does ‘Geoffrey’ condone Caradoc’s continuation, but it also appears as though Caradoc’s work supposedly follows chronologically ‘Geoffrey’s’. No-one but Henry Blois would make such a statement as to leave the history of the Welsh alone because they lack the fictitious book which Walter supposedly gave ‘Geoffrey’. Henry’s gambit is a direct attempt at making the Vulgate HRB and its prophecies appear much older.

Where the Merlin prophecies are concerned, there was suspicion that a modern contemporary was back dating past events so as to appear prophetical. When the historicity of ‘Geoffrey’s’ work came under suspicion, Walter’s source book is introduced into the Vulgate version. Hence, Walter nor his source book are mentioned in the Primary Historia nor the First Variant as these early editions were not widely published. It is only when the circulation of the Vulgate became more widely read that Henry reacted to the suspicion. Henry is scrambling firstly to cover his own authorial tracks and secondly to substantiate the credibility of both the prophecies and the historicity of HRB.

Even Crick realises that the HRB and its prophecies might have been challenged. It is likely that it was known at what early date Caradoc died, so even this may provide Geoffrey’s text with an earlier provenance. Caradoc supposedly establishes the Arthurian and Gildas connection with Glastonbury, so one is led to think his continuation of HRB should not be doubted. ‘Geoffrey’s’ word concerning Walter should supposedly not be doubted either.... as Walter in his own words says he has translated the same book from Latin into Welsh (and back again), which, if this were true, one would logically assume that if Geoffrey is carrying out the same task....
why is it that Walter is not as famous as ‘Geoffrey’ became. The farce is cyclical and has had scholars chasing their tails.

Tatlock\textsuperscript{350} tries to sort this puzzle out concerning Caradoc: \textit{There is no reason why a canon at a loose end should not be received by the Benedictines of Glastonbury.} Much of Caradoc’s \textit{Life of Gildas} is based upon the life of St Cadoc. Tatlock recognizes \textit{Gildas has no connection whatever with Glastonbury} and yet believes Caradoc is writing while at Glastonbury as part of the \textit{Officine de faux}. Tatlock is also duped by Henry’s clever contrivance that Caradoc is a contemporary of ‘Geoffrey’s’, based on the assertion in the Colophon. The naivety in modern medieval scholarship is incredible given the understanding that \textit{Life of Gildas} and HRB are both visibly concocted accounts.

It cannot be established whether Walter may have translated Caradoc’s Brut into Latin as this whole propaganda exercise concerning Archdeacon Walter and his relationship with ‘Geoffrey’ is purely to establish and muddle the source of HRB and is probably only based (like the Ralf relationship to ‘Geoffrey-Gaufridus Artur’) on the Archdeacon’s name being present when Henry signed (in one sitting) the improvised signing of the seven charters at Oxford.

Whether or not Walter was an antiquarian is an unimportant point considering his name also was not employed until after his death in 1151. The signing of the ‘Galfridus charters’ at Oxford c.1153 after Wallingford is importantly relevant to Henry Blois having knowledge that Walter had recently expired, and thereafter, his name could be employed retrospectively. We must not be fooled by such personal details about Walter in that he was well read in history and experienced in ‘oratoria arte’ or that he brought the ‘book’ from Brittany.

‘Geoffrey’ is not translating from a book given to him by Walter, but Henry Blois ends his \textit{Primary Historia} at the relevant point because Henry has already read a copy of Caradoc’s work. It seems highly unlikely Caradoc had been translated into Latin by Walter as Caradoc’s work (as I cover in chapter 22) was written in Latin. It can only be Henry who wrote the passage above implying that ‘Geoffrey’ supplied materials to Caradoc to continue where ‘Geoffrey’ had left off.

\textsuperscript{350} J.S.P. Tatlock, Caradoc of Llancarfan p.145
Caradoc supposedly wrote the Latin *Life of Gildas* which substantiates the Arthurian episode of the kidnap of Guinevere on the Modena archivolt. The *Life of Gildas* substantiates Glastonbury’s antiquity in its contention with Canterbury. The Caradawc or Caradog from the Gwentian Brut or more likely the Caradoc, Duke of Cornwall in HRB may be Henry Blois’ reason for the inscription of *Carrado* on the Modena archivolt (as he is not mentioned in the *Life of Gildas* or the *Vita Cadoci* along with Kai). Perhaps the mention of *Carrado*-Caradoc is Henry’s attempt at irony, since the only version of this kidnap of Guinevere episode is found in Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas*.... which he himself had written. It is not surprising therefore, that this dispute between Melvas and King Arthur is corroborated in the DA where Henry Blois has interpolated the story and where Gildas is seen as the mediator.

To understand the reasoning behind the construction of the original pseudo-history which evolved into the *Primary Historia* found at Bec and its evolution to the First Variant and Vulgate HRB, it is necessary to grasp that initially it was started (the part from Brutus to the point where the ‘Arthuriad’ starts) in Henry Ist time.... while Henry Blois was a young man at Glastonbury c.1128-9. As we have covered, the History of the Franks also posited the hereditary descent from Troy and it is highly probable that Henry Ist, (who was a scholar in his own right), was probably the intended recipient of the pseudo-history (as it set the stage in previous British history) i.e. a female monarch precedent which was the contention of a future Heir since the White ship disaster and the death of William Adelin.

Matilda’s prospective rule, most likely accounts for the inclusion of the many Queens posited by ‘Geoffrey’. If I am correct in my assumption that Henry Blois was the ‘someone’ who recounted the Frank’s history to Henry Ist, as recorded by Huntingdon.... it would surely be in Henry Blois’ interest initially to provide his uncle with an equally grand rendition of British history as that of the Franks from Troy.

The crux to how the ‘Geoffrey’s’ work of HRB was constructed is that when Henry Blois’ uncle died, the gist of the yet unfinished *pseudo-historia* was remoulded (adding to it the Arthuriad), but certain features of the fictitious storyline remained unaltered in *Primary Historia*; especially concerning the five British queens which had been included to fulfil a specific and earlier agenda regarding the Empress Matilda as heir to Henry.
At that time, the prospective book had political ramifications in setting a precedent for accepting a queen.

As for the motive behind some other preferences, attitudes or allegiances which Geoffrey shows, we can only be conjectural. My guess is that links were highlighted with a more prominent connection concerning Brittany when Stephen came to the throne as the point of the pro-Brittany stance held in HRB seems unclear in its motivation. Trying to divine the motive and what accurately transpired is a can of worms....foremost, because Henry is trying to achieve many things at different times and the reader will see that these different agendas are reflected in DA. Where HRB is concerned, firstly, Henry is Norman and trying to hide his authorship in pretending to be a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’. Secondly, the text is squed to conform more with known historical sources when he comes to re-editing the Primary Historia as the First Variant. The reasoning behind this is so that the First Variant is to be presented as viable history/proof in his case for Metropolitan at Rome in 1144 and tailored toward an ecclesiastical Roman audience. (This is evident as I cover later in discussing the format of the First Variant). The prophecies which started out with innocuous intent, merely composed to fascinate the contemporary audience of their ability to see so many relevant episodes which had transpired in their time.... becomes a political invective against Henry II (once the prophecies are updated in 1155), predicting that should the Britons/Celtic tribes rebel.... the Normans would be defeated.

What has confused scholars more is why the First Variant adheres more historically to the insular, Roman and Continental annals and has a biblical bent. We know the First Variant has an 1155 updated version of the prophecies attached, so we are unable to know in what form it was presented at Rome and what other editorial changes to the prophecies were added which we find in the Vulgate version which were not in the presentation copy for the case of Metropolitan.

Henry Blois groomed Eustace expecting to have influence over Eustace after Stephen’s death until such time as the truce was made at the end of the Anarchy. After Henry’s brother Stephen died and Henry II came to the throne, Henry Blois found himself in a difficult position in self imposed exile. It is here we see the concoction of VM and JC prophecies as Henry Blois has one last attempt at regaining power by inciting rebellion by predicting an adopted seventh King. Once back in England in 1158 and
there is no chance of regaining his original power, Henry settles for the aura of Venerable statesman where age had moderated political ambition and his writing at Clugny had brought calm.\textsuperscript{351}

In 1158 Henry set about the third phase of his authorial edifice which he has left to posterity. This was the updating of the DA with Joseph material and the invention of a new tale which was to be the pinnacle of his inventive mind. It was based on a historical truth, but he had no way of understanding Melkin's prophecy. He knew it held the key to finding the island of Ineswitrin on which Joseph was buried. Henry was not a fool and knew the 601 charter which referred to the same Island was not a fake. Because Henry came across the prophecy of Melkin, he introduced a forgotten character from antiquity into British history; one Joseph of Arimathea.

Because of Henry Blois’ muses, Joseph of Arimathea then became the focus of Grail literature along with Arthur. This is a brief synopsis of Henry’s evolving authorial edifice which culminated in Grail literature and is only mentioned here so that certain previous misunderstandings as to how the three main bodies of literature link up can be understood by the common denominator of Henry Blois. I have wished to avert the reader to the direction of where the evidence we are about to cover is leading us in our coverage of three genres of Arthuriana, Glastonburiana and Grail literature.

If one does not understand Henry Blois as the author of HRB, it is impossible to see through the affiliations he makes, or account for the anachronistic association of Arthur and Joseph and the Grail heroes.... or understand ‘Geoffrey’s’ seemingly contradictory views. As a ‘Norman’ Henry sees himself and his heritage through his grandfather as a rightful

\textsuperscript{351} \textit{Dom David Knowles, The Monastic Order in England}: “When Henry II came to the throne the Bishop of Winchester left the country, not to return until 1158. During the 13 years of life that still remain to him he appeared in a very different character. Age had moderated ambition and brought calm; under the new King there was no room or need for military Bishops; the aims and outlook of the papacy had changed and the generation of Clugny ecclesiastics had almost all passed away. Henry could now fill the role of an elder statesman, the father of the hierarchy. He supported Beckett quietly, but staunchly, as 20 years before he had supported his nephew, William of York, in his day of distress, and he, who 20 years before had been the opponent of the Cistercians of the North, and the object of Bernard’s most violent invective, was now the advocate of the friend of the Cistercians, Gilbert of Sempringham. He was indeed, universally respected, even revered, and the praise of Gerald of Wales who knew him only in these mellow years of generous patronage, has secured his reputation with posterity”.

inheritor of Britain. The Welsh of his present era he hates and makes it plain in GS and HRB saying they are nothing more than savages. There is a lot of rationalisation of this position as his affiliations stretch as part of the heritage of the emigration of the British (to Brittany) at the Saxon invasion.

This position changes of course as he entices rebellion in the later prophecies and even predicts Henry II loss of power as the end of Norman rule. Of the Angli and the Saxones he feels the same and politically posits the Normans as eradicators of the Saxon invaders and holds the same tone as that intonated by both Gildas and Bede. The Scots also, he holds in contempt, coloured by King David's affiliation with Matilda. He is contemptuous that his brother has made a deal with King David three times and each time David has broken his word. We witness this in the prophecies and GS.

Glastonbury is not mentioned in HRB, but if it had been, suspicion would fall on Henry as author of HRB. Winchester features heavily and by so doing provides evidence of an early monastic house at which Constans stayed. It is all part of what the First Variant brings as reliable history upon which Henry Blois’ metropolitan is granted in 1144. Winchester is much vaunted in HRB second only to London. St Amphibalus is posited and Arthur’s Dragon was sure to turn up if all had gone according to plan. Arthur’s dragon as a (forged) standard was clearly inspired by the Bayeux tapestry. Harold’s dragon standard or banner may well have been in Henry’s possession to be produced or ‘found’ at an opportune moment. No one is sure of what became of it after its capture at Hastings. Adam of Damerham however, does say that Henry endowed a banner to Glastonbury.

Canterbury is ignored in HRB for previous disputes Glastonbury had had with it and because of Henry Blois’ enmity with Theobald and the Ass of Wickedness (William of Corbeil), both treated with distain. Henry does his utmost to promote Winchester as a metropolitan in real life as well as by implication in the prophecies and by providing adequate proof in the storyline of HRB that in terms of primacy it antedated Canterbury.

Henry Blois’ medieval mind is fascinated by Stonehenge. He has no idea how it came to be there. ‘Geoffrey’ loves to astound by providing bogus anecdotal history and etymology. His cleverness runs throughout HRB where we witness his Mons Ambrii which the contemporary reader would know to be Amesbury. Geoffrey lets his reader deduce the eponym is so
called by its proximity to the *Giants Dance* brought back from Ireland by Merlin Ambrosius and instigated by Aurelius Ambrosius. Here we get a good idea of how ‘Geoffrey’s’ mind works. He obviously knows the lay of the land and weaves etymology with known geography.

‘Geoffrey’ is not a parochial Welshman; he is a man of state affairs who is well travelled throughout insular Britain and he has an exceptional grasp of historical names of populations on the continent and of course geographical regions. By comparison with many others in Henry’s own era, he travelled extensively on the continent and on errands for his brother or carrying out ecclesiastical duties.

For the description of the Giants Dance for Stonehenge, we only have Henry Blois’ imagination to thank. ‘Geoffrey’s’ twist on Nennius’s slaughter of the Britons and the connection with Stonehenge just highlights his art form. Initially in Huntingdon’s report to Warin there was no miracle: *'Uter Pendragon, the son of Aurelius, who brought from Ireland the Dance of Giants which is now called Stanhenges'*. Henry Blois in his later Vulgate HRB providing an answer to people such as Huntingdon who had commented that *'none can imagine by what art the stones were raised or for what purpose'*. At the introduction of Merlin into HRB along with the prophecies, Henry Blois’ resolution as author of HRB as to how the edifice appears on the landscape is also weaved into the storyline providing a fascinated audience of the Vulgate Version the solution to how the monument occurred and the fact that this must be evidential of Giants in history as found in many old texts.

Coincidentally, these may be the giants that Arthur or Brutus fought. The fact Henry has Merlin transfer Stonehenge from Ireland shows also that Henry is aware of Megalithic structures in Ireland. Henry loves to provide solutions in eponyms or myths to things that puzzle him and his audience. Stone circles were common and therefore, apart from the fact that the stones come from *Killaraus mons*, they also are provided with an array of bogus detail: *For in these stones is a mystery, and a healing virtue against many ailments. Giants of old did carry them from the furthest ends of Africa and did set them up in Ireland at what time they did inhabit therein. And unto this end they did it, that they might make them baths therein when so ever they ailed of any malady, for they did wash the stones and pour forth the water into the baths, whereby they that were sick were made whole. Moreover, they did mix confections of herbs with the water, whereby they that*
were wounded had healing, for not a stone is there that lacks in virtue of leechcraft.\textsuperscript{352}

Henry Blois has no problem with pure invention, but the state of his mind is anything but pure.\textsuperscript{353} What is most interesting is that between 1138 when \textit{Primary Historia} was produced and 1144, when the Anarchy was in full swing and the First Variant was finalised as a presentation copy for Rome, Henry’s pleasure in his private hours was given over to refining an already bogus history with more mythical detail as he wove Merlin into HRB. It is not a certainty that the First Variant changed that much between 1144 and the second attempt at metropolitan in 1149. Until his brother’s death in 1154, Henry must have been refining the text.

Henry detested Alexander, Robert of Gloucester, Robert de Chesney and Waleran also, so his dedicatees were more chosen as a guise to hide his authorship than any other reason. However, the city of Gloucester (for reasons in context of the initial unpublished \textit{pseudo-historia}) is given prominence\textsuperscript{354} in being founded by Claudius (Claudiocestria)….. or its alternative eponym from Gloius, son of Claudius, where both the dubiously historical Lucius and Arviragus\textsuperscript{355} are conveniently buried. Gloucester supposedly had a large See and the bishop Eldadus has a brother who is one of Aureliius’s brave knights who killed Hengist. The Consul \textit{Claudiocestrie} is given prominence and is distinguished in battle against the Romans. Henry must have known Gloucester well as it is \textit{en route} travelling into southern Wales. Certainly the writer of HRB and GS has a good knowledge of it.

The writer of GS is also at pains to tell us that the city of Bath gets its name from ‘\textit{a word peculiar to the English language signifying wash place’}, but ‘Geoffrey’ in HRB is also cognisant of this as Bladud built the baths. Obviously Henry knew Bath well as he was in attendance with his brother there in GS. The invention of Bladud, who was from Badon…. no-one had ever heard of before. \textit{Kaer Badum} is really introduced at Bath to correlate

\textsuperscript{352} {HRB. VIII. xi}

\textsuperscript{353} {Macabre scenes are depicted from a bent mind: The Dragon shall bear him aloft, and swingeing his tail shall beat him upon his naked body. Then shall the Giant, again renewing his strength, pierce his gullet with his sword, and at last shall the Dragon die poisoned, entangled within the coils of his tail.}

\textsuperscript{354} {The prominence given to Gloucester is a direct resultant derived from when the original pseudo-history was written to please or endear Henry Blois to family members of King Henry I; so his bastard son’s ducal house (who later became Henry and his brother Stephen’s nemesis) at this period was afforded illustrious provenance from a faux etymology \textit{Claudiocestrie}}

\textsuperscript{355} {We shall see that both Lucius and Arviragus are both embellished false personas invented by Geoffrey.}
with Badonicus Mons or Mons Badonis which Geoffrey locates from mention in Gildas, Bede and Nennius and connects to Arthur’s last battle in ‘Geoffrey’s’ usual conflationary method of association of disparate anecdotal information.

As regards Exeter and Totnes in Devon, we know Henry Blois has knowledge of Uffculme from his early days at Glastonbury and he has been to Plympton as he describes the early morning attack in GS with eyewitness detail. The siege of Exeter, Henry Blois was definitely involved in... and probably used Totnes as Brutus’ and Vespasian’s landing as he would have known that it was the highest navigable point on the Dart. Also one would probably pass through it on the way to Plympton.

A certain Judhel of Totnes built the castle and was succeeded by his son and the Cannons of Laon on their journey visited Judhel at Barnstable. We might speculate that given that their travel record bears witness of the contretemps about Arthur, there is a chance of this very tradition being an interpolation.... given that Laon is close to Meuse and Bec and on the route down to Rome which Henry often frequented.

I am suggesting that in their travelogue Henry might have inserted the anecdote in regard to having seen that the earlier travellers passed through Devon; and this might have been done while resting over at Laon. After all, if he goes to the extent of promoting his rescue of Guinevere into the engravings on the Modena Archivolt, this would only be a small effort by comparison. Another interest which is also corroborated in GS is Henry Blois’ love of Castles. Of the many towns mentioned in HRB, nearly all have early Norman castles.

‘Geoffrey’s’ Saltus Geomagog which is ‘near Totnes’ where the Giant is thrown over a cliff by Corineus is probably the cliffs at the entrance to Salcombe.... (Salgoem)’as it is still so named’, says ‘Geoffrey’. Salcombe has the giant’s name of Magog spliced onto it and is posited as the location of the wrestling. For Henry to know that there are cliffs there on which to base his fight scene with the giant and the fact that it is stated to be near Totnes.... one must assume, Henry has been to those cliffs. My point is that later the reader will understand that there is reasonable evidence that Henry Blois has actively searched for the Island of Ineswitrin. He is one of the few people who knows it is in Devon. It just so happens that these cliffs overlook Burgh Island. Burgh Island is the Ineswitrin in the 601 charter and
the island to which the geometrical data in the Prophecy of Melkin locates.... with alarming accuracy.

It is doubtful a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ would be so well travelled having a good grasp of the geography from the south west of England and all the way to Scotland. Henry Blois is well-travelled from Brittany to Flanders, with highly specific knowledge of the environs of Burgundy and the ports on both side of the channel. HRB was not written by a parochial Welshman. Our author's geography is extremely detailed even down to the Aravian Mountains on the French side of the Alps.

‘Geoffrey’s’ affiliation and the prominence he assigns to the Cornish or Cornwall has been puzzling for most commentators because Gildas, Bede, Nennius pay much attention to the South west nor do the *Annales Cambriae*. This affiliation of Arthur with Cornwall might be more based on the genuine tradition of the Warlord Arthur rather than the totally fictitious chivalric Arthur from Caerleon. The propensity to things Cornish are based upon mostly Arthurian detail but the question is why has ‘Geoffrey’ after his invention of Arthur’s Welsh base at Caerleon, brought a tradition of Arthur’s southern heritage to the fore.... unless there is some substance to it in association with Warlord Arthur. I refer back to the travellers from Leon. There is no substance at all to King Arthur at Caerleon and the reason for the Welsh backdrop is based upon a Welsh and Bardic oral tradition, not specifically about Arthur, but more on memory of old wars of the Britons.

Lifris was from Llancarfon and relates episodes about Arthur in the *Vita Cadoci*. There are Roman Archaeological remains at Caerleon and so prominence was given to this area as a credible setting. It existed within an area that ‘Geoffrey’ associated with the ancient Britons and Henry had been there. Given Henry’s interest in architecture and his visits to Rome, he writes of the ruined Roman buildings that Caerleon: *passing fair was the magnificence of the Kingly palaces thereof with the gilded verges of the roofs that imitated Rome*. In reality ‘Geoffrey’ distinguishes his own present hate for the Welsh in GS while at the same time situating the grandeur of the Arthurian court at an obscure Caerleon where there were ancient remains. There is this hate for the Welsh so evidently expressed in both HRB and GS which totally negates a real Geoffrey being from Monmouth and certainly not ‘Brito’.

---

356 HRB IX, xii
The conundrum for most commentators on the HRB has been Geoffrey's contradictory attitude to the insular races and his lack of damnation of the Norman overlords in the prophecies. In fact Henry Blois is the Norman overlord! Henry’s prospective self-‘adoption’ as a returning Briton as evidenced in the John of Cornwall prophecies is contrasted with his own current hatred for the residue of the remaining Celtic races. Henry’s opinion has mostly been coloured by their rebellion in the time of King Stephen’s rule, but he also holds the same opinion about the Irish. The Cornish and the Breton’s as Celts are looked upon in a much more favoured light.

Geoffrey’s knowledge of the sea ports of France is more than a Welsh cleric living at Oxford could reasonably be acquainted with. Henry Blois writes from experience, knowing intimately Mont St. Michel, Rennes, Tréguier and Kidaleta, journeying through the channel island ports on his many excursions to and fro across the channel. In Henry Blois’ usual lack of attention to detail regarding distance (to affect an air of a chronicle rather than first hand experience), he has Arthur travel to the small island of ‘Tumbe Helene’ to avenge Hoel’s niece.... knowing full well that Barfleur is 72 miles away. He must have visited Mont St Michel with his uncle or as a monk.... but we know he went to Mont St Michel and met Robert de Torigni in 1155. Henry certainly knew of Barfleur and may indeed be an indication of why he wrote the poem found in Orderic from which he uses the same expression (fish food) as found in the Merlin prophecies.357

‘Geoffrey’ mentions a few places in Normandy and includes a Duke of Normandy as well as the Duke of Poitou. The name of Ruteni comes directly from Lucan’s Pharsalia and ‘Geoffrey’ has placed them in Flanders on the basis that the town of Ruthia was in Flanders and Ruthena was a city near Paris. The Ruteni and Moriani seem to be from Flanders, but to avoid detection as author of HRB their provenance is uncertain i.e. not specifically defined. As it happens, his brother is the Count of Flanders.

However, Gerinus of Chartres, again in Blois lands, is given prominence over the twelve peers of Gaul. The Allobroges, who are from Burgundy, are prominent, but again, there is no sign or hint of Blois glory.... where after the battle: Arthur made grant of Neustria, which is now called Normandy, unto Bedevere his butler, and the province of Anjou unto Kay his seneschal.

357 Note 6. If Henry did not write the poem, he certainly had read Orderic.
Many other provinces also did he grant unto the noblemen that did him service in his household.

One can be sure that the Blois region is omitted on purpose without being specifically named. Funnily enough, every other province is named; Aquitaine, Brittany, Normandy and Anjou get mentioned along with Maine. The region of Blois is the only one not glorified by name, but Henry compensates for this by deciding to place the epic battle in Burgundian Blois lands instead.

‘Geoffrey’s’ ease linking continental names is an indicator of his knowledge of continental saints such as St Leodegarius which name he gives to the Consul of Boulogne. Bladud’s son Leir is one of Geoffrey’s greatest triumph’s.... but without an eponym to fascinate his audience he would not feel satisfied; and so it was Leir who built the city on the river Soar, that in the British is called Kaerleir, but in the Saxon, Leicester. The story of King Leir incorporates so many aspects of the human experience and it is parabolic, dealing with empathy and true love. When the story finishes and Cordelia and her husband Aganippus defeat the wicked dukes in Britain and then restores the Kingdom to her father, it appears as if Henry of Huntingdon in his letter to Warin makes an observation, Hence the saying: words said in moderation should be all the more valued. We could speculate that this was an observation made by Galfridus Arthur and not Huntingdon’s observation to his friend Warin i.e. it was in the script of the Primary Historia, as it is a precept of Cicero’s work on Oratory.

When King Leir hits hard times, he goes in search of Cordelia for succour and: Landing at last, his mind filled with these reflections and others of a like kind, he came to Karitia, where his daughter lived... Henry’s bogus eponym in his favoured region of Blois is La Charité in a supposedly archaic Latinised form as Karitia. The town of La Charité-sur Loire began as the first of the Cluniac priories on an island site in the Loire. The Priory of La Charité-sur Loire is a Cluniac monastery not far from Clugny, Autun and Langres, in which Henry started his life as an oblate.

Henry of Blois was rumoured to be Abbot of Bermondsey, a substantial monastery, before becoming Abbot of Glastonbury.... and Bermondsey was a dependent priory of the Cluniac monastery of La Charité-sur-Loire. This may be the reason for ‘Geoffrey’s’ choice of Cordelia’s place of residence with the King of the Franki, Aganippus. Aganippe is best known as a spring on Mt Helicon where we find the Muses of classical Greek literature. Given
Henry’s own personal reference in the Meusan plates to Muses, and in the preamble of HRB, it seems fair to assume Henry is versed in Greek literature.

In a *life of St Folcuinus* by Bishop of Therouanne, a lighthouse is mentioned and Therouanne is only 25 miles from Boulogne. This ‘Turris ordrans’ or tower Odraus Farus is a structure (a tower on which a fire was lit to guide ships through the Dover straights) known to ‘Geoffrey’ in his travels most likely or from the *life of St Folcuinus*…. but ‘Geoffrey’ fictionalises that it was built by Caesar: *He (Caesar) then threw himself into a certain tower he had constructed at a place called Odnea.*

‘Geoffrey’ loves to distort names such as *Charité* to Karitia and we can see the same in Geoffrey’s Odnea from ordrans or ordrensis and ‘Wace’s’ Ordre. The only reason ‘Wace’ made Karitia into Calais was again a case of Henry Blois distancing himself from a suspicion of authorship of Wace’s *Roman de Brut*; Henry Blois impostors Wace, as I shall get to later.

King Arthur fights Frollo on an island outside the city of Paris in front of onlookers. This again shows topographical acquaintance with the lay of the land of a certain island which would in Henry’s estimation have been outside the walls of Paris in Arthur’s day. We could postulate that this would be a difficult presumption for a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ to make without having eyeballed the topography.

Throughout the HRB ‘Geoffrey’s’ knowledge of regions, cities and towns is not that of a parochial cleric living in Oxford who originated from the Welsh Marches. Henry Blois, as a well-educated, well-travelled and continentally born person has no problem inventing the Basclenses for the Basques and is not favourable to Poitou which is a reflection of his own bias (in 1138) and knows regions such as Guasconia. In this instance of Gascony, Henry Blois loves to Latinize nomenclature giving his readers a sense of the archaic; but also providing recognisable forms for his contemporary Anglo-Norman/continental audience.

When it comes to his own region of Blois or Burgundy, avoiding suspicion of authorship completely, he refers to his own family’s southern region as the people of the Allobroges. This nomenclature is found in Fulcher of Chartres *Historia Hierosolymitana* and the eleventh century Chartres cartulary. How would a Welsh Geoffrey know this and why is our author coy about any specific mention of the region known to be that of Blois? The Senones Galli are of course only slightly differentiated
geographically from the Allobroges...the distinction though is obvious to the native Henry Blois. Again, the town of Sens is within the Blois region of lands, yet he knows and differentiates the areas. All these family lands were held now by his brother Theobald.

‘Geoffrey’s’ *Augustodunum* is Autun where we find the See of St Leodegarius who we just mentioned. After having lost a skirmish at the river Aube, Thorpe translates wrongly that the city of Autun is on Arthur’s left hand whereas the Latin text has *relict a leava civitate* i.e. Langres.... as Arthur is coming down from the imaginary skirmish on the Aube. It was the fictional Lucius Hiberius who could not make up his mind what to do on his way to Autun and therefore marched his army into Langres for the night. ‘King Arthur’ knew that the quickest way to Autun from Langres for an army was along the Roman road through Dijon. Why Faral says: *Il faut reconnoitre que la Geographie de Geoffrey est assez indécise*...is plainly nonsensical in this instance as ‘Wace’ is even clearer about certain facts, indicating that Henry has the picture straight in his mind. The problem most commentators have had is a want to place *Siesia* in conjunction with a known name rather than employing another of ‘Geoffrey’s’ attributes by giving the valley its eponym by who built the road through it.

The First variant has *Siesia, Siessia* or *Soissie Sesie* in Wace and sounds like Ceasar; but as we will discuss later, material in Wace is specifically squewed to make it seem as if it were not Henry Blois (or Geoffrey) who wrote the *Roman de Brut*. Arthur, *leaving the city (of Langres) on his left, he took up a position in a certain valley called Siesia*, through the which, *Lucius would have to pass*.359

Henry Blois or ‘Geoffrey’ had chosen for Arthur’s pitched battle a place on the Roman road of the Via Agrippa. We may speculate that it was known locally to the Burgundian inhabitants and to Henry Blois, (a frequent traveller and native), as the ‘Vale of Caesar’. Tatlock gives two other pieces of relevant information which are more interesting to us since we know it is Henry Blois writing HRB. There was a monastery near Donzy called *Sessiacum* 36 miles from Avallon and about 60miles from Autun. But, even more likely as to the naming by ‘Geoffrey’, since Henry is attempting to use ancient allusions, is a castle called La Sessie which the count of Champagne

---

358 MSS of Wace have Soissie, Suison, Soeefie, which is meant to hide Henry Blois’ previous accurate knowledge of the Roman road which occupies Caesar’s Valley
359 HRB, X,vi
The Fact that a Welsh cleric at Oxford knows that the River Aube flows from the Plateau de Langres seems unlikely. The fact that a Welsh Geoffrey knows the Allobroges are the people of the region of Blois i.e. Burgundy.... seems more unlikely, or their distinction from the Senones.

Henry names the location where Arthur cuts off Lucius Hiberius’ forces as ‘Ceasar’s Valley’ or the valley of Siesia. The Via Agrippa is a long Roman road which runs in what is a vast vale and there are hills in the distance on both sides of the Roman road.

Arthur is envisaged as heading south marching from the North. He has Langres on his left as Henry (‘Geoffrey’) imagines Arthur’s progress down to the Via Agrippa. Henry’s local geographical knowledge understands that if Lucius wanted to get an army from Langres to Autun he would naturally travel on the Via Agrippa. It may not be by accident that Saussy (a small village) is only six miles from the Via Agrippa.... mid-way between Langres and Autun.

Henry Blois portrays a visualised engagement somewhere between Vaux-sous-Aubingny and Dijon. The Roman road runs straight as an arrow in a valley plain for 22 miles from Dijon before turning at Vaux-sous-Aubingny to run perfectly straight for another 14 miles to Langres. Commentators have thought the supposed Welshman ‘Geoffrey’ had spuriously identified a non-existent location. The valley of Siesia is nowhere

---

360 Recueil des Histoires des Gaules, X11,322. Henry’s brother was Count of Champagne.
361 The Allobroges occur in two periods in HRB and are given exalted status. They and their Duke Seginus befriend Brennus. Arthur subdues them and of course meets the Romans in their territory. Are we to be duped into believing a Welsh Cleric knows the Burgundian’s archaic name and topography of the region? Yet Henry Blois would be fully aware of the peoples in his family’s region. Fulcher of Chartres refers to the Allobroges in his Historia Hierosolymitana in the eleventh century; a copy of which probably existed at Clugny. How does a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ have local knowledge to differentiate the Allobroges by region from the Senones Galli? How is it that ‘Geoffrey’ has read Orosius? As Tatlock points out…. where the Senones Galli really belong is in early accounts of the capture of Rome by the Celts in fourth century BC; just the place where ‘Geoffrey’ uses it. Orosius’ Historia II, 19 tells of the ‘Galli Senones, Duce Brenno’ attacking Rome. Again, we see the source of Henry’s inspiration. The same exploits of Brennus and his Galli Senones are related by Landolfus Sagax which we know is a source ‘Geoffrey’ follows closely in the First Variant. It is not by accident that ‘Geoffrey’ highlights this region in eastern France; but Tatlock unwittingly comments that to his mind ‘there is scarcely reason why it should have been well known in History’. I know that this exposed seems like an ode against scholarship, but it beggars belief that the Abbot of Glastonbury is never implicated as author of HRB. Henry has perfect knowledge of the region of eastern France and was in charge of the place where Arthur’s relics were discovered. Principally, when Master Blehis is reckoned the source for Arthurian and Grail Literature,… and more so, when Glastonbury is not even mentioned in HRB and Joseph and the Grail and Arthur are intricately connected to Glastonbury in the interpolated DA dedicated to Henry Blois, where the location of Arthur’s grave is stipulated in DA before it was unearthed.
found in the Roman Annals, but may have been known locally as such in Henry’s time.

The remarkable point to make about Henry calling the Valley plain, the valley of Siesia is his purposeful mis-spelling of ‘Caesar’, just as Charité is intentionally corrupted to Karitia....or his knowledge of the village of Saussy. Would the courtly Norman and clerical audience for HRB know the locations referred to from their own geographical knowledge? It is odd to think the contemporary readership (post 1155) believe in the literal translation from ‘Geoffrey’s’ ancient (Briton) book from which he is supposedly transcribing.

There are many coincidences to cover like the ‘round table’ appearing at what was Winchester Castle during the last years of Henry’s life. While we are at this juncture it is worth noting that ‘Wace’ knows exactly, in his mind, where this battle is taking place and becomes more specific about its topography than the supposed ‘Geoffrey’. Even though most commentators believe Wace is merely transliterating in a more vibrant French octosyllabic couplet than Geoffrey’s HRB Latin prose.... one can tell that it is the same author. ‘Wace’ knows exactly the topography also and expands in places where Geoffrey remains vague.

Henry impersonates Wace to widen his audience into the continent by retelling HRB in colloquial French verse: Now Langres is builded on the summit of a mount, and the plain lies all about the city. So Lucius and part of his people lodged within the town, and for the rest they sought shelter in the valley. Arthur knew well where the emperor would draw, and of his aim and purpose. He was persuaded that the Roman would not fight till the last man was with him. He cared neither to tarry in the city, nor to pacify the realm. Arthur sounded his trumpets, and bade his men to their harness. As speedily as he might he marched out from camp. He left Langres on the left hand, and passed beyond it bearing to the right (just as the Roman road bends today at Vaux-sous-Aubingny). He had in mind to outstrip the emperor, and seize the road to Autun. All the night through, without halt or stay, Arthur fared by wood and plain, till he came to the valley of Soissons.

There Arthur armed his host, and made him ready for battle. The highway from Autun to Langres led through this valley and Arthur would welcome the Romans immediately they were come. The King put the gear and the camp followers from the host. He set them on a hill nearby, arrayed in such fashion as to seem men-at-arms. He deemed that the Romans would be the more
fearful, when they marked this multitude of spears. Arthur took six thousand six hundred and sixty six men, and ranged them by troops in a strong company. (Wace)

He is writing for a continental French audience in Wace. Henry re-names what in HRB was Ceasar’s valley to the valley of Soissons (Soissie, Saoise) in Wace which is a pun on Soixant or sixty’s. The number appears to be randomly generated by mystic association most probably with the 666 from Revelation.362

Henry Blois knows the topography of the region but is vague when he envisions a spot on the River Aube to camp for Arthur’s troops and around Langres; he just passes it to the left of Langres in HRB and the valley is just a place ‘through the which Lucius would have to pass’. So, if Wace is merely copying a dead Bishop’s work (of Asaph), how is it he knows there is a highway between Langres and Autun and also that Langres363 is on a hill with a plain beneath? How does Wace write: Lucius rose early in the morning, purposing to set forth from Langres to Autun his host was now a great way upon the road…. and know that it is 14 miles to the right turn (at Vaux-sous-Aubingny) and the battle is envisaged about 10 miles after that where the bogus army is situated on a hill. How is it both know of the right turn bend in the Roman road? This is the same mind imagining the same fictional battle in the same mind’s eye.

The surprising fact that is little mentioned is ‘Geoffrey’s’ and ‘Wace’s’ obvious talent at battle strategy, yet there is an ease with which Henry describes some of the goriest scenes. The Britons have cavalry on the flanks which charge which throw Lucius into disorder the same tactic used at Tinchebrai in 1106, Henry would have heard from his uncle. ‘Wace’ is even better at war tactics than ‘Geoffrey’ and we know Henry fought and witnessed many a pitched battle as is made plain in GS.

---

362HRB X viii. *Roman fashion, in the shape of a wedge, so that when the army was in full array each division contained six thousand six hundred and sixty-six soldiers*. More probably, the number is a complete invention based upon Isidore’s 6,000 for the size of a Legio.

363 ‘Geoffrey’ calls Langres Lengrias which was never its name. Henry is affecting an archaic form but he does refer to Autun as Augustodnum correctly. ‘Geoffrey’s’ knowledge of France and its people and regions in relation to each other is just too informed to be anything other than interested and first hand. None of this is as M. Faral believes, ‘mere ignorant archaic colouring’. Continental regions were known by Henry and personages apportioned fictitiously to them but done to a level of expertise which surpasses the capability of someone from Wales.
The Grim details of death on the battlefield in HRB, coughing blood from chest wounds, kicking in the throes of dying are not ‘Geoffrey’s’ the cleric from Oxford’s experience but Henry’s from the battle field. This ability and interest in military strategy is highlighted in GS; and Henry himself had obviously experienced sieges and open field battle on many occasions and understands the subtleties of tactical warfare and ruses. This again qualifies Henry so much more than a Welsh cleric at Oxford to describe the many strategic battle scenes and especially in a region governed by Henry’s family and forebears and in which he travelled in his youth.

Henry’s Roman vassals and his geography are supplied by accounts of Crusaders, which probably derive from his Father’s tales, mixed with biblical names. One name stands out as a total invention, Alifatima King of Spain. This is Henry’s invention, as he conjoined the names of Ali and Fatima, Mohammed’s cousin and son in law. This information was probably sourced from his good friend Peter the Venerable who had translated the Koran. Henry’s knowledge of the Moors in Spain would also have provided the background for such an invention.

Obviously, there was an historical Arthur or there would be no canvas, but he can resemble nothing of the picture painted by ‘Geoffrey’ because his greatness would have been recorded before ‘Geoffrey’ (as Newburgh complains), rather than been anecdotally mentioned in Annales Cambriae, Nennius or William of Malmesbury’s GR. Arthur may or may not have been a King of the Britons or merely a rebellious warlord, but the point is it does not matter.

The only thing that matters is we know Geoffrey’s account is untrue and if some unscrupulous Bishop can invent such an account.... why should we even believe the slim and doubtful record of the persona of Geoffrey of Monmouth ever having existed. Why is it that commentators are duped into believing what the author of an obviously fraudulent book has wanted

---

364 Henry Blois was in Wales in 1136 at Kidwelly castle fighting against Gwenllian’s forces where her army was routed. She was captured in battle and beheaded. Her son Morgan (a name featured in Wace) was also slain and another son, Maelgwyn captured and executed. ‘Geoffrey’ invented a Briton queen called Gwendoloena to lead the troops in HRB. Should we suppose that Lidelea is Kidwelly (given Geoffrey’s penchant for distorting names) and was it the castle which belonged to the Bishop of Winchester?

365 Ironically Tatlock says: On the whole in warlike matters Geoffrey is well informed and Intelligent for an ecclesiastic and a scholar.
to portray to secrete his own personality? There was never any flesh on Geoffrey’s bones, but what little there appears to be.... was put there by Henry Blois. Once, little regard for the truth is uncovered in the material composition of HRB.... why is it that researchers have naïvely accepted the persona of Geoffrey?

Our scholars force the pieces to fit concerning Merlin and Arthur rather than accepting there was an Arthurian ‘tradition’, but HRB and Arthur’s exploits recorded in it, are wholly the composition of a fertile yet learned mind. The whole of the HRB is constructed by Henry Blois. Does it matter how he constructed it or from which source a certain detail or inspiration came. As long as scholarship strains at every detail yet swallows the flimsiest premise upon which the persona of ‘Geoffrey’ is built.... there will be no resolution to the authorial edifice which Henry Blois’ has composed known as the Matter of Britain.

No-one will ever discover the most important fact which is embedded in the constructed edifice of Henry’s work which is to be found in the Grail literature as long as they disassociate the Josephean Grail from the Arthurian HRB and both of their connections to the Prophecy of Melkin.... and then the prophecy’s association with Avalon and Henry’s association with Glastonbury.

Henry’s work covers three main genres; the HRB, Glastonburyana and Grail literature. So, the real importance of a potential present day discovery that is part of this Matter of Britain will remain undiscovered without understanding that the HRB was constructed by a man who wished to hide his identity. One will never understand the Matter of Britain and its connection to Grail legend without the inclusion of Henry Blois as Master Blehis. One will never understand the Matter of Britain if one does not understand that the same person corrupted William of Malmesbury’s works so that one work corroborated another. Once this chicanery is grasped and while understanding the methodology of the construction of HRB and the fraudulence found in the Glastonburyana of DA.... the important implications of the prophecy of Melkin (upon which Grail literature is based) will remain hidden. If Henry Blois uses the same methodology employed in HRB (that of mixing fact and fiction) as he does in his precursor to Perlesvaus or Grail book (Sanctum Graal), upon which all subsequent Grail literature is built.... we can be certain Joseph of Arimathea’s relics and the enigmatic duo fassula will be discovered in the
near future on Burgh Island. This can only happen if scholarship as it stands today dismisses the ready acceptance of the false premise upon which Geoffrey of Monmouth’s persona is held to be a reality. It also assumes scholars will no longer advocate the invention of Melkin and his prophecy as a 14 century fake since the very purport of that prophecy when deciphered locates Ineswitrin in Devon.

Unless the evolving agenda of Henry Blois is understood by scholars, false assumptions based upon false dating will lead to false conclusions. For example, Tatlock’s credulity is influenced by believing details in Caradoc and DA are derived from different people:

As for Glastonbury, later to loom so large in Arthur’s tradition, he first appears there in this life of Gildas. Should anyone wonder why Geoffrey’s later-written Historia ignores Glastonbury…. this very local legend may have been unknown to him, or he may have had his reasons for not wishing to join the chorus of praise for Glastonbury. Best of all, the Arthur here historically inharmonious with the masterful grandeur of Geoffrey’s Arthur; and anyone who fancies ignoring necessarily proves ignorance has a very different conception of Geoffrey’s personality and purposes from that book.

Just how ‘Right and Wrong’ can one be in a sentence. Although Tatlock refers to the difference between the ridiculous or rebellious figure of Arthur in some of the ‘Saints Lives’ legend, he never suspects that the Life of Gildas and the author of ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arthur are one and the same. He labels any connection between Arthur and Glastonbury as ‘Monk-craft’. ‘Monk-craft’ or the officine de faux was of a later date and followed what Henry had instigated in DA.

It is my own opinion that Culhwch and Olwen was written after the HRB and has several points in common with the Life of Gildas which Tatlock witnesses. As Tatlock points out, there is a commonality and we cannot be sure of the influence that Henry Blois might have had on Culhwch and Olwen considering that his influence spread far and wide.

366 The legendary history of Britain. P 196-199
367 Culhwch and Olwen, has the exaggerated claims made for Arthur. Also there is a passing mention of campaigns that he had conducted in India, Europe, Scandinavia, Corsica and Greece and Africa. O.J. Padel comments: The difficulty lies in knowing how far this text is independent of Geoffrey’s History. It must follow that since Arthur’s continental campaign is a fabrication by ‘Geoffrey’…. the poem has either been interpolated by Henry Blois or it follows in chronology the HRB.
Henry’s authorial works (the paint of our three genres of study) was not a hobby or bumbling project for Henry Blois, because when he returned from Clugny and found his hopes of Celtic rebellion were never going to come to fruition, he embarked upon his greater venture of promulgating Grail literature based upon icons found in the Melkin prophecy. Henry is solely responsible for the embryonic germs of Grail literature and the linking of ‘his’ Arthur to a discovery on a document he had made at Glastonbury concerning Joseph of Arimathea i.e. the Melkin prophecy… and manufacturing Arthur’s grave to be found in the future.

It is sure that there was an Arthur with a different character to ‘Geoffrey’s’ in various ‘Saints Lives’ and this is probably why Henry Blois chose the medium of a saints life i.e. The Life of Gildas in which to write his propaganda. Especially since the writer was well known to have written the Brut y Tywysogion and was Welsh. There seems little evidence to support a pre-Arthur tradition in Wales prior to Geoffrey as seen in the older branches of the Mabinogion.

Henry Blois has merely concocted the grandiose myth of Chivalric Arthur based upon the slim details in Annales Cambriae and Nennius and saints lives. Whether the mention of Arthur in Nennius or the anecdotal references in the annals have any substance we will never know, but Henry has done his best with Aurelius and Ambrosius to fit with the Arthur Legend. Henry has employed what scant details existed in insular annals to the fullest.

The early rescue of Guinevere must be Henry’s invention but Henry could not employ this previously concocted episode in HRB without raising suspicions about his previous authorship of the Life of Gildas and its affiliations in storyline with Glastonbury; especially since he had just paid stoneworkers to represent that episode on the cathedral at Modena. His contemporaries would have made that connection.

However, the most conclusive proof that Henry Blois is in fact Geoffrey Monmouth comes from the fact that there is not one mention of Glastonbury or Joseph of Arimathea who is connected with Arthur in Grail legend. The fact that Phagan and Deruvian, who, as we will cover, are wholly an invention of Henry Blois are in HRB and referenced in the first 34 chapters of interpolated DA, indicates HRB and the interpolations in DA were written by the same man. There is more evidence of Henry Blois’ early hand at Glastonbury which we shall cover in conjunction with Eadmer’s
letter and latterly with Henry’s Perlesvaus in which he ties Arthur and Joseph together and contrives the myth involving the *Ealdechurche* in its connection with Joseph in DA.

The matter covered here in Part I is meant to show Henry’s direct involvement with the prophetic work of Merlin as it pertained to his political position as brother of King Stephen and nephew to Henry I and how he used these prophecies to try to regain political power from Henry II. Once the reader is satisfied that ‘Geoffrey’ is Henry Blois, a Pandora’s Box opens up to how the *Matter of Britain* evolved and why it is that King Arthur was found at Glastonbury.

The critical point of this exposé is to show that the myth involving Joseph of Arimathea is in fact a reality and the reason it is assumed a myth is because Henry Blois has mixed fact with fiction, just as we have witnessed in HRB. As long as our most renowned scholars behave like the blind leading the blind, Joseph’s relics will remain on Burgh Island.
Chapter 16

Pytheas and the Island of Ictis

The island of Ictis was engaged in the tin trade. The Island was referred to by the explorer named Pytheas c.325 BC. Our interest in this island is to establish its whereabouts. Ictis was a central marketplace which gathered tin to be sold to Phoenician traders...not an island where tin is produced. Its location made it the ideal marketplace. The reason this is important to this exposé of our three genres is because of two people already mentioned; Joseph of Arimathea and the elusive Melkin are intricately linked to this island.

In the next chapter, I will show the prophecy of Melkin contains precise directional data which points out Joseph of Arimathea’s burial site on this island of Ictis. As we have alluded to already, it later becomes clear that Henry Blois changed the name of Ineswitrin for Insula Avallonis in the copy of Melkin’s prophecy. The only copy of Melkin’s prophecy which has been
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passed down to posterity is included in John of Glastonbury’s *Cronica* which must have been derived from Henry’s inclusion of the prophecy in another work...in which he substituted the name of *Insula Avallonis* for Ineswitrin so that it would tie back to his own Island invention which we find in ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB.

My intention is to show that the island of Ineswitrin is the identical location as the ancient island of Ictis. Also that the prophecy of Melkin which geometrically directs us to Burgh Island, (once decrypted), is the same Island upon which Melkin states Joseph of Arimathea is buried, along with the *duo fassula*. The directions in the prophecy of Melkin supposedly lead us to *Insula Avallonis* because Henry Blois substituted the name on the original document.

The prophecy in fact locates Ineswitrin. Henry had substituted Ineswitrin for *Insula Avallonis* on the Melkin prophecy purely because he had secreted a bogus grave containing King Arthur at Glastonbury before he died. This island presently called Burgh Island is the same as the Devonian King donated to Glastonbury in the charter dated 601 referred to by William of Malmesbury. This will become clear as we progress, but firstly we need to understand how it is that Joseph of Arimathea is buried on Burgh island and the reasoning behind why this Island was chosen as a burial site. The obstacles which have prevented the discovery of the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea are many. The first is the meddling of Henry Blois by changing the name of Ineswitrin to Avallon in Melkin’s original prophecy. Secondly, modern scholars such as Carley and Lagorio have been duped by the fraud of Henry Blois and have misdirected others. They have been led to false conclusions as to the existence of Melkin. A major factor has been scholarships’ inability to decode the prophecy of Melkin which has led them to believe that it is a spurious fourteenth century invention. The other main problem is that another branch of scholarship has been unable to determine the location of Ictis.

What needs to be made clear is that the Ineswitrin donated by the King of Devon to Glastonbury on the 601 charter; the Island of Ictis known to be on the southern coast of Britain, discovered by Pytheas and described by Diodorus; the *Insula Avallonis* of Melkin’s prophecy.... are all the same place. On this Island is Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb. It is accessed by a long
tunnel\textsuperscript{369} leading to a hewn vault. The vault originally was used to store tin ingots in an era when the Phoenician's came to Britain to trade tin.

Cornish traditions have maintained that Joseph of Arimathea was a tin merchant who visited Britain. It is part of Cornish tin-miners folklore that there is a saying and song that "Joseph was a ‘tin-man’ and the miners loved him well." Let us assume for the moment that if this legend has any truth to it, one could conclude that he would have visited the island which sold tin to the ancient world. The Island of Ictis was referred to by Pytheas, Strabo, Pliny and Diodorus amongst many others. The search for the Island of Ictis originated due to a Greek named Pytheas, who made a journey by sea, circa 325 BC and wrote a chronicle of his voyage, which no longer exists. He mentioned the island in his journals and left quite specific detailed eye witness references to it, the most pertinent being that it dried out at low tide and was located in southern England.

It is because of Pytheas’s notoriety and the fact that his original writings no longer exist, that over time, spurious references with conflicting evidences from other ancient chroniclers both Greek and Latin, have almost made the island's location indeterminable. The original account of his journey and his description of the island and its environs, have become garbled. Some of the subsequent chroniclers when referring to Pytheas’s voyage disbelieve what Pytheas had related. Pytheas’s log or account of his journey was called ‘On the Ocean’. We know something of his travels through the other Greek historian called Polybius, who lived around 200 BC. Timaeus writing in the third century BC mentions Ictis before Polybius. The most pertinent ancient writers who relate to Pytheas' voyage are Diodorus Siculus and Strabo. Diodorus gives a good description of the island of Ictis and its trade. He ascertained his account from Pytheas’ original eye witness description. It tells how large cart loads of tin were brought to the island.

Diodorus’s ‘\textit{Bibliotheca Historica}’ in the following passage relates to the Island of Ictis and the British tin trade: "\textit{We shall give an account of the British institutions, and other peculiar features, when we come to Caesar’s expedition undertaken against them, but we will now discuss of the tin produced there. The inhabitants who dwell near the promontory of Britain,}
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known as Belerium, are remarkably hospitable; and, from their intercourse with other people’s merchants, they are civilized in their mode of life. These people prepare the tin, in an ingenious way, quarrying the ground from which it is produced, and which, though rocky, has fissures containing ore; and having extracted the supply of ore, they cleanse and purify it, and when they have melted it into tin ingots (Astragali), they carry it to a certain island, which lies off Britain, and is called Ictis. At the ebbing of the tide, the space between this island and the mainland is left dry and then they can convey the tin in large quantities over to the island on their wagons. A peculiar circumstance happens with regard to the neighbouring islands, which lie between Europe and Britain, for at flood tide, the intermediate space being filled up, they appear as islands; but at ebb tide, the sea recedes, and leaves a large extent of dry land, and at that time, they look like peninsulas. Hence the merchants buy the tin from the natives, on Ictis and carry it over into Gaul (Galatia); and in the end after travelling through Gaul on foot about a thirty days journey, they bring their wares on horses to the mouth of the river Rhone.”

Diodorus is witnessed to be quoting from Posidonius. Pliny, who wrote circa 50 AD on the subject of Ictis, quotes from Timaeus who was contemporaneous with Pytheas.

It is evident that over the period of four hundred years when these Greek and Latin speaking historians were recounting Pytheas’ exploits, mostly second or third hand, an inaccurate account has been passed down about an island that traded tin. The only inaccuracy in Diodorus’ account is obviously a mix up with the ‘Channel islands’ as being in the same group where Ictis is located. Diodorus has conflated these ‘neighbouring islands’ as being in the proximity of Ictis. The word “near” when referring to neighbouring islands has made it impossible to find a relative location on the South West coast of Devon and Cornwall.

The most probable explanation of this confusion is that it is a combination of Pytheas’ original eye witness account combined with that of
a later trader who gives account of passing the Channel Islands or even Pytheas’ original mentioning other islands nearby. There is no location which fits Diodorus’ description on the coast of Devon and Cornwall i.e. no conglomeration of islands on the peninsula of Belerion. Pliny quotes Timaeus’ account of Pytheas’ voyage ‘six days sail inland from Britain, there is an island called Mictis in which white lead is found, and to this island the Britons come in boats of Osier covered with sewn hides’.

Pytheas, sailing from Ushant, made the southern tip of Cornwall. Diodorus’ quotes from Posidonius who travelled in Britain around 80BC and describes the metal workers of Belerion carrying their tin to a certain Island called Ictis which acted as a great trading post for merchants. Ictis was the central point from which tin was sold until the Roman invasion. At this time accounts given by Strabo show that Ictis and its location was actively being sought out by the Romans in order to plunder it.

Pytheas as a ships navigator had mastered the use of the "Gnomon," an instrument similar to the hexante or Sextant as it is known today. This instrument was used by Phoenician and Greek navigators since very early times and Pytheas used it to calculate the latitude of Massalia, which he found to be 43' 11' N, almost matching the exact figure of 43' 18'N where Marseilles is in fact situated. It was a committee of merchants from Marseilles that engaged the services of Pytheas to undergo his voyage of discovery. He was a renowned mathematician of that city, who was already famous for his measurement of the declination of the ecliptic, and for the calculation of the latitude of that city, by a method which he had recently invented of comparing the height of the gnomon or pillar with the length of the solstitial shadow.

The important fact is that Pytheas in 325 BC, is capable of working out latitude. This can only be done by appreciating that the nautical mile measure is one sixtieth of a degree. Now, if Pytheas knows of this measurement it would be ludicrous to think that someone in the sixth century AD called Melkin known as a geometer and astronomer does not understand the same unit of measurement. If you are an extremely competent mathematician and can see polaris, you can work out a distance
between two points i.e. Avebury and Burgh Island and one could work out the height of Avebury above sea level.

The only reason I bring this up now is that many sceptics do not realize that the ancients, like us, are constrained to the same unit of measurement, defined by the size (circumference) of the earth. Thus there are sixty nautical miles to one degree and it is the only natural division of measurement, given that there are 360 degrees in a circle and our earth is defined by its circumference. A nautical mile is 6076 feet or 1852 meters.

The earth measures 21,600 nautical miles in circumference. A nautical mile is equal to one minute of arc of a great circle. All navigators or mathematicians at whatever time they lived, lived on this same earth and its size has not changed. Therefore there has always been only one immutable measurement which subdivides the earth at its circumference. This is the nautical mile of which there are 60 in one degree. Melkin who gives us instructions to Burgh Island as the resting place of Joseph of Arimathea, uses this same unit of measurement as it cannot change over time. It is a function of measurement of the circumference of our earth and the only unit to define distance between two points on this earth’s circumference using star sights and planetary bodies.

Ictis is a single Island in Pytheas’ account. However one might view the confusion of the plurality of Islands; we know that Pytheas is talking of a singular Island called Ictis to which wagons cross over when the tide recedes which sells tin.
The Belerion mentioned by Pytheas is most likely defined as the southern promontory of Great Britain commencing with Salcombe in South Devon. This ‘promontory’ stretching to Land’s End geographically adheres to Pytheas’ description. We can therefore understand his definition of the south west peninsula or ‘promontory’ as a description derived by a Navigator. There is also the fact that the name of Belerion tends to suggest the area defined by a people and that same area would then latterly become known as Dumnonia which included both Devon and Cornwall. Incidentally, the chronicler Ptolemy says this area was populated by the Hebrews and may well be the origin of the name of Belerion derived from the God Bel. They were being defined by a people: ‘the natives of this promontory area more than the norm, being ‘friendly to strangers’. Just west of the entrance into Salcombe estuary, about 2.5 miles west of ‘Bolt tail’, there lies a small island called Burgh Island which fits Pytheas’ description exactly.
The Island of Ictis as it appeared in 1918 and relatively unchanged since Pytheas first visited. This was known in the British tongue as the ‘Island of White Tin’ and is synonymous with the Ineswitrin on the 601 charter. Note approximately 5 buildings on the Island (5 cassates).³⁷⁰ Pliny, who is using Timaeus as a source says, “there is an island named Mictis where tin is found, and to which the Britains cross”. He uses the word ‘proveniat’ which commentators have assumed as meaning that Tin was actually mined on Ictis. The real meaning is ‘provend’ as a supplier which matches the concept of ‘Emporium’ found in other accounts describing Ictis. Diodorus writes that tin is brought to the island of Ictis, where there is an Emporium, literally being translated as a ‘marketplace or agency’ and this is the definition which defines the role of Ictis. Diodorus relates that Ictis was dry at low water and “the natives conveyed to it wagons, in which were large quantities of tin”. The fact that Burgh Island is connected by a causeway at low tide, across which these wagons could convey the tin are the essential facts relayed by Pytheas himself.

The fact that large quantities of tin at this stage in 350BC and more specifically before that, was produced in Devon can be seen archeologically. It makes little practical sense to think that the Isle of Wight or Hengistbury
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point or Thanet are even viable candidates for the island of Ictis as proposed by previous commentators.

It is known that tin mining had first started in between the Erm and Avon estuary in the early British Bronze Age. There is ample archaeological evidence to show that tin streaming existed on the moors behind South Brent at Shipley Bridge on the Avon c.1600BC not far from Burgh island.

The Island of Ictis, first heard of in the chronicles of the ancient writers, was probably coined from the Greek *ikhthys* meaning fish, because up until recently Burgh Island was renowned for the shoals of pilchards that congregated naturally around it in Bigbury Bay. We can speculate that Pytheas referred to the Island as *ikhthys* island or ‘fish island’ i.e. Ictis Island. The shoals of pilchards in the bay were legendary well into the 18th century. Fishing fleets are recorded to have made catches of 12 million fish in a single day. The pilchards were cured with salt and were either pressed for oil or shipped by the barrel load to Europe. It seems extraordinary that the one Island described by Pytheas as ‘Fish Island’ and renowned for its huge shoals that sometimes darkened the whole bay, would not be associated with the Greek word *ikhthys*. Especially, being the only tidal island which dries out with a sand spit on the southern promontory as described by Pytheas (apart from St Michael’s mount in Cornwall).

More importantly it is situated just 10 miles from the huge alluvial tin deposits that existed on southern Dartmoor which prompted the name in old British. The island was called Ineswitrin in the language spoken in Dumnonia in the time of Melkin. If we accept the old English name of Melkin’s Ynis Witrin is synonymous with *Insula Avallonis* (only because the name was changed/substituted by Henry), and this island is where Joseph the tin merchant is buried; if we can then establish this island as the Island of Ictis which then links to Joseph and his tin mining affiliation.... we can accept more easily how it is that he is buried there with something Melkin refers to as the *duo fassula*. As we have covered, there seems to be no doubt that Ynis pertains to ‘Island’ in old English, but if the name ‘Witrin’ were derived from an island known as ‘white tin’ from the Old English *hwit* for white, we have a solid connection with tin.

The reasoning behind the appellation of ‘White tin’ is based upon the ancient world’s fascination with tin’s shininess. Tin is a metal as well as
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being an alloy which adds to copper to make a much harder bronze. Tin is shiny and the ancients termed this shininess as ‘white’ which is clearly seen in the French and Latin terms for tin. The French termed it *fer-blanc* (or white iron). Pliny’s Latin refers to tin as *plumbum album*, *(or white lead)*. We can see the primitive association of shiny with ‘white’ and can understand the provenance of how a known metal became ‘shiny lead’ or ‘shiny iron’. The origin is unknown for the English word ‘tin’ i.e. no-one has understood any etymological connection for our present day English word ‘tin’. It is quite feasible that an *r* was dropped from ‘trin’ to give ‘tin’ and hence ‘white trin’ is contracted to ‘witrin’.

It is not unfounded to posit this explanation for the provenance of the name Witrin if the island donated in the 601 charter is synonymous with Pytheas’ Ictis. The fact that Pytheas’ island is on the ancient promontory of Belerion which was later known as the equivalent area of Dumnonia would suggest why its King donated the island to Glastonbury. The island of Ineswitrin was never anything to do with Glastonbury’s location. Nor was Melkin’s Island which unequivocally is situated in Devon by the solution to the data provided in the prophecy as seen in the next chapter. This will become clearer as we progress and understand the separate agenda’s of Henry Blois.

There is little doubt that the 601 charter existed and is genuine as related by Malmesbury. In fact William of Malmesbury originally started his proof of Antiquity for Glastonbury starting with the 601 charter which now constitutes chapter 35 of DA. As I have explained, Ineswitrin is identified to pertain to Glastonbury simply because of the etymological contortion pulled off by the author of the *Life of Gildas*....where we are led to believe Ineswitrin is identified as the old name of Glastonbury.

The fact that it was Henry Blois who changed Witrin to Gutrin to more suggest the Glass of Glastonbury in the explanation found in the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas*, *(which differed from the name seen on the charter)*, indicates someone is trying to convince us of something which is not true. If we also consider that Joseph of Arimathea was never mentioned before Henry’s arrival at Glastonbury, and nor was Ineswitrin, it suggests Henry is the cause of this confusion between Avalon and Ineswitrin and both of their spurious connections to the location of Glastonbury.
Now, this gets further complicated by the fact Henry reverses his original need to convince us that the charter pertains to the Island Glastonbury when, later, after 1158.... Henry undertakes to hide the body of King Arthur to be discovered in Avalon (in the future). It then becomes important for Henry Blois to reverse his initial need of Ineswitrin to be equitable as the old name for Glastonbury.... and subsequently convince us that Glastonbury is now Avalon. This will become much clearer when we cover the chapter on DA. But, if we remember Avallon is named from the French town and is ‘Geoffrey’s’ invention in HRB (where Arthur supposedly died), it should not be difficult to grasp that the interpolator of DA is the person who tells us where to look to find Arthur’s body.

Henry Blois also provides us with a cross which planted in King Arthur’s manufactured gravesite at Glastonbury which confirms the name of the location as Avalon. For the moment we must continue with the present evidence which shows why Joseph is buried on this island, because of its connection to tin.

In a recent discovery on the Eastern shore at Wash Gully, 300 yards off the coast on the approaches to the Salcombe estuary, divers recently uncovered 259 copper ingots, a bronze leaf sword and 27 tin ingots. The wreck of an old trading vessel found there, dates from around 900BC and measures 40ft long and is constructed from timber planks. It is thought to have been powered by a crew of 15 seamen with paddles. This indicates like the evidences on Dean Moor just above the island that there was a tin trade prior to Pytheas' era. There is more physical archaeological evidence along this small stretch of coast, between the mouth of the river Erm and Salcombe, which adds credibility to Burgh Island being synonymous with Ictis and its links with the tin industry. The archeological evidence indicates that there was considerable trade in tin ore being shipped abroad from an early period. The tin trade must have been seriously interfered with by Julius Caesar's expeditions in 55 and 54 BC. The recent find of tin ingots at the mouth of the River Erm 2.5 miles distant from Burgh Island should confirm it as the ancient island of Ictis and its link with the tin trade. Especially with Strabo’s concise account of how these ingots arrived in their present location, inshore of the reef just a short distance from Burgh Island.

Strabo relates the fact that the people who controlled the Island of Ictis took great pains to hide the business of the island from Roman vessels seen
on that part of the coast. Late in Ictis’ history, with the emerging Roman Empire trying to get their hands on as much tin as possible, it proved necessary, in its final century of trading, to conceal the active trade of the island as so much tin was being stored there.

Strabo relates: ‘Now in former times it was the Phoenicians alone who carried on this commerce for they kept the voyage a secret from everyone else. At one time when the Romans were closely pursuing a certain Phoenician ship-captain in order that they too might uncover the tin markets in question, jealously guarding the secret, the ship-captain drove his ship on purpose off its course into shoal water; and after he had lured his pursuer into the same ruin, he himself escaped by a piece of wreckage and received from the State the value of the cargo and what he had lost. Still, by trying many times, the Romans learned all about the voyage.’

Strabo tells us of a Phoenician trading vessel whose captain lured a Roman pursuing vessel onto a reef. The fact that the only evidence we are likely to find of the outcome of such an account appears as archaeological evidence today and so close to the Island we are identifying as Ictis…. should be a strong case in favour of Burgh Island’s identification as the ancient location of Ictis.

Strabo’s vessel, obviously on its return voyage home just having left from the “Tin Isles”, while being followed by a Roman vessel and unable to elude it; duly steered into the reef at the mouth of the river Erm which caused the sinking of both vessels on a shoal. This endeavour, as we saw in the passage earlier, was to maintain the secrecy of the location of Ictis. The only thing we could hope to find are ingots inshore of a reef nearly 2000 years later and this is what the divers found. The ingots were spread inshore of the rocks just as a moving sinking vessel would distribute them as it sank after having had its own keel ripped out by the partially submerged reef.

Now, there would be no point in this selfless deed unless of course the captain was seen heading to seaward from the proximity of Ictis. He must have been fully laden because he was on a return journey to his home port and hence the cargo mentioned by Strabo. If overhauled and captured, the Phoenician captain would have difficulty explaining, being laden with ingots in close proximity to an island…. without the Roman deducing this was the Island which sold tin.
If the Phoenician was somewhat distant from the island and then captured, he might convince the Roman that Ictis was at any location. But to be seen heading to seaward departing from what looks to be a Lee shore and in close proximity to an island, would surely have made a Roman captain suspicious.... if he had indeed survived to tell the tale or captured the Phoenician captain with his cargo.

This caption shows the white water at the head of the river Erm caused by the submerged rocks. These are called West Mary’s rocks onto which the Phoenician pilot ran his vessel. The image also shows the proximity of these rocks where the ingots were found to the fabled Island of Ictis situated in Bigbury Bay. The captain of the Phoenician vessel, whose own life was preserved, was rewarded by his countryman or the agency on the island for managing to maintain the secrecy of the island.

Under normal circumstances, it is very strange that a trading vessel laden with a cargo of tin ingots, having just left the coast would fall upon the tidal Mary’s rocks at the mouth of the Erm estuary. The only explanation to why the ingots are inshore of the reef can reasonably be explained by Strabo’s account. If we have located Ictis, (as Melkin later confirms), it seems extraordinary for a cache of ingots to be found which correlates with Strabo’s ancient record. Logically, why would a vessel set out in foul conditions after having loaded a cargo only to fall prey to rocks which are sometimes covered depending on the state of the tide. Especially on the river mouth next to the island from which one had just set sail.
Strabo’s account explains the archaeological find of astralagi dating from that period. Strabo’s report that this island was held in such high esteem by the Phoenicians as an Island from which tin was obtained witnesses that Ictis was probably kept secret to avoid plunder. It is why the vault itself within the island was never discovered. The Island remained unexposed to Roman discovery and takeover as Strabo indicates until the era of Joseph of Arimathea.

It is probable that the early wagoner’s who brought the tin down to the island mentioned by Diodorus would be a detail mentioned by Pytheas and it is strangely coincidental that the only wagon pin found in Devon is only a couple of miles from the island.... and on an old track way leading up to where the tin was found at Shipley bridge and Dean Moor. The island’s monopoly and establishment as the most convenient place from which to export came about by its proximity to the tin source. Another major factor is the islands ease of navigation to land on the spit at all states of tide i.e. for the foreign tin traders to land onshore.

The word ‘Emporium’ (used in a description of Ictis) indicates that Ictis acted as a market, which indicates some sort of central agency, trading post or even monopoly from which the tin was traded. This would make sense practically, understanding that a trading vessel would not want to wait around for the tin to be brought down from the various tin streamers high up on the moors, or from miners in the various river valleys i.e. Ictis is a central delivery and pick up point below Dartmoor.

This leads to a natural conclusion that Ictis maintained some sort of vault or storage area from which tin was dispersed as trading vessels arrived. This would also concur with the ‘wagon loads’ being transported ‘to’ the island of Pytheas’ eye witness account. Vessels arriving from abroad could expedite their business by landing and loading on the sand causeway and if the winds were fair, return home without a long wait in the anchorage at Bantham.
The island of Ictis acted as the main tin agency for the western peninsular of England, declining from around 50BC until its closure due to Roman encroachment. Until that point, miners up on Dartmoor would have found it very difficult to deliver to the coast as demand dictated, without an agency on the shore to deal with the comings and goings of foreign vessels. There is no question that the tin was traded with Europe.... the Greek historian Herodotus in the 5th century B.C, referring to the tin trade. Herodotus in book 3 referring to the ‘Isles in the west’ says ‘I cannot speak with certainty nor am I acquainted with the islands called the Cassiterides from which tin is brought to us....it is never the less, certain that both our tin and our amber are brought from these extremely remote regions, in the western extremities of Europe’.

Ptolemy, writing c.140 A.D. says of the British Isles, ‘they were peopled by descendants of the Hebrew race who were skilled in smelting operations and excelled in working metals’. Biblical records recording the use of tin as far back as the ‘coming out of Egypt’ with Moses; ‘Tubal-Cain the instructor of
every artificer in works of brass and Iron’, and the building of the first Temple.

Ictis might have had an ancient heritage, but at some stage evolved into its role as a market place or pick up point for foreign vessels. Ictis’ central agency, originally determined by geographical convenience; dissolved, as the industry changed or as the Roman’s search for the tin island became ever closer to discovery as we saw in Strabo’s account.

Ictis contains what probably can be likened to one of the first bank vaults to ever exist…. an old cave where the Ingots were stored for collection. As such it would allow the miners to bring their tin down from the moors when they wished and the foreign traders to purchase their ingots at their arrival point. To store this quantity of tin in one location needed some sort of security from plunder and therefore the vault was built to secret the tin on the island. It is the old tin vault which then became Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb and to which Melkin’s instructions lead us to.

If Ictis is the ‘White Tin’ island of Ineswitrin in Devon and Ictis is synonymous with Burgh Island; the information that Melkin later provides by geometrical precision which leads us to this island and Joseph’s connection with the tin trade…. and the fact that Melkin shows us that Joseph’s tomb exists there…. should under normal circumstances indicate to the scholastic community that the island needs to be archaeologically investigated.

Barry Cunliffe who wrote about Ictis has fixated upon Mount Batten in Plymouth as the location for Ictis. He refers in his book to the wreck site which produced the find of the tin ingots in the mouth of the Erm River. By the caption above we can see it is in clear sight of Burgh Island…. which to any perceptive investigator might be a match for Diodorus’ description. But, Cunliffe does not even mention Burgh Island. This is because there is no superficial archaeological evidence on the island.

The archaeological community’s ignorance of the part the island played in secreting and storing the tin is the reason there is no evidence of its role as a storage facility. For archaeologists to investigate they must first understand how the island operated. The scholastic community which denies Melkin’s existence (and hence the directional data in his prophecy) has led to the assumption that any burial place of Joseph is fictitious. This is
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of course is true relative to Glastonbury, but not to the vault secreted 50ft under Burgh island which became Joseph’s tomb.\(^ {373} \)

It was the community at Folly Hill just above Bigbury on Sea which operated Ictis as a storehouse and mart for tin.... due to its close proximity for loading tin ingots onto foreign vessels. The island remained uninhabited so as not to draw attention to pillagers. There would be no community which has left archaeological evidence of dwelling on the island itself. As the charter shows, in 601AD there were only five cottages on it long after Joseph had been buried there.
The Folly Hill site just above Burgh Island which is being archeologically excavated shows evidence of a large community living along the hillside from the present Bigbury Golf course to the other side of what used to be the cart route down from the tin deposits on the moors. Bronze Age pits were uncovered underneath the Iron Age surfaces and have been dated by ceramics. Only a small area along this ridge at Folly Hill has been archeologically surveyed, but there is evidence through high resolution ‘magnetic gradiometry’ and from surface evidence that a large community lived along the ridge. This was probably the community which controlled and operated the Ictis trade. Presently the archaeological excavation has dated the site to around 300BC through to approximately 300 AD and shows evidence of extensive trade with the continent, but what is most interesting is the find of some locally made granite clays and these are surely evidence of the earlier culture that initially set up Ictis.

In 2003 a component of an Iron-age ‘Linch-pin’ was found south west of the iron-age hill fort of ‘Blackdown Rings’. No other iron-age finds have been found in the area, which indicates that the cart pin was lost ‘en route’ down from Shipley Bridge to Ictis. The Pin is of the Kirkburn type and dated to around 300BC. Where this pin was found is right next to the oldest road down from the alluvial tin deposits on Southern Dartmoor which leads to
the tidal road in Aveton Giford…. the same track that the wagons took to get to Ictis.

Just as Pytheas had said, carts brought the tin to the tidal beach. The use of carts is rare in the hilly terrain of Devon, compared with the rest of the country and for the most part, pack horses were used. So this really is a singular link to the usage of carts in a prehistoric period. The Devon Archaeological Society goes on to say in their report: ‘The Loddiswell find is the only example known so far in Devon of a piece of equipment which can with reasonable confidence be attributed to the prehistoric chariot or cart. It therefore provides the earliest evidence in the county for the use of a wheeled vehicle.

There is strong evidence to indicate that Burgh Island is the ancient Ictis…. and that Melkin’s island which has been given the name Insula Avallonis…. is in reality the ‘White Tin island’ of Ineswitrin donated to Glastonbury by the King of Devon. As we progress we shall understand all the reasons which clearly show that Henry Blois has substituted the name of Ineswitrin on the prophecy of Melkin. Posterity has received Melkin’s prophecy with all its attributes in what it intended to point out i.e. the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea. The crucial difference now is that the prophecy of Melkin names the fictional island of Avallonis, invented by the muses of Henry Blois in HRB.

If we can accept that Henry Blois changed the name on the Melkin prophecy so that it coincided with the name of island where Arthur was taken after Camblan, I shall also show in progression how it is that we can be certain that the Prophecy of Melkin existed in Henry Blois’ era and that he in fact saw it. Let us, for the moment, see why Melkin says that Joseph of Arimathea is buried on this Devonian Island.
Chapter 17

The Prophecy of Melkin

*Insula auallonis auida funere paganorum, pre ceteris in orbe ad sepulturam eorum omnium sperulis propheciae vaticinantibus decorata, & in futurum ornata erit altissimum laudantibus. Abbadare, potens in Saphat, paganorum nobilissimus, cum centum et quatuor milibus domiicionem ibi accepit. Inter quos ioseph de marmore, ab Armathia nomine, cepit sompnum perpetuum; Et iacet in linea bifurcata iuxta meridianum angulum oratori, cratibus*

The Isle of Avalon, greedy for the death of pagans, more than the rest of the world, for the entombment of them all, decorated beyond all others by the spheres of portentous prophecy. In the future, adorned shall it be by them that praise the Most High. Abbadare mighty in Saphat, noblest of pagans, has found sleep with 104 other knights there. Among these Joseph of Arimathea has found perpetual sleep in a marble tomb, and he lies on a two forked line next to the southern angle of an oratory, where wattle is prepared above the mighty maiden and where the aforesaid Thirteen spheres rest. Joseph has with him in his sarcophagus two vessels, white and silver, filled with the blood and sweat of the prophet Jesus. When his tomb is discovered, it will be seen whole and untouched and will be open to the whole world. From then on those who dwell in that noble Island shall lack neither water nor the dew of heaven. A long time before the Day of Judgment in Josaphat; open shall these things be and told to the living.

Above is an acceptable translation of the cryptic set of phrases making up Melkin’s Prophecy. It foretells of the Island of Avalon, upon which, the discovery of Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb will be found in the future. It is commonly understood that the reference to duo fassula means that two vessels are to be found also in the tomb. It refers to Judgement day in the future, so one assumes this is how it became known as a prophecy. It was written by a man who knew where a tomb was located on a specific island. He was not a prophet but merely left a cryptic message for posterity in a set of instructions which, if understood and followed, determine where the Island is located. What seems to be a prophecy about events surrounding the discovery of the tomb is more a prediction of the consequence of two bodies being discovered. It was written by a man who knew what the tomb contained and it is not a fourteenth century fake as considered by modern

---

374 This theory was first discovered by Kim Yale and Goldsworthy.
scholars. Rather it should be considered as having accompanied the 601 AD charter to Glastonbury. In 2012 Kim Yale discovered the meaning which was encoded in the prophecy in ‘Melkin’s Prophecy Decoded’. I have used much of his material in this chapter.

John of Glastonbury replicated the Melkin prophecy in his ‘Conica’. The understanding today is that the prophecy, and Melkin himself, are a fourteenth century invention i.e. a forgery. This theory is largely based upon the fact that Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Avalon is known to be fictitious and it is considered that fraud was carried out at Glastonbury by Henry de Sully in the production of King Arthur’s grave. This is viewpoint is incorrect, because Henry Blois is responsible for the manufacture of King Arthur’s grave between the pyramids as stated in DA before his death.

When we consider the accuracy of the resultant geometry and when we follow the precise instructions of Melkin’s prophecy, modern scholarship’s deduction is falsely based on an erroneous premise. This position however, has been taken by experts who have no understanding that the prophecy is a cleverly constructed riddle. Scholars have based their assumptions on the fact that there was no previous tradition of Joseph at Glastonbury prior to the Great Fire in 1184. This position is incorrect as we will cover in the chapter on DA. But, it would be accurate to say that there was no stated tradition of Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury before Henry Blois.

Henry’s inception of Avalon in HRB was then later embellished into William of Malmesbury’s DA. Henry Blois has substituted Insula Avallonis for Ineswitrin on the extant fragment of Melkin’s prophecy to fit with his agenda which locates his fictitious Island of Avalon at Glastonbury. As we shall see in progression, Henry Blois is responsible for Glastonbury assuming the name of Avalon by a confirmation found written on the cross at Arthur’s disinterment which leads us to believe that where Arthur’s remains were discovered is the geographical Avalon mentioned in HRB.

Joseph of Arimathea, through Henry Blois’s interpolations in DA and through the name change of the Island on which he is buried, became attached to Glastonbury lore. The name of Ineswitrin was substituted for Avallonis on Melkin’s prophecy by Henry Blois which falsely relates to Joseph’s tomb on Avalon…. simply because there is no real geographical ‘Avallon’ except in Burgundy.
It is thought Avalon’s association with Glastonbury has only occurred since the discovery of Arthur in 1190-91. This position is hardly tenable considering *Insula Pomorum*’s association with Glastonbury c.1156-7 (or as most commentators believe- 1155 when VM was being written). Through spurious lore planted in William of Malmesbury’s interpolated DA, which not only corroborates the invention of Avalon in HRB and confirms Arthur’s association with Glastonbury as posited in *Life of Gildas* (c.1139-40) and it also confirms that Joseph came to Glastonbury in DA, which I think unlikely.

We can establish all interpolation was done after William of Malmesbury’s death and most interpolations were inserted before Henry’s death; and some are as early as 1144. Some interpolations in DA were made after Henry’s death but we shall look at DA in detail in a later chapter.

The final summation or coalescing of Henry’s agendas are witnessed in the interpolation which constitutes the first two chapters of DA. We can
conclude that this particular material was written after Henry’s return from Clugny sometime after 1158…. after VM had been written at Clugny. As the reader will remember, Henry was opining the 19 years of his brother’s reign in VM.

However, Joseph’s introduction and establishment into Glastonbury lore comes in interpolated passages which sets up a historical scenario (or plausible background) for his sudden appearance in lore. Joseph’s only verifiable connection with Glastonbury was that the prophecy of Melkin, in which his name is mentioned, was found at Glastonbury along with the 601 AD grant of Ineswitrin while Henry was abbot. Joseph is introduced into DA as follows: While preaching in the region of the Franks, as narrated by Freculf, Philip chose and ordained twelve disciples, whom he put in charge of his beloved friend, Joseph of Arimathea, who buried the Lord. In the sixty-third year of the Incarnation, and the fifteenth of the Assumption of Mary, these missionaries arrived in Britain. They failed to convert the barbarous King, but obtained the concession of a swampy and forest-girt island, known to the natives as Iniswitrin.

What I should make clear is that the Prophecy of Melkin did exist in the time of Henry Blois and he not only used it as inspiration to create the mythical island where Arthur was taken in HRB, but also used the same notion as found in the original Melkin prophecy of a body being discovered in the future; which caused Arthur’s momentous disinterment after Henry’s death.

Henry Blois had stated in DA where the manufactured grave site of Guinevere and Arthur was situated. The Melkin prophecy’s greatest contribution to the muses of Henry Blois was that the duo fassula in the prophecy was the template for the creation of the Grail and hence its attachment to Joseph. The decoding of the prophecy could easily be likened to what became known as the Quest for the Grail.

Some features at Glastonbury were purposefully made to seem significant and were highlighted in DA as if they naturally correlated to certain words written in Melkin’s prophecy. The idea behind this was that Melkin’s prophecy, which foretold of Joseph’s tomb being uncovered, could only now conceivably be understood to be situated at Glastonbury.

A peculiarly detailed description of the construction of the church takes place to coincide with the ‘Wattle’ of Melkin’s cratibus. The oratorii of Melkin’s prophecy became synonymous with the Old church. Melkin’s
adorandam virginem also was made to equate with the old church and its dedication to the ‘Virgin Mary’. I shall cover the DA and the Glastonbury interpolations in GR3 at length further on. But, we should look upon the first 34 chapters of DA as having little to do with William of Malmesbury. The following chapters in DA (35 onwards) are relatively unadulterated and reflect Malmesbury’s true work.

Henry Blois had free rein in the DA to substantiate his fictitious island of Avalon from HRB and establish its synonymy with the island upon which Joseph was actually buried; the inspiration for which was taken from Melkin’s prophecy. This is how Henry Blois brings Arthur’s Island, Joseph’s burial island, and the new VM’s etymological Insula Pomorum…. all to be synonymous with Glastonbury. The VM’s transformation of an island, which previously in HRB had merely been mythical and without geographic position…. becomes identifiable with a location known for its apples i.e. in Somerset. This concocted aura which Henry created around Avalon was so that all his previous propaganda coalesced and posterity is led to believe that Avalon’s location was synonymous with Glastonbury. This is where Henry manufactured a grave where the bogus remains of King Arthur and Guinevere were going to be found.

Once the grave site was opened, Glastonbury was confirmed as Avalon by the ‘leaden cross’…. contrived as an epitaph found in the grave. After Henry Blois’ death, Avalon was deemed to be an old name for Glastonbury once DA gradually became more widely read. Most were convinced by corroborative interpolations which had previously been inserted into DA. As we shall discover when dealing with Eadmer’s letter…. the inspiration for employing the ‘Leaden cross’ and its placement in Arthur’s grave and what it accomplishes when uncovered, came from an idea Henry Blois had during the contention with Canterbury as witnessed in Eadmer’s letter. Therein is a reference to a lead tablet being described in St Dunstan’s grave. Henry mimics the cross found there in the same way for proof of King Arthur’s grave, as Canterbury had done proving Dunstan’s body was at Canterbury…. in establishing as proof that the body was never moved to Glastonbury.

At this point we should note how Henry Blois brings Arthur’s Island, Joseph’s actual burial island and the VM’s etymological Insula Pomorum all to be synonymous with Glastonbury. The VM transformation of an island in a location known for its apples i.e. Somerset, was implied so that all Henry’s
propaganda coalesced into the firm location of Glastonbury. We know John of Glastonbury takes his material from many sources and his rendition of the prophecy of Melkin is the only rendition left to posterity. It has Henry's own invention of Insula Avallonis replacing the original Ineswirin, which was the island originally stated on the genuine Melkin Prophecy. To highlight how Henry adapts his work from a previous standpoint (agenda), we can witness that he is the one who attempts to bring his invention of Avalon (from HRB) into line with his later post 1158 agenda with the introduction of Joseph lore. The previous agenda in 1144 he had wished Ineswirin to be understood as synonymous with Glastonbury so as to substantiate the 601 charter (which in effect establishes Glastonbury's antiquity).

The intention of Henry is achieved probably by his own later addition to a verse in VM which aligns Glastonbury with Insula Pomorum through Joseph. John of Glastonbury in his Cronica has an additional quote tacked onto the VM verse concerning Insula Pomorum. What is clear is that John of Glastonbury is quoting from an edition of VM which now makes Glastonbury into New Jerusalem by association with Joseph. It seems fairly obvious that this would have come from Henry's hand originally as he is guilty of the conversion of Avalon at Glastonbury. It is Henry who
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375 Arthurian Literature XV edited by James P. Carley, Felicity Riddy. We find that Watkin is on the trail to find out how it was that Avalon underwent a transformation: What then of Avalon? The author of the Vita Merlini stated that it was to the island of apples that Arthur was taken; in 1138 Geoffrey of Monmouth had already said that Arthur was taken to the Isle of Avalon to be healed (Incorrect. In EAW this is not stated). Thus it is clear that by 1150 (incorrect) the isle of Avalon and the isle of apples are considered to be identical, and here again we are on the verge of the identification of Avalon with Glastonbury. Finally, the connexion is made yet again when both Gerald of Wales and the interpolator of Malmesbury derive Avallo or Avalloc………. It may seem odd that the mythical isle of the Vita Merlini can be identified with an actual place. P.82. One would think that if Watkin was witnessing the ‘verge of identification of Avalon with Glastonbury’ in this period, Watkin would enquire who the abbot of Glastonbury was at that time and to whom was DA dedicated…. could he be the interpolator? Who was the patron of Gerald? How possibly, in Perlesvaus, is the chapel covered with lead etc. etc. The problem is endemic in Arthurian scholarship. If one does not recognise the evolution of HRB from Primary Historia to First Variant to Vulgate and one insists that any interpolation in DA is subsequent to Arthur’s supposed disinterment…. it is impossible to understand Henry Blois as the author of the Matter of Britain; especially, when Perlesvaus’ early date is denied, simply because the colophon which mentions Avalon and King Arthur and his wife is assumed to be only rationally possible after the disinterment. This assumption that Avalon only became synonymous with Glastonbury after the bogus unearthing of Arthur is a huge erroneous deductive presumption by modern scholars.
originally puts Joseph at Glastonbury by concocting the first two chapters of DA (his last insertion into DA).

John in chapter 2 of his Cronica repeats all Henry Blois’ propagandist bogus etymology found in either DA or Life of Gildas. He then goes on: *From these facts, then, it is clear why it is considered an island and why it is called both Avalon and Glastonbury. In praise of this Island a certain poet sang: (Verses). The island of Apples, which is called Fortunate, is truly named, for it brings forth all things of its own accord. It needs no farmers to till the fields and there is no cultivation save that which nature provides. It freely brings forth fertile stalks and grapes and apples born of precious seed in its forests. The earth nourishes all things as bounteous as tended land; one lives a hundred years or more*. This is just as it is written in VM, but then John continues as if still quoting from the ‘poet’ (an obvious reference to ‘Geoffrey’s’ VM):

‘This was the new Jerusalem, the faith’s refinement, a holy hill, celebrated as the ladder of Heaven. He scarcely pays the penalty of hell who lies buried here’.

This later addition, one can be sure, was tied up with Henry’s last agenda introducing the Joseph material into the first two chapters of DA. ‘New Jerusalem’ is not a concept relative to King Arthur. Henry is introducing the fact that Joseph is buried in Avalon and therefore we can understand the change of name on the Melkin prophecy from Ineswitrin to Avalon firstly to accommodate the future unearthing of Arthur and secondly so that Joseph is somewhere at Glastonbury also.

Henry Blois’ interpolation points out in DA that Arthur is buried at Glastonbury between the pyramids and buried with his wife .... long before the discovery of Arthur’s grave (as does Perlesvaus). Obviously, John did not concoct this addition himself, but is using as a source, a copy of VM which is no longer extant and which Henry had subsequently altered when introducing Joseph lore into DA.

Henry’s masterpiece of deception is in the transformation of his own invented ‘location-less’ Avalon in First Variant and Vulgate HRB into what the modern world now believes is the ancient island of Avalon.... now situated at Glastonbury. There is only one man who could make all the foundation blocks of his literary edifice combine.... while disguising his

---

hand under the name of William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Master Blehis amongst others.

William of Malmesbury may have only produced one copy of DA and presented it to Henry Blois for his approval as intonated in the prelude and dedication of DA. DA was dedicated and given to Henry Blois while Henry probably promised to make a copy for William of Malmesbury, but never did. It is possible also, (which I will cover in more detail later), that Henry obtained all of William of Malmesbury’s works after his death in 1143 from the abbey of Malmesbury as he had recently installed his own choice of abbot there.

Therefore, DA, in either case (whether at Malmesbury or in his own possession) was in Henry’s hands.... and he was free to reconstruct it as he wished: This island was at first called Yniswitrin by the Britons but at length was named by the English, who had brought the land under their yoke, Glastinbiry, either a translation into their language of its previous name, or after Glasteing of whom we spoke above. It is also frequently called the isle of Avalon, a name of which this is the origin. It was mentioned above that Glasteing found his sow under an apple tree near the church. Because he discovered on his arrival that apples were very rare in that region he named the island Avallonie in his own language, that is ‘Apple island’, for avalla in British is the same as poma in Latin. Or it was named after a certain Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters because of the solitude of the spot.377

Henry Blois wrote the life of Gildas. It is plain when we investigate Caradoc’s history in chapter 22 that he dies c.1130. What Henry Blois achieved writing Life of Gildas after Caradoc’s death in his name and impersonating him by using his name as a known Welsh chronicler is Arthur’s introduction to Glastonbury. Just as Arthur was mentioned in other genuine saints’ lives such as the Vita Cadoci and the life of St Efflam.... the format of saints’ lives was mimicked by the construction of Life of Gildas. Arthur appears in Vita Cadoci as uncontrolled and tyrannical and in other saints’ lives as rebellious. But in Life of Gildas he becomes slightly more chivalric, akin to the Arthur of HRB. Arthur is brought into association with Glastonbury through the abduction episode, but the manuscript’s

---

377 John Scott, DA. Ch.5
initial intent was to place Gildas at Glastonbury which in effect provides a date in antiquity with which the abbey might be associated.

Henry finished the *Life of Gildas* in the same era as composing the *pseudo historia*. The spat between Glastonbury and Canterbury had existed before Henry’s arrival in 1126, but was made worse by him personally as we shall cover later when we look at Eadmer’s letter. However, the enmity grew personally between Theobald of Bec and Henry from 1139 onward and the contention of the whereabouts of Dunstan’s relics which encouraged the proof of the antiquity of Glastonbury i.e. the writing of DA.... became of prime importance and thus was followed by the further polemic concerning another of Henry Blois’ domains found in HRB. That concerned the antiquity of Winchester. HRB establishes a monastic institution at Winchester in the time of Constans.

As I have maintained, Henry inserted the last sentence in *Life of Gildas* to fulfil a separate agenda which convinced others the 601 charter was genuine by locating the unknown whereabouts of Ineswitrin as being synonymous with Glastonbury. (How could the Island of Witrin be an estate given to the old church on which it was situated?).

This controversy which began as a contention of Antiquity through Osbern’s accusation, became a contention regarding primacy after William of Malmesbury had died as Henry pursued his goal of metropolitan for the south west of England. The final sentence in the *Life of Gildas* as we have covered, establishes synonymy between Glastonbury and Ineswitrin: *Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin (made of glass). But after the coming of the English and the expulsion of the Britons, that is, the Welsh, it received a fresh name, Glastigberi, according to the formation of the first name, that is English glass, Latin vitrum, and beria a city; then Glastinberia, that is, the City of Glass.*

The 601 charter which refers to the Devonian Island in William’s GR3 and DA is anciently dated and therefore, because the charter can be produced and is ancient.... it becomes the ultimate proof of antiquity. From that time forward (in name alone) *Yniswitrin* is trans-located to Glastonbury by ‘Caradoc’s’ etymological late addition as we have discussed.

It is only much later after the composition of VM that *insula Avallonis* and *Insula Pomorum* became synonymous with Glastonbury. Henry’s various interpolations comprising the first 34 chapters of William’s DA also
confirms Glastonbury as Avalon. From different sources, DA is employed to corroborate and interlock the various foundation blocks of Henry's literary 'edifice of illusion' which focus's Glastonbury as Avalon. Henry's agendas evolve during his life and therefore it is made more difficult to see the relationships which make up the myth which constitutes Glastonbury lore.

In the past, it has been impossible to see the relationship between Ynis Witrin and Avalon without the understanding that Henry is the author of HRB and his involvement with the 601 charter. We then have to work out what relation Ineswitrin has to the Island where Joseph of Arimathea's body is buried. This must be followed by uncovering the relationship between Glastonbury and the Avalon of HRB and then follow how Melkin's Joseph of Arimathea is related to the chivalric Arthur from HRB in Grail literature. Finally, when we establish how Grail literature brings together Joseph of Arimathea, Arthur and Avalon and the Grail itself (which has its origin in the prophecy of Melkin as the duo fassula).... we find that through Henry's continental family connections in Marie of Champagne, we arrive at the reason Chrétien references Master Blehis and Robert de Boron Blaise as the fount from which information on the Grail originates. The pieces of a puzzle must be placed in position and placed in relation to each other to build a picture according to plan and therefore, we must, with much other evidence to follow, look to the architect, Henry Blois.

This is why the DA becomes so important in our investigation. We can also see Henry's work (rather than later interpolators) if we understand his agendas more. Rather than accepting that the tracts covered so far are fraudulent, faux-historic or interpolated, (as modern scholars accept).... we should be looking at the reasoning behind why this activity has taken place. From this, we may determine when for instance Brut y Brenhinedd was written.... as the Avalloc mentioned above in DA is Henry’s work. This associates Avalloc and his daughters with Ynys Afallach and thereby; the sisters coincidental introduction on Insula Pomorum in the VM, where Henry is seen to be linking Merlin to the Welsh Bardic tradition through Taliesin. Henry’s edifice is a web formed from his authorial prowess and his changing circumstance; designed from a devious mind which hid its identity from the public domain.

In later years, having stepped out of the role of the all-powerful knight bishop, occupied with affairs of state while brother to the King; Henry is reduced to employing his ingenuity and brilliance in the formation of a
literary edifice which constitutes a gratifying yet erroneous rewrite of History which becomes what is now known as the Matter of Britain

I have digressed here just to show in a brief way how it is that much of the corroborative evidences which substantiates disparate material is established or coalesced in DA... and this shows how important DA was to Henry as a fundamental part of the evolving illusion he composed. The DA locks many pieces of Henry’s jigsaw into place.

It is at a later point in Henry’s life (post 1158) when his intended insurrection against Henry II had not transpired (despite Henry Blois’ prophetical efforts), that he returned quietly to England, reduced in his power, and not in favour.... and under suspicion by the new King. It was under these circumstances that he started on his next great authorial feat.

Henry introduced Grail literature into the public domain both on the continent and in Britain. The foundation blocks in terms of ideas for Henry’s muses is based on Melkin’s prophecy and we can see evidence of the existence of the prophecy while Henry was alive by his endeavours to find Ineswitrin which we shall get to shortly. So, it is Melkin’s prophecy which links the Grail to Joseph and Henry’s concocted Grail stories which link to his concoction of the Chivalric Arthur of HRB. This finally brings us back to the subject in hand which is Joseph and his burial site on the Island of Avalon as stated in the only version of Melkin’s Prophecy to reach posterity.

The only certain mention of the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea existed with the set of instructions we find in the Melkin prophecy at the start of the chapter. These instructions are attested to have been written by a man called Melkin. However, Montacute is posited as Joseph of Arimathea’s burial site also; this information coming from Glastonbury but entirely separate from the prophecy itself. Certainly, this is not by coincidence as Montacute concurs with part of the instructional data elucidated from the solution to the cryptic prophecy. So, whoever posited that Joseph was ‘carefully hidden’ in Montacute had a definite knowledge of the solution to the Melkin prophecy and had decoded the prophecy.... or more probably....was responsible for constituting the prophecy of Melkin i.e. Melkin himself.

One can only surmise differing scenarios; Melkin planted this information regarding Montacute as a referential clue which would confirm the marking of the 104 mile ‘line’ to Joseph’s tomb (as the ‘line’
passes through Montacute). In which case, the association of Joseph’s burial site with Montacute must have been placed in a separate manuscript set apart from his prophecy. The only other deduction might have been that someone had decoded Melkin’s puzzle, but this is unlikely because Henry Blois (as will become apparent) physically searched at Montacute for the tomb of Joseph.

This search must have been based on the information supplied which cryptically mentioned Joseph’s ‘careful burial’ in connection with Montacute. Henry Blois does not know where the Island of Ineswitrin is located which the Melkin prophecy originally stated had Joseph’s remains buried on it, but Henry knows the island is real as it has the same name (before he changed it) as that found in the 601 charter regarding Ineswitrin.

Another possibility is that when the tomb is eventually opened it will be seen that the Turin cloth came from the tomb as posited by Kim Yale and this would imply that previously in history, (but after the death of Henry Blois), the tomb has been opened. Goldsworthy\(^{378}\) posited that it was the Templars who found the tomb by the connection that it was the granddaughter of the last ‘grand master’ who first produced the Turin cloth.

What will become clear is that the Melkin prophecy could not be a fourteenth century invention because the data within the prophecy itself, (which scholars could not unlock), in fact turns out to be a set of instructions. These instructions to the location of Joseph’s tomb are so precise that they identify Burgh Island (by measurement from two major landmarks) as the old tin island of Ictis which links to Joseph by the tin trade. Like the Dumnonian island of Ineswitrin, Burgh Island is located in Devon, just as our ‘Island of White tin’ or Ineswitrin is named as a consequence of its association with the tin trade.

Once Henry Blois is understood to have found Melkin’s work at Glastonbury, there seems to be three important pieces of this work which he employed while building his own literary edifice of rewritten history. Firstly, we may speculate that he based Merlin the prophet on Melkin\(^{379}\) having seen the prophecy and it may have been Henry Blois himself who termed it ‘Melkin’s prophecy’ as it is known today. I would assume the extract, as it exists, came from a larger work and I am suggesting it was

\(^{378}\) Michael Goldsworthy. *And did those feet.*

\(^{379}\) I posit this as his original Merlin Ambrosius from HRB not Merlin Sylvestris in VM, which Henry is obviously witnessed to be conflating with the Welsh Myrrdin.
Henry who extracted it and changed the name of Ineswitrin and substituted it with *Insula Avallonis*.

Secondly, there is no way that ‘Geoffrey’ is translating from an old book given him by Archdeacon Walter as recorded in HRB and there is no island named Avalon before ‘Geoffrey’.

Tatlock has established that HRB is a composition made up of many sources by the author. Not one scholar has ever recognised Henry Blois as author of HRB using ‘Geoffrey’ as a pen name. But, the idea for providing a semblance of an ancient source book upon which he fabricated the HRB, may have been based upon Melkin’s works. Melkin’s works may have been in a Brythonic tongue (if other works ever existed) but certainly the prophecy was written by Melkin in Latin as its obtuse directions would not have survived translation.

Henry Blois is the initial instigator of Grail literature in Britain and on the continent. But it is Henry Blois who associates Arthur with Joseph in Grail material. Material on Arthur, as Bale and Pits imply, in a book thought to have been written by Melkin i.e. the book titled *‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’* was obviously written by Henry Blois.... and this is where John of Glastonbury may have got some of his material from. Why, if there is no basis to connect Arthur to Melkin, have Pits and Bale associated Melkin’s name with Arthur? It is more likely that Henry Blois impersonated Melkin and composed the book Leland refers to.

However, let us return to the prophecy itself: Kim Yale explains the prophecy by interpreting the translation so that the intended instructions are revealed from the first part of the convoluted Latin puzzle:

*Island of Avalon, coveting the pagans in death, above all others in the world they are honoured for their entombment there before the circle of portentous prophesy (Avebury). In the future (the island) will be adorned by those that give praise to the highest. The father’s pearl, (Jesus) mighty in judgement the noblest of pagans (Jews), sleeps 104 miles from it (Avebury), by whom he received interment by the sea from Joseph named from Arimathea, and has taken his eternal rest there, and he lies on a line that is two forked between that and a meridian, in an angle on a coastal Tor, in a crater, that was already prepared.... and above is where one prays which one can go at*
the extremity of the verge; high up in Ictis is the place they abide to the south at thirteen degrees.

A conventional translation of the second half of the prophecy is as follows:

*Amid these Joseph in marble named from Arimathea has found perpetual sleep and he lies on a two-forked line next the south corner of an oratory fashioned of wattles for the adoring of a mighty Virgin. In his sarcophagus are two cruets, white and silver filled with the blood and sweat of the Prophet Jesus. When his sarcophagus shall be found entire and intact in time to come, it shall be seen and shall be exposed to the whole world. From that day forward water, nor the dew of heaven shall fail the dwellers in that ancient isle for a long while before the day of judgment in Josaphat. Fully uncovered shall these things be and declared to living men.*

The above implies that Joseph of Arimathea is buried somewhere in relation to the church of the Virgin at Glastonbury. This is due to the manoeuvrings of Henry Blois initially; but monks at Glastonbury have expanded upon Henry’s initial impetus by inventing further material after his death. This now makes it impossible not to believe that Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb is intricately linked by proximity to the church at Glastonbury.

Modern scholars have tended to discount Melkin for several reasons. The first and most obvious is that they do not understand that Melkin’s prophecy was intended as a riddle. The prophecy’s main *raison d’etre* was to indicate that Joseph of Arimathea was on an island called Ineswitrin and preserve this information into posterity. The problem is that the prophecy (now changed) starts: *Insula Avallonis*. Modern scholars have understood that HRB is a concoction. So, they have also deduced that the island of Avalon (which was never heard of before HRB) is an island of make believe…. existing in its first reference in a book which is known to be a composite concoction of a *faux*-history.

Researchers have never contemplated that the island name of Ineswitrin was substituted on the prophecy for the manufactured name *Insula Avallonis* by Henry Blois. The reason for the invention of a puzzle by Melkin
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was so that the Island and the contents it secreted would not be discovered, until such time as indicated in the puzzle itself.

One must assume that there would be no point in Melkin constructing a riddle which hides the location of an island in Devon if the monks at Glastonbury knew where it was. The exception to this is, if certain monks knew what the island contained and were guarding its secret at a point during the Saxon invasion. The most obvious solution to me would be that after an attack on the monastery which existed on Burgh Island, Melkin signed the island over to the monks at Glastonbury. Possibly certain monks were privy (like Worgrez who did not pass on the secret information). Yet, the works of Melkin or just the prophecy itself were found at Glastonbury. So the likelihood is that they were delivered at the time the 601 charter was signed as indicated by the personal reference (‘I, Bishop Maworn, drew up this deed. I, Worgrez, Abbot of the same place set my hand thereto’).

If Melkin was the King who was donating the Island, we then have to work out why he would invent a puzzle which in effect secreted the location yet stipulated the name on the charter. The simple answer is that under pressure from the Saxon invasion, the island was donated to the pre-West Saxon house of Glastonbury and the coded message was constructed in case an abbot like Worgrez was unable to convey his secret about what was contained on the island or where the island was located.

However, what someone knew or did not know at that period becomes irrelevant over the five hundred year time span which elapsed.... in which Melkin’s work gathered dust at Glastonbury.... until William of Malmesbury found it (as he did the 601 charter) and Henry Blois started reading Melkin’s words.

Certainly, someone back in 601AD knew of the secret contents of the tomb within the island and constructed the geometry to form Melkin’s puzzle. A set of instructional and directional data were created and incorporated into what appears to be a prophecy written by a madman. It in fact indicates with alarming accuracy, the location of the island on which it states that Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb is to be found.

The startling fact is that there are only two references to where the body of Joseph of Arimathea might be buried. Both places could only have been posited by someone who had knowledge of the meaning behind the puzzle. One of the locations is on an Island as we have covered, but another place where Joseph is rumoured to be ‘carefully buried’ is in Montacute. The only
way Henry Blois could have had foreknowledge of Montacute as being connected with the tomb of Joseph is if the name were given as a partial solution to the puzzle. Thus, in effect, Montacute is a marker point or even a confirmational clue to a point on the intended 104 nautical mile line posterity is instructed to find. This is stipulated by the geometry of Melkin’s riddle once the riddle is understood.

Therefore, some other manuscript named Montacute separately. This could only have been written by Melkin or someone who has knowledge of the 104 mile line we are instructed to construct in order to locate the Island. This might indicate that Melkin had other works at Glastonbury.... as Montacute is not mentioned in the prophecy itself. Any person who had not decoded the geometric line which is 104 miles long (i.e. by scribing it on a map of southern Britain), would not know it went through Montacute with such precision.

Henry Blois had been averted to the connection between Joseph’s burial place and Montacute and went in search of the tomb. This same information regarding Joseph and Montacute which was available to Henry Blois was passed down through generations at Glastonbury until the time of Father William Good in the era of the dissolution of the monasteries.

Modern scholars should re-consider (before consigning Melkin to fraudulent invention) and ask how it is that the only two locations relevant to Joseph’s burial place were both on manuscripts found at Glastonbury and both feature in the solution to Melkin’s riddle. They are both on the line, which, when constructed, indicates Burgh Island in Devon.... exactly 104 nautical miles from Avebury (sphaerula/circle) as intended by the puzzle. How is it that a key pointer to the solution (the hill of Montacute) is known before the fourteenth century if the prophecy is a forgery? We shall cover the Montacute search by Henry Blois shortly.

The real problem is that too much spurious and contradictory information has been written about Melkin by Prof James Carley. He and other commentators who believe his analysis and pretence of ‘expertise and scholarship’ concerning Melkin’s existence (and the content of his prophecy) should reconsider the speculative pronouncements on which their notoriety exists.

Further, it is alarming that those who profess to be knowledgeable about Glastonburyana, Arthuriana and Grail literature, having been mentored and submersed in this material for years have barely mentioned Henry
Blois’ name. One must assume the reason for professor Carley’s denial of the validity of Melkin and his prophecy is because he does not recognise Henry Blois’ hand in Grail literature or Henry Blois’ fraud in the composition of HRB and his interpolations into the first 34 chapters of DA. Carley has followers such as sub-deacon Paul Ashdown, who also pronounces on a subject he does not understand. I must point out most emphatically, Melkin never mentions Glastonbury as suggested by both ‘experts’.

Subdeacon Ashdown has this to say on the subject:

The enigmatic ‘Prophecy of Melkin’, included in the Chronica of the monk John ‘of Glastonbury’ (John Sheen) of 1342, which built upon the work of William of Malmesbury and Adam of Domerham. The previously unheard-of character of Melkin, who was ‘before Merlin,’ is presented in the same vaticinatory pseudo-Welsh tradition as the Arthurian seer (Merlin) as imagined by Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the Latin is therefore deliberately cryptic. Here we read for the first time of the burial of Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury, in a hidden tomb which will be revealed at a millennial future time before the Day of Judgement. He lies (as I have argued elsewhere) in a folded linen shroud, probably to be identified with that of Christ, and with two vessels containing (presumably one of each) Christ’s blood and sweat’.

The ‘bad archaeologist’ is singing from the same hymn sheet: The idea of a body being buried in a split garment rather than in a split line seems to make more sense to me.

Those ignorant of the meaning of Melkin’s in linea bifurcata seem to have an obsession with finding meaning behind the prophecy which they ironically determine is a fake.

Paul Ashdown continues to regurgitate the speculative concoctions of Prof. James Carley:

This rigmarole may well incorporate older elements but, in the form in which we have it, is datable to the aftermath of Edward I’s visit through the inclusion of the figure of Abbadare. As first suggested in 1981 by James Carley, he is to be identified with Baybars (in Arabic al-Malik al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars al-Bunduqdari), Sultan of Egypt and Syria, Edward’s formidable adversary during the Ninth Crusade, who had captured the fortress of Safed, Melkin’s ‘Saphat,’ (and with it the Galilee) from the Templars.
in 1266, and died of poisoning in July 1277, in the year before Edward’s visit to Glastonbury. I have argued elsewhere that Melkin’s reference originated in some satirical lay which had consigned the deceased Baybars and his paladins to one of the alternative Mediterranean, Oriental or Antipodean locations of an Avalon which has here been repatriated, along (uncomprehendingly) with the Sultan, to its British origin.

Included among the sleeping ‘pagans’ (i.e. in contemporary usage, Muslims), perhaps because of his status as a wealthy Jew, is Joseph of Arimathea. Although ‘Melkin’ is the oldest source to tell of his burial at Glastonbury, his tomb’s exact location is clearly regarded as an occult secret. It seems most unlikely that John Sheen was himself the author of the Melkin doggerel. Indeed, he seems to have been the first to confuse the mysterious linea bifurcata, which I have interpreted as a shroud, with some kind of esoteric line in church or churchyard.

Prof Carley is of course the source for the piffle about Baybars, but the ludicrous notion of Ashdown’s is even more ridiculous. Modern scholars accuse JG of the prophecy’s fabrication, but if John Sheen was the author of the Melkin prophecy (as some experts profess), why accuse Sheen of confusion over his own interpretation of linea bifurcata. John correctly understands the purport of the prophecy being relevant to determining where the grave is. Ashdown’s interpretation of a ‘shroud’ from a ‘bifurcated line’, found in an obviously geometrically encrypted puzzle, with measurements of length and angle, is preposterous. It is not worthy of consideration as it is passed off as learned deduction. John Sheen is exactly correct in recognising the line geometrically as an esoteric line and it is only through the contortions of Henry Blois and his interpolations into DA and GR3 (B version) that Sheen believes the linea bifurcata finds relevance with the old church.

The fact that William of Malmesbury did not mention Melkin is best explained by William’s distrust of fables. Why is it incumbent upon William of Malmesbury to include what he does not understand? If he had seen Melkin’s work and any mention of Joseph of Arimathea, he probably would have simply dismissed it. Any evidence he might have seen would have
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been written 500 years before his time. Perhaps there were no other works of Melkin.... but Bale and Pits attest there were. But given the title of one concerning the round table (De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda).... I suggest Henry is culpable of writing under Melkin’s name. In any case, William of Malmesbury probably would have discounted any mention of Joseph as mere fabrication, even if Iniswitrin was on the original prophecy and he had seen it with that name written thereon. The Melkin prophecy was too obtuse for Malmesbury to even consider mentioning Melkin or the prophecy.

It was the 601 charter alone which proved antiquity. The proof of antiquity for the Abbey was William of Malmesbury’s directive in the composition of DA as the title suggests. To William, the Melkin Prophecy was meaningless. There were saints and their relics at every religious house as it was good for business, but if William had seen Joseph of Arimathea’s name in connection with Britain (or Glastonbury) it would have been discounted. As we shall discover further on, it was not even William of Malmesbury who posited St. Philip as the apostle across the channel as witnessed in GR3 and DA.

The important key to unlocking Melkin’s riddle is the ‘bifurcated line’. The bifurcated line is where we are informed Joseph’s tomb lies, but there has to be two lines for one to bifurcate the other. It is the line which bifurcates the ‘Michael line’ which Melkin wants us to find and construct on a map. The point at which it bifurcates at Avebury is the solution of Melkin’s puzzle. The only line or marker that Melkin could guarantee would not be destroyed over millenia and would always exist.... is the alignment now known as the St. Michael line which runs across southern England. I will explain in progression how churches now exist on this line.

As Melkin’s intention was to provide a key, he used the ‘bifurcated line’ and its bifurcation point as a starting place from which a separate line would divide (at thirteen degrees) and act as a ‘pointer’ 104 nautical miles long to Burgh Island in Devon. The ancient alignment of the Michael line is the starting line, without which, the rest of the instructions in the prophecy could not be understood. The Michael line is made up of landscape features which include Avebury stone circle, Glastonbury tor, Burrow Mump, and the Hurlers, to name a few.\textsuperscript{383} We can understand the reference to a sperula

\textsuperscript{383}The Sun and the Serpent. Paul Broadhurst, Hamish Miller
which obviates the word ‘Sphaerula’ or circle and which pertains to Avebury stone circle, where the bifurcation occurs. These are immovable reference points on the British landscape which constitute a straight line that would not move overtime.

The Michael line, or as Melkin refers to it, ‘the English Meridium’ (*Meridium Anglum*) acts as Melkin’s line; which we are instructed to bifurcate. It is from within this prehistoric stone circle that Melkin directs us to Burgh island by way of completing the instruction.... and drawing the line 104 nautical miles long.

Those scholars who believe that this nautical mile measurement could not be made or understood in 600 AD by Melkin.... must forget that Pytheas in 325 BC could only arrive at deducing the Latitude of Marseille (which he did quite accurately) by using the nautical mile measurement.

There are just two numerical instructions in the Melkin prophecy. One is that we are to draw a line 104 miles long which bifurcates the original line within the Spherula (of Avebury). The angle at which the line is to be divided or bifurcated is thirteen degrees and this is Melkin’s other numerical instruction. If we carry out the instructions on a map, the line we are instructed to create coincidentally goes through ‘Devises.’

More pertinently, but definitely not coincidentally, it goes through Montacute.... a marker hill just like Glastonbury tor and Burrow Mump. At the end of the line stretching from Avebury to the coast, which is at thirteen
degrees to the Michael line.... exactly 104 nautical miles away is the Island of Ictis better known as Burgh Island or the Ineswitrin upon which Melkin says are the remains of Joseph of Arimathea and the enigmatic Grail (*duo fassula*).

With precision, (to the yard) the line Melkin has helped us construct, leads to Burgh Island which we have already identified as Ineswitrin. The bifurcation angle between his unmovable line and the one we are instructed to draw on a map is 13 degrees. The reader can construct the same line drawing as I have on Google Earth. Don’t forget that Melkin’s measurement of 104 is in nautical miles.

Now, it would be silly to insist that Burgh Island has nothing to do with Joseph of Arimathea or Melkin without explaining the coincidence that this line runs right through Montacute the place where ‘Father Good’ cryptically writes that Joseph of Arimathea is ‘carefully hidden’. No doubt, scholars will insist that the only two places mentioned as the resting place for Joseph of Arimathea, which are both precisely on the line Melkin is instructing us to create, is just a coincidence.

If we ignore their pronouncements, this would then allow the fact that Henry Blois knew of the clue regarding Montacute which prompted his search of the hill evidenced by the production of *De Inventione*. This would then reasonably negate the notion that the persona and prophecy of Melkin are a fourteenth century forgery. No commentator has previously understood that Henry Blois had based his Montacute search for the relics of Joseph of Arimathea on evidence which must have been provided by Melkin. This evidence or false lead which implicates Montacute as Joseph’s burial site was only meant as a confirmation point on the line.

Unless the prophecy is decoded, Henry Blois could not know this, so he assumed Montacute might be the Island he was looking for. Henry’s discovery of the ‘Holy Cross of Waltham’ will be covered in chapter 18. However in a brief aside, it seems likely Henry had been to the south west (in Devon) also looking for this mysterious Island of Ineswitrin.

Just to re-iterate.... Melkin’s original prophecy was about Ineswitrin and it was Henry who substituted its name for *Insula Avallonis* on the copy of the prophecy that JG has copied into his Cronica. Henry Blois, also fully comprehended, that Ineswitrin was not at Glastonbury, because he is the
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one responsible for the propaganda, which in fact trans-located the Island not only into Avalon... but its location to Glastonbury as an estate of that island. He knew that Ineswitrin was in Devon as it was donated by a Dumnonian King in the 601 charter. Blatantly deducible by the provenance of the donator. Since Devon and Cornwall were once known collectively as Dumnonia, it will not come as a surprise that Looe Island which had a small Celtic chapel on it would have appeared as a possible location to which the prophecy applied when Henry was looking for Ineswitrin.

Not surprisingly then, Looe Island was appropriated by Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ tenure before 1144 when it appeared in a list of the abbeys possessions. This recently acquired possession is also referred to later in a confirmation of Glastonbury’s possession by pope Lucius II. Pope Lucius II just happened to be the friendliest pope toward Henry Blois. It was pope Lucius who granted Henry metropolitan status to Winchester. The ownership of Looe island by Glastonbury was important as it appears again in another papal confirmation in 1168; again while Henry was alive.

It does not take much to work out that there was little territorial interest in Cornwall before the Norman Conquest and up to the point in 1144 when Henry claims a piece of the mainland opposite Looe Island in the parish of Talland... and both the island and the mainland area were then referred to by the name Lammana. Henry thought Ineswitrin was Looe Island as he associated the Ineswitrin as pertaining to the Dumnonian King as stated on the charter 601 charter. We know Henry was looking for Joseph’s remains by his search at Montecute.

It would not be wise to rule out the possibility that Henry’s real interest in Looe Island was connected to finding the relics of Joseph of Arimathea. In fact the Island is still connected to Joseph of Arimathea in local legend where it is said the Island was called Lammana and Jesus was put on a beach nearby to play while Joseph of Arimathea was with him.
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The map above shows the ‘bifurcated line’ where it divides within Avebury stone circle and runs through Montacute at an angle of 13 degrees to the Michael line for 104 nautical miles to Burgh Island.

The termination of the 104 mile line is on the present Burgh Island, the old Ineswitrin.

Melkin indicates that posterity would find the island where Joseph is buried 104 nautical miles from Avebury where Burgh Island is situated. Burgh Island just happens to fit Diodorus’ corrupted rendition of Pytheas’ description of Ictis, in that it has a tidal sand bar and in practical terms is
situated centrally to the biggest deposit of tin in Britain and therefore was the ideal place from which to export.

Melkin was known as a geometer, but until now we have had no proof of his existence; the encrypted geometrical instructions given by his puzzle lends credence to those who attested that he was a geometer and to his very existence. So, let us take a closer look by breaking down Melkin’s obtuse Latin prophecy sentence by sentence as Kim Yale indicated:

\[ \text{Insula Aualonis avida funere paganorum:} \]

The island of Avalon, as I have posited, was named by Henry Blois in place of the original name of Ineswitrin. It is on this Island which Melkin tells us Joseph of Arimathea is buried. Melkin’s Ineswitrin provides Henry Blois with the inspiration of a mystical island upon which Arthur is last seen alive…. and a locus from which the re-emergence of Arthur is to come. Some commentators\(^\ref{386}\) assume Arthur is buried on Burgh Island because ‘Geoffrey’ wove the mythical island into the storyline of HRB and was understood as Arthur’s last known location. Since both Avalon and Chivalric Arthur are both imaginary ‘make believe’…. Arthur cannot be on Burgh Island. To be clear, the name of *Avallonis* has nothing to do with Melkin. It seems relatively certain that Henry had no idea of the location of the Devonian island of Ineswitrin even though he had been as near as Plympton as witnessed in GS, and even nearer if I am correct about Salcombe (Salgoem) and ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Saltus Geomagog* (which is said to be near Totnes), where the Giant is thrown over a cliff by Corineus, which we covered earlier.

However, Melkin’s word *Avida* means ‘coveting’ so the sense is ‘coveting the pagans in their death’ in reference to the island. *Paganorum* cryptically refers to a Jew; as *Abbadare* was King of the Jews the noblest of pagans and Joseph was presumably one also. Carley’s

\(^{386}\text{Goldsworthy, \textit{And did those feet.} It is quite ridiculous of Goldsworthy to posit that King Arthur is buried on Burgh Island. If the chivalric Arthur of HRB is a composite and fabrication of Henry Blois’ ‘Geoffrey’…. how can he have any remains? Goldsworthy’s premise is based on his belief that Avalon was indeed an Island and was the subject of the original Melkin Prophecy. Once we understand that Avalon is named after a Burgundian town, the notion that Arthur’s connection to Avalon then becomes untenable…. except when we understand that the author of HRB is Henry Blois and the inspiration for the mythical Island is Melkin’s prophecy…. which originally referred to Ineswitrin, but was replaced by \textit{Insula Avallonis}}\)
notion of *Paganorum* having connection to Muslim Baybars we can dismiss as irrelevant.

*pre ceteris in orbe ad sepulturam eorum omnium:*

The phrase is usually translated as: ‘At the burial of them all, will be decorated beyond the others in the world’ The more probable sense would be that those buried on the island are honoured above all others in the world.

*sperulis prophecie uaticinantibus decorate:*

This phrase has been understood only in ‘gobbledygook’ as connected with prophesying and soothsaying circles by most translators. The meaning is quite clear in conjunction with the other instructions in the prophecy and refers to Avebury stone circle as the bifurcation point. The word is used twice in the prophecy; once as ‘*sperulis*’, as in this instance; and once as ‘*sperulatis*’. Both of them convey meaning through *Sphaerula*. However, *sperulatis* in the second instance refers to the symbol for degrees i.e. a small circle after the number. Since it is a small circle it is written in the diminutive form, but by degrees it actually refers to the acute angle of 13° at
Avebury formed by drawing the line which goes through Montacute relative to the Michael line.

_ et in futurum ornate erit altissimum laudantibus: _

The sentence gives the sense that when Joseph's tomb is discovered, the Island of Avalon will be arrayed by the mass of new converts, giving praise to God. This sense concurs with the final part of the prophecy which indicates that Joseph's sepulchre will be opened to the whole world, giving an impression that the island will become a pilgrimage.

_ Abbadare, potens in Saphat, paganorum nobilissimus: _

_Abbadare_, mighty in judgement, most noble of the pagans. The name _Abbadare_, has given rise to speculation about the word's provenance and meaning, but it has to be a reference to Jesus, meaning “The father's pearl”. The rationale behind Melkin using this appellation is by combining _Abba_ meaning father and _Dar_ meaning pearl in Aramaic, and Hebrew. That _Abbadare_ should be found with Joseph in the sepulchre is yet to be discussed, but as the Grail literature suggests something connected with Jesus is buried with Joseph. It is only the commonly misinterpreted understanding of the _duo fassula_ which makes us think it is a vessel of some sort. The denial of the Roman church of Chapter 29 of the Acts of the Apostles and the silencing of the tales of the Britons may well have a basis in truth before and after Augustine’s arrival. Similar to the journey of the Holy family in Maurus’ account, we can assume Joseph leaves Jerusalem, and arrives at Ineswitrin (Ictis) after having sailed on from Marseilles, to an island familiar to him, taking with him what Henry Blois later interprets as _sang réal_. This is carried inside an ark or box by some Grail accounts. The Grail romances which refer to the Grail as an object metaphorically refer to some artefact connected to Jesus. As the reader will be aware, the word ‘_Abbadare_’ would have been used by Melkin to avoid direct reference to ‘Jesus's body’. This would avoid an adverse reaction of heresy, (especially deposited in the Monastic system) whereby the prophecy itself might be destroyed leaving no knowledge of the island to posterity.

_ cum centum et quatuor milibus domiiconem ibi accepit: _
...cum centum et quatuor translates ‘with one hundred and four’. Milibus is actually cryptically referring to ‘miles’ employing the measurement of nautical miles. The reader will remember the unit of nautical miles (because of the only divisible unit of measurement) correlates to a sixtieth of a degree; this same unit having been employed by the ancients. The nautical ‘knot’ only came into use in 1630 AD.... but the ancients had subdivided the globe into degrees of a circle reckoned on the immutable laws of Geometry. The numerical division i.e. 60 nautical miles to one degree is defined by the circumference of the earth and the 90 degrees which make up the four quadrants of the earth which correlate to the 360 degrees which make up a circle. This unit of measurement of one nautical mile as a sixtieth of a degree had evidently been calculated by Pytheas’s calculations in Latitude\textsuperscript{387} and the fact that Phoenicians found their way to Ictis in Herodotus’ time and perhaps even in Solomon’s.

Melkin was attested as a geometer and astrologer and is now vindicated as one. He is perfectly capable of measuring the distance from Avebury to Burgh Island, but could only be certain of the transference of this measurement to posterity in the immutability of what constitutes a nautical mile i.e. one sixtieth of a degree.

Some translators have inserted the word ‘Knight’s’ from the Latin word ‘Militus’ with the assumption that it refers to ‘the others’ that are said to be buried in Avalon. Other translators have opted for implanting the word “saints”, assuming a scribal error for 104 as a measurement across the landscape in nautical miles. Some commentators, while not replacing the number, have assumed that a mistake has been made and that Melkin is referring to the 144 thousand saints in the Book of Revelation 7:4, 14:1 & 14:3.

This misrepresentation has been highlighted by later interpolators as in the case of Capgraves ‘Nova Legenda Angliae’, which renders the sense of Melkin’s words to ‘milia dormientium accepit’ which refers to Joseph who has 104,000 sleeping with him.

This nautical mile measurement is precisely 104 miles (to within a yard) from the Cove stone in Avebury to the entrance of the tunnel on Burgh Island. The figure below shows the line Melkin requires us to draw on the map which Kim Yale called the Joseph Line. The 'Joseph line' drawn from

\textsuperscript{387}http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01hlkcq
Avebury to Burgh Island passes directly over St. Michael’s Montacute. Montacute acts as a marker on the line which we are instructed to create. It is no coincidence that Montacute is on the hypothetical line (until constructed) where the body of Joseph is ‘carefully hidden’ and is confirmed by Father William Good. Henry Blois knew this information.

The Joseph line forms the acute angle of 13° at Avebury with the Michael line and runs through the castle at Devises and then through Mons Acutus (Montacute). It is 104 nautical miles to Burgh Island from Avebury.

domiicionem ibi accepit:
most translators render ‘took his sleep there’ or ‘received his rest there’. This sense of the sentence has been mistranslated as “Abbadare, powerful in judgement, the most noble of the pagans took his sleep there with 104 thousand”. ‘Abbadare’ appears to be taking his rest with 104,000 others if Mille is employed instead of Milibus; especially when the first words of the next sentence are ‘inter quos’ which translates as ‘among whom’. The meaning which Melkin is conveying is that Joseph and Jesus (both) are taking their rest there.

Inter quos ioseph de marmore, ab Armathia nomine, cepit somnun perpetuum:
The usual translation of the sentence is 'among these Joseph of Arimathea received eternal slumber in a marble tomb'. In the previous
set of words Melkin used ‘domicionem ibi accepit’ and now he is using ‘cepit somnum perpetuum’ immediately afterwards. Melkin has devised a riddle in which he speaks of two people once the meaning is understood. ‘Jesus received his rest there’ and ‘Joseph named from Arimathea took his perpetual sleep there’. The word ‘Inter’ by most translators is rendered ‘among’, but this is a riddle we are deciphering…. and Melkin’s meaning is derived from ‘interrare’; to put in the earth, bury.

‘Inter quos’ is translated as ‘among whom’ but here Melkin is using a play on words and his meaning is ‘to inter’ or ‘interred with whom’ which infers two people. The implication of this is that it now establishes ‘Abbadare’ as another separate subject in the tomb and the translation infers ‘Abbadare’, ‘interred with whom is Joseph, named from Arimathea taking his eternal slumber by the sea’. ‘Marmor’ translates as a marble stone or as ‘the sea’. Small wave motion in calm water gives the impression of marble, hence the expression, ‘a marbled sea’. It was said that King Arthur, when he was fictitiously found, was ‘not in a marble tomb’.388 This point was possibly made to distinguish it from Joseph’s tomb which was commonly thought (because of the word Marmor in the Melkin prophecy) to be marble and which might have been in the same grave yard at Glastonbury. However, the sentence that Gerald of Wales wrote which has the beginning missing in the manuscript reads: [The beginning of the sentence is lost.] . . . had proposed, thus Arthur’s body was discovered not in a marble tomb, not cut from rock or Parian stone, as was fitting for so distinguished a King, but rather in wood, in oak that was hollowed out for this purpose....

It just seems an odd coincidence to mention marble or stone when there are so few examples of sixth century sepulchres from which Giraldus might be comparing. It is possible Giraldus is making reference to marble to compare with the other notable person of Joseph.... who is supposed to be in the same graveyard and understood to be in a marble tomb as indicated in the prophecy. If this were the case, Gerald who died in 1223, (if that was his implication) would show that the prophecy would not be John of Glastonbury’s invention. But there are many more definitive ways which show the Melkin prophecy pre-existed John which we shall come to.

---

388 Giraldus Cambrensis, Speculum Ecclesiae, X.
Henry Blois was patron to Gerald and some of the points made by Gerald about Arthur may indeed have been informed by Henry himself. However, I shall cover what Gerald has to say on Arthur’s disinterment shortly, because this may have a bearing on his relationship (as patron) with Henry Blois, even though the unearthing took place 20 years after Henry’s death. Gerald however, does not mention Joseph of Arimathea and gets his Glatonburyana concerning Avalon and Ineswitrin straight from the rewritten DA. It is mainly because Gerald does not mention Joseph that modern scholars believe Joseph’s name is interpolated into the DA much later. The scholar’s assumption is not entirely tenable if we assume Gerald is only interested in Arthur i.e. not concerned with what he presumes is some concocted fable in order to increase alms.

Bale understands Joseph being buried in a Marble tomb when he renders the phrase as ‘somnum sub marmore coepit’. However, one twist that has not been considered is that ‘Joseph de marmore’ could be a reference to Melkin's understanding of Joseph of the sea as in 'sea trader'. However, the more likely translation, given the islands location…. and in reference to Abbadare is: ‘by whom he received interment by the sea from Joseph named from Arimathea’. The repetition of ‘dormicionem’ as referring to Abbadare, then being immediately followed by ‘sopnum perpetuum’, referring directly to Joseph of Arimathea, indicates that Abbadare and Joseph are two different entities…. especially since the ‘mighty in Judgement’ is referring to Jesus. Melkin has set out to misdirect his readers with the double meaning of ‘inter’, informing us that Jesus has received his rest there. This he has done by not offending Christian sensibilities.

*Et iacet in linea bifurcata iuxta meridianum angulum oratorii:*

This sentence is most frequently quoted in reference to Melkin’s prophecy, the usual translation being: ‘and he lies on a two forked line next to the southern corner of the oratory’. William of Worcester who measured and described the abbey church at Glastonbury c.1478 has grasped that ‘in linea bifurcata’ is part of a geometrical instruction, designed to indicate the grave site. Monks at Glastonbury have continued the tradition of concocting seemingly plausible evidence that infers the ‘Line’ applies to directions within the abbey grounds centred on the old church: ‘and opposite the second window (of the lady chapel) on
the south side there are in the cemetery two stone crosses hallowed, where the bones of King Arthur were buried, where 'in linea bifurcata' lies Joseph’ etc.

Most commentators have previously suspected the line referred to is an indicator to where the tomb is located. Henry’s misdirection has been built upon the word ‘oratori’ linked with ‘adorandam virginem’. It is upon these words and words like ‘wattle’ that the Glastonbury deception was based. These inventions helped the eventual translocation of the Devonian Island to Glastonbury. We will never know which words have been altered or inserted but we can conclude Henry changed Ineswitrin for Avalon and we can also deduce that the numerical instructional data was not tampered with…. and nor were the obtuse words like sperula and bifurcata which are central to the decoding of meaning.

Nowadays, Glastonbury is considered as Avalon and the 'linea bifurcata' that supposedly gave directions from the oratory, has now become a ‘folded linen cloth’ in which Joseph is buried, because modern commentators are still trying to find sense in the prophecy. It is shameful that certain modern commentators have misinterpreted the original purport of 'linea bifurcata'. It is no longer accounted as anything to do with a directional instruction. It is those same commentators who deny the existence of Melkin and deem his prophecy a fake. If it was a fake, why waste time inventing convoluted solutions that don’t augment the position for which the doubters say the prophecy was concocted.

If linea bifurcata really alluded to a cloth, one would think that if the prophecy were a late concoction designed to convince us that Joseph is specifically at Glastonbury Abbey; an exacting, more persuasive and less obscure set of words might have been written. If we try to put the prophecy in terms of a fourteenth century forgery it would be an impossible coincidence that there just happens to be a line on the English landscape which bifurcates into another line at a point within a circle, at the exact angle and length provided in the prophecy. Not only does this line go over Montacute, but its total length defined as 104 miles stops/terminates on an island…. and this by any interpretation is what the puzzle is designed to do.

---

389 This misinterpretation of Melkin’s words stem possibly from Lord Fromes account written to Henry V where…. describing a recent discovery: This Coffin was adorned most excellently beyond the others, with linen cloth inside all over. I shall cover this later in the chapter on Giraldus.
(locate the island). The puzzle starts with and points out as its subject 'the island' where Joseph of Arimathea is buried. The probability of this puzzle being invented by a fourteenth century monk at Glastonbury is as idiotic as those experts who still maintain the prophecy is a fake.

Some modern commentators have used the most imaginative ways of trying to understand the meaning of 'bifurcata'. The most far-fetched is derived from a meaning of 'in linea' as linen and 'bifurcata' as folded to give a folded linen cloth.

Scholars have been duped into believing Glastonbury is Avalon, therefore, there is no further requirement to seek directions to Avalon or so the logic goes. One can then understand their supposition that Joseph is described as 'lying in linen' and lies somewhere in the abbey grounds. But, what then becomes of the rest of the riddle. What is the point of the extraneous words such as Sperulatis (degrees), Sperula (Avebury circle) Tredicim (thirteen), cum centum et quatuor (104), Milibus (miles) or even more to the point Abbadare.

No early commentator has even posited Joseph 'lying in linen' and it seems our modern experts get more outrageous testing the bounds of their own credibility. Since John of Glastonbury, it was understood 'where' Joseph lay i.e. in Avalon. It is only in the modern era such unconnected notions exist where a 'bifurcated line' has no relevance to geometry.

The \textit{linea bifurcata} was the crux of Melkin's instructions and the Glastonbury establishment needed to establish a link with their \textit{oratori}. Hence, we get the versions of concocted measurements from the 'Old Church' from a randomly placed pillar on the site of the old church.... to mislead the gullible into thinking Melkin's 'line' is connected with a church supposedly founded by Joseph. Therefore, posterity is led to believe, Joseph's sepulchre must be within the Abbey grounds. All this, mostly brought about by interpolations into DA.

However, we could, like modern scholarship, ignore Melkin's puzzle, but coincidence cannot outweigh the bounds of probability. Is it probable that an invented set of words supposedly concocted in the fourteenth century can now be understood with alarming accuracy as a set of instructions, which, when put into action, form on a map of southern Britain and indicate a line which locates the Island of Avalon (Ineswitrin).... which coincidentally falls upon an island in Devon? To believe that this is a
coincidence or conclude the geometry is irrelevant would have to be considered as ‘studied ignorance’.

The fact that this geometric coincidence coincides with a charter found at Glastonbury concerning Ineswitrin donated by a Devonian King, and.... taking into consideration the implications of a genuine etymology that this was an island named ‘White Tin,’.... might be more than a rational mind can accept as coincidence. A further improbable chance occurs in that: this same Island fits a description given by Diodorus of an Island in the ancient world which ‘provended’ tin. Coincidence then leads us to the legend of Joseph visiting Britain as a tin merchant and his name being connected with the same island by the solution to Melkin’s puzzle indicating his sepulchre is upon it.

The final glory of the ‘bifurcated line’ was brought to the fore in the bogus directions given on the illustrious brass plate, with the helpful reminder ‘lest we should forget’. The implication from the plaque is that we should not question that Glastonbury was any other place but Melkin’s Avalon.

From ‘Meridianum’, most commentators have derived ‘Southern angle’ from Melkin’s text. The word ‘meridianum’ conveys the sense of a plotted line like a meridian and this was surely Melkin’s intention. It is also worth noting that ‘meridianum angulum’ could be translated as an ‘English Meridian’; surely a pun not lost on Melkin. Melkin is referring to the angle at 13 degrees to the St. Michael line and this is why the strange inclusion of the second ‘habitantibus’ becomes a split word of habit antibus, ‘residing opposite’ the 13 degree angle formed within Avebury.

The oratory is a small chapel of prayer and fits conveniently the description of the wattle church. Whether the old church was ever wattle is debatable considering the efforts gone to by Henry Blois to have words coincide with features in the prophecy.... which is evident in my exposition of interpolations into GR3 and DA. We will never know in this instance if the word ‘oratory’ was added to comply with ‘cratibus’ or perhaps ‘cratibus’ was originally written to intend ‘crater’ implying hole or void in the ground and the Oratory was on Burgh Island. To my mind, too much is made of the construction of the old church in Malmesbury’s work and smacks of ‘the lady protesting too much’. The wattle construction becomes too insistent with comments about its rude construction: The church of which we are speaking, from its antiquity called by the Angles, by way of distinction, ‘Ealde
Chirche,’ that is, the ‘Old Church,’ of wattle-work, at firsts savoured somewhat of heavenly sanctity even from its very foundation, and exhaled it over the whole country; claiming superior reverence, though the structure was mean.

There may have been further interpolation in providing a rationalisation of why the ‘wattled’ could not be seen and was ‘covered’: and the tradition of our ancestors has handed down, that the companion of his labours, Paulinus, who was Bishop of Rochester after being archbishop of York, covered the church built as we have before observed, of wattle-work with a covering of boards.

We know the directional data in the Melkin prophecy has not been changed as the accuracy is too improbable to be random. But one can speculate about other interpretations: some other words as ‘ora tor’ could be a possible word split. We might speculate that one solution would be that the Latin word ‘ora’ and ‘tor’ from ‘torus’ were split. ‘Ora’ translates as ‘the border or coast of a country; particularly the sea coast or maritime district’. The word ‘tor’ from the Latin ‘torus’ meaning ‘a knoll or high mound of earth’. Maybe Melkin gives the real sense of where Joseph’s body lay i.e. an island resembling ‘a Tor by the coast’ or ‘Tor by the sea’.

Most commentators have assumed cratibus applies directly to the oratory as its construction method, but what is the relevant meaning of ‘Cratibus preparatis’? If Burgh island was the Ictis of old, based on Diodorus’s description, and ‘large quantities of tin’ were taken to the island; the community of tinners would have to keep the cache of ingots safe, hence the ‘prepared cave’ hewed out long ago…. that applies to the tomb and not to the wattle construction of a church at Glastonbury. Is Melkin using the term ‘Crater’ to describe a cave or cavern or ‘hole in the ground’ which was ‘pre-prepared’ which refers to the Ictis repository? These are high definition micro directions not macro geographical instructions which locate the island by way of data transferred to a map. In other words, once the island is located, we are told that Joseph is in a ‘Crater’ which was pre-prepared or ‘dug out’ long ago.

In the scenario where Glastonbury is concerned…. the ‘preparatis’ is hard to rationalise as pertinent to ‘wattle preparation’. Wattle by definition is a preparation. Without the storage area on the Devonian island, the functionality of Ictis and its description as an Emporium
would be redundant; so, more likely, it refers to the *crater* rather than a reference to the production or preparation of wattle.
super potentem adorandam uirginem supradictis sperulatis locum habitantibus tredecim:

This is a difficult part of the prophecy, especially to find relevant meaning to a situation in Glastonbury. If we accept that the prophecy is a puzzle to be de-ciphered, we should try to be inventive in our interpretation…. as so far, there is little which complies with Glastonbury. We cannot be sure however, that Henry Blois has not tampered with any of the words. It does seem even after Henry’s death, the Glastonbury monk craft is complying with the wording of the Prophecy…. not vice versa.

If the prophecy was a fake it would be more plainly understood. Because it is genuine, it is obtuse and carries out the function it was designed for. ‘Super’, translates as above, upward or on high and ‘potentem’, as mighty or powerful. ‘Adorandum’ meaning adorable could be split into ad orandam we could be looking at the word orandam, meaning ‘to pray to’. Virginem; derived from ‘Virga’ is a reference to the Virgin Mary to most commentators. ‘adorandum virginem’ therefore renders “adorable virgin or maiden”. One idea is that these may be local instructions to the entrance of the vault, giving its relation in the local vicinity to the crater in relation to where an old chapel used to be situated on the Island

If we split ‘adorandum’ into ‘ad orandam’ it renders ‘in prayer’. The English word ‘verge’ has the same derivative root of virga. If one interprets this word string ‘super potentem adorandum uirginem supradictis’ as a whole, whilst splitting ‘supradictis’ into ‘supra ad ictis’, we get the sense ‘up where one prays at the verge high up on Ictis’, This may be too contrived, but still more credible than Muslims and Baybars being in anyway connected to the prophecy.

Supradictis translates normally as ‘aforementioned’ and seemingly refers to sperulatis but sperulatis is different from the previously mentioned sperulis.

Is Melkin referring to the ‘aforementioned sperulis’ in the early part of the prophecy or is he splitting the word ‘supra-ad-ictis’; informing us that Joseph and Jesus are ‘high up in Ictis’?

However, this also appears contrived and does presuppose Melkin knew the island was once called Ictis.
One might conclude that if this information concerning Joseph was passed down to Melkin 600 years after the fact, there would have to be some form of writing explaining why this island was chosen by Joseph. One cannot be sure what Melkin wrote in the manuscripts found at Glastonbury (if there were any) for Henry Blois to use as inspiration for his Grail literature. Perhaps he used the prophecy alone.\(^\text{390}\) Another consideration is how Joseph’s name got confused as the ‘authority’ in the ‘High History of the Grail’ and also became misunderstood as the narrator. One might imagine that the authority for the story of the holy relics reaching Britain stems from Joseph himself. Some commentators assume the name refers to Josephus\(^\text{391}\) the historian in the ‘High History of the Grail’; the authority upon which the tale rests. It is unlikely Josephus, had any involvement with the Perlesvaus from which the \textit{High History} is derived.

In brief, the ‘High History of the Grail’ or Perlesvaus was in its original form written by Henry Blois. It says that the origins for all the Grail material came from the Island of Avalon. We know that Avalon is a Henry Blois invention, hence anything connected with the Grail, Joseph or Arthur on Avalon…. derives from Henry. Our expert on this subject James Carley reckons: ‘that there must be some sort of relationship between the Grail romance Perlesvaus and Glastonbury Abbey has long been recognised; the colophon itself informs readers that the work is nothing more than a translation into French of a Latin original found at Avalon/Glastonbury’.\(^\text{392}\)

Most commentators have assumed that the reference in the ‘High History of the Grail’ to the book having its source in the Island of Avalon indicates the writer of the Perlesvaus transcribed it from there. Henry Blois is the inventor of the name Avalon and abbot of Glastonbury. Scholars just need to accept a fraud on a large scale and that Henry Blois committed it. It is not too far-fetched to assume Henry Blois wrote the Perlesvaus colophon (just as he did Gaimar’s epilogue and the colophon in HRB…. to misdirect) and implied that his French translation was from a Latin original; and either could only have been written by himself. Henry Blois invents Avalon

\(^{390}\) It is plain that the prophecy contains the main elements of Henry’s inspiration i.e. a body to find in the future, the \textit{duo fossula} as the Grail, the quest or search element, and the mysterious island where he situates King Arthur.

\(^{391}\) The Antiquities of the Jews, by Flavius Josephus

\(^{392}\) Glastonbury Abbey and Arthurian tradition p.309
in HRB but in VM converts *Insula Pomorum* to equate with it. Then he makes Avalon commensurate with Glastonbury in DA. DA confirms the illusion of Glastonbury in antiquity being synonymous with the island of Avalon.

Carley makes misguided assumptions that whoever wrote the Perlesvaus ‘Glastonbury’ edition must have made a trip to England to know about King Arthur’s disinterment. The assumption is based upon what the author supposedly sees and therefore the geographical references to Glastonbury. Allusions in the colophon of Perlesvaus to Arthur’s interment in Avalon; is not an *a priori* upon which one can presume a date for the composition of Perlesvaus i.e. after Arthur’s disinterment.

Modern scholarships assumption is that the Arthur and Guinevere reference in the Perlesvaus colophon refers to an already transpired disinterment of King Arthur at Glastonbury. The Colophon does not imply that, but scholars for generations have been cloned to believe this chronology of events. They have forced the pieces of evidence to fit their own theory and ‘assumed’ chronology. The reference in the Colophon rather takes the form of a statement of fact... from someone who knows where the bodies are and who has planted Guinevere’s lock of hair along with bones which supposedly were Arthur’s in Avalon. This person knows where both bodies lie in a manufactured gravesite set up by him to be discovered in the future (just like Joseph in the Melkin Prophecy).

Obviously in DA, Henry deliberately points out the whereabouts so that in time (after his death) some monk in the future reading DA, like

---

393 Carley bases his assumptions thus: ‘even if it does not seem necessary to postulate a trip to England to account for the Glastonbury= Avalon= the place of Arthurian burial equation, there are still the internal allusions to which seemed to show a precise knowledge of the Glastonbury landscape. In the Lancelot scene in particular we have an obvious evocation of Glastonbury Tor (la Montaigne de la valee), the old church (chapel novelement faite.... covert de plon), and Chalice Well (‘un fontaigne mout cler’ which flows ‘de la hautece de la forest par devant la chapele’). Carley then concedes that it is not easy to account for ‘the reference to the stream flowing from the forest above past the chapel and here we may have at least the Echo of some sort of verbal communication to the author of Perlesvaus’. P.317

394 Carley quotes Carman: Until after the latest year ever chosen by a reliable scholar as the date of composition of the Perlesvaus, the exhumation of King Arthur is not mentioned in any continental document, and Helinand of Froidmont actually affirms that Arthur’s grave has not been found. We just infer that the Perlesvaus, which alludes to this event must have been written in England.
Henry de Sully,\textsuperscript{395} knows where to find the body between the two pyramids. Don’t forget, both ‘chivalric Arthur’ and ‘Avalon’ are both inventions in HRB by Henry Blois posing as Geoffrey. By Gerald’s account the location of the grave was known prior to the disinterment. Also according to Gerald’s account we can deduce Henry Blois must have told King Henry II also.... and possibly intonated the depth of the grave.

Since Nitze and Jenkins found seven manuscripts containing parts or the complete Perlesvaus, two more fragments have turned up. Modern scholarship has determined they are all linked with the north-eastern part of France. Rather they all emanate from Henry Blois. The Brussels manuscript (BR) and the Paris manuscript (P) contain a passage found in the ‘Wells’ fragment (We), but the (We) fragment is more closely related to the Oxford manuscript (o); although it is not a direct copy. The 14th century Welsh text of the Perlesvaus (W) is closely linked to the early printed editions of 1516 and 1523 (BL). However BL and W are linked to the Oxford manuscript. All seem to derive from a common source.

Since Potvin’s (BL) was found in France at a late date, there is nothing to deny that it too originated from an early Glastonbury version in England. This would enable us to suggest an English source which would have been the source used by John of Glastonbury. If this English source was separate from a version created by Henry in France, this would explain the commonality of all the versions seeming to originate in France. This assumption was based on the diction and style of writing; so, one could posit Henry as the originator of a British and French source.

It would also explain how in the variations, the pseudonym of Henry Blois appears as Master Blehis. It answers the conundrum of how John of Glastonbury had an early copy of the Perlesvaus from which to construct his synthesis of all previous lore up to the time he wrote his \textit{Cronica}.

A comparison of the Welsh text with the Wells text, establishes that the Wells text cannot be the direct source for the Welsh one. However, the Welsh version and the printed editions are a subgroup of the same family from which the Oxford and the Wells version are derived e.g. our primary British source, (as long as we allow BL originated in Britain). We know that the Wells version can be dated to the first half of the 14th century and was

\textsuperscript{395} Henry de Sully who was abbot of Glastonbury and later became Bishop of Worcester in 1193 is a different person from Henry Blois’ Nephew of the same name.
written in Britain. Analysis of the Wells fragment indicates that the original scribe was Anglo-Norman.

Carley suggests the providence of the Wells fragment appearing ‘less than 10 miles from Glastonbury Abbey makes it desirable to reconsider the thorny question of the relationship between Perlesvaus and Glastonbury’. In other words it is time to consider who might be the common denominator.

Henry Blois has not been considered (even though the likeness of his name is said to be the authorial provenance), because of the assumption regarding the dating.... based on the colophon and its mention of Avalon which to a scholar's brain, can only exist at Glastonbury after the Leaden cross appears. The presumption of the use of the name Avalon only being known at Glastonbury after the disinterment of Arthur is based on another erroneous scholastic assumption.

Scholarship, spuriously has deduced that it was Henry de Sully who manufactured the gravesite. Henry Blois is adept in creating illusion. The reader concludes that the Latin text of Perlesvaus is ancient from which we now have the French. Especially poignant, as we progress through this quagmire of evidence and join these three previously disconnected genres of study.... we find that Henry Blois has planted a grave of Arthur at Glastonbury and left it to mature until after his death. We must therefore take into account that we find the same notion in steering posterity to a conclusion that Arthur and Guinevere were to be found in the tomb at Glastonbury (Avalon in Perlesvaus) as indicated in DA long before they were discovered.

L'auteur du Haut Livre du Graal affirme même que son texte est copié d'un manuscrit latin qui a été trouvé en l'Isle d'Avalon en une sainte meson de religion qui sié au chief des Mares Aventurex, la oli rois Artuz e la roïne gisent.

'The author of the High Book of the Grail even claims that his text is copied from a Latin manuscript which was found in the Isle of Avalon in a house of holy religion which sits atop reaching tides where King Arthur and Queen Guenievre lie'.

The first observation is that the colophon does not insist or intonate that Arthur and Guinevere have been found. The author knows that they ‘lie’ at Glastonbury. There is nothing to say that this was not written by Henry Blois prior to the unearthing of their gravesite as it certainly was!!!. Henry Blois had not only planted, but left directions toward the gravesite in
chapter 31 of DA: but I omit it from fear of being tedious. I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids, and many other leaders of the Britons.

We shall cover this point later in the chapter on DA, but obviously if Henry Blois wrote this and planted the body of Arthur, it is hardly surprising we find Gerald’s eye witness testimony that he saw Guinevere’s lock of hair. It becomes obvious who must have planted it there in progression of the evidence put forward here in this exposé.

Gerald actually states that the cross has Guinevere’s name on it and DA states Arthur is buried with his wife. Both the leaden cross and what was written in DA is provided by Henry Blois. We get back to the most obvious point which shows that this reference precedes the disinterment as no other incidents about the disinterment were mentioned in DA. How could they be, Henry Blois the interpolator of DA was not present and nor was the scribe who wrote the anecdote above. It is the same person!!

There is no evidence which runs contrary to my position which is that 20-30 years prior to Arthur’s discovery Henry Blois manufactured a gravesite (again based on an idea his muses had recognised in the Melkin prophecy). It makes no sense for scholars to insist the composition of Perlesvaus post-dated the disinterment of Arthur. It is worth noting also, how intently the Old Church was being focused on as being synonymous

396 Il cevaucha tant qui lest venus a l’avesper en un grant vaele, o il avoit forest e d’une parte d’autre; e dure bien la vaele grans lieus galoshes. Il esgarde a desre desor la montagne de la vaele, e voit un chapel nouvellement faite, qui mout estoit bele e riche; si estoit covert de plon, e avoit par desore deux croix, qui sembloient ester d’or. The assumption that Arthur and Gawain go to Avalon and see Guinevere and the fact that Guinevere was supposedly disinterred with Arthur at Glastonbury (when added as a proof to what is avowed on the leaden cross), has led modern scholars to believe that Glastonbury must be the location of Avalon. Carley states that: ‘both the internal passages and the colophon make it abundantly clear that the author of Perlesvaus must have had Glastonbury in mind when he described Avalon and that he must, therefore, have heard about the famous Arthurian excavation of 1191. From this incontestable fact both Nitze and Carman deduced that the author must have come to England himself to obtain news of the discovery. It needs to be stated unequivocally: the author of the pre-cursor of Perlesvaus was in England and most emphatically he had Glastonbury in mind. The author of the source of Perlesvaus is the inventor of Avalon. Henry Blois created Arthur’s grave site and was not alive at the excavation. What Carley avers as incontestable because Nitze and Carmen made a false assumption is irrelevant. It should rather be understood that Henry indicated where to find Arthur’s tomb in DA before he died. The initial author of the contents found in Perlesvaus had never heard about the famous Arthurian excavation of the 1191…… he was the instigator of its manufacture 20-30 years before the unveiling transpired!!!
with the Grail chapel (upon which the Grail chapel was modelled). Yet the supposed Island on which that Chapel was supposed to exist is the tor (‘atop’ in the colophon) a mile or so away. Henry Blois, as he does in the St Patrick Charter, is using both the St Michael church on the Hill as part of the same establishment as below at the abbey and interrelates them both. The fact that the DA avers that the wattle church was renovated and covered in lead (in the first 34 chapters of DA which is known to be interpolated) should of course alert scholarship to the possible coincidental authorship of Perlesvaus and to the dating of the interpolations in DA.

The Cove stone within Avebury stone circle is where the bifurcation or fork occurs between the Michael line and the Joseph line at 13 degrees. The line extends for 104 nautical miles from this stone to within 1 yard of the entrance to the tunnel on Burgh Island.

Most translators have rendered the translation of *sperulatis locum habitantibus tredecim* ‘where the aforesaid 13 spheres rest’. The word
‘sperulatis’ has in this case been employed cryptically as a relevant part of the instructional material. Without decoding it’s meaning (as pertaining to ‘degrees’) the direction of 13° just becomes a random number of 13, lost along with the 104 in the meaningless riddle.

The original use of the word is ‘sperulis’, from which we derived sphere/circle at the beginning of the prophecy, related to the stone circle of Avebury. Melkin gives the impression he is referring back to ‘sperulis’ by employing the word “aforementioned” trying to convince the reader that the two words ‘sperulis’ and ‘sperulatis’ have one and the same meaning. However his use of the word for the second time has the same sense as in circle or sphere, but is employed differently as a diminutive form. This small circle is the symbol for degrees i.e. 13°.... the symbol being a small circle °.

We know we are dealing with geometric instructions. Otherwise the prophecy is meaningless if it pertained to the abbey grounds at Glastonbury. In the contortions of previous interpretations at Glastonbury of Melkin’s prophecy no commentator, scholar or monk has tried (in their ingenuity) to weave the number 13 into any bogus directions in connection to the bifurcated line and the old church. In other words they can find no relevance to its meaning.

Melkin’s ingenuity has prevented the ‘13’ ever been associated with the enumerated angle at the point of bifurcation. The essence of the prophecy is indecipherable if the initial line which runs across Britain is believed to be in some way relative to where the old church was situated. This misrepresentation was cleverly depicted by the bogus directions on the twelfth or thirteenth century bronze plaque.

The word locum is rendered as ‘where’ by most commentators, but this same word also translates as ‘tomb or sepulchre’ in Ainsworth. Locum generally understood by translators as locus, refers to a place such as the location or place being discussed.

The word habitantibus means to ‘dwell’ or ‘abide’, and seems very out of place in this sentence. We could speculate that if ‘habit’ and ‘antibus’ were split....the sense of ‘dwelling opposite’ the 13 degree angle might be feasible. It is only because ‘habitantibus’ is unusual, especially in this section of the directional part of the prophecy, that it would seem that the word needs to be split. Some commentators have contrived the sense as the thirteen sperulatis actually ‘dwelling’. The reader can see how accurate Melkin has
been.... and by carrying out a simple trigonometric calculation the precise angle of 12.838568 degrees, which is only 9 ‘seconds’ out.

The prophecy is a puzzle to be unlocked, not a piece of prose designed to highlight Joseph’s presence at the Abbey. From the Latin below we can only hope to make sense by applying not only directions on the landscape but topographical detail as well, so a few liberties have been taken in trying to make an overall sense of what Melkin intended by:

*Et iacet in linea bifurcata iuxta meridianum angulum orator, cratibus praeparatis, super potentem adorandam virginem, supradictis sperulatis locum habitantibus tredecim.*

‘Both lie in a bifurcated meridian line in a pre-prepared cave near a chapel that is above it; where one prays at the verge high up in Ictis. In a tomb they reside opposite a thirteen degree angle’.

Or

Both lie on a bifurcated line which is at an angle to a meridian in a previously readied crater up at the verge near where on prays up high in Ictis in a place opposite at 13 degrees they dwell.
Or
Both lie in a bifurcated line in a tor by the sea above in a prepared crater in a tomb above which is the mighty adorable virgin and they dwell opposite an angle of thirteen degrees on a meridian.

Or
Both lie on a line that is two forked between that and a meridian, in an angle on a coastal Tor, in a crater, that was already prepared and above is where one prays which one can go at the extremity of the verge, high up in Ictis is the place they abide at thirteen degrees.

In the caption above we can see the 13° formed between the Michael line and the Joseph line which ‘bifurcate’ inside the ‘sphaerula’ at Avebury at the Cove stone.

_Habet enim secum Ioseph in sarcophago duo fassula alba & argentea, cruore prophete Jhesu & sudore perimpleta:_

This is usually translated as ‘Joseph has with him in the sarcophagus two vessels, white and silver, filled with the blood and sweat of the Prophet Jesus’.

It is wholly down to the interpretation Melkin’s prophecy that the ‘duo fassula’ becomes synonymous with the Holy Grail. Over time, the importance of the prophecy has transformed the _duo fassula_ to become
synonymous with the two jugs on the heraldic shield of Glastonbury. The Glastonbury establishment has attempted to concur with as many features in Melkin’s prophecy such as constructing the bronze plaque with its spurious directions.

Lagorio and Carley have assumed the Melkin prophecy is mimicking the vessel of the Grail having found its provenance from the continent. This assumption is incorrect. Henry Blois was inspired by what he thought were vessels in the prophecy. Glastonbury is conforming to the prophecy not an invented prophecy conforming to any existent tradition at Glastonbury derived from Grail literature.

The implication is that in the sarcophagus or tomb, Joseph has with him two ‘fassula’. Why would someone in the thirteenth or fourteenth century invent two vessels along with words like sperula and sperulatis that have no bearing on the church at Glastonbury? Why invent two numbers like 13 and 104? As I have pointed out, ‘thirteen’ is not even utilised as part of any existing lore which tries to equate the number’s relevance to the old church, with a measurement or direction. Why, if the prophecy is an invention based upon continental Grail literature, would the supposed fraudster and inventor of the prophecy of Melkin go to the effort of finding an explanation that the 104 is a misprint for 144 and then apply it as referring to saints from the book of Revelation?

It is not difficult to see that the institution of Glastonbury is complying with the prophecy in an effort to find common features, which are then made to appear as pertaining to a fictitious burial site at Glastonbury relative to the church. If this were an exercise in writing a prophecy that conformed to features found at Glastonbury.... even I could have made my intended fraud easier to be understood. It would be simpler to omit what appear to be random numbers and terms (such as sperulatis) which are hard to equate with any prospective burial site at Glastonbury.

The prophecy does not fulfil the proposed intention for which scholars have insisted the prophecy was fabricated. It truly would be the most startling coincidence that someone could invent a prophecy from supposedly composite parts (referring to Baybars etc. in the east) which coincidentally directs by its data to an island unintentionally which by chance was donated to Glastonbury. This is the intention of the prophecy as it starts with the word insula.... but obviously in its original form pertained to Ineswitrin not Avallonis.
It would also be an amazing coincidence that all the pertinent information supplied in the prophecy without leaving out one piece of data (which is supposedly redundant data), formulates a solution of a line on a map (entirely relevant) which located an island in Devon. This island coincidentally might have been Ictis. A further coincidence would be that Joseph of Arimathea by way of association with the tin trade is also indicated to be buried on the Island thought to be Ictis and yet found to be the same Island by deciphering Melkin’s riddle in which he is specifically mentioned. A truly remarkable set of coincidences 800 years after the prophecy’s supposed invention by John of Glastonbury. Yet if we are to follow our expert’s analysis of why the prophecy was invented; what was the point of the prophecy’s invention, as Joseph’s body has still not been located at Glastonbury?

Ironically what may have prevented a falsified find of Joseph’s remains was the fact that Glastonbury monks were unable to produce something so sacred as the blood and sweat of the Lord Jesus.

The Prophecy leads the reader by way of purposeful design to believe that the ‘duo fassula’ holds two liquids, blood and sweat. So from the Latin ‘vas’ a vase, or ‘vascula’ a vessel…. commentators have assumed the word ‘vassula’ as the container of a liquid.

A ‘fasciola’ however, is a bandage and a ‘fasceola’ is a swaddling cloth or a cloth swathe.

Alba translates as ‘white’ and more commonly refers to a ‘white cloth’. This might imply that if the body of Jesus is found with the body of Joseph as the prophecy implies, Melkin might be inferring a white grave cloth. Could this be the Turin Shroud of which there was mention in all four Gospels?

Argentea generally translates ‘of silver’. It also has another meaning of plated (as in silver plated) but also means ‘overlaid’. Is this the heart of Melkin’s message which really shows who it is that Joseph brought to England and the proof?

Cruore from ‘Cruor’, translates as blood. The Glastonbury ‘cruets’ as vessels or as Father Good referred to them as golden ampullae are purely derived from word association from the Latin word for blood, ‘cruore’ which led to ‘cruet’. This is another case of Glastonbury conforming to the prophecy and not the prophecy conforming to lore at Glastonbury.
Some people have chosen to translate as ‘two cruets’, leaving out the word ‘fassula’ as the vessel. They have mistakenly represented the blood supposedly contained in the vessel as the vessel itself, which held the blood. Again one must wonder why such contortions took place if the prophecy were a late invention. In no way are the two beer jugs as represented in the Glastonbury Arms in anyway representative of the Grail.... if Glastonbury monk craft were following an established Grail tradition. Rather, Glastonbury is seen to be doing its best to conform to features in the Prophecy.

Why, if ‘monk craft’ were mimicking a Grail tradition does it stray from the singular Grail? It is Henry Blois who consolidates his misinterpretation of the duo fassula into the Grail cup of the last Supper and from where Robert de Boron gets his idea of the vessel used at the ‘last supper’. Henry Blois as a serial ‘conflator’ adapted a couple of ‘Vessels’ into a singular Grail, based on the cup from the last supper. The prophecy predates his expansion of the idea through his muses. Henry's interpretation of duo fassula is the singular primordial germ of the icon of Grail Literature.

Sudore translates as sweat or travail. Melkin’s real intention is that the enigmatic ‘duo fassula’ is a doubled swathe or breast cloth from ‘fasciola’. The swathing cloth, is a ‘doubled’- ‘duo’, white cloth covered in sweat and blood from Jesus, (overlaid, from ‘argentea’, as one would overlay an image with silver). If Geoffroi de Charney who was the first to exhibit the Turin Shroud, had removed it from the tomb it would explain its sudden appearance in the 1350's.

Perimpleta has always provided the word for ‘full’, in the context of ‘filled with the blood and sweat’ by most commentators on the prophecy. Perimpleta is not a word in its own right that has meaning, so one can conclude it must be part of the riddle to be solved. It can be made up from ‘per – impleta’, coming from the verb ‘impleo’ which means 'I fill up'. ‘per-‘ is a common Latin prefix for emphasis, i.e. 'completely'. 'Pleta' comes from 'pleo' which simply means 'I fill'. So, if

397 Goldsworthy. And Did Those Feet. His theory is that the Templars discovered the tomb and removed the shroud. He does not however note that if the Templars had found the tomb and had produced the shroud and had knowledge of a body…. comment on the fact that it would be a good reason for the pope (conspiring with King Philip) to give orders for all Templars to be murdered on Friday 13th across Europe. If the body of Jesus had been discovered it would be the end of the Vatican.
Melkin is not giving misdirection by association and there are not two vessels alongside Joseph in the tomb, I would suggest another way of looking at Melkin’s riddle.

‘Peri’ is a word meaning ‘around’ and is usual as a prefix meaning enclosing, as in the word ‘perimeter’. ‘Pleta’ giving, ‘I plait’ in English, meaning to fold or as the definition gives, "to bend cloth back over itself”. Melkin has a message to convey, otherwise why include it in the prophecy? Is he implying that Jesus is in an ‘enclosed fold’ or ‘enclosed in a fold’? The breakdown of the word appears to imply the Turin Shroud is the article that Melkin is describing. This would mean the tomb on Burgh Island has been discovered already by the Templars. Is Melkin informing the world that a ‘doubled grave cloth, covered with blood and sweat from the prophet was folded over Jesus and was present in the tomb when he wrote?

\[\text{Habet enim secum Ioseph in sarcophago duo fassula alba\& argentea, cruore prophete Jhesu \& sudore perimpleta:}\]

‘Joseph has with him in the sarcophagus a doubled white swaddling cloth covered with the blood and sweat of the prophet Jesus that was folded around him’.

We could speculate that Joseph has with him in the tomb a doubled white folded cloth that was laid over the prophet Jesus and outlined by his sweat and blood. The Koran refers to Jesus as the prophete Jhesu. Melkin by naming Jesus is also hinting at the person behind the Abbadare enigma.

\[\text{Cum reperietur eius sarchofagum integrum illibatum, in futuris videbitur et erit apertum toto orbi terranum:}\]

The translations of this sentence appear for the most part as: ‘Once his sarcophagus is discovered, it will be seen whole and untouched and then open to the whole world’. Another way of translating the above could be: ‘With the discovery of his tomb, which will be whole and undefiled, from thenceforth it will be viewed and open to the entire world’. The word integrum translating as ‘entire or whole’ is in reference to the body of Jesus being preserved by cedar oil in the Grail Ark as has been explained by Kim Yale and Michael Goldsworthy.

---

398 If we consider that the Michael line is shadowing an existing line demarcated by monuments from the Neolithic era…. someone in the modern era has aligned the churches which constitute the St Michael line. The wealth for such an endeavour can only come from a wealthy institution.
Ex tunc nec aqua nec ros celi insulam nobilissimam habitantibus poterit deficere. 'from then on, those who dwell in that noble island will lack neither water nor the dew of heaven'. Melkin starts the sentence ‘ex tunc’ or literally ‘from that time’, indicating the expectation of change at the point of time when the tomb is unveiled. The *insula nobilissimam* translating as ‘noble Island’ is where Henry Blois got the idea for having Arthur brought to an island and then extended it to where he would come from as part of the ‘Briton hope’.

*Per multum tempus ante diem Judiaioalem in iosaphat erunt aperta haec, & viventibus declarata:* Most translations of this passage differ only slightly: ‘for a long time before the day of judgement in Josaphat, these things will be openly declared to the living’.

With modern scholarship freely admitting to large scale fraud at Glastonbury abbey, it is extraordinary how accepting they are of an unsolved mystery. Does scholarship really think that the prolific inter-relationship of Arthuriana, Glastonburyana and the Grail edifice just happened randomly i.e. formed, following on from what ‘Geoffrey’ (based at Oxford) wrote of King Arthur? Did not the King Arthur story suddenly appear in the exact era that Henry Blois was abbot of Glastonbury, Bishop of Winchester, Legate to the pope and brother to the King. Yet, not one commentator has even discussed Henry Blois as instigator or author of *Life of Gildas* because they think Caradoc was a contemporary of Geoffrey’s.

Few researchers have even mentioned Henry’s name in connection with the three genres.... the man who avowed that the greatest worth (more than riches) was that of the art of authorship; the man who compared himself to Cicero. Authorship was the aspiration to which Henry Blois accounted great worth. Are we really to believe a man who held such thoughts, even to the extent of revealing his passion on his self composed epitaph on the Meusan plates, only left the dull record of his deeds at Glastonbury?

---

399 Ironically, James Carley, the expert on affairs at Glastonbury and Athuriana says of Henry Blois: *Although he did not himself produce any work of erudition, he was a supporter of scholarship and was a patron of two fine writers: William of Malmesbury and Gerald of Wales. Glastonbury Abbey p.20.* As an expert, one probably could not make a bigger gaff, but scholarship’s naivety is endemic.
There is no concise position on the Prophecy of Melkin by experts. Supposed academics would not recognise Ictis if it had a sign on it.... or equate Joseph of Arimathea’s tin trading connections in association with it. Most archaeologists dig up ancient detritus and have never heard of Ictis. They have no idea of the practicalities of navigation in antiquity or seamanship. Scholars who study medieval literature, such as ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB, know that it has little historical accuracy and yet it pretended to be an accurate historical record. If they do not accept ‘Geoffrey’s’ history and recognise fraud; why accept naïvely the fraud of a created persona?

Nothing is known about the man who wrote the most popular blockbuster in the medieval era and what is known about him is as dubious as the contents of HRB. The fact that scholars have accepted Henry Blois’ scribble of Galfriedus Artur on a few charters around Oxford and the fact that a totally bogus Bishop of Asaph signs alongside Henry Blois on the Treaty of Winchester.... has convinced them of ‘Geoffrey’s’ real existence.

Historians have combed through works which provide the basis for Glastonburyana knowing they are full of forgeries. Few commentators have been looking for the architect; the common denominator, who combines Arthurian material in HRB and continental Grail literature and connects them to Glastonbury. Modern research should focus on which manuscripts provide essential building blocks for Henry’s edifice and whether or not these manuscripts were fraudulently written by the most prolific author in the 12th century and the person responsible for the largest interpolative fraud in DA.

If scholars had recognised the perpetrator in Henry Blois, rational deductions could be made.... such as Master Blehis, Blaise, Bliho-Bleheris, having a similar name to Monseigneur Blois in Grail literature....or the coincidence of the glorification of Winchester in HRB.... and Henry’s connection with the metropolitan request. If there was any intellectual merit to the term ‘medieval scholarship’ they should have deduced Henry Blois was behind the creation of Avalon as well.

Because of this lack of vision, Joseph lore has been discounted and is thought to have arrived at Glastonbury from France. Melkin’s prophecy has been suspect because of a flawed chronology in assuming Arthur and Joseph and Avalon were not interpolated into DA until after Arthur’s disinterment. At least, where Avalon and Arthur are concerned, Gerald
even contradicts this spurious assumption of modern scholars. Typically, medieval scholars have chosen to ignore Giraldus, the only eyewitness account; to make their theories fit together. Again, we shall deal with Gerald’s evidence later.

The main stumbling block to the discovery of Joseph’s tomb is the intransigence of the proprietor of Burgh Island to allow a radar imaging sensor to be pulled over the tomb and tunnel. Of course, she has taken advice from the very people I have described above, especially the ‘experts’ at Exeter University and the Devon Archaeological society. The real problem is that the present owner of Burgh Island is Jewish. If one does not believe in Jesus one is hardly going to concede that He or his uncle are entombed 50ft below the surface of the Island, especially when experts tell her Melkin did not exist and have no idea what the prophecy indicates.

Armitage Robinson first implies Melkin’s prophecy to be fake following the evidence based upon the apparent late emergence of Joseph of Arimathea mentioned in manuscripts. Margret Murray, contrives a Coptic origin for Melkin’s prophecy and Aelred Watkin thinks it could be oriental in origin.400

He goes on to say ‘It could be a tour de force of monastic forgery. It is either the earliest or latest link in the chain that connects Joseph of Arimathea with Glastonbury. It is either of great or of almost no significance....’ I am no scholar, but this does sound as if Watkin has not formed any useful opinion and is sitting on the fence. However, I would rather Watkin’s prevarication than Carley’s pretence of authority concerning the prophecy which has mis-directed a generation of cloned medievalist ‘experts.’

Let me state for the record: Melkin’s prophecy is of the greatest significance, but it is Henry Blois who connects Joseph of Arimathea with Glastonbury by changing the name on the prophecy to Insula Avallonis. The prophecy is the earliest link which connects Joseph to an object (the duo fassula) which is related to Jesus.... and which Joseph brought to a tin island called Ineswitrin, now called Burgh Island. Joseph did this to avoid the Jews of Jerusalem who had in effect condemned his son to death. He brought the body of his son to an Island he had traded with (in

400 Glastonbury Abbey and the Arthurian tradition. P.26
the past) which had been shut down as an operating tin mart by the Roman occupation.

Bale and Pits posit that Melkin wrote a book titled ‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’. Why they would do this if no book existed, we can only speculate. However, this was long after ‘Geoffrey’ and no volume has come to light. My view is that this book (judging by its title) was written by Henry Blois. The chances are that John of Glastonbury derived certain extracts from this book, corroborating HRB’s fictions such as Arviragus’ role in history.

The chivalric round table (mensa rotunda) where all around it are equal is Henry’s own expansion on his HRB when posing as Wace. He impersonates the real Wace, for the most part versifying the First Variant version. Henry Blois’ Roman de Brut made sure the HRB with minor expansions was written in his own vernacular. Thus, the tales of Arthur spread quickly across the continent. Wace, (impersonated by Henry Blois) claims he was not the source of the ‘round table’, yet coincidentally no-one can date its manufacture accurately or when it happens to turn up at Winchester or the source for its appearance in Wace.

The HRB written in Latin before the Roman de Brut could only be understood by the educated clergy and courtiers. ‘Wace’s’ version made HRB more accessible. The fact that the ‘round table’ is associated with Winchester is another indicator of Henry’s stamp of authorship. What convinces me most is the fact that in 1155.... Henry is publishing the Vulgate HRB (or at least the latest version of prophecies) and yet ‘Wace’ says he wrote the Roman de Brut in 1155. In reality, he must have started it at least two years previously, hence the reason why the first half of Wace’s poem is derived from the First Variant version. Scholarship is still in the dark as to why ‘Wace’ started with First Variant and finished Roman de Brut with Vulgate as a template. It is not improbable that Henry Blois commissioned the Winchester Round table. The story that it was built by Cornish carpenters is of a later date, but it could well date from 1170-1200. There is

---

401 There is a possibility that Harley MS 6358 reflects a state of composition in that it too is split between a first Variant which ends with a Vulgate. Scholars assume this is a result of two copyists but like Wace’s Roman de Brut formed similarly, it may reflect a transitional stage from First Variant to Vulgate. What it probably reflects is that Henry Blois was versifying HRB before 1155 and completed it after that date using the later Vulgate version as a template. Harley MS 6358 may reflect Alfred of Beverley’s source of the evolved First Variant.
no definitive expert opinion which could deny this date as a speculation....
as there are so few samples with which to compare the dendrology.

Robert de Boron’s *Merlin* creates the round table in imitation of the table
of the Last Supper and of Joseph of Arimathea’s Holy Grail table. The fact
that nothing is known of ‘Robert’ except that he comes from the village of
Boron just north west of Clugny, not far from Autun and Langres should
make us suspicious that Robert’s knowledge of the Grail, and Avalon and
Joseph is derived from Henry Blois.... an uncle to the main Grail
propagators court at Champagne and Troyes.

What is known of Robert’s life comes from *Joseph d’Arimathe* where he
applies to himself the title of *meisters*, just as ‘Geoffrey’ was *magister*, but
later he uses the title *messires* meaning Knight. At the end of the *Joseph
d’Arimathe* poem, he mentions being in the service of Gautier of Mont
Belyal. Henry Blois just loves to portray a persona; but like Gaimar and
Geoffrey (and Wace), what we are led to believe about the author’s persona
in reality is usually based in some sort of identifiable and plausible reality.
However, *Le Gentil*’s misguided assumption is that the mention of ‘Avalon’
shows that ‘Robert de Boron supposedly wrote *Joseph d’Arimathe* after 1191,
when the monks at Glastonbury claimed to have discovered King Arthur.
This *a priori* is so misguided but endemic in modern scholarship.

Until it is accepted that most interpolations in DA were made by Henry
Blois, there will be misinterpretation; like a defective gene passed down to
the next generation of Arthurian scholars. This misconception has been
mainly promulgated by Lagorio and Carley and Crick.

Henry, if he did not author both Robert’s *Merlin* and *Joseph d’Arimathe*,
he is certainly the source which we shall cover later. To be clearer, Henry
impersonated Wace, and interpolated Gaimar’s *L’estoire des Bretons* after
1155 by inserting the epilogue.

Henry’s inspiration for the Island of Avalon (not the name) derives from
the prophecy of Melkin. By Henry’s own propaganda, Avalon was
purposefully being steered toward geographical location. Arthur’s island
from HRB was brought into close association with Glastonbury. This
proposition is evident in the transformation which is made in VM as early
as 1155-7. Obviously, Henry had nothing to do with the actual unearthing of
Arthur at Glastonbury, but assuredly he is the instigator.

Henry, we can speculate, based on Gerald’s evidence instructs Henry II
and also points out where Arthur is buried between the pyramids in DA. We
can speculate that Henry Blois informed King Henry where the body he had planted 10 or so years before his death would be found when King Henry came to visit Henry Blois the day before he died. Coincidentally, the reader will understand how the monks in 1191 used Henry’s search at Montacute for Joseph, recorded in *De Inventione*, as a template to the unearthing of Arthur in the abbey grounds.

The similarities between Adam of Damerham’s description of the unearthing of Arthur’s grave and that description found in Henry’s concocted *De inventione* are strikingly similar. I think that Adam has confused the two accounts to a degree. We may assume the Montacute dig took place c.1144 at the same time Looe Island was procured. Henry was looking for Ineswitrin.

Henry Blois had no intention of unearthing the body of King Arthur in his own lifetime. He just laid the seeds for the future so that both Grail literature and HRB which spoke of Avalon became the location where Arthur was to be eventually found.... at Glastonbury. While HRB storyline was spread on the continent through ‘Wace’s’ work, the audience were being primed with Henry’s latter agenda....the offshoots of Grail literature. This propagation of early oral Grail stories transpired for most of the decade of the 1160’s.

It is hard to believe that Henry de Sully would produce a cross and promote Glastonbury as Avalon and more incredible that the entire population of England supposedly accepted the evidence of the cross alone.... and from thenceforth Glastonbury was synonymous with Avalon.

The DA had many allusions to Arthur.... *Life of Gildas* placed Arthur at Glastonbury. Grail literature mentioned Avalon long before the discovery of Arthur’s body and all knew Avalon was in the west. Avalon’s island location surrounded by apples in VM (under its other name as *Insula Pomorum*) leaves little scope for imagining it might be anywhere else.... considering Arthur was at Glastonbury in the kidnap episode and Arthur was last seen at the Island of Avalon (according to ‘Geoffrey’). It is the conglomerate of these factors (along with the Leaden cross) which brought the ready acceptance that Glastonbury was Avalon in 1191 when the bones were exposed. To believe Avalon had not been pre-ordained at Glastonbury by Henry's propaganda before the disinterment and then
readily accepted at the time Arthur was uncovered…. we just have to look at Gerald’s testimony.\footnote{402}

This manufactured unearthing accompanied by the Leaden cross is the very act that cements all Henry’s efforts. \textit{Here lies buried King Arthur in the Isle of Avalon.} Avalon, from that moment onward, certainly became synonymous with Glastonbury. But, the major groundwork had been accomplished already by Henry’s interpolative efforts in the first 34 chapters of DA.

Obviously, William of Malmesbury only mentions Arthur in passing just enough to comment on the oral ‘hope of the Britons’. Even though Henry employed various means in DA to make us believe that William was well acquainted with the name Avalon, William had no idea Avalon was commensurate with Glastonbury and the name is not in GR. William’s words in GR: \textit{this is the Arthur, concerning whom the idle tales of the Britons rave wildly even today; a man certainly worthy to be celebrated not in foolish dreams of deceitful fables but in truthful history.}

Another reason modern scholars deny the historical Melkin is because Bede does not mention Melkin. Bede, c.673–735 was an English monk at a Northumbrian monastery in modern Jarrow and even though the monastery had a good library, he would not have read Melkin’s works as they only existed at Glastonbury…. if any other manuscript apart from the prophecy and the 601 charter existed…. if indeed Melkin was the King of Devon. The best speculative proposition might be that the volumes mentioned by John Pits and Bale (if they existed) may have been authored and deposited at Glastonbury by Henry Blois. Certainly a manuscript existed at Glastonbury from which Melkin’s prophecy was extracted which had been adulterated.

John Leland says he saw fragments of Melkin’s work, even a ‘volume of great antiquity’. As a guest of Abbot Whiting, Leland went right through the library at Glastonbury. He says he took notes from an ancient fragment of Melkin’s \textit{Historia} and divulged certain facts about Melkin not found in the Prophecy. He says Melkin was born in Wales, and that he wrote a \textit{Historiola de Rebus Britannicis} in prophecy form. Is this maybe the template for Merlin? Is HRB’s bogus assertion that itself is a translation based on Walter’s book derived by notion of Henry Blois

\footnote{402 See Chapter 27. Gerald of Wales and the discovery of King Arthur’s tomb.}
having seen some manuscript of Melkin’s. Bale, Capgrave, Hardyng and Pits either give the titles of the books, supposedly written by Melkin or incidental added information from them.

The three books which John Pits cites, as having been written by Melkin, are the, ‘De antiquitatibus Britannicis’, ‘De gestis Britannorum’ and ‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’. Any one of these three could have contained the Melkin prophecy cited in the *Cronica* by John of Glastonbury. It would be obvious to most that the title ‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’ would not have been written by Melkin. This is Henry’s work from which JG obtained his information that is not interpolated into DA. It is really silly that scholars are in denial about Melkin’s prophecy considering *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda* said to be written by Melkin is at Glastonbury, is about King Arthur and the round table and that we know both subjects are Henry Blois’ inventions. But it does also show amongst a host of other evidence that Melkin’s name was known to Henry Blois. We could speculate that the other two titles may be genuine works of Melkin and if not; one or the other may have contained Henry Blois’ a copy of the *Primary Historia* so that it appeared there was a source book for HRB.

Even without the solution to Melkin’s prophecy which witnesses an intelligent design, the evidence points to the existence of a real person in antiquity. Whoever Carley thinks the fraudster is.... ‘Melkin’ has produced a coincidental set of numbers and clues which by transformation of the data provided in a cipher, transcribe to create a line onto a map and pin point an Island in Devon. Another reason for discounting Bede’s authority in connection with omitting reference to Melkin can be explained in what William divulges in his GR. ‘Nay, they even report, that he (Bede) went to Rome for the purpose either of personally asserting that his writings were consistent with the doctrines of the church; or of correcting them by apostolical authority, should they be found repugnant thereto’. What is a near certainty is that the Roman church, whether at an early stage (evidenced by the exclusion of Acts 29, see chapter 36), or even later, after Augustine’s arrival in Britain…. eradicated any rumour of Joseph (and possibly Jesus) in Britain and stamped it out. The only residue nowadays is the Cornish legend and a fortuitous find of Melkin’s prophecy indicating Joseph’s sepulchre is on Ineswitrin.

Bede may have been censored by the Roman Church on what he says regarding any tradition found in Britain. These rumours as Augustine found
in Britain when he arrived relates to the Britons: "who preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world", could only mean one thing. These traditions, if they incorporated the Uncle of Jesus, throw up primacy issues with Rome’s self-professed monopoly on Christianity; especially, if any substance were found in the rumours and allowed to foment, regarding the supposed British traditions. Since Melkin’s works probably came to Glastonbury at the time the grant was dated, (601AD), it is doubtful if Bede, far away in Jarrow, had even heard of Melkin. One can be sure though, that the Templars knew something that threatened Rome’s monopoly on Christianity.

The fallacious Glastonbury legacy has been exacerbated in the modern era by the scholastic community’s inability to find its way through the smoke of Glastonbury literature and Grail legend. Almost as a heredity defect re-occurs in later generations; false premises and *a priori* positions are handed down from mentor to pupil; one scholar cites another assuming the same erroneous premises and no solution is discovered or progress made to unravel the Matter of Britain.

Carley states: *My mentor for many years has been Valerie M. Lagorio, a fine and imaginative Arthurian scholar, one whose articles on the evolution of the Joseph of Arimathea legend must be regarded as definitive.*

It is clear that I am annoyed at the complacency of modern scholars. Neither Carley’s nor Lagorio’s views are ‘definitive’. Carley’s presiding authority over Glastonburyana is obviously an extension of having found a niche on which to do his dissertation. This was his erudite work on John’s *cronica*. To compose a thesis on this work alone takes a vast amount of peripheral study by which he has become our present day expert. It is a known fact that he assumes an air of the foremost authority on the goings on at Glastonbury. It is also known that he does not accept contrary opinions that do not dovetail with his own views. Lagorio, similarly grew out of her dissertation which traced the development of the Joseph of Arimathea legend. Their views are neither definitive nor wholly correct. The impression one gets is that of entitlement over the whole domain of Arthurian scholarship.

The DA is a minefield unless one understands why DA was interpolated and by whom and Scott’s book\(^{403}\) has helpful insights. Few

have deigned to even scratch the surface of what is and is not interpolation. In an unkind critique of John Scott’s translation of the DA (referring to it as ‘uninspired’) Carley does laud his mentor as the superior knowledge and fount.... from which, he has obviously followed and accepted all her views, concerning the Joseph tradition at Glastonbury: Modern Scholars have examined the process of accretion which led to this connection and Valerie M. Lagorio, in particular has given a masterful analysis in her study on “The evolving legend of St Joseph at Glastonbury”.

Lagorio’s views have shaped Prof. Carley’s and Lagorio’s view is: As a consequence of the Arthurian affiliation, the abbey some fifty years later incorporated St Joseph of Arimathea into the legend of its foundation.

The fact is that Joseph and Avalon were established by Henry Blois in DA before 1171. Lagorio’s and Carley’s assumption (followed by Scott) is that after Chrétien mentions the Grail or Robert de Boron had written Joseph d’Arimathie.... a Joseph tradition was incorporated at Glastonbury, upon which, Melkin’s Prophecy (supposedly much later) imitated the Grail by the invention of the duo fassula. This viewpoint is the reverse of how events transpired in that.... the Grail (duo fassula) is the essence of Melkin’s Prophecy and the Melkin prophecy was most emphatically extant in Henry Blois’ era.

Their assumption is largely based upon the fact that Joseph is not mentioned in the St Patrick charter and their assumption is that the whole charter was written during the contretemps with the bishop of Bath. This presumption of chronology is again incorrect. The charter of St Patrick was written by Henry Blois himself, probably just before his second attempt at gaining metropolitan status for Winchester in 1149; as I will show in the chapter on the DA.

There would be no Grail tradition without a ‘duo fassula’ ....and there would be no tradition of Joseph (except that found in Cornwall) without Melkin’s Prophecy. There would be no Avalon without the genuine prophecy of Melkin’s instructions (which point to Ineswitrin in Devon) which in turn became the basis for Insula Avallonis in Henry’s HRB. The name Avalon is based on the Burgundian town, just as Karitia and Autun and Langres are all cited in HRB by Henry’s personal knowledge of them.

Lagorio’s view of Joseph lore is that: to date, no-one has traced his slowly evolving legend, or tried to assess the many factors which promoted the
successful joining of Joseph the saint with Arthur, the Hero King, in the hallowed grounds of Glastonbury.\textsuperscript{404}

The real problem is that everyone has accepted Lagorio’s conclusions thereafter which make it impossible (following her chronology) to successfully join the dots between Joseph, Arthur and Glastonbury. Without establishing Henry Blois as author of HRB and primordial Grail literature…. she is in no position to assess the many factors which promoted the successful joining of Joseph the saint with Arthur.

Until Henry Blois’ fraud or at least his hidden authorship is accepted, no-one will ever contemplate or understand the link between the three genres i.e. Geoffrey’s Arthurian work in HRB and the \textit{Vita Merlini}; Glastonburyana (embodied in \textit{Life of Gildas}, DA and GR3 version B), and the origins of Grail Romance. Until an intransigent scholastic community recognise they have been duped and Joseph’s entire legend (as we know it) is based upon the Melkin prophecy…. scholarship is blindfolded. Unfounded pronouncements such as Carley’s assessment of the prophecy of Melkin will prevent scholastic advancement. Lagorio has no solution as to how the Joseph legend arrived at Glastonbury believing it transpired through a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’. Where does she think the ‘extant legends of the abbey’s origins’ came from…. if not from DA. Every commentator recognises fraud in DA, but the assumptions of Lagorio are misguided without recognising the early fraud of Henry.

Lagorio’s misunderstanding is based upon the assumption that any mention of Arthur in DA follows the discovery of his bones and that Joseph lore at Glastonbury is a later insertion: \textit{With this record of prosperity, Glastonbury had little need to enhance its Glory with Arthur’s counterpart, Joseph of Arimathea.} Yet around 1250 the monks quietly incorporated Joseph into their founding legend, possibly \textbf{succeeding to the fortuitous convergence of factors} supporting such a claim: the impact of traditional belief in Britain’s conversion to Christianity by an apostle; Joseph’s legendary status as an apostle and missionary; \textit{extant legends of the abbeys origins}; and \textbf{the Arthurian Grail cycle, which proclaimed Joseph as the apostle of Britain}.

Who put out the propaganda \textit{supporting such a claim}? Firstly, Henry Blois is the originator of the Arthurian Grail cycle as explained further on.
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When we cover the DA in detail, it becomes clear that the bulk of the first 34 chapters of DA have been written by Henry Blois.

Ferdinand Lot (my uncle) dismisses Glastonbury legend as nothing more than invented by a conclave of falsehood... meaning monk-craft. Ferdinand Lot wrongly confirms scholarship’s viewpoint that the fraud evident in DA was carried out over a long period of time after the discovery of Arthur’s body and by many monks. The scholastic viewpoint excludes the truth behind Henry’s inventions. The Grail as an icon and the book which Henry must have written, (referred to as ‘Sanctum Graal’), was based on the duo fassula from the prophecy.

The Grail itself derives its name from the interpretation of the prophecy. The ‘holy blood’, contained in one of the supposed vessels, was interpreted as sang real. Logically, if there is no truth behind the chivalric Arthur character found in HRB and his deeds are subsequently encompassed in a body of literature which involves Joseph of Arimathea and the Grail (and this is connected to Glastonbury lore), and we know the DA was presented to Henry Blois (and interpolated).... then it becomes fairly obvious that the common denominator (once the originator of the Grail stories is accepted as Master Blehis) is Henry.... who is also ‘Geoffrey.’

The first step to any understanding of the Matter of Britain is to contemplate that Melkin’s prophecy existed at Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ era. It is similar to Wisdom.... one cannot possess it without a certain knowledge of God (thus fear). Once one can understand that the island, about which the Melkin prophecy speaks, is the template of a non-geographically located Avalon.... transferred by Henry’s muses from a real island (Ineswitrin) to a mythical island presented in HRB.... one can then understand why it was and who changed the name of the island on the Melkin prophecy. The emblem of the Grail should be recognised as having been derived (again by Henry’s muses) from the duo fassula through ‘Master Blehis’ and the inspiration of Robert de Boron. Robert’s knowledge of Joseph existed through Henry’s knowledge. Henry was Robert’s ‘Blaise’ and any knowledge of Joseph which Robert had.... came originally from Henry’s inventions which were based on the Prophecy of Melkin.

The glorification of Glastonbury as Avalon takes place after Henry’s return from Clugny in 1158. Glastonbury is never mentioned in HRB which only highlights the author’s connection to HRB in that Arthur had already been associated to Glastonbury by himself in writing the Life of Gildas.
Henry could not betray his authorship of Vulgate HRB, especially now the prophecies were updated.... otherwise, he would then be implicated for inciting rebellion among the Celts through his prophecies. It was a bit of a 'chancy move' to pay for the sculpture on the Modena archivolt and have Arthur associated with Glastonbury. HRB could not mention Glastonbury. If Henry got discovered, he would have been the laughing stock and branded a liar; but he was not going to let all his previous efforts in creating the *psuedo historia* destined originally for his uncle to go to waste.

Winchester is however glorified in his earlier work in First Variant and it ultimately led to Henry obtaining metropolitan status for Winchester in 1144. Winchester is mentioned more than any other place except London in HRB. We may speculate as to why Henry did this. Firstly, Winchester was the main city in southern England in the Saxon era and secondly after the *Primary Historia* was written, the second redaction (the First Variant) featured Winchester with early monasticism. This ploy indicated it was a religious house long before the Roman usurpation of primacy at Canterbury. This of course is tied up with the effort to gain metropolitan status for Winchester.

Glastonbury was going to be glorified through Henry's invention of Grail stories concerning Joseph and through the planting of Arthur’s body to be discovered in the future.

Someone has constructed the prophecy of Melkin to lead us to Burgh Island and has surely set out to manifest the whereabouts of Joseph of Arimathea's tomb, leaving specific and precise instructions within his prophecy. It was not Henry Blois. It was someone who knew what 'is' on Burgh Island.

If Melkin had wished to spell out the location of Avalon (or more accurately Ineswitrin) he would not have hidden his instructional data so cleverly and cryptically. Without determining the start of the instructions (knowing what the bifurcated line refers to), there is no way of finding the Island or working out the solution to the puzzle.

The 'island' is the primary subject of the prophecy. It is perfectly clear from the prophecy that the tomb of Joseph is on the same island mentioned in the prophecy (changed name or otherwise). Also, if Melkin had wanted us to understand immediately that Jesus was buried alongside Joseph, he would not have referred to him as 'Abbadare'. There is no doubt that Melkin wanted someone in the future to understand this
riddle.... otherwise there would be little point in writing it. The clues in it are extraordinarily accurate and precise and could not randomly fall into an order to indicate Burgh Island by way of following instructions to draw a line on a map.

Who would employ a word like *sperulatis* which has no meaning, unless it was intended as part of a puzzle? The Latin in the prophecy is archaic and grammatically incorrect and who knows what single word could have been added or subtracted; but I do not think there has been any change except the name. Because of the numerical accuracy of the directional data, and the use of obtuse words, the prophecy is evidently original and has not for the most part been changed. However, Melkin was presented with a conundrum: how to carry into posterity the knowledge of a tomb and what it contained without destroying the very vehicle of the Christian religion by which the puzzle would be perpetuated into the future.

Melkin’s puzzle relates to the finding of a tomb. The evidence of what is found within will provide us with a different account of that which transpired immediately after the crucifixion, which is currently found in the gospel accounts. That Joseph did come to Britain with an object (or two) is evidenced by the criteria put forward in Melkin’s prophecy. When the tomb is opened, what is found within will directly contradict Roman Catholic eschatology.

However, the Grail (which is the body of Jesus) will never be found without determining the key to the instructions in the prophecy which is Melkin's *linea bifurcate*. Without this key, none of the other directional clues have any relevance. Especially where, some modern commentators are insisting that the *linea bifurcata* is a 'folded linen', which is complete nonsense. Also the scholastic community’s misunderstanding of the credibility of using the unit of the nautical mile (the 104 measurement) is based in ignorance, because Pytheas used this same immutable unit defined by the circumference of planet Earth. Even the medieval chroniclers at Glastonbury understood the prophecy related to a geometrical instruction; even though, through bogus directions in geometrical terms in relation to the old church. It is purely coincidental that Melkin's *duo fassula* turns out in reality to be the burial shroud of Jesus, but this is secondary to our present focus as Yale and Goldsworthy have provided an account on the appearance of the shroud in the modern era.
Linea bifurcata was surely understood as instructional or directional by the writer of the late liturgical piece, prefixed by Hearne to John of Glastonbury’s chronicle. Any affiliation between the old church and the bifurcated line’s bogus relevance to it could only exist after the fire in 1184, indicating the position of the now burnt church. The bronze plaque is fairly irrelevant to our inquiry regarding Henry Blois. However, after relating information about the line from the pillar (with the bronze plate affixed), outside on the North, through the point up to which the eastern end of the old church originally came, the writer states: ‘near this line, according to certain ancient writers lies St. Joseph with a great multitude of Saints’. It is also obvious that John of Glastonbury had understood that the ‘Linea’ was a directional instruction as he writes: ‘amongst whom, Joseph also was buried, and placed (et positus) in linea bifurcata over against the aforesaid oratory’.

Most medieval commentators have assumed that Joseph was buried near the Old Church, in the grounds of Glastonbury Abbey. The institution at Glastonbury Abbey has proactively encouraged and propagated such a position to find relevance to the church which had burnt. This is because of Henry’s propaganda in DA which implied that Joseph had built the original. In Medieval times the ‘linea bifurcata’ was at least understood to be part of a geometrical instruction which would point out the location of the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea as it was intended. I should briefly indicate how our two top authorities considered opinions have understood Melkin and more importantly his prophecy.

Prof. Valerie M. Lagorio writes: ‘a mystifying prophecy had arrived to Melkin, a pagan sage who supposedly lived before Merlin. In essence Melkin stated that Joseph, together with two cruets holding the blood and sweat of Jesus, was buried near the vestusa ecclesia; and that when his secret tomb was found and opened, the ancient island of Britain would never again know drought’.

She goes on to say: ‘the full import of this account rests less on the promise of future miracles than in the establishment of Glastonbury as Joseph’s and Arthur’s joint resting place’.

In The evolving legend of St Joseph of Glastonbury, she states ‘there is a very remote possibility that Joseph may have journeyed to the Glastonbury area of Britain and preached the faith there’. She further concludes, ‘if
Joseph did come to Britain then his Glastonbury- accorded fame has a ring of poetic justice. Based on the known facts, however, it is only in the late 15th century England that the legend of St Joseph of Arimathea and Glastonbury came to full maturity.

Firstly, Melkin did not mention cruets nor did he state that Joseph was buried near the vestusa ecclesia and certainly did not mention drought. Melkin’s words ‘At that time neither dew, nor rain, will lack from that noble island ‘apply to spiritual refreshment, the same as biblical references of the same nature; not to any metrological future condition. I only mention this so that the reader can see that the purport of the prophecy is lost on Lagorio.

Melkin had no idea that Joseph’s resting place in the future would be at Glastonbury. The fact that Joseph is thought to be at Glastonbury is entirely down to Henry Blois. If Henry had not replaced the name Ineswitrin for Avalon on the original prophecy, and used this name in HRB, Arthur would never have been unveiled at Glastonbury either. The prophecy of Melkin was Henry’s inspiration for the potential discovery of Arthur’s body in the future. The major difference is that the Melkin prophecy foretold of Joseph’s sepulchre being found and this gave Henry the idea to manufacture the grave of Arthur to be found at a future date. One is bogus, the other real.

The point is not whether Joseph might or might not have gone to Glastonbury, it is the fact that Joseph is buried on an island.... and the man who knew this (as a certainty) composed the prophecy. Lagorio has no understanding of the fraud of Henry Blois and even denies Melkin’s existence.

Prof. James P. Carley’s views are mainly unfounded and contradictory. Carley states: it was at roughly the period of Edward’s visit that the prophecy of Melkin the Bard was concocted at Glastonbury. Carley’s main reason for positing that Melkin’s prophecy was a fraud is that he believes, like his mentor, the prophecy was concocted as a consequence of the Grail tradition. The opposite is in fact true!!!!!

Henry based the Grail tradition on Melkin’s knowledge of the whereabouts of the tomb and who was in it. Carley’s ‘wholly respectable holy blood relic, historically unimpeachable, brought to England by Joseph of Arimathea’ is not fiction.... but is the basis of Grail literature first propagated by Henry Blois. Melkin’s prophecy was the source material for Henry’s muses.
There is of course only one way to disprove this standpoint and that would be to go to Burgh Island and enter the tomb (which is now bricked up) with qualified archaeologists. Therein is the problem. There is no crossover of expertise. No archaeologists are qualified to assess the faulty views of medieval scholars. It is not their field of expertise to divine whether or not such a tomb exists. Those who supposedly have the expertise to advise archaeologists on the validity of the tomb’s existence have discounted Melkin. Hence the unfortunate necessity of this study; written by an untutored retiree to confound modern scholar’s misconceptions.

The fact that someone has entered the tomb since Melkin’s day is undisputable on two points. One is that the Turin shroud mentioned by Melkin came from the tomb. This is clearly shown by Goldsworthy and Yale. Secondly, the fact that some institution has tried its best to make sure that the information concerning the marker point of Montacute on Melkin’s line, (of which Father Good informed us), never reached the public domain. I will explain this shortly, but it involves the destruction of Father Good’s information in all but one of the copies of Maihew’s Trophea.

We know that Arthur’s dis-internment was at a fabricated grave site.... manufactured for posterity by Henry Blois and we know also Joseph has never been found. Would it not be simpler to go to Burgh Island, the place we are directed to by a real person in history.... who had knowledge of what the tomb contains? Goldsworthy had tried to achieve this but was told by the local coroner he could do nothing. The owner was advised by experts that Melkin’s prophecy was a fraud.

The determining factor which has allowed the perpetuation of the Glastonbury fraud is the transposition of the island to which Melkin refers.... to Henry’s ‘fabulation’ of Avalon at Glastonbury. The only fraud bigger than this is the continuance of the Roman Empire in the form of the oppressive Catholic Church... conning the gullible into the belief by ‘confession’ in the atonement of their sins.... while their bishops and priests are abusing choir boys.

If, as Scott suggests, there was a consolidating author of DA c.1230, why did the said author not eradicate the contradiction in foundation stories rather, than smoothing one into the other. I would imagine the date is considered a point at which the list of abbots ends in 1134 and the
presumption that Joseph material is added in between this time and 1247 by a consolidator.

Melkin's works were found at Glastonbury by Henry Blois and it is through his imposture, chicanery, guile, and craft and skill and inventiveness as an author.... on which Glastonbury's notoriety exists. As the deception was subsequently believed and more extraneous lore was added (such as the bronze plaque), the modern understanding of Glastonbury's status is that it 'is' Avalon.... the place where King Arthur was buried. Its lore is built upon King Arthur by the man who composed HRB. It is also built upon the appropriation of history which pertains to an island in Devon and the events that transpired there after the crucifixion.

I will cover the search for Joseph at Montacute shortly. However, in this next passage we can get a good idea of Carley's understanding of Melkin and how Carley gets the chronology and reasoning about Glastonbury (the Montacute dig) and the prophecy muddled: these two excavations can ultimately, I think, be linked with the figure of Joseph of Arimathea. After the stone cross found in Arthur's tomb identified Glastonbury as 'insula Avalonia', it was only a matter of time before Joseph of Arimathea's name (taken in this context out of the French Grail romances) came to be associated with Glastonbury and in 13th century additions to William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitates Glastonie Ecclesie it is first stated that Joseph was the hitherto unknown apostle of Christ who evangelised Britain and built the wattle church at Glastonbury. With the Joseph legend came the Grail, which was transformed into an ecclesiastically respectable relic, two cruets containing the blood and sweat of Jesus. Ultimately Glastonbury produced writings by a Merlin like figure, Melkin the Bard, which articulated in a rather cryptic prophetic form Joseph's role in early Glastonbury history. In Melkin's prophecy it is made quite clear that Joseph's place of burial is unknown and that if the tomb is ever found great miracles will occur.

No matter how one understands the words of Melkin's prophecy, 'Joseph's role at Glastonbury' is not implied and nor is Glastonbury mentioned. This only comes by implicative as subsequent monks, historians or chroniclers have been duped by Henry’s fraud. Again, it is Henry’s transformation of the genuine island of Ineswitrin by substituting its name as Avalon and the bogus corroborative evidence supplied in DA (and the ‘Leaden’ cross) which forms Carley’s opinion.
To state that Melkin had made it clear that Joseph’s place of burial is unknown is quite unintelligent. The very objective of the prophecy is to point out the location. The reader will understand in the following extracts that Carley has virtually no fixed opinion on Melkin. This is why it is so crucial that he should not be accounted an expert on the subject nor his opinions on Melkin should carry any weight.

Leland says that Melkin was anciently known as one of the most famous and erudite of British writers and his later obscurity was a result of the Saxon invasions. However, Leland mentions Melkin’s belief that Joseph of Arimathea was buried at Glastonbury. Melkin does not mention Glastonbury and nor has he gone to the trouble of creating a cipher which obviously indicates an island in Devon.... if he believed Joseph was buried at Glastonbury. This is Henry Blois’ propaganda which has translocated the relics of Joseph to Glastonbury.

Both Carley and Leland are duped by Henry Blois’ transformation and conflation between Avalon and Glastonbury. Leland himself does not believe Joseph is buried at Glastonbury but more accurately should have said that Melkin believes Joseph is buried in Avalon.... although Melkin did not. Melkin knew as fact that Joseph was buried on Ineswitrin and if Kim Yale is correct about the breakdown of the word ‘supra ad ictis’ he may well have known the island was once called Ictis.

Carley goes on to say about the prophecy: ‘its general sense however is clear; Avalon has always been known as the burial place of pagans. Buried there is Abbadare powerful in saphat, who sleeps there with 104,000, among whom was Joseph from across the sea who lies ‘in linea bifurcata’ against the South corner of the wattle church built by the 13 inhabitants of the place. Joseph has with him in his coffin two silver cruets filled with the blood and sweat of the Prophet Jesus’.

Carley informs us that Melkin is telling us that the wattle church was built by the 13 inhabitants of the place. He then goes on to say that Melkin’s prophecy defies exact translation and any interpretation of it abounds with difficulty of every kind. ‘Whatever the origin of Melkin it is clear that Glastonbury accepted the prophecy with gratitude though she never pretended to have understood it.’

It is clear that Carley does not know the origin of Melkin. Carley admits: The language of the prophecy, which was probably put together in its present form in the 13th century, is singularly obscure and defies precise translation.
It is startling to me, with these pronouncements, that our present authority is so ready to discount Melkin. Carley goes as far as saying regarding Melkin’s inclusion into John of Glastonbury’s *Cronica*: ‘as a historical personage mentioned in the gospels and venerated as the local Saint and patron, Joseph of Arimathea could well be expected to have left his remains at Glastonbury; these would be relics worthy of the greatest veneration. Interestingly though, Melkin’s prophecy is very vague on the issue’. The text states that he is buried at Glastonbury: *Et iacet in linea bifurcata iuxta meridianum angulum oratorii, cratibus praeparatis. But what this actually means has caused considerable confusion (and certainly exercised the ingenuity of modern commentators).*

Melkin’s prophecy is anything but vague. Carley’s eyes deceive him, for nowhere does the text state that Joseph is buried at Glastonbury. (It is Henry’s propaganda which makes the conversion). Lagorio also has the same problem. The text does however locate an island, but it is not at Glastonbury and nor is Joseph of Arimathea’s tomb. Carley’s opinion is formed by John of Glastonbury’s *Cronica* when he interprets part of Melkin’s prophecy, he states that: ‘*Joseph sepultus est et positus in linea bifurcara iuxta oratorium predictum*’. ‘Joseph is buried, and positioned in a line that bifurcates where the oratory was’.

Carley knows JG is referring to Glastonbury but does not understand Melkin does not. This in itself would be an odd assertion for John of Glastonbury, if (as some have posited), he invented the prophecy himself. Where do the numbers 104 and 13 fit in? Why include the elusive *sperula*? John can hardly be the person who provides us with genuine instructions which locates an island 104 nautical miles away by way of a line which bifurcates the Michael line at 13 *sperulatis*. Without the 13 degree angle, even if one had knowledge of the Michael line, one would still need to know where the bifurcation point occurs (in the sphaerula of Avebury). The angle at which to extend the 104 mile line is vital to locating the island.

Logically, Carley would have us believe JG interprets his own concocted prophecy…. and conveniently leaves out all the irrelevant data which modern scholars choose to ignore also. The difficult conundrum with which modern scholars are therefore presented is…. why include spurious numerical values like 104 and 13 in the first place if the prophecy is an invention to bolster the presence of Joseph at Glastonbury? The answer will not be found in Abu Adar al-Badr or Sultan Baibars or al Malik Adh Dhahir
or the Syrian fortress of Safad. The geometry of Melkin is unequivocal and has nothing to do with Glastonbury. It marks an island in Devon, in England...not Syria.

Carley goes on to explain how a certain R. Willis arrived at *Linea Bifurcate* being interpreted and equated to a linen shirt through *Linea*=undergarment... being divided by two flaps and Aelred Watkin thinking it a corruption of *ligno bifurcato*, the sense being that Joseph lies under a cross.

Carley is also baffled by the bifurcated line; again because of his focus at Glastonbury: *‘In none of these cases is there any indication that this line has actually been located or that the site has been excavated. Presumably the monks could find no burial site with which they could identify with Joseph. The prophecy, however, suggests both that this site exists and that finding it is an enterprise of occult meaning, which could be linked with the millennial vision’.*

It is gratifying (in this instance) that Carley concedes the site of Joseph’s burial might exist based upon what the prophecy suggests. Until the prophecy is decoded and one understands whose relics are with Joseph in the tomb, the magnitude of the meaning is more than a ‘Millennial vision’.

To imply that the line has not actually been located is incorrect. More accurately, Carley has chosen to ignore Yale’s solution to the prophecy as this would involve some backtracking and embarrassment from previous ‘scholarly’ postulations. Let me state clearly that the line exists and *that this line has actually been located*.... the evidence for it has been available for more than 20 years. The ‘Michael line’, is an alignment running across southern England. It is a line of alignment which has existed since the Megalithic period. It is also known as the Beltane line and was certainly aligned in Melkin’s era, same as it is today.

What it is and why someone has adorned it with St Michael churches and similarly in Montacute and on Burgh Island does not concern us for the present. What it does indicate though, is sometime in the past, someone might have been aware of the lines which Melkin refers to.

---
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The Michael line is the line that Melkin is showing us to bifurcate within the *sperula* at Avebury with a *meridianum*, at an angle of 13 degrees, and extend a line 104 nautical miles. The *meridianum* mentioned by Melkin indicates it is a line on a map.

Melkin is not vague about where the body is buried. The prophecy does not reference any part of the church at Glastonbury. From this we should be able to understand that someone i.e. Henry Blois, has put much etymological effort into the translocation of both HRB's Avalon and the 601 charter's Ineswitrin, to seem as if the location to which they pertain exist at the island of Glastonbury. This transformation was aided by *Insula Pomorum* becoming Arthur’s final resting place in VM. What we can determine is that Henry Blois’ efforts have paid off; for posterity has swallowed the illusion. The illusion was facilitated also by author B’s reference to Glastonbury as an island c.1000.... even if the Somerset levels were not flooded enough to isolate Glastonbury as an island in the 12th century.

Carley maintains that: ‘*The facts of the story- that is, that Joseph's relics were never located-seem incontestable, although it is difficult to understand why this is the case. Why would the later mediaeval community at Glastonbury not undertake some sort of exhumation, the finds of which could be associated with Joseph? Why did Melkin's prophecy put the unearthing of Joseph's grave squarely within an apocalyptic tradition? Surely it would have been more convenient to have physical relics on display to corroborate the so-called ancient writings and to stand as an ecclesiastical parallel to the Arthurian relics*’.407

Carley asks the most sensible question: Why did Melkin's prophecy put the unearthing of Joseph's grave squarely within an apocalyptic tradition? When Joseph’s grave is opened it will be apocalyptic... the unearthing will be nothing less than the eradication of the Roman Catholic lie about a body vanishing into heaven. The Christian religion has no understanding of the Prophets of Israel. Not even Henry Blois could unearth Joseph as they did with Arthur after Henry’s death.

No-one understood what constituted the *duo fassula*. We can see that Henry Blois, when he relayed the Grail stories at the court of Champagne to

---

Marie and Alix in their original form, must have used the term *sang real* and listeners to Bleheris misheard it and Jongleurs like Chretien wrote San Graal. Henry made the connection to the vessel (fassula) in the prophecy because of the mention of the blood itself. We can safely conclude, later troubadours who had heard his words must have heard reference to *san Graal* instead of *Sang Real* or Holy blood, as Henry Blois himself assumed the prophecy to refer to.

But, Henry still understood the enigma of the *duo fassula* as a vessel as is clear in Robert de Boron’s references.... even though in the interim transition from oral to written word, it becomes a holy ‘Graal’ or *san Graal*, but still contains the blood as is inferred in the prophecy. Henry understands it as a container and because of this, links it to any container known to be associated with Jesus i.e. either the cup of the last supper as Robert’s version indicates (or the Magdalene foot bowl). Certainly, Helinand knows from whom the information came but does not mention Melkin and has an idea of what the Grail consists of: ‘At this time a certain marvellous vision was revealed by an angel to a certain hermit in Britain concerning St. Joseph the noble decurion who deposed from the cross the body of our Lord, as well as concerning the paten or dish in which our Lord supped with his disciples, whereof the history was written out by the said hermit and is called ‘Of The Graal’ (De Gradali).

Helinand was a minstrel who won the favour of King Philip Augustus c.1180 the same who might have provided the book to Chrètien as he was the son of Adele of Champagne. Helinand who is the first to connect a British Monk with the Grail and the history was written out by the British monk.

Evidence of a British monk trying to influence people on the continent implying the ‘Grail book’ is ancient, smacks of Henry’s propaganda. Now, it would not be a speculation too far, that this insert into Helinand’s chronological history may have been instigated originally by information left at Froidmont by Henry. Probability suggests that Henry Blois is the connection especially in that we know Henry commissioned many Tournai marble fonts and must have passed through this area. Froidmont is very close to Tournai. It seems fair that knowledge of the Graal may have been spoken of by a passing bishop of some renown who left a book written by an ancient British monk (which just so happens to get to Philip Augustus).
Carley’s reflections above are easily answered. It would have been difficult to fake the Grail at Glastonbury. Who is going to be brave enough to forge an object on which so much potential and mystery rests? If someone was going to fake such a thing it would have been Henry Blois as he has no regard for twisting the truth. It was easier and more propitious to convince the world that his chivalric alter-ego had at one time existed by creating a grave with old Gorilla bones and a lock of hair which pretended to be relics of Arthur and Guinevere.

It was probably Henry Blois who told Henry II where the body was located as well as making it seem as if William of Malmesbury had casually mentioned its position in DA. Giraldus relates a story of Henry II involvement. Henry Blois could have told the King while Henry Blois was on his deathbed. We know Henry had surreptitiously indicated the graves location between the pyramids in DA.

We know that Henry II visited the old and blind dying bishop and was castigated by him regarding Becket. There is also some possibility that the unearthing was instigated by Eleanor of Aquitaine who may also have been privy to certain information from the King or Henry Blois as she had just been released from prison on Henry II’s death. At this time the French court and the court of Champagne presided over by Eleanor’s two daughters Marie and Alix would have been immersed in Arthuriana and Grail literature for twenty years since Henry Blois’ death. They were both married to Henry Blois’ nephews. We might speculate that Eleanor had also heard all these stories while imprisoned. We should not forget that Eleanor was mother-in-law, to two of Henry Blois’ nephews and it is possible she may have been given books by Henry Blois or by her daughters while imprisoned. Do not forget that this is a man who went out of his way to rewrite history and to spread and propagandise his fabrications on two continents using his connections.

The commonly accepted scenario is that Henry de Sully fraudulently concocted the pantomime of Arthur’s disinterment when Richard I, Eleanor’s son had just inherited the throne. Supposedly funds had dried up for the reconstruction of the abbey since Henry II’s death. This may have been coincidental and opportune…. but there is no way that Henry de Sully consummated Henry Blois’ Matter of Britain edifice by fabricating a cross and confirming the historicity of Henry’s fiction. To carry out such a fraud, one would need to pass some censure or scrutiny of those at the dig. One
might conclude the grave had lain dormant for some time. Adam’s witness of curtains surrounding the dig is a confusion with the dig at Montacut which Henry had turned into a ‘fairy tale’ now known as *De Inventione*.

Henry’s aim and reason for laying bare the grave’s location in DA and also perhaps passing this information to the King was so that, like Joseph’s tomb, it would be found in the future. Henry had procured and moved enough relics in his time as bishop and abbot of Glastonbury, to be sure that after his death the grave site would be re-found…. 40 years after William had supposedly mentioned it casually in DA. Once this set of circumstances is understood, it allows an earlier date for Perlesvaus than that previously thought.

We are no longer bound by contrived chronologies which the scholastic community has deduced, such as…. there is no mention of Avalon in DA until after Arthur’s disinterment. It now becomes feasible in the time line to account Blihos Bliheris, or Master Blehis as the provider of the information for Chrétien…. which had hitherto been discounted due to the colophon in the Perlesvaus which refers to Arthur and Guinevere’s grave at Glastonbury/Avalon. Scholarship, adhering to the assumed *a priori* that DA408 did not have this information inserted into it until after the unearthing of Arthur’s grave.

This view is held erroneously, assuming DA was first published c.1134.…. and no interpolations were made until after Arthur’s bogus exhumation. This in effect leaves a gap of sixty years. If we can accept the fact that Henry Blois interpolated DA, who died 1171…. as well as accepting that he had pointed out the place of Arthur’s gravesite; it would mean that from the time it became public knowledge until the disinterment in 1191, the gap would be 20-30 years since Arthur’s and Guinevere’s ‘relics’ were interred in the grave yard undisturbed (assuming the grave was manufactured post 1158). We should not forget that it is ‘Geoffrey’ who indicates Arthur’s association with *Insula Pomorum* c.1155-58.

Rather than the commonly accepted principle upon which scholars reckon the unearthing took place, (funding for the abbey’s

---

408 Chapter 31. *I Passover Arthur, famous King of the Britons buried with his wife in the monks cemetery between the two pyramids.*
reconstruction), we should think of it differently. Arthur’s gravesite was known locally before the fire. We should not think of any reason for exhuming him as the Glastonbury graveyard and church was packed with saints anyway. One must not forget Henry’s propaganda concerning Arthur’s grave had only recently been manufactured and was part of the fledgling Lore of the previous generation. But, after the fire, as the new building arose, it was a consideration, as Gerald relates…. to have Arthur’s body put in the new Church on more sacred ground. We therefore now have a gap of less than ten years from the fire and a good reason for making Arthur a feature of the new Church. So, to assume Henry de Sully is the instigator of the fraud is unfounded. Especially as the fabricator of the cross must be Henry…. in essence, it establishes Henry’s Avalon at Glastonbury. We already have witnessed this is his intention by creating Insula Pomorum in VM. We could speculate that all Henry de Sully is doing is carrying out the time honoured ploy of reaping an increase in alms for his church by increasing the prominence of Arthur within the new building.

Henry Blois finally fulfilled the translocation of a fictional island by concurring with ‘Geoffrey’s’ assertion where Arthur was last witnessed to be. Miraculously the grave is found and confirmed to be in Avalon.

Now, the reader is aware that Melkin’s Ineswitrin has been replaced in Melkin’s prophecy with the name of Henry Blois’ Avalon…. the disinterment of Arthur in effect has diluted somewhat the problems of disinterring Joseph as he lies supposedly on a bifurcated line ‘undiscovered’ near the old church. But, all are now convinced that since Arthur’s disinterment has proved Glastonbury to be Avalon by that which is stated on the leaden cross…. all may now accept that Joseph is buried there also, purely because of the substitution of Ineswitrin for Avalon on the Melkin prophecy. It is also confirmed by Henry’s propaganda which Robert de Boron relates concerning Joseph and the magical vessel, that it too is connected to the vaus d’Avaron in the west, (En la terre vers Occident, Ki est sauvage durement, En vaus d’Avaron) which could only be construed as Glastonbury.

Carley is as much in the dark as everyone else.\(^{409}\) He asks the right questions: Abbadare, potens in Saphat, paganorum nobilissimus, cum centum et quatuor milibus domiicionem ibi accepit: ‘This portion of the text has been

\(^{409}\) Cicero. No one can speak well, unless he thoroughly understands his subject.
almost universally ignored or, in the case of Capgrave and Usher versions, deleted. Why, for example is Abbadare buried with 104,000? Is this a mistake for the 144,000 of Revelations 7:4? And why is the pagan nature of the cemetery stressed? There is no doubt that Glastonbury was once a pagan shrine, but what does this reference mean in this context? Finally, just who is Abbadare and where is Saphat’. 

Abbadare is not buried with 104,000, he is buried 104 nautical miles from the sperula and he lies on a bifurcated line, the end of which coincidentally terminates on an island 104 miles from the said circle of Avebury. There are two Jews on the Island not pagans. Abbadare is Jesus and Saphat is not a place. It is excruciating that Saphat has become a place as Carley proceeds to lead the next generation of medieval scholars astray. He pontificates further with a pretence of diligent authority: Concerning the context of these last two words, at least, I think I can provide some suggestions. The first important point is that Abbadare is specifically called a pagan. Secondly, the sound of his name clearly suggests an Arab source and this of course ties in with the pagan epithet. Thirdly, later in the prophecy there is a section with pagan and Arab (specifically Moslem) connotations: Jesus at 1.11 is called the ‘Prophet Jesus’. Moreover, this very unusual term to describe Jesus is used at one other point in John’s Cronica. In this passage John describes the adventures of one Rainald of Marksbury who traveling to the holy land, was captured by a certain sultan, and then was released after he obtained for the sultan some of the soil from Glastonbury cemetery. The sultan at one point asks Rainald; si haberet noticiam cuiusdam insule inter duos montes site ubi Ioseph ab Arimathia nobilis decurio quiescit qui prophetam Ihesu assumpserat de cruce.

According to John, these events occurred when Michael de Beckery was sacristan at Glastonbury Abbey, which was in the last quarter of the 13th century. That the ‘Prophet Jesus’ of the Melkin prophecy contains an echo of the Rainald adventure is in my opinion highly probable. Surely Melkin’s Abbadare is the garbled rendition of some pagan name which Rainald (or another crusader) brought back with him from the East. Moreover, the whole Rainald episode is concerned with the sanctity of the very soil of the cemetery, since the sultan released Rainald only after the latter had brought back some earth from this most sacred burial ground. The parallels with Melkin’s statements about the pagans buried at Glastonbury because of its sanctity
suggest that there is a strong tradition linking the two episodes, that some eastern material has been absorbed into Glastonbury lore.\textsuperscript{410}

Melkin did not make any statements about pagans buried at Glastonbury. Melkin’s \textit{Abbadare} is not a garbled rendition of Rainald or has any connection to the Rainald episode. The ‘garbled rendition’ is rather the explanation and improbable supposition of Carley’s.... rather than the inaccuracy of Melkin’s instructions. Carley seems to think that: \textit{Abbadare is a latinized form of some name like Abu Adar (used as a personal name) or perhaps a version of the relatively common name al-Badr. Another possibility is that it is a transliteration of the name of a Sultan Baibars (al Malik Adh Dhahir) who seized Safad from the Templars in 1266- the interpretation would assume that Baibars was the Sultan to whom Rainald refers.}

\textit{Abbadare} has nothing to do with ‘al Malik Adh Dhahir’ or Safad or ‘Abu Adar’.... or the blind leading the blind. The island is in England and the person in the tomb as far as the prophecy is concerned is Joseph of Arimathea. Now, even if you were to understand only that Joseph has something with him, we might just take a moderate guess and come up with Jesus.... considering it is only in association with Jesus we know anything of Joseph. Because Jesus is referred to as a prophet (which he was) why should Carley’s convoluted suggestion have any merit.... just because Jesus is referred to as a prophet. Jesus refers to himself as a prophet in Mathew 13.57 and Mark 6.4 when some took offence at him: \textit{Then Jesus told them, ‘A prophet is honoured everywhere except in his own hometown and among his own family’}.... In Mathew 21.11 do not the crowds say: ‘This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee.’

Safad, Baibars, ‘al Malik Adh Dhahir’, ‘Abu Adar’ is pure piffle dressed up as learnèd deduction by Carley. Carley goes on to say: \textit{the Arab connections are a means of providing a very probable identity for the place rendered as Saphat. If the basis for this portion of the prophecy is material which Rainald brought back from the Holy Land, then Saphat is almost certainly a transcription of Safad, which was a major Templar fortification in the Kingdom of Acre.}

John of Glastonbury (and every other sane person) thought the Melkin prophecy related to Joseph of Arimathea and Avalon in England. To pronounce Melkin an invention whilst positing this sort of nonsense does

\textsuperscript{410} Carley. The Chronicle of Glastonbury abbey p. lviii
not commend scholarship. Saphat is ‘judgement’ and the word refers to Jesus!!!! To think also that the prophecy is a composition of tradition, or even a composite work of more than one person…. we can dismiss as trite postulation. It would be hellishly clever of different people, combining different material at different times, to hazard upon random figures which generates precision geometry through a line which bifurcates and terminates on an island (the subject of the prophecy).

If the false premise that Melkin’s prophecy is an invention is maintained, it becomes easier to extrapolate nonsense regarding it. I quote the expertise of Carley at length here: In this section of the prophecy it seems clear, therefore, that we are dealing with a tradition which was originally separate from the material about Joseph of Arimathea and the Grail. Historically, both traditions must have been formulated in their present form at approximately the same time, that is, in the second half of the 13th century. The psychological reasons for the linking are also easy to understand; both stand as traditions with occult and eastern meanings, which could easily be associated with the general context of an ancient prosthetic tradition. The possible astrological hints are the last aspect of the prophecy which I wish to discuss. Bale and Pits (following him) seem to assume that Melkin is making some sort of astrological reference in his text. Bale, for example, describes Melkin as follows: **astorum peritus ac geometer, non solum arcana somniorum et cometarum eventus discutere atque planetarum dispositiones demonstrare solebat.** The first possible suggestion of an astrological meaning comes in the confusing phrase **sperulis prophecie vaticinatibus decorate.** Spaerula as a diminutive of sphaera, does occur in the Vulgate Bible where it seems to mean a small ball or sphere. Other specialised mediaeval meaning of this word include knob, chape of a sheath, or incense receptacle. But none of these seems to fit here. The word, moreover, occurs again later in the prophecy: superadictis sperulatis locum habitanstibus tredicim. Watkin suggests in an unpublished note that in these contexts it might refer to a whorl pattern of Celtic crosses in the cemetery at the old church of Glastonbury. Alternatively he considers that it might describe some kind of clothes or headgear that could produce the idea of a spiral. But these and almost any other alternative translations do
not explain why the sperulae are prophesying, and why Avalon is the place with 13 sperulatis inhabitants.\footnote{Carley. The Chronicle of Glastonbury abbey p.lix.}

One wonders if Watkin also had a PhD\footnote{Aelred Watkin achieved a Double First in History, and was a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.} to come up with the spiral or headgear idea. The piffle which has been written by those who pretend to better inform us is depressing in its pretension. The deciphering of Melkin’s cryptic prophecy has been seen and witnessed by Carley and summarily dismissed.... and we can see why: any other alternative translations do not explain why the sperulae are prophesying, and why Avalon is the place with 13 sperulatis inhabitants. Our expert Carley is a ‘distinguished research professor’ B.A. (Victoria); M.A. (Dalhousie); Ph.D. (Toronto).

So let us defer again to the authority on the subject of Melkin and Carley’s expert analysis of the prophecy: Sphaera is itself the word normally used to describe a heavenly body. In this context the diminutive spherula might well be used to describe a small representation of a planet or constellation. Certainly this interpretation would explain why the sperulae in this text could be endowed with a prophetic function. This suggestion would also help to explain why there were 13 ‘sphered’ habitantibus. The number quickly brings to mind astrological associations and the hypothesis that these 13 are the signs of the Zodiac with some planet, perhaps the sun at their centre seems very feasible’.

Feasible to whom? This is astounding piffle, but it continues: It is also important to note just what locus is being discussed in connection with the 13 sphered things. From my earlier discussion of Joseph’s burial site and from the mention of cratibus preparatis, I think it becomes clear that the reference is to the original wattle church which was destroyed by fire in 1184. This suggests that the prophecy contains at least one remnant of a much earlier tradition. Moreover, the reference to the wattle church recalls a very peculiar statement which William of Malmesbury made about the floor of the old church: Moreover in the pavement may be remarked on every side stones designedly interlaid in triangles and squares, and figured with lead, under which if I believe some sacred enigma to be contained, I do no injustice to religion.

There are no ‘13 sphered things’ and it is Henry Blois (as we shall see in the chapters on GR and DA) who attempts to find a connection between
‘wattle’ and the old church, which, we know was in wood when William wrote. Now, why would the interpolator of GR3 and DA have us believe there is a connection to ‘wattle’ with the church? Do you think that it is because the prophecy is extant in the interpolator’s day and it is the same interpolator who would have us believe Glastonbury is synonymous with Avalon?

It beggars belief that Lagorio and Carley both focus on the drought or lack of water either in Britain or at Glastonbury and do not understand the intended spiritual meaning behind the turn of events immediately following the future discovery of the tomb of Joseph and Jesus. The same metaphorical language pervades biblical prophecy, which, to a certain extent, Melkin was mirroring.

After explaining that ros celi has something to do with the Rosicrucians, Carley then goes on to conclude ‘at this time I am unable to formulate any kind of exposition of the meaning of the climatic promise of the prophecy, but I do contend that these esoteric parallels exist, that the key to the prophecy is astrological, and that it is somehow linked with the occult symbols which William saw on the old church floor’. Piffle again!! The key to the prophecy is geometrical.

So let me state for the record, the prophecy has nothing to do with William of Malmesbury’s observations. The prophecy has no astrological or Eastern connection (except for Joseph and Jesus hailing from there). The ‘Climatic promise’ however is a certainty. It is the purport of the Melkin prophecy.

The tomb has to be opened first and this is hardly likely to happen if so called experts like Carley deny the existence of Melkin and the set of instructions plainly evident in his prophecy. The opening of the tomb on Burgh Island will bring about the ‘Climatic promise’; but don’t expect rain!!! Religion is the new ‘race’ and we are defined by it. Contemplate the discovery of a body which a third of the globe previously thought had disappeared to heaven.

In the *Downside Review*, Carley pretends to elucidate further, but exposes that he has little understanding of the prophecy. He expounds in an exposé called *Melkin the Bard and esoteric tradition at Glastonbury Abbey* from which we can observe his rather uncertain standpoint as to whether Melkin existed. We can also witness his views as to ‘precisely what sources
and traditions stand behind the few extant lines supposedly written by this vates and Bard’....

Carley proposes that: ‘Glastonbury Abbey, it transpired, had its own Welsh bard, whose greatness rivalled Merlin's and who pre-dated Merlin by a number of years’. The idiocy of this statement is apparent in that Henry Blois’ or rather ‘Geoffrey’s’ Merlin was partly based on Melkin. How can a fictitious character make up fictitious prophecies in what is known to be a pseudo-history.... be called into relation with a historical person who has encrypted geometry into what looks like a prophecy; a prophecy which points out to posterity where Joseph of Arimathea’s relics are deposited.

Carley then goes on to say: ‘no modern scholar, it seems to me, can seriously maintain that this discovery was altogether legitimate, that there really was an ancient bard called Melkin in whose writings were stored at Glastonbury’. It is here that the mud has to stick. No serious scholar could maintain otherwise. There was an ancient bard. It is not as mad as some of the previous statements to posit that Melkin may well have been the donator of Ineswitrin to Glastonbury by the 601 charter... as the Devonian King.

Referring to John of Glastonbury's Cronica, Carley makes the observation that: ‘John does not claim to have rediscovered Melkin; in fact, he seems to assume that his readers will have knowledge of this figure and that they can consult the older text from which he is ostensibly quoting’.

Henry’s version of DA was followed by Adam of Damerham’s Historia de Rebus gestis Glastoniensibus. John’s Cronica followed Adam’s to recount and consolidate the propaganda started by Henry in DA. William’s DA was impregnated and interpolated before Henry’ Blois’ death, even though Melkin is not mentioned in it. Let us also remember that Glastonbury is not mentioned in HRB and is the oldest church in England. Carley is right in that Henry Blois did write other corroborating material from which JG is consolidating. Otherwise we could not have Arviragus from HRB attached to Glastonbury lore. I will deal with Arviragus under the chapter on DA.

If a reader believed the content of HRB.... is he to assume Glastonbury did not exist? To excuse this omission, positing it was known as Avalon is ludicrous.... because Avalon did not exist before Henry. If Melkin and the prophecy were mentioned in DA most contemporaries would have connected Robert de Boron and Chrétien’s work to Henry Blois considering
Arthur was going to be unearthed at some stage and the *vaus d'Avaron* becomes the place where Joseph is supposedly buried also.

At Henry’s death, Avalon was at Glastonbury according to his own propaganda; the holy blood which is mentioned in the Melkin’s prophecy was the *sang réal*, Joseph was connected to Avalon etc. etc. If Henry’s aim was to secret his authorship (which he has certainly done for over a thousand years), the inclusion of the Melkin prophecy in a book dedicated to him would lay bare the rest of his fraud. In Henry’s lifetime, two separate continental authors concur that Joseph did bring something to England and the only tract which associates Joseph directly with Glastonbury and the Grail is *Perlesvaus*.... yet Robert associates Avalon with Joseph and the Grail.... and Chretien associated Arthur with the Grail.

Since Henry is the instigator of the Grail stories, the inspiration for which was derived from the works of Melkin at Glastonbury, it is hardly likely (since William does not mention Melkin elsewhere) that Henry is likely to implicate himself in the interpolative fraud by introducing into DA the material which inspired his mythical Island into HRB or the *duo fassula* upon which the Grail was based; because his name is associated with that book as dedicatee. John’s attitude toward Melkin (as Carley correctly points out), negates the proposition that John is the forger of the prophecy. Adam does not mention Melkin. Why should he? If Carley cannot make head nor tail of Melkin’s prophecy why would Adam be any the wiser. He ignores it too!!!

Henry either got rid of any works of Melkin, so the source of his edifice would never be discovered.... or possibly Melkin’s works were destroyed in the fire.\(^{413}\) Luckily a copy of the prophecy survived, but we know by the island’s change of name.... the prophecy has been doctored by Henry. So, one must conclude that some of the works ascribed to Melkin (especially *De Arthurii mensa rotunda*),) have a Henry Blois provenance. This is where JG is getting his extraneous connections not incorporated in DA.

In consideration of all we have covered so far, it would be ignorant to assume this next interpolation in DA was written by any other than Henry Blois. Otherwise Adam and John would never have believed they were at Avalon and the VM’s *Insula Pomorum* would have no relevance to Glastonbury:

\(^{413}\) Adam of Damerham relates that many books were destroyed by the fire.
This island was at first called Yniswitrin by the Britons but at length was named by the English, who had brought the land under their yoke, Glastinbiry, either a translation into their language of its previous name, or after Glasteing of whom we spoke above. It is also frequently called the isle of Avalon, a name of which this is the origin. It was mentioned above that Glasteing found his sow under an apple tree near the church. Because he discovered on his arrival that apples were very rare in that region he named the island Avalonie in his own language, that is ‘Apple island’, for avalla in British is the same as poma in Latin. Or it was named after a certain Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters because of the solitude of the spot.414

Modern scholars have, for the most part, dismissed John’s quotation which relates Melkin’s prophecy as a forgery, and the general assumption has been that John of Glastonbury was responsible for the fraud. Carley goes on to say: ‘An examination of later medieval and renaissance citations of Melkin, however, suggests that this dismissal of Melkin represents a very modern attitude’. Carley and Lagorio’s dismissal of Melkin, being the main proponents.... are the ‘modern attitude’. However, their views are based on redundant misconceptions.

Modern scholarship has effectively delivered a character assassination on Melkin, purely because they have no understanding of the prophecy. Yet, ‘up to the mid-eightheenth century, every major compilation of British writers included a section on Melkin and his work’.

Without Melkin and Henry Blois, there would be a pitiful legend at Glastonbury. Carley confirms that he has no understanding of the prophecy he is purporting to elucidate upon: ‘Since it is written as a prophecy, it is not surprising that the meaning is somewhat obscure; what is confusing is just how garbled the actual syntax is, and how altogether incomprehensible the allusions are’.

Carley then states: Once again, the hypothesis that it is a late forgery, consciously written as such, does not by any means seem as obvious as scholars have suggested’.

For all Carley’s dubious hypotheses; it is not a forgery. Carley tells us he will analyse both the text and allusions to Melkin by saying: ‘what I hope to establish is both the considerable antiquity of portions of the prophecy and

414 John Scott. DA. Ch. 5
that the existing fragment is only one item in a larger corpus of works ascribed to Melkin’.

The Prophecy as a whole (not portions of it) is from antiquity. The only part definitively more recently forged is the name Avalon which was substituted for Ineswitrin. In fact, the events the prophecy refers to transpired c.35AD. If Joseph was Jesus’ father (or uncle).... Jesus was buried after the crucifixion on Joseph’s tin island and later interred there himself. The nearest we can get to the antiquity of the prophecy is in connection to the charter which is dated to 601AD which refers to the same Island.

Carley then goes on to give his interpretation of the prophecy in translation: In the translation which follows however, I have tried to remain as safe as possible to the text itself since my purpose is one of elucidating meaning rather than enhancing poetic value: The Isle of Avalon, greedy in the burial of Pagans, above others in the world, decorated at the burial place of all of them with vaticinatory little spheres of prophecy, and in future it will be adorned with those who praise the most high. Abbadare, powerful in Saphat, most noble of pagans, took his sleep there with 104,000. Amongst them Joseph de Marmore, named ‘of Arimathea’, took everlasting sleep. And he lies on a forked line close to the southern corner of the chapel with prepared wattle above the powerful venerable maiden, the 13 aforesaid sphered things occupying the place. For Joseph has with him in the tomb to white and silver vessels filled with the blood and sweat of the prophet Jesus. When his tomb is found, it will be seen whole and undefiled in the future, and will be open to all the earth. From then on, neither water nor heavenly dew will be able to be lacking with those who inhabit the most noble island. For a long time before the day of judgement in Josaphat will these things the open and declare to the living. Thus far Melkin.

After much uncertainty on most issues in the prophecy, Carley excuses his untenable rationalisations with the following conclusions: ‘There is a disease which attacks most scholars who deal with the history of Glastonbury Abbey, a kind of galloping gullibility. This essay is not, I hope a manifestation of early symptoms of this malady’. Carley’s are less like early symptoms of a malady but rather a mortal sickness.

He then goes on to make his position less clear than positions explained previously:’ I am not suggesting that the Grail has links with the Templars and Glastonbury (through Safad and the Red Cross Knight), nor that this
symbol is the key for resolving the secrets of the universe, nor that this esoterica Abbadare came from the East to be buried at Glastonbury, nor even that this esoteric alchemical exercise has any intrinsic metaphysical meaning. **What I do suggest however is** that Melkin’s prophecy is an example of a highly esoteric text laced with occult information, and that it contains hints of a consciously coded secret which by the time of John of Glastonbury had become altogether garbled. Equally important, this paper suggests that the prophecy quoted by John is only one item in a large corpus of works attributed to Melkin, although it is difficult to determine either the number (from 1 to 3 according to various accounts) or the exact age of the material. I think that what Leland has to say about Melkin and his works must be taken as somewhat accurate’.

One wonders why, if the prophecy is esoteric text laced with occult information, and that it contains hints of a consciously coded secret, the solution to the code is still ignored by Carley. Carley himself admits he is at a loss to what it all means.

This is the state of modern medieval scholarship where one is bent on preserving reputation rather than uncovering the truth. Until scholarship catches up with Henry’s clever façade involving the authorship of HRB and realises the two people first known to propagate both Arthurian, Josephian and Grail related material i.e. Robert de Boron and Chrétien de Troyes (both also supposedly come from the Blois region and speak of things directly related to Glastonburyana), there will be no discovery on Burgh Island.

The final summation of Carley states: **When scholars determined that Joseph of Arimathea was almost certainly created as the Glastonbury Saint through the transmutation of the French Grail legends, then it seemed equally clear that Melkin’s prophecy was forgery.** This condition must in general terms still be accepted, since the prophecy in the form it now stands certainly cannot predate the 13th century. But what my study shows is that the prophecy is at least as complex as the earlier excavation (Arthur’s), that it cannot be dismissed as the fabrication of a single author with a clear purpose of deception. It must, in fact, date from several periods and include material from a number of traditions. **Melkin, too is no doubt a fabricated rather than historic personality, but this creation seems to involve complicated transmutations of older documents rather than conscious forgery.**
If Melkin is not a historic personality, who is it that has devised the riddle which so accurately locates an island in Devon 104 miles from the *sphaerula* at Avebury. How is it that an Island even exists on the opposite end of the same 104 mile line which just happened to bifurcate the only known line on the landscape at 13 degrees within the circle or *Sphaerula* indicated in the prophecy?

This is an extraordinary coincidence that the line falls (at its extension of 104 miles) on an Island in Devon.... especially when our expert has advised us that the Prophecy *must, in fact, date from several periods and include material from a number of traditions*. That random material translates onto a map which indicates an Island truly is a ‘*fortuitous convergence of factors*’!!!!!!

That someone in the past has decoded such a set of geometrical instructions that identify an island from a set of obtuse words that *date from several periods and include material from a number of traditions* is in itself amazing. Especially now the people who would concur that these were geometrical instructions i.e. the Templars have gone and built a whole load of St Michael churches on all the spots demarcating the lines so that posterity did not lose this information again.

If one follows the supposition that French Grail Literature is the cause of Joseph lore at Glastonbury, one will never understand how Henry Blois built his literary edifice known as the *Matter of Britain*. There are so many contradictory opinions in Carley’s output, it would have been more helpful to remain silent than pontificate with a pretence to authority. 415

William of Worcester who measured and described the abbey church c.1478 at Glastonbury has understood that ‘*in linea bifurcata*’ is meant as part of a geometrical and measurable instruction: *Et ex opposite secunde fenestre ex parte meridionali sunt in cimiterio duo cruces lapidee concuate vbi ossa Arthuri regis recondebat vbi in linea bifurcata iacet Josephus ab

---

415 Carley. The Chronicle of Glastonbury abbey P. 1, li. *The Grail itself might be heterodox and not an actual relic but the events describing it (and especially the Arthurian connection) could all be interpreted as historical fact*. Given both the existence of this French material and the lacuna in Glastonbury tradition, it became practically inevitable that Joseph’s name would be assimilated. In fact, from Glastonbury’s perspective, the French tradition would have appeared *almost inspired*; it provided the missing clue to Glastonbury history. Now, I wonder whose inspiration might have influenced the French tradition. Could it be Master Blehis or even Bliho-Bliheris. Is there a clue anywhere? To posit that the Arthurian connection could in any way be connected to Joseph (as possible historical fact) is silly…. and an anachronism too far. Just imagine the inevitability of it all; the *fortuitous convergence of factors* which assimilates Joseph at Glastonbury!!!
Arimathea....‘and opposite the second window (of the lady chapel) on the south side there are in the cemetery two stone crosses hallowed, where the bones of King Arthur were buried, where ‘in line bifurcata' lies Joseph of Arimathea'.

The bifurcated line presented problems and early propaganda concentrated rather on the construction of the church to affect a compliant match to the prophecy. This can be witnessed by the Perlesvaus versions that emanated from Henry Blois where the ‘Old Church’ is made to coincide with the Grail chapel. These versions have the Grail chapel covered with lead as it was in Henry’s day. In the Perlesvaus there is a: *chapel nouvelemant faite, qui mout estoit bele e riche; si estoit covert de plon*... It would not make sense to maintain that the Perlesvaus is written by a continental scribe, long after Henry’s death with the occurrence of the 1184 fire at Glastonbury which burnt the church covered in lead.

Are we supposed to believe the author of Perlesvaus is linking his story to Glastonbury by a church which has burnt down? We know the author is fully acquainted with Avalon and Joseph. We know that the author is acquainted with the fact that Guinevere and Arthur are buried in Avalon.... and we know the story emanates from Master Blehis and a certain Blihos Bleheris ‘who knew the whole story’. Let us take an intuitive guess who the author was and why he was referencing a still existing old church (before the fire) and knows of Arthur’s burial location before the disinterment in 1191.

By reversing the mistaken assumptions of scholars which dictate that all things Arthurian in DA post-date the discovery of Arthur’s grave, we now can realise Henry was the interpolator of DA who indicated Arthur was buried in the ground at Glastonbury. Therefore, mention of Guinevere and Arthur in the tomb together, (made plain in the colophon of Perlesvaus), no longer determines (as scholars have previously thought) that the Perlesvaus must have been written after Arthur’s disinterment; because Henry (the writer of the colophon) knew what he had placed in the manufactured gravesite. What this allows then is that Master Blehis is now contemporary with Henry Blois.

This then allows the person attested to have propagated Grail legend who has a name like Monseigneur Blois, Master Blehis, Maistre Blohis, Blihos Bliheris or Blaise to possibly be Henry Blois. We should not forget
either that Giraldus Cambrensis’ latinised version of the name ‘Bledhericus’ is the ‘famosus ille fabulator’ who had lived "shortly before our time" i.e. in the period 1160-1170; not to mention the Bliocadran!!!

We have come across Hericus before but not with the BL prefix like all the others from whom Grail legend emanates. We know that Henry is the Hedgehog in the Merlin Prophecies with the pun on ‘Hericus’ instead of Henricus and we know he rebuilt the city of Winchester.

*Of Winchester: all will fall down*

*And the earth will swallow you up*

*The pastoral see there will be razed.*

As we have noted before, The Hedgehog is Henry’s own reference to himself:

*A hedgehog which will be loaded with apples will rebuild her.*

In the Melkin prophecy, the bifurcated line was important. Somehow, if the prophecy was to be relevant to Glastonbury, the featured ‘line’ in the prophecy should be presented as being directional in relation to the church or *oratori* which Henry Blois had linked to Joseph in DA. This was the only object by which the ‘bifurcated line’ could seem relevant.... as even the later Glastonbury acolytes understood ‘the line’ as being instructional and directional toward the place where Joseph was buried. The logic was that Joseph, having founded the church (through Henry’s propaganda), must have been buried in it before it was burnt. The simplest solution was to concoct a sense of directional relevance from the *oratori* and the problem was overcome.

We can conclude therefore, unlike the allusions to wattle in the prophecy, which substantiated that the church was the same intended place as that to which the prophecy referred....the bifurcated line would have been more difficult to incorporate as part of Glastonbury lore until long after the fire since the church was no longer visible.

Therefore, Henry makes it appear that the allusion to wattle was written by Malmesbury in both GR3 and DA. At this time, there is no mention of the bifurcated line in Henry’s propaganda. Not even Henry could simulate any relevance to the church with a bifurcated line and two random numbers. This was left to a later generation of monk-craft (after the fire) who implied the bifurcated line had relevance to the burnt down church. They, however, chose to leave out the numerical
information from the Melkin prophecy. Because they, like Carley, had no idea to what the numbers referred.

Thereafter, the implication was that the bifurcated line had relevance to the church and pretended to point to its location. This cannot logically stand the test of scrutiny as the reader is now cognisant that the prophecy predated the fire (as Henry’s muses had used it as a template). So, why the bifurcated line would be referencing the church or any point in it where Joseph might be buried makes no sense. Surely it would have been obvious before the fire if Joseph had ever been buried at Glastonbury. The bronze plaque is later propaganda which does show the credibility and weight which was given to the prophecy in trying to mimic aspects of its geometric data. What it does show is that not even Henry could work out what the bifurcated line alluded to.
The bronze plaque which provides fictional relevance to Melkin’s prophecy.

The 31st year after the passion of the Lord twelve saints among whom Joseph of Arimathea was the first, came here. They built in this place that church, the first in the realm, which Christ in honour of his mother, and a place for their burial, presently dedicated. St David Archbishop of
Menervia rested here. To whom the Lord when he was disposed to dedicate that church appeared in sleep and recalled him from his purpose, also in token that the same Lord had first dedicated that church with the cemetery: he pierced the bishops hand with his finger, and that's pierced it appeared in the sight of many on the morrow. Afterwards indeed the same Bishop as the Lord revealed, and the number of saints in the same grew, added a chancel to the eastern part of this church and consecrated it in honour of the Blessed virgin. The altar whereof, of priceless sapphire, he marked the perpetual memory of these things. ‘and lest the site or size of the earliest church should come to be forgotten by reason of such additions, this pillar is erected on a line extended southward through the two Eastern Angles of the same church, and cutting off from it the chancel of the aforesaid. And its length was sixty feet westward from that line; its width twenty six feet; the distance of the centre of this pillar from the middle point between the said angles, forty eight feet’.

The writer of the late liturgical piece prefixed by Hearne to John of Glastonbury’s Cronica continues Glastonbury’s propaganda. Melkin’s original 104 miles becomes the rationalised 144 thousand saints. After relating information about the line from the pillar (with the bronze plate affixed) outside on the North through the point up to which the eastern end of the old church originally came, the writer states: ‘near this line, according to certain ancient writers lies St. Joseph with a great multitude of Saints’.

Father Good states: This cross, moreover, had been set up many years before to mark the length of the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin, made by Saint Joseph with wattle. The length was measured by a straight line from the centre of the cross to the side of the chancel afterwards built of hewn stone, under which also there was of old, in a subterranean crypt the Chapel of St Joseph. Outside, in the wall of this Chapel of the blessed virgin...

To the North of the Lady Chapel stood a column (Father Good relating that it was a Cross) upon which a bronze plate was attached. It was close to the site where the pyramids used to be, the column foundations being uncovered in 1921. The function of the bronze plaque affixed to the column was propaganda but not Henry’s. However, it confirms my point that the monks were complying with the prophecy not that they invented the document. They are witnessed attempting to produce a satisfactory
relevance for the bifurcated line and hence the ‘cutting off’ allusion which gives the appearance that it complies with some sort of understanding of the word ‘bifurcate’. The bronze plate related the vision of St. David, so that positioning of the Chapel added by him, gave pertinence to Melkin’s bifurcated line:

‘and lest the site or size of the earliest church should come to be forgotten by reason of such additions, this pillar is erected on a line extended southward through the two Eastern Angles of the same church, and cutting off from it the chancel of the aforesaid. And its length was sixty feet westward from that line; its width twenty six feet; the distance of the centre of this pillar from the middle point between the said angles, forty eight feet’.

As we can see from the above there is a direct attempt to make the bifurcated line relevant. In logic, from the description above, the bifurcated line is only made relevant by its associations with the new additions. And therefore if one were to believe the wholly concocted pretention of geometrical nonsense, one would have to believe the prophecy is a late invention.

However, even though the monks perfectly understood the bifurcated line had relevance to instructional data (which supposedly pointed out Joseph’s burial site); modern scholars, who insist the prophecy is fake, now determine the *linea bifurcata* relates to a linen cloth. One wonders therefore why they should bother seeking any explanation for what they think is a fraud and deny the medieval monks their interpretation of the bifurcated line as geometrically relevant.

The existence of the column still standing with the bronze plate in place can be traced back to the second quarter of the 17th century, and relates the story of the arrival of Joseph of Arimathea, the dedication of the original church by our Lord in person, and how the church was built to honour his Virgin mother. The plaque seems to have carried out its intended function as a propaganda instrument showing by measurement the location of the old church. J. Blome on 10th June 1345, having obtained his royal permit, set out to search for Joseph within the Glastonbury grounds. One of the reasons given for the search was ‘because it is said in certain ancient writings that the body was there buried’ a reference to Melkin’s Prophecy: *in quibusdam Antiquis Scripturis dictur continere Corpus eius ibidem fuisse Sepultrum.*
For all Carley’s pronouncements on Melkin the following is astounding: *Whether or not John actually fabricated the prophecy- to which there is no reference in GC for example- is not relevant here.*[^416]

Who wrote the prophecy is the most consequential fact of all Glastonburyana lore. It is highly relevant to establishing its veracity. If John flourished supposedly c.1400 where he says he stops his history in the prologue or the earliest date for John’s *Cronica* could be 1375 (since it refers to John Chinnock as *postea abbas*); or even if we take the date when the *Cronica* actually finishes which is 1342.... how is it that J. Blome is searching the grounds on information obviously supplied by Melkin’s prophecy.... when Carley is the main proponent in accusing John of fabricating the prophecy. If we assume the *Cronica* was started in 1340 and finished in 1342 it is still astounding Blome gets a royal writ on the grounds of a prophecy so newly invented. How is it that Blome has a Royal writ to search.... especially if Melkin or his prophecy were supposed to be fabricated? Are we to believe the royal writ was granted on grounds of evidence supplied in Grail literature?

As I have stated, this transpired before the reliable Leland, (not prone to exaggeration or invention), saw the original text (of Henry’s with the name Avalon) of the Melkin prophecy and described it as an *Exemplarium Vetustatis*.[^417] So, what Carley deems as not relevant becomes highly relevant

[^416]: Carley. The chronicle of Glastonbury abbey. Xxvii.

[^417]: It is worth noting here just how the scholastic world feeds from one generation to the next expanding on erroneous theories which in the end make little sense. It is plain Watkin has no more idea about the early provenance of Melkin’s prophecy than Carley: *Leland saw the original text of this prophecy and described it as an exemplarium vetustatis and it is certainly couched in a style that is antique, obscure and ungrammatical. Its general sense, however, is clear: Avalon has always been known as the burial place of pagans. Buried there is Abbadare powerful in saphat, who sleeps there with 104,000 among whom was Joseph from across the sea who lies in Linea bifurcate against the south corner of the wattle church built by the thirteen inhabitants of the place. Joseph has with him in his coffin two silver cruets filled with the blood and sweat of the prophet Jesus.*
in that; through Henry's interpolations in DA in chapters one and two and the existing knowledge of Melkin's prophecy, a search is carried out for Joseph's remains before John 'flourished'.

Carley further states: Blome's writ therefore, represents the first witness to an awareness of Melkin outside Glastonbury. I can only stress that Henry Blois' search at Montacute was for Joseph.... and the only reason he is looking there is because Melkin has connected Joseph's burial place to Montacute. Montacute sits on the line we are led to construct. The 104 mile line is the essence of the Melkin prophecy once deciphered and when constructed on a map, it defines which Island the relics of Joseph are on. Only Melkin could know this and thus we have the resultant of this search for Joseph at Montacute which was unsuccessful in the production of the fabricated De Inventione; long before Bloom's search.

The royal writ is printed from the patent role in Rymer's Foedera:

The King to all of whom these presents shall come, Greeting! John Blome of London has petitioned us that since (as he asserts) a divine injunction has been laid on him as concerning the venerable body of the noble decurion Joseph of Arimathea, which rests in Christ buried within the bounds of the monastery of Glastonbury, and is to be revealed in these days to the honour of God and the edification of many; to wit, that he should seek it diligently until he find it; because it is said to be contained in certain ancient writings that his body was there buried: We therefore, (if so it be) desiring to pay, devout honour to this sepulchre, and to the relics of him who performed such offices of religion and humanity to our Redeemer in His death, taking down His body from the cross and laying it in his own new sepulchre; and hoping for ourselves and all our realm a wealth of grace from the revelation aforesaid; have conceded and licence given, so far as rests with us, to the said John that he should have power to dig within the precinct of the said monastery and seek for those precious relics according to the injunction and the revelation made to him in the places where he shall see it to be most suitable: provided, however, that this can be done without hurt to our beloved leader in Christ the Abbot and convent of the said monastery and without destruction of their church and houses there; and that for this purpose he have the license and assent of the Abbot and
convent themselves.....In testimony whereof and witness the King at Westminster on the 10th day of June. By the King himself.

Evidently, the search was instigated by the will of John himself as no grave containing Joseph was found. As I have stated before; just as Henry never mentions Glastonbury in HRB, so he never mentions Melkin or his prophecy in DA. It is also relevant that Henry introduces a certain Maeldinus (Melchinus) in a bit role in VM for no certain purpose, which suggests to readers also.... that his name is associated with Insula Pomorum and therefore Avalon. We know Melkin lived c.600 AD and his works are attested by others. Leland visiting Glastonbury Abbey prior to the ‘Dissolution’ states: ‘while examining (the chests in the library) in addition to many other exemplars of remarkable antiquity, I found a fragment of Melkin’s Historia’.

Leland states that Melkin was anciently known as one of the most famous and erudite of British writers. Now if John Leland’s stated goal was ‘to make a search after England’s antiquities and peruse the libraries of all Cathedrals, Abbies, Priories, Colleges and all places wherein records, writings and secrets were reposed’, one would think he was qualified to comment on Melkin’s fame and erudition in Britain. Leland as a guest of Abbot Whiting perused the library at Glastonbury. It is possible that Melkin wrote a Historiola de Rebus Britannicusc. Leland also states that Melkin flourished before Merlin, but misinterprets Melkin by implying it was Melkin’s belief that Joseph of Arimathea was buried at Glastonbury (through Avalon). Melkin obviously knows where Joseph is buried on the island of Ineswitrin.... otherwise his cleverly constituted instructions would be meaningless. So, contrary to what Leland asserts, Melkin does not imply Joseph is at Glastonbury or Avalon. Leland has deduced this because of the change of name on the prophecy.

John Leland in his Assertio Arturii cited Melkin from which he gives information from the extract he has seen stating that he ‘celebrated the name of Gawain’ and that he ‘praised Arthur’; information which is entirely independent of Melkin’s prophecy. It indicates surely that Melkin has an Arthurian or even Grail affiliation independently of what is normally considered the natural connection through the ‘duo fassula’ and Joseph. Logically, the only person to promote chivalric Arthur is Henry Blois and
here is our most solid proof that Henry Blois is connected to Melkin\textsuperscript{418} and therefore he knew of Melkin’s prophecy. The book Leland is referring to is a concoction associating Melkin and Arthur and most probably composed by Henry. The fact that the chivalric Arthur is Henry Blois’ alter-ego and we know he has used the Melkin prophecy to inspire parts of his work which constitute the \textit{Matter of Britain}…. (with all the other evidence put forward), it should convince the most ardent sceptic that the prophecy existed in Henry Blois’ era.

The references Leland cites are flimsy and must post date Henry’s invention of the chivalric Arthur. It has been thought that Leland’s testimony might be derived from a time when his mental capacity was waning but the \textit{Assertio Arturii} was written a decade before Leland’s death in 1552 according to Carley,\textsuperscript{419} so it would seem as if somehow Leland is seeing a reference to a book authored by Henry Blois under the name of Melkin.

Robert de Boron’s magical vessel is the same as Chrétien’s Grail; both stem from Henry’s knowledge of the prophecy which connects Joseph of Arimathea to the Grail and the Isle of Avalon. Melkin’s affiliation with the Grail stories can only transpire in two ways. Either Gawain, Arthur and the Grail (and therefore Joseph) are connected through a genuine undiscovered manuscript of Melkin’s as Bale and Pits seem to suggest regarding Arthur; or Leland is referencing a lost work composed by Henry Blois impersonating Melkin, which refers to what we know to be Henry Blois’ invention i.e. the chivalric Arthur. The most likely answer is that Henry’s Grail literature is based on the Melkin prophecy and possibly other Melkin material now lost. The reason we posit genuine material from Melkin is; how else could the geometric clue of Montacute be known except it were provided by Melkin, the composer of the puzzle itself. From where did the information concerning Montacute come from which just so happens to be 100% relevant, which is not in the prophecy itself yet is pertinent to it once the line is revealed in decryption of the prophecy.

\textsuperscript{418} In Leland’s \textit{Assertio Arturii}, we are told that Melkin named Glastonbury as Arthur’s burial place. We must assume then that Henry Blois who manufactured the grave site of Arthur is writing under Melkin’s name (Blome’s testimony bearing witness) and since we can conclude the round table (which turns up at Winchester) is a Blois manufactured artefact…. we may speculate his authorship of a work called \textit{De Regis Arturii mensa rotunda} is also a fabricated text which was burnt in the fire to which Leland has seen references.

\textsuperscript{419} Justin .E. Griffin. Glastonbury and the Grail. P.242
The probable solution, where all the pieces fit together, is the scenario that Melkin witnessed the tomb on an island he called Ineswitrin or the information about the tomb was handed down to him through generations, from the earliest time of arrival of Joseph with the coffin of Jesus at the Island of Ictis (known c.600 as Ineswitrin). It is also pertinent to remember that the clue of Joseph being ‘carefully hidden’ in Montacute was extant in the time of Henry Blois; otherwise we would not have the Holy Cross of Waltham concoction in *De Inventione*. Therefore, it seems fair to posit, Henry used Melkin’s prophecy as an inspirational source for Joseph material which found two early outlets in Robert De Boron’s *Joseph d’Arimathie* and Perlesvaus. Henry then tied in Merlin from HRB…. also witnessed by Robert. Ultimately the round table which features in Robert’s work (which was made a reality at Winchester) was originally initiated by Henry posing as Wace as early as 1156-7.

John Bale, writing in 1548, says that Melkin was a geometer as we have touched on already and an astronomer specialising in Comets. Bale describes him: *astorum peritus ac geometr, non solum arcana somniorum et cometarum eventus discutere atque planetarum dispositiones demonstrare solebat.....* 'Not only skillful in astronomy and a geometrician, but discusses the secrets of dreams, the events of comets and demonstrates the disposition of the planets'.

The solution to his prophecy testifies to Melkin’s skill as a geometer. It is common knowledge that one is able to navigate by the heavenly bodies with the aid of an instrument which measures between horizon and a heavenly body. Distance over the earth’s surface can be determined between two places with the aid of careful calculation taken at each place. The dismissal of Melkin’s measurement of 104 miles and the geometric precision which he employs to indicate Burgh Island at 13 degrees must now be accepted, given the talents that are attested to him. It must be remembered that the unit of nautical miles is used so that a unit of measurement correlates to a sixtieth of a degree; this same unit having been employed by the ancients and by Pytheas’. This unit of measurement is the only one Pytheas could use to determine the latitude at Marseille.
Melkin’s prowess as a geometer is borne out also, if we take into account information regarding Montacute as an accurate marker.\textsuperscript{420}

Carley believes Bale may have derived the astronomer and geometer attribute for Melkin from terminology in the prophecy. Carley does concede that: ‘it may indicate that he actually saw material credited to Melkin which has since disappeared’. I think the latter is more likely as no comets were alluded to in the prophecy. Bale, cites another work by Melkin which he names as \textit{De Arthurii mensa rotunda}, which one would assume Leland had seen to divulge about Gawain; although Leland does not mention this title. Is this a lost invention of Henry Blois’ as it is he who invents the Round Table scenario firstly through Wace? It is also in Robert’s story of Joseph and then in Robert’s \textit{Merlin}, where Merlin creates the Round Table in imitation of the table of the Last Supper. This version probably has its roots with Henry. The method of Dendrochronology by which the table is dated slightly later c.1270 has no other comparative example on which to date it and so..., given a margin of error, and the expert opinions of those taking a stab in the dark; the present table at Winchester is more than likely to have been commissioned by Henry Blois. If it was found to exist in Billericay we might have concluded differently. The man who invented the utopian ideal of the round table based on his witness of the baron’s behaviour at Stephen’s court and witnessed how they aspired to climb the pecking order was Henry Blois. He therefore included the icon in his versified version of HRB impersonating Wace as I will cover. So, we should be sceptical of the Dendrology experts’ date of fabrication. Who else would build it and deliver it to Winchester?

We are told by Capgrave that Melkin lived just before the time of Merlin and King Arthur circa 550AD. Pits in his \textit{‘De illustribus Britanniae scriptoribus’} circa 1620, describes him as an ‘Avalonian’, and calls him a British bard, historian, and astronomer. He dates him with assurance to 560 AD, within the reign of Malgocunus (Maelgwn). These anecdotes are more probably rationalizations rather than facts. Leland however, calls Melkin’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item In Carley’s exposé on John’s Cronica he remarks: \textit{Why the monks thought Joseph might be buried at Montacute has never been established; but there is a strong parallel with Arthur’s exhumation and the story of the finding of a miraculous cross at Montacute. P. lvi.} If Carley would accept the solution to Melkin’s Prophecy (which he denies has any veracity) he might just answer his own question. Sadly he knows nothing of celestial navigation or Melkin’s ability to define a line in nautical miles. It is a sad reflection on scholarship when the dots need to be connected for them.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
prophecy a ‘fragment of history written by Melchinus an Avalonian’ which sounds as if Henry’s stamp is on this as Avalon is his invention.

Nowhere is Avalon heard of prior to ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB. John Pits cites three books written by Melkin: *De antiquitatibus Britannicis*, *De gestis Britannorum* and *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda*. How could all of these references be fictitious? It would seem to me that the last title is…. but there was possibly other Melkin material at Glastonbury but if so why did Malmesbury not see it. Henry Blois may have embellished it in his usual fashion written under the name of Melkin.

Henry Blois’ common authorship is also witnessed through a combination of written and oral transmission in the ‘Chapel ride’ scene from the Glastonbury Perlesvaus, Chrétien de Troyes and Robert de Boron, where incidental detail is found common to all three. Robert and Chrétien’s work is the means by which the Grail cycle developed, inspired by the *duo fassula* of Melkin and tied back in through Wace and Gaimar into the earlier HRB. But what is most fascinating is that Henry must have entertained not only Marie and Alix, the Count of Poitou, and Philip whilst incognito, posing as the elusive Master Blihis. It is Henry or his employee who stands in the court incognito as a troubadour and spreads his Arthurian legacy through affiliations to the Grail.

---

421Carley. The Chronicle of Glastonbury abbey p.lx. It is an odd irony that Carley waxes lyrical never connecting the dots of common authorship: *Like a new Brutus, Joseph appealed to a deep seated national pride and has remained a part of the myth of English greatness.*
Chapter 18

De Inventione, Waltham and Montacute. The connection between Father William Good and Melkin

The short manuscript known as De Inventione Sanctae Crucis Nostrae was written by an unknown author. The main purport of the tract seems to be to give an account of the establishment of the abbey and church of the Holy Cross at Waltham in Essex. It also contradicts the Vita Haroldi concerning Harold’s death and two other accounts of where he was buried. William of Malmesbury’s account in GR states Harold’s mother asked for the dead King’s body after the battle of Hastings and was given it without ransom. Harold’s mother buried the body at Waltham where he had built the church in honour of the holy cross. However, the church of ‘holy cross’ to which Malmesbury’s account refers, probably derived its name from the fact that it housed part of the original Calvary cross which Harold is said to have procured. There is no mention in William’s account of the Holy Cross coming from Montacute in connection with Waltham.
Most scholars have assumed *De Inventione* was written by a canon after Becket’s death and around 1177 when Henry II rededicated the abbey on account of a promise made as an act of penance for the murder of Thomas Becket. The reason for assuming this era is that, the *De Inventione* ends with an account of the death of Geoffrey de Mandeville in 1144. Most have assumed this is an account written by one of the canons which were removed at Henry II rededication of Waltham. I believe *De Inventione* is another instance of Henry Blois using his personal experiences and knowledge to concoct certain histories for his own personal gain and for those under his control. There will be a very few scholars who will agree with my theory that *De Inventione* was written by Henry Blois. So it is worth looking at the information which we can glean in regard to Waltham and Montacute to see why Henry might have written such a tract.

What I am proposing concerns the geometry of Melkin’s prophecy and Montacute and what I believe was an attempt by Henry Blois to find the body of Joseph of Arimathea based upon information which only later came to light and was relayed by Father Good: “The monks, never knew for certain the place of this saints burial (Joseph’s) or pointed it out. They said the body was most “carefully hidden” on a hill near Montacute and that when his body would be found, the whole world would wend their way there, on account of the number and wondrous nature of the miracles worked there”.

There are several coincidences. The first is that Joseph’s name is connected with Montacute in conjunction with a paraphrase of the last lines of Melkin’s prophecy. If we accept the coincidence of Henry Blois being the primordial instigator of Robert De Boron’s *Joseph d’ Arimathie*, and also being Abbot of Glastonbury where Melkin material was found; along with Henry Blois being Dean of Waltham Abbey.... and the fact the ‘Red Book of the Exchequer’ says he was prior of Montacute.... all this must warrant

---

422 Carley is wrong in assuming the account was written just before the discovery of Arthur p.304. Although the Holy cross was supposedly discovered in 1035, the account was not written until after 1177; it first appears then very shortly before the Arthurian excavation. Carley’s deduction is conjecture probably also based on the fact that Arthur’s disinterment had similar facets to those described in *De Inventione*. *De Inventione* is a product of Henry Blois and his involvement with the search for the sepulchre of Joseph on an Island as proposed in the Melkin prophecy. Henry thought Joseph’s remains were at Montacute because of the marker clue left behind by Melkin in another work.

423 H. Hall, ed, The Red Book of the Exchequer, vol 2, 752. In a passage ‘ex libro Abbatis de Ferversham’, it is stated that Henry was prior of Montacute previous to his appointment as Abbot of Glastonbury. It only becomes pertinent concerning that which Father William Good had to say about Joseph of Arimathea’s remains being
closer scrutiny regarding the absolute cock and bull legend of how the Holy Cross arrived at Waltham having been found at Montacute.

In the ‘Red Book of the Exchequer’ it lists Henry of Blois as Prior of Montacuete. Montacuete was a possession of Glastonbury. It may well be that plans for a new religious house were in place at Montacuete which were subsequently shelved by King Henry Ist and maybe Henry Blois was prior of Montacuete before Glastonbury, but this is conjecture.

There is no certainty of where Henry was in the interim between leaving Clugny and his arrival at Glastonbury. As we have already covered, he was probably with King Henry Ist and his own brother Stephen in France in 1128. However, it is of little consequence if he were at Montacuete before Glastonbury. If the Red book is in error and Henry’s notoriety in Montacuete is derived from the dig, while abbot of Glastonbury; it makes no difference either. It is the coincidence of a dig being carried out at Montacuete and corroborative evidence concerning a marker point in Melkin’s geometry which then links to Waltham where Henry was Dean; conjoined with the information concerning Joseph’s body which says he was most “carefully hidden” on a hill near Montacuete.... which makes this investigation worthwhile. If, unlike intransigent modern scholars, we can accept that a work of Melkin existed at Glastonbury in Henry’s era, we can then understand how the short sentence ‘Joseph is carefully hidden’ in Montacuete, came to be so significant to Henry Blois and why he instigated a dig at Montacuete which he later used as a basis for De Inventione Sanctae Crucis Nostrae, the legend of the Holy cross’s arrival at Waltham.

What I am proposing is that Joseph’s name was originally linked to Montacuete by Melkin in a separate manuscript from the prophecy as an aid to solving the geometry which defines the 104 mile line which leads to Burgh Island. As a dig was performed at Montacuete and no remains of Joseph were found, the episode was used by Henry Blois to provide a legend for the glorification and increased income to the Dean of Waltham.

The implication is that the Holy cross was bogusly found instead of Joseph. When the implication is expanded, the Holy Cross, supposedly unearthed on the whim of a premonition of the local blacksmith at

‘carefully hidden’ at Montacuete in consideration of Henry’s part in writing the De Inventione Sanctae Crucis Nostrae in Monte Acuto et De ductione ejusdem, apud Waltham.
Montacute, might have been buried by Joseph when he came to Britain.... although any connection to the dig and Joseph are not made.

Modern scholars link the dig at Montacute to parallels in Adam of Damerham’s account and that of Giraldus Cambrensis’ concerning the unearthing of Arthur, rather than linking the Montacute dig to Melkin’s description of where Joseph is ‘carefully hidden’. There are only two accounts which posit where the body of Joseph might be. It is spelled out by Melkin in his prophecy which refers us to an Island called *Insula Avallonis* (or the substituted Ineswitrin), the modern day Burgh Island. The other location is that passed on to posterity by Father William Good after the dissolution of the monasteries, which, remarkably points out the hill of Montacute. It is not by coincidence that Montacute is on the line Melkin has sent us to locate!!

On the subject of Montacute, this is what Carley has to say: Montacute, and by extension the Waltham had connections with Glastonbury, which would cause the Glastonbury community to have an active interest in the story. Montacute is, of course, within a few miles of Glastonbury. Both places are characterised by prominent hills and one can be seen from the other. References to a lost charter suggest that as early as the last quarter of the seventh century, Baldred made a grant of 16 hides to Glastonbury at Logworesbeorh i.e. Montacute. William of Malmesbury, too, refers to the ancient name of Logworesbeorh for Montacute and specifically links the place with the personal name of Logwor, occurs on one of the pyramids in the ancient cemetery, the pyramids between which Arthur’s body was later to be found. Henry of Blois, Abbot of Glastonbury (1126-1171), sold the deanery of Waltham in 1144 and tried to buy a gem from the cross for 100 marks. He was himself a Cluniac and may too have at one time been prior of Montacute’s Priory. In the account itself several points stand out. In both cases the excavators must dig to a great depth before they discover anything. At Montacute they finally come across a stone described as ‘Mire Magitudis’. According to Adam of Damerham, the Glastonbury monks also find a ‘Sarcophagum ligneum mirae magnitudis’. Unlike other chroniclers, moreover, Adam adds the strange detail that the site in the cemetery was surrounded by curtains. This brings to mind the tent which covered the dig at Montacute. In sum, then, Glastonbury Abbey would have had a proprietary interest in Montacute doings, at least one 12th century abbot, Henry of Blois, knew the cross well, and it is certainly possible that the community
had early access to a version of De Inventione. The parallels between the two texts may even support the supposition that De Inventione was some sort of vague model for the organisation of the excavation at Glastonbury in 1191. Beyond this it is not possible to speculate although it would be tempting to suggest that De Inventione was an even more specific catalyst for the later dig.'

We can see Carley’s position is that the two digs are linked and remarkably he mentions Henry Blois. Carley would be ignorant that Montacute is a marker on a line portended by a prophecy which he has concluded is a fake. He has also chosen to ignore the solution to Melkin’s instructions and the resultant line it creates. Therefore, any proposition that HenryBlois’ involvement at Montacute might have been centred on Henry’s own search for Joseph at Montacute would not be apparent. Carley has made the connection between Montacute, Glastonbury and Waltham with Henry Blois. We can safely say that the Holy Cross’s relation to Henry Blois in Carley’s mind is not based on a clue left at Glastonbury by Melkin.

Carley believes the legend of Joseph followed the emergence of French Grail stories. His deduction is that the fictitious Melkin and his fabricated prophecy appears in the fourteenth century. He also believes that Arthur’s discovery at Glastonbury has nothing to do with Henry Blois and therefore believes Joseph’s association with Glastonbury is in relation to a continental source. Yet he is uncertain: these two excavations can ultimately, I think, be linked with the figure of Joseph of Arimathea. After the stone cross found in Arthur’s tomb identified Glastonbury as ‘insula Avallonia’, it was only a matter of time before Joseph of Arimathea’s name (taken in this context out of the French Grail romances) came to be associated with Glastonbury and in 13th century additions to William of Malmesbury’s De Antiquitaten Glastonie Ecclesie it is first stated that Joseph was the hitherto unknown apostle of Christ who evangelised Britain and built the wattle church at Glastonbury. With the Joseph legend came the Grail, which was transformed into an ecclesiastically respectable relic, two cruets containing the blood and sweat of Jesus. Ultimately Glastonbury produced writings by a Merlin like figure, Melkin the Bard, which articulated in a rather cryptic prophetic form Joseph’s role in early Glastonbury history. In Melkin’s

---
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prophecy it is made quite clear that Joseph's place of burial is unknown and that if the tomb is ever found great miracles will occur.

What makes it difficult to believe that Carley has formed any recognisable view is that he cannot with any solid foundation say the dig has a connection to Joseph from Grail literature or Henry Blois unless he admits *De Inventione* is a concoction. But if he did, it would become clearer that Henry Blois, Dean of Waltham, was in fact searching at Montacute for Joseph of Arimathea and is the reason behind the concoction. The only way this could be admitted is by accepting that Joseph, being 'carefully hidden' at Montacute is information which directly relates to the solution of the Melkin puzzle i.e. the association of Joseph with Montacute could only be derived by someone who knows the solution to Melkin’s puzzle. One must imagine that this is Melkin himself.

The fact that the person who had this clue, or was aware of this information was Henry Blois, who was looking for Joseph’s grave and who concocts a story to benefit Waltham, would not occur to Carley because he denies the existence of Melkin’s prophecy before the 14th century. Joseph’s association with a grave site at Montacute existed (in other work by Melkin) just as the prophecy did at Glastonbury in the era of Henry Blois.

I think the reader will be aware by now that it would hardly make sense to invent two ‘cruets’. If indeed Carley’s chronology and assessments were correct.... and if the conclusion that the Joseph legend stemmed from Grail literature had any basis, why invent ‘*duo fassula*’ (never previously mentioned) instead of ‘un Graal’? Especially when we can trace how the word Graal is derived from *sang real* to become *san Greal* to *San Graal*.... and this is entirely dependent on the interpretation of the Melkin prophecy and its mention of Jesus’ blood.

The Montacute dig, which, as Carley reckons, can ‘be linked with the figure of Joseph of Arimathea’.... may be linked more probably through Melkin who predates Henry Blois’ Grail literature; and Henry’s link with the prophecy is certainly the substance for Robert de Boron’s *Joseph d’Arimathie* and Chrétien’s *Graal*. Carley states that Henry of Blois, Abbot of Glastonbury, sold the deanery of Waltham in 1144; but who held the deanship until Richard, the next Dean c.1160, seems uncertain. My point is that the *De Inventione* legend dates to any time after the Siege of Burwell and its point is to invent legend to attract pilgrims rather than letting the whole unpropitious dig at Montacute remain unfruitful.
There is no rational commentator who thinks the legendary transference of the Holy Cross from Montacute to Waltham has any basis in truth. But a dig at Montacute has more to do with Joseph of Arimathea than the invention of a legend which involved a fictitious buried cross.... and the connection is through Henry Blois. Henry Blois certainly does not wish anyone to associate his looking for Joseph of Arimathea’s relics.... otherwise what has been written in DA is immediately suspect to have been authored by him. It is for this reason a cross was auspiciously found and there was no mention that he was in search of Joseph at Montacute.

Henry Blois accomplishes again what he had managed to do at Glastonbury. Henry takes control of a defunct, impoverished and independent ecclesiastical house and does his best to turn its fortunes around as quickly as possible. It was an Anglo Saxon house not affiliated to the Benedictines and had no history except that it was founded and named by King Harold. Harold’s battle cry was supposedly ‘Holy rood’ and he was also said to have possessed a piece of the original cross which one assumes is the reason for the naming of his foundation at Waltham. The prior history of Tovi’s involvement with the setting up of the original church is pure concoction on the part of Henry Blois and was used as a basis for supplying the reasoning behind why there was no ‘Holy Cross’.... until miraculously, a flint one was produced in Henry’s day. The Holy Cross disappears for good and is never heard of once it is taken down.

Again, Henry Blois uses the now familiar devise of backdating and fabricating a history and legend for the benefit of an institution under his control. Another reason for the production of De Inventione is also financial in that it confirms lands as if they belonged to Waltham church since its foundation. It implies only subsequently it was patronised by Harold and added thereunto and endowed by a royal patron. It also pretends to house the relics of King Harold, all of which adds to its wealth and therefore that of the Dean and canons.

De Inventione, in my opinion was concocted by Henry to aggrandise Waltham. It commences its tale with an artefact (supposedly from antiquity) while providing an early provenance for its legendary foundation. This is precisely what Henry Blois had done for Glastonbury. The retro method of establishing the legend dissuades any accusation of fraud by Henry. The concoction of De Inventione’s miraculous story adduces sanctity to a heretofore once prominent pre-Norman ecclesiastical house.
now fallen into disrepair. The account of how the cross was found was supposed to have originated with a certain Turkill who relates his tale of events to our fictitious canon and supposed author of De Inventione.

Henry’s invented story told by the supposed Turkill (a similar name Thurkil mentioned in connection with Cnut in GR lends authenticity), related that a stone crucifix was discovered at Lutgaresbury (Montacute), during the reign of Cnut around 1035. The concoction of the legend informs us that the blacksmith at Montacute was given a vision of the location at Montacute hill of a hidden cross. In reality, as we know, the explanation as to why there was an excavation at Montacute is a direct result of Melkin having provided a clue to the solution of his riddle. It is this misleading information which leads Henry to think the body of Joseph of Arimathea is at Montacute and eventuate a genuine dig.... of which we get the pseudo-historical version which comprises De Inventione.

As the tale continues, the smith ignored the vision which occurred to him again. The third time it happened he experienced a twist of the arm and could no longer ignore the vision and approached the prior. With a crowd of locals, who also found his vision credible, they followed him singing hymns in a procession to the spot.... and this event took place before anything was even found! They arrived at the envisioned location and dug a hole uncovering a large cracked stone which they removed. Underneath was the figure of Christ on the cross carved in black flint, a very beautiful and skillful work. Don’t forget, Henry had been to Rome collecting artefacts and these were marvelously carved statues and presumably a black onyx crucifix with statue was purchased. One wonders if these are Henry’s ‘gifts to God’ mentioned on the Meusan plates.

Under the right arm of the flint figure was found another smaller crucifix which was destined to stay at Montacute according to Tovi, but may just be one of the four crosses spoken of in DA. Under the flint statue’s left arm was a bell which we hear no more about and this might well have been destined to tie in with the bell featured in Caradoc’s Life of Gildas which we shall get to shortly. There was also a book containing the Gospels, which we are told was still in existence at Waltham at the time the legend was written down. A tent was temporarily put over the site until the landowner Tovi the Proud, Lord of Montacute arrived.

The Cross was brought down the hill by the villagers and put into a wagon to which was hitched twelve white cows and twelve red Oxen.
Amazingly Tovi had to pray in order to divine where would be the most appropriate place to house the black flint figure of Christ on the cross. Tovi named one place after another, but coincidentally, of four named destinations.... both Winchester and Glastonbury are named, but the cart would not move. The cart would not move until Tovi mentioned the name of Waltham where supposedly, previously, Tovi had erected a small building. The people followed the cart and ‘it is said’ many were cured of their ills during the journey to Waltham. So, ‘sixty six’ stayed at Waltham devoting their time to the service of the Holy Cross and Tovi’s hunting lodge becomes the basis for the founding of the town of Waltham.

Tovi then attempted to have jewelled ornaments attached to the cross, but where nails were attempted to be driven, blood gushed from the stone. Blood was caught in a linen cloth, which, our ‘author’ of this concoction avers, that he saw more than a century afterward. Tovi, stunned by the miracle, then dedicates himself to the cross granting lands at Waltham, Kelvedon, Hitchin, Lambeth, Loughton, and Alverton. By ingenious manoeuvrings of our canon storyteller, the church at Waltham reverted to Edward the confessor who gave it to Earl Harold. Harold also venerated the Cross and confirmed Tovi’s gifts and added many more in gold silver, Jewels, relics he had found in other lands.

Harold, we are told re-founded the church as a college for twelve secular canons. The income from the church came from the manors of South Weald, Palstow, Arsley, Netteswell, Alwarton, Upminster, Woodford, Loughton, Debden, and Brickendon. The income from West Waltham, however, went directly to the Dean because he was ‘in authority over the others’. We then hear of the daily dietary allowance which outdoes even what Henry had managed for the monks at Glastonbury. After Harold had supposedly taken such good care of the monks and the church was second to none in the country, he ordered ostentatious building works to commence and an expensive altar piece.

When Earl Harold had finished building the new church, he had it dedicated and he invited Edward the confessor and his queen who was Harold’s sister and other dignitaries for eight days of feasting. The list of attendants given by our author is not a correct account. The list of the persons present at the signing of the Waltham charter by Edward are those given by our author which took place two years afterward and some of the bishops identified did not reach that dignity until after Kinsige's death.
Anyway, before the feasting began, Harold buries a large number of relics of which supposedly Athelard made a list. King Edward then confirms Harold’s gifts to the church of the Holy Cross in a charter written in gold (just like the St Patrick charter) and signed with a cross; and a curse was put on anyone who should take away from the King’s gifts to the church and the King then goes to Winchester. King Edward then dies and Harold becomes King. In Turkill the Sacristan’s account (from whom all this information supposedly comes to our author), he remembers well those days, and he says the King often visited and brought gifts to the church at Waltham. The church is unlikely to have been built by Harold because its design is about 50 years ahead of other contemporary designs and later we hear Harold’s body has to be moved three times because of building works, so it is hard to accept that it was built and dedicated in Edward’s time.

However,(as the concoction goes) after the battle of Stamford Bridge, King Harold stops off at Waltham bringing even more relics and gifts before going on to the battle of Hastings. While praying for success in the next campaign against the Normans, he prostrated himself in front of the Holy cross. While lying there he looked up at the cross. The black flint figure which was previously looking upward, now looked down (permanently). It was a sign and while Turkill was putting away the King’s gifts, only he saw the head move downward apart from the King. So, with this bad omen Osgod and Ailric accompany the King to the battle field to watch him die. They then go to William the Conqueror to ask for Harold’s body to take it to Waltham. Duke William comes up with a proposal to found his own monastery within which he intends to bury Harold. Osgod and Ailric then offer ten marks and William the Conqueror (Henry’s Grandfather) accedes to their request but does not take the money. The next problem is that Harold’s body cannot be recognized due to mutilation. Therefore, his lover Edith Swanneshals arrives on the scene to identify him from a personal mark on his body.

Henry Blois is presenting his Grandfather, magnanimous in victory and in letting the body go to Waltham. The main point is that the body of Harold is correctly identified by one close to him; therefore, we are led to believe, there can be no mistake of whose bones lay at Waltham. One other source says King Harold was buried under a pile of stones on the cliffs in Sussex and another says he survived to become a hermit and died at Chester. The point that Henry Blois is making for those pilgrims to Harold’s relics is that
they are definitively at Waltham. This second hand story directly from an eyewitness should be enough to counteract any previous versions of Harold’s demise. In fact the ‘canon’ writing our script says the body is still there!!!

Henry Blois has little respect for William Rufus as we have witnessed in his references in the prophecies of Merlin. Our author blames the theft of church artefacts on William Rufus. This obviously provides a reason behind why there is no evidence of this great patronage and wealth apparent in Henry’s day which was bestowed previously by Harold; and thus the need to concoct this story to attract pilgrims.

The black flint cross must have existed as there would be little point in Henry Blois’s invention of the whole Legend, but it would seem the church’s name derives from Harold’s acquired relic of a piece of the real cross on which Jesus died rather than any previous flint cross. Anyway, William Rufus carried off the treasures of the college for the building and decoration of the new churches at Caen. Luckily for the church William Rufus recompensed the church by giving the canons the town of Waltham after the death of Walcher Bishop of Durham who had held it from William I.

William of St. Carileph, the builder of Durham cathedral who succeeded to the estate of Walcher, taxed the canons of Waltham for the building of his castle at Durham; and seems to have looked on Waltham not as a personal grant, but as the property of his see. Logically, if there was any truth to the story that Waltham was founded by Tovi for the service of the church, why is William granting to the church what is already theirs even though charters were frequently re-issued at various times, partly to confirm the founder in times of political upheaval.

The church seems to have reverted back to royal patronage after Walcher; both of Henry Ist’ wives Matilda and Adelicia of Louvain having charge over it. Adelicia was ousted in favour of Stephen’s queen, Matilda, by whom the liberties of the canons were secured by another charter. Her tenure was short, for she in her turn was dispossessed by the Empress Matilda about 1140. It is after this time that Henry gets involved. He wrote a charter as legate confirming Waltham and Epping to the church at Waltham. Henry says in the charter he has seen the proof\textsuperscript{425} of Waltham.

\textsuperscript{425} Franklin, 86. Voss 162-163
and Epping belonging to Waltham. When he writes this charter he is Dean as well as being legate.... so, it must have been written before 1143. I doubt him selling his deanship in 1144 and I believe his connection is through a Royal concession as brother to the King.

Waltham was then restored to Adelicia again, but the story becomes unclear when the canons houses are burnt. An incident took place between Adelicia’s new husband William d’Aubygny and Geoffrey de Mandeville. It was to her patronage, apparently during her second occupation, that our author owed his canonry and prebend. Henry Blois has a habit of flattering his opponents as seen in the dedications in HRB to avoid detection in authorship. He is also adept at inventing relationships between the author he is impersonating or fabricating and personages of standing which establishes contemporaneity. Also, as seen in GS, he inserts negative criticisms of himself so as to deflect suspicion of authorship.

According to our ‘author’, Henry Blois attempted, to carry off the great carbuncle from Waltham. Geoffrey de Mandeville was out of favour with Stephen and Bishop Henry after changing his allegiance to the Empress Matilda. Geoffrey de Mandeville eventually died in the siege of Burwell against Stephen’s forces but caused serious problems while rebelling against him.

It just seems more than coincidental that the Holy Cross is conferred with the power of retribution against Geoffrey de Mandeville, when for a rational mind his death had nothing to do with the cross at Waltham. I believe for a short time after 1144, when the cross was supposedly taken down (which apparently caused the death of Geoffrey at the siege of Burwell), Henry concocted this story with the intent of gaining materially from creating the legend. The precise motives and unfulfilled intentions will never be found out.

What I have tried to show is the link between Henry Blois, Tovi’s fictitious find at Montacute, Henry’s deanship at Waltham and how Henry Blois links this to an earlier episode in his life.... when he searched for the body of Joseph of Arimathea at Montacute. This is probably how, in the end, Carley associates the Montacute dig with Arthur’s disinterment along with Adam’s similarity in description of the two episodes.

I believe the flint cross did exist and Henry had plans to instigate another legendary part of British history based on a crucifix he had procured from abroad.... but somehow his plan or design was thwarted as
he lost control of Waltham. It is also a strange fact that since our author’s account of when the cross was taken down, there is no specific mention of the cross up to when the abbey was dissolved in 1540. There is no mention of the ‘Flint Cross’ by description beforehand except that which is derived from this very concoction of the De Inventione. If the Holy Cross was such a fine work....unprecedented work of the compound, the Supreme artist's hand at work, why is it not described in Vita Haroldi? However the conflation is obvious in the Vita Haroldi quatuor cruces auro atque argento et gemmis fabricates.

While composing the legend, Henry substantiates the story using real people gleaned from charter evidence which would substantiate that Tovi held land both at Montacute and at Waltham. Henry chose Tovi as the protagonist as Tovi is known from other sources to have been a man of some standing during the reign of Cnut and active in the early 1040’s. On Tovi’s death, the properties which pertained to his office as ‘staller’ are said to have passed to his son Æthelstan. We hear again in the De inventione that Æthelstan, lost Waltham, which was then gifted by King Edward to Earl Harold who re-founded the church for a Dean and 12 canons and the foundation was confirmed in 1062, by charter of King Edward the Confessor.

Henry’s account is fictionalized history based upon anecdotal history just as he constructed HRB. The basis for the Holy Cross’s provenance would seem to be based on Henry’s search for Joseph. Henry carried out a dig at Montacute because he was aware of the same information which was eventually passed to Father Good much later which says that Joseph is ‘carefully hidden’ there. It was a message from antiquity supplied by Melkin and it pertained to his geometry. Believing Joseph is buried at Montacute is a misinterpretation of ‘carefully hidden’.

Montacute is a reference point on the line Melkin is directing us to construct on a map which indicates Burgh Island....the clue itself is ‘carefully hidden’ until revealed as a confirmation point on the line. Not by coincidence, Montacute is a hill just like Glastonbury tor and Burrow Mump, both of which partially define the original reference line (the Michael line) which we are led to bifurcate at Avebury.427

---
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427 In other words both ends of the line are defined by.... at one end the sperula of Avebury and the other….Insula Avallonis or what was originally Ineswitrin. The length is defined by the 104 miles. However, so
Melkin’s prophecy is a set of instructions, but the reference to Montacute (provided in a separate part of Melkin’s work), is merely an obtuse pointer, which in no way insists Joseph ‘is’ at Montacute; but rather through association with Montacute we should find where he is ‘most carefully hidden’. Melkin’s intention was as a ‘clue’ to unlocking his puzzle i.e. a reference point on the line and indicator if one has constructed the 104 mile line correctly.

Father Good’s association of Montacute with Melkin’s prophecy is evident by his interpretation: They said the body was hidden most carefully, either there (Glastonbury), or on a Hill near Montacute called Hamden Hill, and that when his body should be found, the whole world should wend their way thither on account of the number and wondrous nature of the miracles worked there.

Even though Father Good’s information speaks of Joseph, it would not be a natural association to make under normal circumstances in William Good’s day. By this time, all assumed Joseph was in Avalon and Avalon was at Glastonbury. It is for this reason it would seem that Father Good’s actions in perpetuating this information derives from the fact that it was privileged information which was about to be lost due to the Dissolution of the monastic system. The clue regarding Joseph’s remains and Montacute had been passed down through the generations. Father Good therefore made a point of passing this nugget of information on to posterity as he held this confidence to be important. It is evident that Father Good’s intentions were to perpetuate to posterity what he had probably been told by abbot Whiting before his death.

Carley refuses to accept the solution to Melkin’s prophecy. It would involve a retraction of many positions mistakenly held, but he would answer his own question: Why did the monks come to associate Joseph with Montacute? Why did they not discover his remains in the abbey cemetery?428

If we can accept Montacute being on Melkin’s line is not a coincidence, then one ought to conclude that one man composed both the geometry in the prophecy and the clue that Montacute is a marker on the geometric line which the data in the Melkin prophecy constructs. This is because both are

---

relevant and are mentioned in relation to Joseph’s burial place. This unlikely coincidence should act as a confirmation by the fact that no-one knew where Joseph was buried except Melkin. It is with this reasoning that we can assume that this ‘tip off’ to a solution to the puzzle was misunderstood by Henry Blois as meaning that Joseph was buried at Montacute. His interest had been sparked by seeing Melkin’s work in the Glastonbury Library and therefore negates Carley’s insistence that the Melkin Prophecy is a 14\textsuperscript{th} century fake.

Most commentators today assume that the reference in Maihew’s Trophea to Father William Good’s account regarding Joseph of Arimathea has its origins in the earlier fictional account supplied in \textit{De Inventione} about the unveiling of the Holy Cross at Montacute by Tovi. This stance is simply incorrect and Tovi’s link to the flint cross is pure invention.

It was Melkin’s Montacute clue which was the basis for the \textit{De Inventione} legend. No one has seemed to ask the question as to why Harold’s relic of the Holy Cross (supposedly a remnant of the original cross) is conflated with the flint cross found in Montacute. Would not Harold’s relic warrant more legend apportioned to it rather than Tovi’s flint cross? In reality Harold’s relic was probably the cause of the church being named after the Holy Cross and Henry Blois when Dean of Waltham attached his own concocted legend to the name by the story found in \textit{De Inventione}.

What is the Holy Cross doing secreted underground in some random location in England buried at the top of a hill? One can’t just come up with a cross as Dean of Waltham at a religious house known for its cross (which no longer exists) without making up a legend for the beautiful new cross that has just appeared. This is why \textit{De Inventione} was concocted but in reality it is the result of a fruitless dig for Joseph at Montacute and the fact that Henry had probably newly acquired a beautiful cross from Rome.

Montacute Priory was not founded until 1078 and so this discrepancy is dealt with in the \textit{De Inventione} by suggesting there was a priest and Sexton at Montacute earlier in the century. Also another strange fact that indicates \textit{De Inventione} is concocted is that the fictitious disaffected canon gives no indication of where he composed the \textit{De Inventione} and certainly betrays no anger at supposedly being ousted from Waltham. When one adds to this smoke the common assumption\textsuperscript{429} that Glastonbury had a version of \textit{De Inventione}.

\textsuperscript{429}Probably because Adam of Damerham has seen a copy.
Inventione,… it might suggest that it was written at Glastonbury or by someone connected.

Father William Good was a Jesuit priest born at Glastonbury who served mass in the Abbey as a boy before its dissolution. He left to posterity, at the English college in Rome, the information conveyed to him by an elder at Glastonbury Abbey. This same information Henry Blois had come across 300 years earlier c.1130 when William of Malmesbury searched through the dusty muniments in the scriptorium at Glastonbury.

Maihew, while he was a student in the English College, after Father Good’s death, copied the following text from the signed manuscript which Father Good had left for posterity. I believe, before the monastery of Glastonbury was disbanded when William Good was still a boy, the secret concerning Montacute which had been passed down from Abbot to Abbot through the ages, finally left Glastonbury with William Good. It was probably passed to him by Abbot Whiting before he was hanged on Glastonbury tor. It was then written down in adulthood by Father Good at Rome…. so the importance of the information would not be lost to posterity. This proves one point. Although it may have been bandied about that Joseph’s grave existed in some place in Glastonbury, it was never unequivocally found. Father good would not think it important to provide the information in his era and we know the grave could not be there anyway.

There appears to have been an attempt to cover up this following passage from being widely made public, since the copies of Maihew’s Tropheia in the British Museum, in the Bodleian library and in the library of Trinity College Dublin are all missing this specific passage. The passage quoted here actually comes from Stillingfleet’s private collection that was sold to Archbishop Marsh’s library in 1704 and is now in Dublin Library.

Archbishop Usher in his Antiquitates, who quotes from Maihew’s Tropheia: ’Quod autem ad montem illum Hamdenhil nuncupatum, in quo aliqui S. Josephum ab Arimathea sepultum perhibent spectat habebatur sane olim sacellum in illo monte constructum inter sacra et veranda angliae loca.’….‘As for the mountain called Hamden hill, in which some

---
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claim Joseph of Arimathea is buried, clearly from the looks a chapel was once located here, built on that mountain, among the sacred and revered places of England'.

The reference there given for it is: Edvard. Maihew Congreat. Anglican. ordanis Benedict. Tabula.2.pag. 1118,1119. Maihew's Trophea is divided into three tabulae but the numbering of the pages is continuous throughout; so the tabula 2 contains pp. 883-1888. Why is it that this one vital aid to verification of a correctly constructed Joseph line is missing from three copies? Montacute is a vital conformational marker on the line which identifies Burgh Island at its 104 mile extension from Avebury at 13 degrees to the Michael line. The Montacute marker point lets us know we have decoded Melkin’s riddle correctly. Although Hamden Hill is referred to, the reference which Father Good makes is to the St Michael's Hill of today, which, as the quote reports had a Chapel on it.

It is interesting to note that there remains no trace of the St. Michael church at Montacute nor at Burgh Island, yet these two locations are two points which link to all the chapels comprising the Templar built Michael line of churches through to the bifurcation point. An attempt has been made to cover-up the clue and testament to Joseph's whereabouts left by Father William Good by someone in the 17th century. We may speculate that the relevance of St Michael's on Montacute hill and St Michael's on Burgh Island close to St Michael's on Glastonbury tor and Burrow Mump were perhaps too obvious a pointer. After all, whoever plotted the linear design of Michael churches must have cracked Melkin’s code otherwise we have an amazing coincidence of Michael churches marking the two lines which are in effect the solution to Melkin’s riddle. We could accept a whole line of churches set upon an old Beltane line as a coincidence ‘at a push’; but one has to get real when the two other St Michael churches or on Melkin’s line and these are the only two place on earth which have references to Joseph of Arimathea’s grave site.

Maihew writes: For this man (Father Good) was situated until now in the same monastery (Glastonbury) in a flourishing position, a boy brought up as a priest to devote himself to sacrifice for the mass, after the overturning of the rule of the Catholic Queen Mary; however, while Queen Elizabeth was persecuting the Catholics, he was made a member of the clergy of the Fellowship of Jesus. And when the church of the Anglican college was
decorated with pictures, he was the first to assemble in that place an enumeration of the distinguished holy men of England, with him as leader, to ensure that the appearances and deeds of those very men in that place were portrayed with a faithful likeness to the truth.

However, concerning the convent of Glastonbury and Saint Joseph of Arimathea, he leaves behind the following, written in his own hand and signed in that place with his own name: ‘at Glastonbury there were bronze plates as a perpetual memorial, chapels, crypts, crosses, arms, the keeping of the feast (of St Joseph) on July 27, as long as the monks enjoyed the protection of Kings by their charters. Now all these things have perished in the ruins. The monks never knew for certain the place of this Saints burial, or pointed it out. They said the body was hidden most carefully, either there (Glastonbury), or on a Hill near Montacute called Hamden Hill, and that when his body should be found, the whole world should wend their way thither on account of the number and wondrous nature of the miracles worked there. Among other things, I remember to have seen, at Glastonbury, a stone cross, thrown down during this Queens reign, a bronze plate, on the which was carved an inscription relating that Joseph of Arimathea came to Britain 30 years after Christ’s Passion, with eleven or twelve companions: that he was allowed by Arviragus the King to dwell at Glastonbury, which was then an island called Avalon, in a simple and solitary life: and that he had brought with him two small silver vessels in which was some of the most holy blood and water which had flowed from the side of the dead Christ. This cross, moreover, had been set up many years before to mark the length of the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin, made by Saint Joseph with wattle. The length was measured by a straight line from the centre of the cross to the side of the chancel afterwards built of hewn stone, under which also there was of old, in a subterranean crypt the Chapel of St Joseph. Outside, in the wall of this Chapel of the blessed virgin, there was a stone with the words ‘Jesus, Maria’, carved in very ancient letters. The old arms of the monastery of Glastonbury confirm (the traditions). These arms are a white shield on which is placed vertically the stem of the green cross, and from side to side the arms of a cross in like manner. Drops of blood are scattered over the field of the shield; on both sides of the upper right and under the arms of the cross are set golden ampullae. These were always called St Joseph's insignia for he was piously believed to have abided there; and even perhaps to have been buried there. There was in that same place (at Glastonbury) a long underground sanctuary
where a very famous pilgrimage was established to the stone statue of that saint there; and there were many miracles done there, even while I was a boy, who was born there (in Glastonbury), and I served mass in the sanctuary as an eight-year old, and I saw it destroyed by the impious man, William Goals, under Henry VIII.'

Thus far go the words of that man (Father Good); as I said, he signs his name in his own hand under these things: I copied them down from the manuscript itself when I was a pupil of the same Anglican college in Rome, and always I kept them safe with me, across sea and land, amid the most savage persecutions of heretics. Nevertheless, it points towards that mount named Hamden Hill, on which some claim the tomb of St. Joseph of Arimathea to be, the sanctuary on that mount was kept safe for some time, built among the sacred and revered places of England. In fact I remember when sometimes I myself would traverse that mount, a certain old man who lived not far from that place would receive me through trust in my worthiness, often, during the reign of Elizabeth the heretic, to visit that place, and there, in a particular place he was accustomed to pray on his knees.

Father Good follows the pseudo-historical myth of Avalon which started in HRB along with Arviragus etc. and consolidated in DA by Henry Blois. However, no-one before Father Good mentions Joseph at Montacute. Adam of Damerham’s account is based on De Inventione which manuscript probably existed at Glastonbury through connection to Henry Blois the author.

The De inventione Holy Cross dig at Montacute by Henry Blois inspired Henry’s muses and seems to be a template for the later unearthing of Arthur at Glastonbury. Hence, I hope the reader can see why I am labouring the point that a connection with Joseph and Melkin’s prophecy which Father Good makes, must have existed at Glastonbury in the time of Henry Blois.

Montacute was not mentioned in DA in connection with Joseph because it would detract from Henry's primary goal; which was the conversion of Glastonbury to Avalon. What this indicates to me is that by Henry's exclusion of the information regarding Joseph at another location i.e. Montacute, is the conformation that the information existed in reality. Montacute would contradict Henry's efforts of transformation of Glastonbury into Avalon and Joseph's place there; Joseph's tomb was
indicated by Melkin to be in Avalon now Henry had changed the name of the island on the Melkin Prophecy.

Avalon, as we have covered, has its basis in the prophecy concerning Burgh Island, (the original Ineswitrin). The name Avalon, in connection with an island, is Henry’s invention as we witnessed in HRB (Arthur’s last resting place); the name derived from a town near Clugny. Nowhere does the name Avalon pre-exist Henry Blois at Glastonbury. The DA that Henry left to posterity as a final version was not fully rewritten until the latter stages of Henry’s life c.1170-71 when he stayed for the most part in his palace at Winchester. The DA was returned to Glastonbury fully interpolated and lastly consolidated by Henry adding the first two chapters. The DA was bequeathed by Henry after his death to Glastonbury along with the other books. Further interpolations were added to DA after Henry’s death.

It is interesting to note concerning Montacute that the statements by Father Good: ‘The monks never knew for certain the place of this Saints burial, or pointed it out’, and ‘even perhaps to have been buried there’, tend to denote that in Father Good’s day it was recognised that previous generations of monks had fabricated the whole legend. It would seem that the subterranean chapel at Glastonbury in Father Good’s time might have been an attempt at establishing a place of worship where Joseph was supposed to be buried even after J. Blome’s search.

In 1367 an anonymous East Anglian chronicler reports that Joseph’s body had been found. We could speculate that this is connected to the appearance of the Turin shroud c.1357 which is possible based on the fact that others have postulated it came from the Templars having solved Melkin’s puzzle and entered the tomb.

However, as the Glastonbury monks were unable to produce the Grail for all to see…. or conjure up the duo fassula which were known to be buried with Joseph…. the legend would lack credibility with pilgrims. As Father Good bears witness, the ‘miracles’ which were prophesied by Melkin and which were supposed to happen at the unveiling of the grave, were already taking place at this underground sanctuary, but not
even Glastonbury monk craft or the wiles of Henry Blois would have the effrontery to fabricate ‘duo fassula’, the icon of the Grail.\textsuperscript{432}

Father Good says: \textit{there were many miracles done there in a long underground sanctuary where a very famous pilgrimage was established to the stone statue of that saint.} If Joseph had been discovered, there would be no need for the statue. Also if Joseph had been found, there would be little point in recording the possibility that Joseph is at Montacute. Although Father Good, attests that Glastonbury is Avalon, he is unconvinced that Joseph is actually buried there. The fact that Maihew went to Montacute circa 1620 and witnessed a man on his knees praying indicates that maybe the chapel was still standing, but it is an odd coincidence that both the St Michael Chapel at Montacute and that which Camden bears witness to on Burgh Island\textsuperscript{433} have left no trace. Possibly, subsequent searchers being newly appraised of this hitherto un-published information concerning Joseph’s burial at Montacute, dismantled the chapel to search beneath for the Grail. We could speculate that some copies of Maihew’s Trophea were meddled with, so as to exclude Father Good’s information being spread abroad.

Even if all three copies were made from one exemplar apart from Stillingfleet’s private one; why is just this section missing out of the entire volume? An even greater coincidence is that Melkin’s original line (the St Michael line) thus named by all the churches built along its axis, is the primary line which we are led to bifurcate at Avebury; and the line Melkin expressly wishes us to construct, (at the pertinent points on that line once constructed), also had St Michael churches on them (at Montacute and Burgh Island).

It is as if someone had traced over the solution to Melkin’s decoded puzzle on a map and plotted St Michael dedicated buildings along the lines. It is as if the dots on the lines are St Michael chapels, but this is not Melkin’s doing. Melkin used what seemed to be fortuitously placed landmarks which

\textsuperscript{432}Wood, ‘Fraud and its consequences’ p. 282. \textit{It would appear, though, that this modesty (in not unearthing Joseph’s bones and the duo fassula) was not a product of the normal forger’s caution, a fear of claiming things so outrageous that the whole fabricated structure becomes endangered. Rather, given Joseph’s role in the crucifixion, and further given the Holy Grail’s heterodox associations, it seems likely that the monks failures here may well have arisen from religious scruples, from a recognition that there were some frauds that could endanger the faith’.} Wood has it right and Henry preferred to manufacture the grave of Arthur rather than Joseph.

\textsuperscript{433}Camden: ‘where the Aven’s waters with the sea are mixed; Saint Michael firmly on a rock is fixed’
constituted the Beltane line. The fact that the topographical land features
of Burgh Island and Montacute on the Joseph line are similar to
Glastonbury tor, Burrow Mump and St Michael’s Mount in Cornwall (on
the Michael line) must be an extraordinary coincidence of nature mixed
with Melkin’s choice in creating the puzzle.... or by Heavenly design, if
one were to consider who it is that is still undiscovered on Burgh Island.

The chapels which mark both the St Michael line and Joseph line were
constructed after Henry Blois’ era. There is an exception and this is why we
should be suspicious of the mention of the St. Michael chapel on
Glastonbury tor which is (not coincidentally) where St Patrick’s charter
was supposedly found. Rather than embark on a digression here concerning
Henry Blois’ construction of St Patrick’s charter replicated in DA,
where not only does he substantiate his invention of Ineswitrin as being
synonymous with Glastonbury (by using the same method of backdating
in the words of St Patrick); but he also introduces Phagan and
Deruvian.... first mentioned in First Variant HRB. We should leave this
until the chapter on DA. But it is interesting that it is Rudborne who
attests Phagan and Deruvian were the consecrators of the old Minster at
Winchester. Henry Blois’ invention and insertion of the St Patrick
charter into DA seemingly appears to have St Patrick (and William of Malmesbury)
referring to the island of Avalon (which is impossible) and
it also establishes Patrick’s burial there where author B cited a rumour
(not mentioning Avalon). (Appendix 32).

However, there should be no surprise that the tomb on Burgh Island
has been discovered previously. If Melkin’s description of the Grail has
something to do with the formation of the Shroud of Turin as others

---

434 Appendix 32
435 Thomas Rudborne c. 1430, an English Benedictine monk of St Swithun’s Priory, Winchester in his Historia
Major has Phagan and Deruvian as founders of the old Minster at Winchester. Antonia Grandsen has noted their
use at Winchester by Rudborne, but they are not mentioned in the thirteenth century account of the foundation. It
is interesting however at both York and Winchester, the tabulae contained information about the foundation of
the old cathedral by Phaganus and Duvianus. Archbishop Usher also cites a Winchester libellus written 1,265
years after the foundation by Phaganus and Duvianus in ad 169. We might think Phagan and Dervuvian were
connected to Winchester’s founding and Henry Blois used their names in HRB and connected them to
Eleutherius and the rest.... isn’t history.
436 The Legendary history of Britain J.S.P. Tatlock p. 248 makes the nonchalant observation: The picking out of
Winchester as the single English See mentioned here is one of the matters which suggests that Geoffrey had
some special favour towards it. Its new bishop Duvianus (Diwanus) has the same name as Lucius’ missionary
earlier...
have elucidated, the tomb must have been opened at some stage prior to the appearance of the shroud.

To carry out the intended aim of the prophecy (which is to show where the grave of Joseph of Arimathea is located), it is necessary to understand the instructional data in the prophecy. This directs us to construct the line (which, not by coincidence, goes through St. Michael’s hill Montacute) as we have shown. The reason Montecute is given as an intended clue is because it verifies a plotting point on the 104 mile line. The puzzle can only be understood by creating a line on a map. This line is the 104 nautical mile line which extends from Avebury to Burgh Island as I have said. It is the solution to what appears as random unintelligible words, which, (once understood), mark out a constructed line which extends through the only two stated places that Joseph is said to be buried. One on the Island of Ineswitrin, which we know is Burgh Island, and the other at Montacute which we know is only a confirmational marker point.

It would be highly unlikely that the two places Joseph is said to be buried just happened by chance to be on a line which purported to unlock his sepulchre’s whereabouts once the intent of the prophecy is decrypted. It is more unlikely the end of the line would end up on an island and that it is all coincidental; because the prophecy was supposedly meaningless and refers to a fortress in Syria according to our current expert.

The Montacute ‘marker’ could only have been known as a point on the 104 mile line by the constructor of the puzzle or someone who has decoded the prophecy since Melkin. Yet if it was information supplied by Melkin and the reasoning we think Henry Blois went in search of Joseph at Montacute, no one before the Templars had decoded the Melkin prophecy. We should conclude the organisation behind the erection of the St Michael churches along both lines might be responsible for opening the tin vault. If I am correct in assuming De inventione is a product of a failed dig in search of Joseph of Arimathea and if Henry used the clue for the inspiration for his dig at Montacute.... we can only assume an earlier provenance for the Melkin prophecy than scholars allow.

437 M. Goldsworthy. And did those feet. The Turin Shroud.
438 Any reader can construct the same two lines on Google earth.
Why is it that scholarship cannot see the wood for the trees when it comes to Melkin? The prophecy has three main subjects.... the Island, Joseph of Arimathea and Jesus, who is cryptically referred to as *Abbadare*. We are told the island is coveting pagans and we know it holds two Jews which Melkin might refer to pagans as Jews (the two most famous Jews to boot). We are told the sepulchre of Joseph is on the Island and he has something there with him. Melkin is reticent to tell us what it is, but cryptically informs us that it is the *duo fassula*, which, we must assume has a close connection to Jesus, as his blood is implied to be in one of the Vessels.... or so the way the words are written.... we are led to believe.

We know there is no vessel like cup, but the Melkin prophecy is directly referring to Jesus through the name *Abbadare*. Melkin informs us, if we find an English Meridian (of which there is only one which runs from St Michael’s mount to Avebury), which is the Michael Line; we are to bifurcate it at a point in a sphere according to the instructions. If one is perceptive, one attempts to derive meaning, but from what we are told by Carley, Melkin’s prophecy is a construct made up of various extracts or traditions. From what I can deduce, random words referring to some incidence (apparently connected with Rainald) does not generate perfect geometry which locates the subject of the Prophecy so precisely i.e. an island.

The point of Melkin’s message to posterity is obviated by instructing us it is a ‘line’.... which, when bifurcated, at that point.... produces another line by the action of bifurcation. We know it is an invitation to uncover a grave site because it is referring to the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea; and the prophecy informs us of the marvellous things which will occur when it is found in the future. Therefore, we know we are looking for a grave on an island. So, we must logically assume that the other information in the prophecy is relevant to finding the tomb. If we follow the purport of the prophecy and apply the relevant details found in it, (none of which are irrelevant or redundant); we must conclude, since the prophecy indicates we are looking for an island, the seemingly non sensible words are clues to uncover the said island’s whereabouts.

Therefore, we must find the relevance and meaning behind ‘all’ the supposedly obscure words found in the prophecy. Once we know that the English Meridian is known today as the Michael line, any investigator can progress. If we deny this fact, listen to the experts, or
are duped by Glastonbury propaganda, there can be no hope of finding a solution or the sepulchre of Joseph.

If we bifurcate that line as instructed within the *sphaerula* (which can only be Avebury stone circle), there are only three other extraneous and unemployed pieces of information, once the meaning behind the prophecy is decoded. If we use the 104 mile line (the other half of a bifurcation) which we are led to believe must be formed on a map, (logically, because we are looking for a geographical location) and employ the bifurcation point of Avebury stone circle, which is on the Michael line.... and follow the instruction to divide (bifurcate) at an angle of thirteen degrees (*sperulatis*); we find the line terminates on an Island in Devon 104 miles from Avebury.

Now, if we accept Insula Avallonis a substituted name for Ineswitrin, (knowing Henry is the inventor of the name Avalon) one would be very dim indeed if one did not recognise the only two places (an island or Montacute) which have been posited as the grave site of Joseph of Arimathea both exist on the line which Melkin has implied should be constructed.

It would be an amazing coincidence if the geometry haphazardly fell on Burgh Island, especially as we have determined that it is the ancient island of Ictis, considering Joseph's association with the tin trade. It also must be considered in association with Ineswitrin and its nomenclature derived from the description of ‘white tin’ and the fact that it has the same name as that found on the 601 charter.

Researchers need to answer how Burgh Island and Montacute are on a line that is unknown until constructed on a map from an encoded document and who it was that built these St Michael churches as markers. Burgh Island and Montacute were previously unconnected before the line is drawn and this line is the solution to Melkin’s puzzle and both places connect to tradition concerning Joseph’s burial site.

How randomly coincidental it would be that Father Good invents such a notion concerning Montacute in connection to Joseph’s resting place, especially being a Glastonbury acolyte. It is even more astounding that for Carley, the prophecy is a cohesion of esoteric material from different sources, invented with no specifics in it that have any meaning except those that might be relevant to the church at Glastonbury, Baybars and a Syrian fortress. In fact it is ludicrous to suggest that the prophecy of Melkin is in any way connected to a fortress in Syria considering the Valley of
Jehosaphat is the metaphoric place where the day of judgement by Jehova takes place.... where the God of Israel will gather all nations for judgment.

What benefit would it bring to our supposed thirteenth century inventor of the prophecy, if his sole aim was to align himself with Grail literature emanating from France as Carley and Lagorio insist? Why would our rogue author randomly interject such words as sperula and Abbadare? Saphat has little connotation or meaning without the person of Abbadare or Jesus. Nor do the given numerical measurements of 13 and 104 have relevance unless we prefer to locate the grave with Carley’s insight of ‘thirteen spheres prophesying’ and reckoning that 144,000 saints are buried within the abbey grounds at Glastonbury.

We must conclude the ‘Carefully hidden’ allusion to the marker point of Montacute, constituted a confirmation of the instructional data left to posterity in the prophecy. I understand that Carley finds the words of the prophecy unintelligible before Kim Yale decoded it, but once I had seen the solution.... there it is, the lines generated by those unintelligible words are geometrically significant to Joseph’s resting place. The words are also significant by combination with other pertinent parts of the prophecy, not only in constructing the line, but by describing who and what was in the tomb and the outcome of its discovery.

Now, if we can accept all the previous, then we must allow the significance of a search at Montacute by Henry Blois.... understanding that he was aware of the ‘carefully hidden’ clue extant in his day. The reason we may assume that Father Good’s information was originally a key to Melkin’s line is that if Melkin had wanted to establish the location of Avalon (Ineswitrin) plainly, he would have given us the details of its location and not gone to the effort of inventing the puzzle and secreting the geographical location. After all, it is the pointer by which Melkin ‘carefully’ confirms where Joseph is ‘hidden’, but not where he is buried. The prophecy does that once it is unscrambled.

Even though we are told in DA that Joseph ‘ended his life’ at Glastonbury and by implication was buried there and it is obviously not true, we should look firstly at who invented the word Avalon and secondly who went to great efforts to convert Avalon into a location at Glastonbury. This is consciously done by a real intelligent mind and it was not done by a fictitious ‘Geoffrey’. Once we know who fabricated the
false evidences, it is easy to work out that if Joseph is really on Burgh Island (or more correctly Ineswitrin) and the location provided in the prophecy is true and correct at the uncovering of the sepulchre on Burgh Island; we can only conclude that it is the same man who substituted his invented name of Avalon on the prophecy so that Joseph would be fictitiously located at Glastonbury also along with Arthur. Now, where this becomes relevant to Robert de Boron’s ‘foresight’ in connecting Joseph with Glastonbury we will get to later but be assured Robert is not aligning ‘convergent factors’ when he knows of the *Vaus d’Avaron*.

Henry Blois started a tradition of fraudulent misrepresentation of Avalon as being identical or correspondent with Glastonbury and hence the outcome is that Joseph’s sepulchre changes locations from a realistic location to an invented location i.e. to where the tomb does not exist. How bizarre it would be if we believed Henry’s propaganda that in Arthur’s time (and the King of Devon’s time), Glastonbury had two previous names for the same place in the same era. We showed earlier that Glastonbury has always had that name or something phonetically similar. Ineswitrin is in Devon and the island of Avalon was never heard of before the arrival of First Variant HRB. Henry Blois’ fantasy name based on a town in the region of Blois is as fictitious as Arthur’s island in HRB just as fictitious as Arthur’s battle at Autun.

The Glastonbury monks chose to ignore the rest of the instructional input such as *centum et quatuor, sperulatis, sperulis and tredecim* as no commonality with the site at Glastonbury could be found even though these are integral in determining the site at Burgh Island. However, as we have covered, if we accept the monastery existed on Burgh Island where the present day hotel now stands…. Joseph ‘lies in a bifurcated line next to an angled meridian in a pre-prepared cave with an oratori above where one prays; at the verge.’

Henry is mindful of discovery as it would become too obvious that Grail literature and its association with Joseph is based upon the prophecy of Melkin and his *duo fassula*. As Henry propagated his French Grail literature in the courts of France and Champagne the same propaganda about Joseph and the Grail was being propagated in England in the *Perlesvaus*.

Joseph began to be established in lore at Glastonbury only through what was written in DA and his prominence became greater as the connections between French Grail literature were associated with Glastonbury after
Henry’s death. The joining of the dots became more connected after Arthur’s disinterment and by the Leaden cross confirming to the world that Glastonbury was Avalon and Geoffrey’s stories of Arthur appeared to be true.

This is not to say that Avalon or Joseph or Arthur arrived at Glastonbury by a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’, but by intelligent conscious design from the mind of one man and we can trace the seedling of this design back to 1157 in VM’s *Insula Pomorum*. However, this ‘convergence of factors’ came together after Henry’s death. An accomplishment in rewriting History greater than Cicero’s; and so much more timeless, colourful and enduring; we are all still trying to find answers today.

As we know, the Joseph connection was tentative because it was so recently established at Glastonbury in DA after Henry’s death but did not get its confirmation from Robert de Boron’s work and possibly from a Glastonbury Perlesvaus until the point of critical mass came at Arthur’s disinterment.

The original Perlesvaus of which we only have portions is undoubtedly from Henry’s mind. What has confused scholars into thinking Joseph was a later development of Glastonbury lore is the complete overshadowing of him by Arthur. Joseph’s legend developed at a much slower pace because of the prominence of the discovery of Arthur at Glastonbury and don’t forget the chivalric Arthur story had been in the public domain since c1139 while Joseph lore at Glastonbury was quietly waiting to be exposed after 1171.

The fact that Joseph is said to be on Avalon through the Melkin prophecy and Arthur happened to be also found on that island is anything but coincidence. Especially, when we know Henry is in reality ‘Geoffrey’, the inventor of the chivalric Arthur.... and continental literature links them both with an island supposedly spoken of by Melkin whose work was found at Glastonbury. The ‘Grail’ object is linked with Arthur by Chrétien.... and Joseph is linked with Arthur and the Grail through Robert de Boron; and even to ‘Avaron in the West’. They then link to Henry and Melkin at Glastonbury, not through coincidence, but by the design of Master Blihis, Blaise, and Bliho Bleheris and Bledhéricus.... all four are linked as being an authority or source for the Grail or recording stories about it.
Henry Blois, a patron of Giraldus Cambrensis⁴³⁹ is part of the reason why Gerald takes such an interest in the disinterment at Glastonbury.... as it is probable that Henry indoctrinated Gerald on Arthuriana before his death. Gerald does not mention Joseph, because his interest is solely in a Welsh Arthur and he was not a Glastonbury acolyte; but he had read DA before the unearthing of Arthur. We should not ignore his testimony given his proximity to Henry II.⁴⁴⁰ We shall look at Gerald’s testimony shortly.

Adam of Damerham, writing about a hundred years after Henry’s death, does not mention Joseph or concern himself with redundantly reiterating anything in DA, but takes his account forward from where DA left off. Adam (not by coincidence) starts his account at the death of Henry Blois. The last chapter of DA is 83 and it relates to Henry Blois. The fact Adam does not reiterate facts about Joseph is entirely different from mentioning Arthur’s disinterment; the events of which had not been recorded in DA.

Because of this fact, it is ridiculous of scholars to stand on the flimsy a priori which presumes bogus Joseph lore was only interpolated into DA after the disinterment of Arthur for the reason Gerald nor Adam mention Joseph in their text; yet both of them comment on Arthur’s unveiling. How could Henry comment in DA about the unveiling of Arthur? He just left to posterity the location where he had prepared a tomb to excite the world on its discovery and confirm his invention of a Chivalric Arthur by putting a leaden cross within.... and the rest becomes history.

Another hundred years later (after Adam) the Joseph legend is fully established and consolidated by John of Glastonbury. He reiterates much of Henry’s lore in the DA and from other Glastonbury sources which undoubtedly came from Henry Blois such as Perlesvauus and the suspected work of Melkin about ‘Arthur and the Round table’ we discussed earlier.

John of Glastonbury’s extract is directly from Henry’s interpolations in DA:

*No other human hands made the church of Glastonbury, but Christ’s disciples founded and built it by angelic doctrine; an unattractive structure, certainly, but, adorned by God with manifold virtue; the high priest of the heavens himself, the maker and Redeemer of humankind, our Lord Jesus Christ, in his true presence dedicated it to himself and his most holy mother.*

⁴³⁹ David Knowles. Saints and Scholars.p.55
⁴⁴⁰ See chapter on Gerald of Wales.
On account of its antiquity the English called this church, the ‘ealdechirche’, which is ‘the old church’, and it is quite evident that the men of that region hold no oath more sacred or binding than one on the Old Church and they shun nothing through fear of punishment for their crime more than perjury. Glastonbury originally built of wattles, is first and eldest of all churches in England. From it the strength of divine sanctity gave forth its scent from the very outset and breathed upon the whole land; and though it was made of unsightly material, it was nevertheless esteemed greatly in worshipful reverence.

What John says in his *Cronica* is fairly irrelevant to our investigation in that Henry Blois’ propaganda is established and believed as genuine lore in his era. Especially, since William of Malmesbury has been dead two hundred years and he is supposedly the fount for this material. JG mixes other sources which one can only imagine were extant at the time John wrote and have now disappeared. John surely but innocently included more of Henry’s propaganda in reference to such personages as Arviragus and Phagan and Deruvian from HRB (all fabrications) which has duped scholars into believing a genuine history.

John in his *Cronica* repeats and embellishes Henry’s pig concoction found in DA and repeats Henry’s derivation of the island of apples through *avalla* (in British), etymologically leading to Avalon being synonymous with Glastonbury. This is clearly part of Henry’s conversion from a geographically location-less Avalon in HRB…. through clever contortion in VM associating Arthur’s last known location which thus identifies *Insula Pomorum*’s synonymy with Avalon, which, in DA, is so named for the scarcity of apples (Henry would not want to be seen concurring with VM) rather than in John’s *Cronica* where the island is named for its abundance. In the DA we find: *This island was at first called Yniswitrin by the Britons but at length was named by the English, who had brought the land under their yoke, Glastinbiry, either a translation into their language of its previous name, or after Glasteing of whom we spoke above. It is also frequently called the isle of Avalon, a name of which this is the origin. It was mentioned above that Glasteing found his sow under an apple tree near the church. Because he discovered on his arrival that apples were very rare in that region he named the island Avallonie in his own language, that is ‘Apple Island’, for avalla in British is the same as poma in Latin. Or it was named after a certain*
Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters because of the solitude of the spot.

We can also tell Henry’s hand in DA as he confirms Glastonbury is Avalon by providing another derivation of the name Avallon through a certain Avalloc. The advantage of this is that like the VM, where Morgen and her sisters lived (Insula Pomorum).... in the DA we have Avalloc’s daughters to conflate with them, providing convincing evidence that Glastonbury, Avalon and Insula Pomorum are all the same place.

The devise, as usual, is Henry’s clever conflation; never explicit but rather letting the reader (or posterity) join the dots of Henry’s propagandist trail. While carrying out his contortion in VM, Henry also adds further confusion, mystery and antiquity to his Insula Pomorum by introducing synonymy with the Fortunate Isle or isles, which were in antiquity mentioned by Plutarch, Ptolemy and Pliny. Henry’s agenda is to bring HRB’s Avalon to Glastonbury in VM: The Island of Apples gets its name ‘The Fortunate Island’ from the fact that it produces all manner of plants spontaneously. It needs no farmers to plough the fields. There is no cultivation of the land at all beyond that which is Nature’s work. It produces crops in abundance and grapes without help; and apple trees spring up from the short grass in its woods. All plants, not merely grass alone, grows spontaneously; and men live a hundred years or more. There nine sisters rule by a pleasing set of laws those who come to them from our country. She who is first of them is more skilled in the healing art, and excels her sisters in the beauty of her person. Morgen is her name, and she has learned what useful properties all the herbs contain, so that she can cure sick bodies........... Thither after the battle of Camlan we took the wounded Arthur, guided by Barinthus to whom the waters and the stars of heaven were well known. With him steering the ship we arrived there with the prince, and Morgen received us with fitting honour, and in her chamber she placed the King on a golden bed............

‘Geoffrey’ wrote Insula Pomorum quae Fortunata vocatur and the only reason apart from conflation with earlier accounts of the island is that Fortunata is a foretelling of one’s destiny and since all this is originally linked to Melkin’s Island, it may well have been included so that the reader believes Joseph was buried there too. This lends itself to the understanding that great things were predicted to occur there and so is contrived to seem associated with the island where Joseph was buried. John of Glastonbury is really the consolidator of Henry’s propaganda template through
information found in DA at Glastonbury which combines the apples connecting them to the old Church and Yniswitrin rather than through an Arthur association with either Avalon or Insula Pomorum:

This Glasteing (a person) pursued his sow through the territory inland of the Angles near the village called ‘Escebtiorne’ all the way to Wells, and from wells by a trackless and watery path which is now called the ‘Sugewey’, that is ‘the sow’s way’. He found her suckling her piglets next to the Old Church on the aforesaid island, beneath a fruit tree; hence it continues down to our own day that the fruit of that tree are called ‘ealdechirchiness-apple’, that is ‘apples of the old church’. This Glasteing, then, after he had entered the island, saw that it was rich in all manner of good things and came to live on it with his whole family. And since at the first, he found apples of the most precious sort in those parts, he called it the ‘Island of Avalon’ in his own tongue, that is ‘island of apples’, and he spent his life there and from his family and progeny, who succeeded him that place was originally populated. Finally, the Saxons who conquered it called the land ‘Glastonbury’ in their own tongue, by translation of the former name, that is ‘Ynswytryn’; for in English or Saxon ‘glas’ means ‘glass’ and ‘bury’ means city.

John of Glastonbury has a copy of the fragment known as the prophecy of Melkin on which Henry Blois changed Ineswitrin and inserted Avalon. What else John has in his possession as source material is unsure, but he has surely seen Henry’s original Perlesvaus a copy of which was probably left at Glastonbury along with material resembling that found in vulgate prose Percival. I would hazard to suggest that the Gospel of Nicodemus, an extension or derivative of the earlier acts of Pilate was composed by Henry Blois. The Gospel of Nicodemus seemed to surface around the time that Henry of Blois was composing Grail literature and certainly it is used as part of ‘Robert De Boron’s’ Joseph d’Arimathie and also included by John of Glastonbury to consolidate the Joseph tradition at Glastonbury.

John of Glastonbury starts his treaties of St. Joseph of Arimathea, which he claims are taken from a book which the Emperor Theodosius found in Pontius Pilate’s council chamber in Jerusalem.... which only Henry would have had the audacity to proffer as such a spurious provenance.
Below, he is quoted at length from a translation by David Townsend from Carley’s thesis study of John of Glastonbury’s *Cronica: Matters which admit doubt often deceive the reader; in order to dispel doubts regarding the antiquity of the church of Glastonbury, therefore, we have added some undisputed facts gathered from the ancient sayings of historians.

When the Lord had been crucified and everything had been fulfilled, which had been prophesied of him, Joseph of Arimathea, that noble Decurion, came to Pilate, as the gospel story explains, asked for the body of Jesus, wrapped it when he had received it in linen, and placed it in a monument in which no one had yet laid. But the Jews, hearing that Joseph had buried the body of Jesus, sought to arrest him, along with Nicodemus and the others who had defended him before Pilate. When they had all hidden themselves, these two—that is Joseph and Nicodemus, revealed themselves and asked the Jews,’ why are you aggrieved against us because we have buried the body of Jesus? You have not done well against a righteous man, nor have you considered what benefits he bestowed upon us; instead you have crucified him and wounded him with a lance’. When the Jews heard these words, Annas and Ciaphas seized Joseph, shut him up in a cell where there was no window, sealed the door over the key, and posted guards to watch over him. But Nicodemus they sent away free, since Joseph alone had requested Jesus’ body and had been the principal instigator in his burial. Later, when everyone had assembled, all through the Sabbath they considered, along with the priests and Levites how they should kill Joseph. After the assembly had gathered, the chief officials ordered, Annas and Ciaphas to present Joseph; but when they opened the seals on the door they did not find him. Scouts were sent out everywhere, and so Joseph was found in his own city, Arimathea. Hearing this, the chief priests and all the people of the Jews rejoiced and glorified the God of Israel because Joseph had been found whom they had shut up in a cell. They then made a great assembly, at which the chief of the priests said, ‘how can we bring Joseph to us and speak with him?’ They took up a piece of parchment and wrote to Joseph, saying,’ peace be with you and yours. We see that we have sinned against God and against you. Deign therefore, to come to your fathers and your sons, for we have marvelled greatly over your assumption. Indeed, we know that we have plotted evil counsel against you, and the Lord has freed you from our evil council. Peace to you, Lord Joseph, honourable among all the people’. And they chose seven men who were friends of Joseph and said to them, ‘When you reach Joseph, greet him in peace and give him this letter.’
When the men had reached him, they greeted him peaceably and gave him the letter. Joseph read the letter and said, 'Blessed are you, O Lord my God, who have liberated Israel, that he should not shed my blood. Blessed are you, O my God, who have protected me under your wings.' And Joseph kissed the men who had come to him and took them into his house. The next day he climbed up on his ass and went with them until they came to Jerusalem; and when all the Jews heard of it, they ran to meet him, saying, 'Peace at your coming in, father.' Joseph responded to them, saying, 'Peace be with you all.' And they all kissed him, and Nicodemus received him into his house and made a banquet for him. The next day the Jews all came together, and Annas and Ciaphas said to Joseph, 'Make confession to the God of Israel, and reveal to us all that which you are asked. We quarrelled with you because you buried the body of Jesus and shut you up in a cell on account of the Sabbath; on the following day we sought you but did not find you. Therefore, we were greatly astonished, and fear has held us even up until now, when we have received you. Now that you are present, tell us before God, what happened to you' .Joseph answered them, saying, 'When you shut me up at evening on the day of preparation, while I stood at my Sabbath prayers, the house in which I was held was taken up in the middle of the night by four angels, and I saw Jesus like a flash of light. I fell for fear onto the ground, but, holding my hand; he lifted me up from the ground and covered me with the scent of roses. As he wiped my face, he kissed me and said to me, “Do not fear, Joseph; look upon me and see who I am.” I looked at him and said, “Rabbi Elijah,” and he said to me, “I am not Elijah, but Jesus, whose body you buried.” Then I said to him, “Show me the monument where I lay you.” And taking my hand, he led me to the place where I buried him and showed me the linen shroud and the face cloth in which I had wrapped his head. Then I recognised that he was Jesus, and I adored him saying, ‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.” Then, holding my hand, he led me into my house in Arimathea and said to me, “Peace be with you. Do not go out of your house until the 40th day. I shall go to my disciples.” And when he had said these things, he disappeared.’

After all this, the noble Joseph of Arimathea, animated by an ardent faith, became the disciple of blessed Philip the apostle, and, filled to overflowing with his saving doctrine, was baptised by him, along with his son Josephes. Later he was appointed guardian of the blessed ever virgin
Mary by blessed John the apostle, while John himself laboured at preaching to
the Ephesians: Joseph was present at the assumption of the same glorious
virgin, along with blessed Philip and his other disciples, and he preached
incessantly through many lands the things which he had heard and seen of
the Lord Jesus Christ and his mother Mary; finally, converting and baptising
many, in the 15th year after the blessed virgins assumption he came to Philip
the apostle in Gaul, along with his son Josephes, whom the Lord had earlier
consecrated Bishop in the city of Sarras. For when the disciples dispersed
throughout the various parts of the world after the Lord's Ascension; as
Freculph bears witness in his second book, in the fourth chapter; Philip came
to the Kingdom of the Franks to preach, and he converted and baptised many
into the faith of Christ. Since then, the holy apostle wished to spread the word
of God, he sent twelve of his disciples to Britain to proclaim the good news of
the Word of Life; over these he set his dear friend, the aforesaid Joseph, who
buried the Lord, along with his son Josephes. More than 600 came with them,
as is read in the book, called ‘the holy Grail’ (Sanctum Graal), men as
well as women, all of whom vowed that they would abstain from their own
spouses until they had come into the land appointed to them. They all made a
sham of their oath however, except for 150, whom at the Lord's command
crossed the sea upon Josephes’ shirt on Easter night and landed in the
morning. The others repented, and through Josephes’ prayers on their behalf,
a ship was sent by the Lord which King Solomon had artfully constructed in
his time and which endured all the way to the time of Christ. That same day,
you and the Duke of the Persians named Nasciens reached their companions;
Joseph had earlier baptised Nasciens in the city of Sarras, along with the King
of the city, whose name was Mordrain. The Lord later appeared to Mordrain
in a vision and showed him his pierced hands and feet and his side wounded
by the lance. Taking great pity upon him, the King said,’ O Lord my God, who
has dared to do such a thing to you? ’And the Lord answered,’ the faithless
King of North Wales has done these things to me, and he who has bound in
prison, my servant Joseph and his companions, who were preaching my name,
in his territories, and who has inhumanely denied them necessary sustenance.
You then, do not delay but hasten to those parts, girded with your sword, to
avenge my servants upon the tyrant and free them from their chains.’

The King, then awoke and rejoiced in the Lord because of the vision
revealed to him, made disposition of the house and Kingdom, began his
journey with his army and coming to the place by God’s guidance,
commanded the aforesaid King to permit God’s servants to depart freely. But the Welsh King, altogether refusing the command, indignantly ordered him to leave his land without delay. When King Mordrain had heard this, he and the aforesaid Duke Nasciens came against him with their army, and Nasciens killed the Welsh King in a battle of just vengeance. Then King Mordrain went to the prison where the wicked King held Joseph and his companions under arrest, led him thence in great joy, and told him the vision which the Lord had revealed to him in order to free them. Then all were filled with great joy and thanked the Lord mightily.

After this Saint Joseph and his son Josephes and their 10 companions travelled through Britain, where King Arviragus then reigned, in the 63rd year from the Lord’s incarnation, and they trustworthily preached the faith of Christ. But the barbarian King and his nation, when they heard doctrines so new and unusual, did not wish to exchange their ancestral traditions for better ways and refused consent to their preaching. Since however they had come from afar, and because of their evident modesty of life, Arviragus gave them for a dwelling an island at the edge of his Kingdom surrounded with forests, thickets and swamps, which was called by the inhabitants Ynswytryn, that is ‘the Glass island’. Of this a poet has said, ‘The twelvefold band of men entered Avalon: Joseph, flower of Arimathea, is their chief. Josephes, Joseph’s son, accompanies his father. The right to Glastonbury is held by these and the other ten.’ When the saints then, had lived in that desert for a short time, the Archangel Gabriel admonished them in a vision to build a church in honour of the holy Mother of God, the ever virgin Mary, in that place which heaven would show them. Obeying the divine admonitions, they finished a Chapel, the circuit of whose walls they completed with wattles, in the 31st year after the Lord’s passion, the fifteenth, as was noted, after the assumption of the glorious Virgin, and the same year in fact, in which they had come to St Philip the apostle in Gaul and had been sent by him to Britain. Though it was of unsightly construction, it was adorned with the manifold power of God; and, since it was the first church in the land, the son of God distinguished it by a fuller dignity, dedicating it in his own presence in honour of his mother. And so these 12 saints offered there, devout service to God and the blessed virgin, freeing themselves up for fasting and prayers; and, in their necessities they were revived by the assistance of the Virgin Mother of God. When the holiness of their lives was discovered, two of the Kings, though pagans, Marius, the son of King Arviragus, and Coel, son of Marius, granted them each a hide of land
and at the same time confirmed the gift. Thus, to this day, the 12 hides take their names from them. When a few years had passed, these saints were led forth from the workhouse of the body. Arthur was buried among those men and Joseph and positioned on a bifurcated line next to the oratory mentioned before. Consequently, he occupies the same place that was the lair of wild beasts, which formerly was the dwelling place of saints, until it pleased the Blessed Virgin to restore to her oratory as a monument of the faithful.

John of Glastonbury writing c.1400 has consolidated what seemingly was William of Malmesbury’s work. It is comprised from William’s interpolated work by Henry, Henry’s Grail literature and possibly other work put out by Henry. We know Arviragus is a concoction of Henry’s in HRB and since there is no mention of Arviragus in DA it is no doubt to hide his authorship of the interpolations in DA. Yet John of Glastonbury starts his work with Arviragus so we can absolutely be sure (knowing that Arviragus is a Henry invention in HRB) that John is being supplied other lore than that found in DA connecting Arviragus to Glastonbury…. and this must be part of Henry’s output which has since disappeared.

Joseph’s relics had not been found. John says he lies on a bifurcated line next to the Oratory. John of Glastonbury does not speak as if he had invented an overly complicated prophecy and utilised but one piece from it. He speaks like a man who only understood a part of what he had read from a prophecy. This is a vague description for someone who is posited to have gone to the trouble of inventing an otherwise meaningless prophecy; especially when his extract seems to ignore his other efforts mentioning Sperula and random numbers and Abbadare in the rest of the prophecy composition.

If the Melkin prophecy had no validity it is surely being underutilised if designed specifically to bolster Joseph lore at Glastonbury. If the Melkin prophecy was not just another piece of information in the mass of Glastonbury lore that John is consolidating he makes little use of his capital considering the Melkin Prophecy’s sole purpose was to locate Joseph’s burial place and association with Glastonbury. When will modern scholars wake up?

Eusebius of Caesarea c. 325 knows nothing of the Gospel of Nicodemus although he was aware of "Letters of Pilate" referred to by Justin and Tertullian. He was also aware of an anti-Christian text called Acts of Pilate
not the same as the present day text. It seems as if the letters of Pilate or the acts were used as a base for the epic known as the Gospel of Nicodemus.

The Gospel of Nicodemus is unique in that it mentions the soldier who speared Jesus on the cross called Longinus and the names of the two criminals who were crucified beside him. Many others are mentioned also just as Henry was at ease concocting characters in HRB. This to me has the hallmark of Henry Blois, who, as we saw in HRB, has no qualms inventing history or supplying names not previously heard, and apportioning to them pivotal roles in history. The Gospel of Nicodemus also is written by a man who has a good grasp of the issues concerning Pilate’s importunity and who is not afraid to concoct as a truth his own eschatological conclusions on Adam (the first spiritual man) and Hell and other biblical icons found in GS. Our author also has a good grasp of storytelling and is well acquainted with the bible.

He makes bold statements such as: And all these things which were spoken by the Jews in their synagogue did Joseph and Nicodemus forthwith declare unto the governor. And Pilate himself wrote all the things that were done and said concerning Jesus by the Jews.

Henry has a knack of supplying the provenance of the work and then suggesting in the story how it came to be. No-one refers to the Gospel of Nicodemus before Medieval times. It seems to be an accretion of previous works or work. Its object in the main, originally, was to furnish irrefutable testimony to the resurrection but the Nicodemus version has much to say about Joseph’s role after the crucifixion.... and we can conjecture that a version which features Joseph so prominently may be by the hand of Henry. Whether or not Henry wrote it, is not important. But Robert de Boron has without doubt derived his story from Henry Blois or had certainly seen it in a book composed by Henry Blois or heard it at some continental court from Henry. It is not a coincidence that a medieval manuscript appears concerning Joseph of Arimathea i.e. the Gospel of Nicodemus from which Robert draws upon in Joseph d’Arimathie? This glorifies and corroborates episodes in the Gospel of Nicodemus. Meanwhile Henry Blois is introducing Joseph material into the DA and writing Grail literature using the inspiration derived from Melkin’s prophecy.

Let the reader put themselves in Henry’s shoes. One obtains this information from an old tract that Joseph of Arimathea has a sepulchre on an island. He is at Glastonbury and the island is named as Ynis witrin, so it
is in Briton. You find a charter dated 601 on which the same name of Yniswitrin is found. You have no idea where the island is. Firstly you use the charter to establish Glastonbury’s antiquity. Malmesbury has no idea where this supposed island is either so dismisses the bastardized Latin prophecy because neither he nor Henry could make head or tail of all the meaningless word strings; so best just use the charter because one can see it is genuine. Only after Malmesbury dies it is fortuitous for Henry to have this old charter apply to Glastonbury; so he adds etymological hodge podge to *Life of Gildas* which he had already written putting his Arthur with Gildas; again for proof of Glastonbury’s antiquity. Henry might as well corroborate/celebrate the recent *Life of Gildas* story by engaging stone masons while passing through Modena.

Joseph has no provenance in Briton apart from the fables spoken of by the Cornish rumour of Joseph’s visits as a tin merchant. As a trader Joseph was relatively unknown so his notoriety would have been on his return to stay in Briton with the awful events just having transpired in Jerusalem.

Augustine’s Catholic Romans probably stamped out any tradition of Joseph so their monopoly and primacy through Peter would not be diluted by a Joseph; a direct relation of Jesus who arrived in Briton.

Later c.1160-70 Henry has started this whole Joseph, Grail, Arthur, Avalon juggernaut in motion by inventing stories and entertaining his family in Champagne with them. Henry now needs to attach Joseph’s provenance to Glastonbury so that he can consolidate the last interpolations in DA. What better way than to attach Joseph to Briton than by what JG has just informed us above? Where do you think JG found the bulk of his source material; from which mind?

Matthew Paris c. 1200 – 1259 better known as Matthew Westminster who wrote the *Flores Historiarum* has possibly the first précis of Melkin’s prophecy written in the margin. In Archbishop Usher’s ‘*Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*’ he provides us with the variant of Melkin’s prophecy, which cannot be dated as it is not in the main body of text, but it does however plainly show the prophecy’s evolution. There is no geometric numerical data included (i.e. the thirteen *sperulatis* and the 104 *milles*) because, as with modern scholarship, the relevance of the numbers were not understood:

‘*Joseph ab Arimathea nobilis decurio in insula Avallonia cum xi. Sociis suis somnum cepit perpetuum et jacet in meridiano angulo lineae bifurcate*
Oratorii Adorandae Virginis. Habit enim secum duo vascula argentea alba cruore et sudore magni prophetae Jesu perimpeleta. et per multum tempus ante diem Judicii ejus corpus integrum et illibatum reperietur; et erit apertum toti Orbi terranum. Tunc nec ros nec pluvial habitantibus insulam nobilissimam poterit deficere.'

'Joseph of Arimathea, the noble decurion, received his everlasting rest with his eleven associates in the Isle of Avalon. He lies in the southern angle of the bifurcated line of the Oratorium of the Adorable Virgin. He has with him the two white vessels of silver which were filled with the blood and the sweat of the great prophet Jesus. And for a long time before the day of judgement, his body will be discovered whole and undisturbed; and will be opened to the whole world. At that time neither dew, nor rain, will lack from that noble island'.

What I have tried to make plain is that from a very early time Melkin’s prophecy existed and no-one understood what it meant or its relevance to Glastonbury. It is for this reason, once it was commonly accepted that Glastonbury was Avalon, after the disinterment of Arthur, the Melkin prophecy, on which Henry had substituted the name Avalon for Ineswitrin… became prevalent in its association with the Island of Avalon.

"Nobilis decurio" is St. Jerome’s translation in the Vulgate of St. Mark’s "honourable counsellor". Rabanus Maurus 776–856 (the archbishop of Mainz), in 'The Life of St. Mary Magdalene' uses the same appellation along with Helinand. Some commentators assume Joseph was a member of a provincial Roman Senate as ‘decurions’ are reported as being in charge of mining districts.

The Glastonbury propaganda machine has never been able to find any resolution or use for Melkin’s tredicum or the word sperula from the prophecy, but the 104 was made to apply to other saints interred at Glastonbury. The linea bifurcata, the oratorii, the cratibus and the adorandam virginem were the only pieces of the prophecy which could actively be used in conjunction with the old church as we witness here in an extract from Dugdale’s Monasticon Anglicanum: "Here St. Joseph, who is considered by the monkish historians as the first abbot, erected, to the honour of the Virgin Mary, of wreathed twigs, the first Christian oratory in England."

In Dugdale’s Monasticon Anglicanum c.1650 the tradition which Henry started is now no longer a part of his propagandist edifice it is
now the truth that everyone accepts: *The ancient church of wood or wicker, which legend spoke of as the first temple reared on British soil to the honour of Christ, was preserved as a hallowed relic, even after a greater church of stone was built by Dunstan to the east of it. And though not a fragment of either of those buildings still remains, yet each alike is represented in the peculiar arrangements of that mighty and now fallen minster. The wooden church of the Briton is represented by the famous Lady Chapel, better known as the chapel of Saint Joseph; the stone church of the West-Saxon is represented by the vast Abbey church itself. Nowhere else can we see the works of the conquerors and the works of the conquered thus standing, though but in a figure, side by side. Wherein is proved by all kinds of testimonies, and authorities, that for certain, S. Joseph of Aramathia, "with divers other holy Associates, came into, preached, lived, dyed, and was buryed in Britayne, at the place now called Glastenbury in Summersetshire."

The Bishop of Winchester was too clever to reveal that he is the link between Glastonburyana and French Grail material being propagated at the court of Champagne. The DA, originally written by William of Malmesbury around 1129-1134, only had Joseph and Avalon interpolated into it sometime in the 1160’s while Henry propagated Grail lore through Master Blihis, which we now know found fruition in Robert Chrétien and Walter Map.

The commonalities of such incidents as the ‘chapel ride’ episode, found in Perlesvaus and Chrétien, indicate that stories concerning the Grail all originated from one source and probably from Henry as the oral source on the continent. Perlesvaus, the Lais of Marie and Walter Map’s work along with Chrétien de Troyes, and Robert de Boron’s work having icons and personages in common as early as 1170 indicates that just before that era Master Blihis had been busy.

Nitze establishes that John of Glastonbury’s version of the chapel ride account did not come from Perlesvaus yet funnily enough believes what is written in the colophon about there being a Latin original. Since Perlesvaus is obviously written by someone acquainted with Glastonbury it does not take a scholar to work out who the originator is. Ironically, Carley states that what the contents of that Latin original might have contained has caused much speculation among Grail scholars; one particular alluring
theory is that this book might also be the source for John’s material about Melkin.\textsuperscript{441}  
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Chapter 19

Eadmer’s letter

The dispute between Canterbury and Glastonbury over the relics of St Dunstan.
We have arrived at this point demonstrating Henry Blois to be the author of several tracts. The letter written to the Glastonbury monks by Eadmer indicates at what an early stage Henry Blois can be implicated in disseminating falsities. If we can read between the lines and understand the motives, the letter corroborates what I have maintained through this discourse about Henry’s ability to fabricate. Henry Blois is a fabricator.... a person who has no qualms about bending the truth to suit an end. Henry Blois is internally, vainly imperious, but ostensibly portrays an exterior of an educated and outwardly balanced man who eventually fostered a persona of venerable patron of the church. In his early days before the Machiavellian usurpation of the crown by his brother, Henry is presented as humble monk with time for the common man as William of Malmesbury portrays him in the prologue to DA in the early stages of his career. It probably only took until 1135 until William fully understood Henry’s true nature. By this time the nonsense of this dispute over Dunstan’s relics had probably passed, as its main instigator had moved on to greater ambitions and more fantastic fabrications.

I hope to show the reader that Eadmer’s ire in his letter to Glastonbury is aimed at the young Henry Blois. Also that William of Malmesbury’s strange
stance on lambasting Osbern’s work is on account of the pressure brought to bear by Henry Blois, who had instigated the rumour concerning Dunstan’s translation from Canterbury. William, in Henry’s employ and ensconced at Glastonbury, most probably knew that it was the young enterprising abbot who had put about such rumours, but being a mere historian could in no way implicate the new abbot and nephew of King Henry I.

The earliest and only written concocted Glastonbury account of how the abbey came to possess the body of St Dunstan is written in the interpolated part of DA. Eadmer does not imply that the events of St Dunstan’s translation to Glastonbury is written down anywhere. We can grasp fully the original account of Glastonbury’s pretensions and the details of the concocted legend through Eadmer’s refutation of the Glastonbury claim. In fact, Eadmer implies the spreading of the Dunstan rumour is verbal and he had *never heard that anyone who was there at the time has ever said or written anything concerning these matters which you have put about... Not a single word, spoken or written, that any sane man could accept..........Have you, pray, any writings to prove matters stood thus?*

Sir Archibald Campbell Lawrie\(^\text{442}\) claims Eadmer died in 1123 on the 13\(^{\text{th}}\), January. There is no definitive evidence for this and most commentators put Eadmer’s death at 1126 at the earliest and more probably afterward as we shall see. However, no-one to my knowledge has answered sufficiently why this rumour suddenly appeared which spurred Eadmer’s sarcastic refutation by correspondence to the Glastonbury monks. This letter to the Glastonbury monks in occasional indirect references infers that Henry Blois could be the abbot at the time when the letter was written. So (if I am correct in this analysis) Eadmer must have lived after 1126 when Henry joined the abbey.

My proposition is that the person who established the rumour of Dunstan’s relics at Glastonbury and provided the only written account of the Glastonbury concoction in DA regarding the rumour is the same man i.e. Henry Blois. This has not been posited before because it has always been assumed that an interpolator after the fire at Glastonbury is responsible for

---
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the insertion in DA which actually upholds the rumour rather than any response or mention of Eadmer.

However, we do know of the existence of another interpolator who added to DA after Henry inserted his final interpolations which constitute chapters 1 and 2 of DA. This consolidator may or may not be responsible for the T version of DA, but what is a certainty is that the amount that the consolidator achieves is far less than Scott accounts to his efforts. Scott, the authority on DA is unaware of the interpolations of Henry Blois and concludes a much later coalescing of DA. I would say that an intermediary consolidator after Henry’s death (or even another redactor before the scribe of T) has expanded upon Henry’s initial interpolation in DA. Certainly at least one interpolator writes after the fire in 1184.

The legend of the translation of Dunstan would be easier to maintain or concoct after the fire if there were initial evidence backing up the claim supposedly written by ‘William of Mamesbury’. One would then only have to ‘re-find’ the grave site as the later redactor of DA achieves in the post 1184 account of the Dunstan exhumation which constitute chapters 24 and 25 of DA.

There are many reasons for positing Henry’s involvement in propagating the translation rumour. Let us see if the evidence drawn from not only William of Malmesbury but from the narrative of Eadmer’s letter implicates Henry Blois.

Eadmer admired William of Malmesbury and knew him as a friend. William’s obvious avoidance of this story rather than its inclusion or rebuttal in his own VD, tells us that he was aware of the story. It should be clear that William’s refusal to compromise his integrity by going along with the rumoured Dunstan translation from Canterbury was the main impetus (alongside the abbey’s proof of antiquity) for writing DA. This is made plain in the prologue of DA. William refers in this prologue to the ‘original plan’ which was to counter the most consequential of Osbern’s errors; which stated that Dunstan was the first Abbot at Glastonbury. There is no doubt that the Glastonbury church stood long before Augustine’s arrival and William makes this plain in the prologue to VD I: *In fact, Glastonbury passed under the sway of the church long before St Patrick, who died in AD 472, while Dunstan saw the light of day in AD 925.* Incidentally, there is no indication that William’s VD I or II were interpolated. (Nor is William advocating any relationship with Glastonbury by the above)
So the ‘original plan’ or intent mentioned in the prologue of DA was not only to counteract Osbern’s inaccuracy, but also to show that by merit of age, Glastonbury had greater cause for celebration and respect. Age generally established primacy, but because Augustine was a Roman envoy, Canterbury was conferred with that honour. This was obviously an ongoing dispute over time when Henry arrived in 1126, and involved nearly every religious house as it defined the ecclesiastical pecking order. Anyway, William’s curious snipes at Osbern’s work in the two prologues to VD in conjunction with certain statements in the prologue to DA indicate that there is some political manoeuvrings going on. I believe the cause of most of it is in deference to Henry Blois.

Henry Blois arrived at Glastonbury in 1126. He may have arrived back with his uncle from Normandy after settling differences with the princes of France. Huntingdon has King Henry’s return date at September 1126, when he was accompanied back to England by the recently widowed Empress Matilda.

I envisage a young abbot, around 25 years of age, eager to impress his uncle by contributing knight’s service and funds to the royal coffers, sorting out what once was a very rich institution at the time of Doomsday. One choice of action would be to gain advantage of Glastonbury’s association with Dunstan, enhancing the visits to Glastonbury by pilgrims and increasing the alms they brought. Henry has a penchant for crosses and understands the power they have over Christians. It seems by inference of the image of the redeemer, he sets one up at Glastonbury specifically relating to Dunstan as we can gather from Eadmer: *If you listen to my advice, you will remove those bones which you have loaded onto the image of our Redeemer, before He is Himself angry with you. It is sufficient that He be honoured for Himself and there is no need to keep up holiness on Him through dead men’s bones or otherwise.*

Henry attested in his own *libellus* that he set about regaining misappropriated lands through previous bad practises by former abbots. He also re-gained lands previously belonging to Glastonbury which had been gifted in reward by his former relatives as past Kings. Henry capitalises on the known association of Dunstan at Glastonbury by claiming his relics rest there. In my scenario, Henry puts about a story which adds credence to such a claim and an explanation of how the circumstances transpired that such a relic is fortuitously found at Glastonbury.
Author B’s account of the life of Dunstan relates his early saintly life at Glastonbury and certainly a Dunstan tradition existed at Glastonbury. All Henry did was capitalise on an asset through tradition. Eadmer in his letter makes it clear that when he himself visited Glastonbury, no translation myth existed. In fact Eadmer states that Glastonbury monks were known to pay their respects to Dunstan at Canterbury only in the recent past.

One of William of Malmesbury’s efforts being half Norman and half English was to preserve for posterity the deeds of the English saints. Yet William definitely knew of this rumour and who had started it and for what reason. William of Malmesbury’s GR states: *I have followed the true law of the historian, and have set down nothing but what I have learnt from trustworthy report or written source. Moreover, be that as it may, I have this private satisfaction, by God’s help, that I have set in order the unbroken cause of English history, and am since Bede the only man so to do, or at any rate the first. If anyone therefore as I already here suggested, has a mind to follow me in writing on this subject, let him give me the credit for the collection of the facts and make his own selection from the material.*

William was already there at the abbey when Henry Blois arrived, having been employed by the Monks prior to Henry’s arrival to write the lives of Indract and Patrick (St Benignus was never written\(^{443}\)). It appears the monks had already approved (corrected) these lives prior to Henry’s arrival. It seems of little advantage except from someone who wishes to capitalise on Glastonbury’s association with Dunstan to engage another investigation into Dunstan. Author B, Adelard, Osbern, an old English author also and Eadmer himself had already re-ploughed Dunstan’s biographic field with little fresh to add without invention.

My proposition is that Henry wanted William of Malmesbury to paint a version not from the angle which glorifies Canterbury’s association with Dunstan (as Osbern and Eadmer had done), but to provide a picture which implies a greater attachment by Dunstan as a ‘former pupil’ to Glastonbury. Diplomatically, Henry persuaded William to embark on the biography hoping that he would be convinced by ‘oral’ tradition at Glastonbury by implying that previous biographers had underperformed. I suspect that Henry Blois was intending to plant evidence (concerning Dunstan) in the

\(^{443}\) As we shall cover shortly, this myth was created to establish St Patrick at Glastonbury rather than association relying on author B’s reference to Patrick.
chest of papers from which William was to glean the information for DA. However, Henry did not bank on William’s probity or their close acquaintance.... or Eadmer’s tenacity and assurance that Dunstan’s bones never left Canterbury.

In VD I in the prologue, William diplomatically states that the reason for writing (and him earning his next commission): Most holy Fathers, in the celebration of the love and honour of your most blessed father Dunstan our pious zeal strives to compete with the whole of England. And it may be that ours is the greater glory in this contest, seeing that we love as a former pupil one whom they look up to as a saint and an Archbishop. So it is that we can join love to our reverence yielding in neither to those of Canterbury, who boast that they once had him as their primate. Hence it has come about that, for all our diligence in looking out writings concerning his life, we are sad that they do not come up to your expectation. For we have found that the old lives lack polish, and the new reliability. So we have reasonably enough been to that extent saddened: for rustic writings give no pleasure, and it is shaming to repeat things that lack of firm basis in truth. It is a misuse of learning and leisure to retail falsehoods about the doings of saints: it shows contempt for reputation and condemns one to infamy. I should be glad to be unaware that this fate has befallen a recent author of a life of the blessed Dunstan; he is often either mistaken in his views or biased in his judgement.

My speculation is that while Henry was putting these rumours about, that he wished to influence William so that William would attest Dunstan’s translation as part of history. The tensions surrounding William’s unwillingness to co-operate are evident in the prologue to DA. What is not so clear is William’s change of attitude to Osbern’s work since completing GR in 1125. It can only be the result of a recent development and it seems to be down to the arrival of the new abbot. William had praised Osbern for his work as a hagiographer and liturgist in GR: I would gladly add more facts.... about this great man (Dunstan) but I am restrained by Osbern, precentor of Canterbury, who has written his life with Roman elegance, being second to none in our time as a stylist as well as leading the field without dispute in music.444

444 GR chap 149.3
William’s unwillingness to substantiate what he knew to be untrue, had to be balanced with his ‘anxiety to win your favour’ and his way out of this diplomatic mess. William, as *confrater* at Glastonbury, decided a course of action to mitigate this embarrassing situation and to distance his work on Dunstan from Eadmer by making almost no use of material from Eadmer’s *life of Dunstan*. In this way he did not contradict or diminish his friends work. William in VD made no specific reference to it for this reason. But, contrarily, William ostensibly defends Glastonbury against Canterbury by using the deceased Osbern’s work as he pillories most of Osbern’s erroneous assertions in an attempt to appear on side with the Glastonbury monks. William saw this as a way out. He could corroborate Glastonbury’s historical antiquity by seeming to counteract the false statements of the Canterbury precentor, without having to fully compromise his integrity by substantiating a Henry Blois rumour that he knew to be false. This is made plain in his accusation against Osbern concerning prophecy: *But what he (Dunstan) foretold I do not presume to say, for I find nothing in old books. As I have said before, whoever claims to tell of the feats of saints, but goes beyond what has been written in the past, is surely of unsound mind.*

It was in Osbern’s work that the gross accusation of Glastonbury’s recent foundation was made which relates back to the primacy issue and pecking order of Clergy and religious houses. William had misunderstood that he was expected not only to counter this false accusation (that Dunstan was the first abbot), but also to authenticate the Dunstan translation rumour started by Henry Blois. This initially was Henry Blois’ intention in commissioning VD. But William on the other hand had understood the ‘original plan’ was to write a better version of Dunstan’s life, while at the same time expounding upon the abbey’s antiquity.

As soon as Henry Blois understood that William was not the person to embellish the rumour he had started, Henry and the Glastonbury monks commissioned DA. William went on to finish his first commission demonstrating to his fellow monks he was vehemently against Osbern’s original slight of their abbey. However, William’s reasons for writing VD1 are different from Henry’s because Henry could not explicitly ask William to propagate a fabrication: *it was because you had taken offence at such mistakes (of Osbern) that you appealed to me to display the obedience our*
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445 VD ii 35.2
confraternity demands, and to give a new description of the saints doings, using (as it were) the press of my labours to remove the lees of untruth and strain out a purified version of the facts. So that I could do this with more assurance you showed me writings, both in Latin and in English, that you had found in an ancient chest of yours.

Even though William had previous affiliation with Canterbury; Canterbury could hardly contradict the claim of antiquity as Glastonbury was in truth more ancient: *It was an ancient place as I have said, going back well beyond his time; but though it owes its first foundation to earlier benefactors, it is indebted to Dunstan for its new pre-eminence.*

Just as a quick comment, to substantiate for the reader that the interpolations in the first 34 chapters of DA were fabricated…. if William had truly reached the conclusion of an apostolic foundation after his researches at Glastonbury (as is commonly thought by modern scholars), he would have stated it here…. as VD II is written after the main body of DA i.e. the unadulterated material of William’s work which constitutes chapters 35 onwards…. which is largely untouched except for small interpolations.

So, William in effect, would not distress Canterbury as long as he did not state that Dunstan’s relics were at Glastonbury. However, Henry was the proponent of the rumour and William came up short, not acquiescing by recording as history what he knew was not true. It is on these grounds that the DA was commissioned to address the most important issue of the abbey’s antiquity. The carping nature of William's criticism against Osbern can only be understood as wishing to appear as angered as the rest of the institution within which he mixed and ate his bread at Glastonbury.

The accusations against Osbern were several, but above all was his assertion that Dunstan was Glastonbury’s first Abbot. William took Osbern to task for exaggeration and his use of obviously concocted speech as if Dunstan had spoken what was quoted. William also set out to confound him on theological errors: *How heinously the chanter of Canterbury went astray in relating the life of our father. For apart from a very few details in which he kept on the right track, there are very many others—almost all in fact—where he confused the order of miracles or strayed from the truth by diminishing or exaggerating events. In particular following the practice of the rhetoricians, he often attributed to speakers words which they might indeed have spoken in*
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446 VD ii 10.3
those circumstances-but who, I ask you, could have passed them on to our day with all accuracy? Scarcely, I repeat, scarcely has a slender report of
events trickled through to us; far less could I believe that words; which flew
away the moment they were spoken, could have been held on to. There is
nothing of the sort in the old writers following whose account I have on your
instructions roll back the miracles to their proper order and corrected the
details of events. I have added what is lacking, and cut out what is
superfluous. But I’m afraid it will be difficult to gain pardon for this remark
from the ill-disposed even though-to quote the opinion of a great orator-I
should not be afraid to be called arrogant when I’m speaking the truth.

If William of Malmesbury really thought that there was any truth in the
rumour that Dunstan’s body lay at Glastonbury, he would have said so.
William’s only way out of this compromising situation as Winterbottom and
Thompson suggest, was to propose a third book on Dunstan’s posthumous
miracles. But for obvious reasons this never got written: ... but a few things
that have been preserved in writing will claim a place in the following book.

The question is: does the chronology and scenario fit the statements
made in the three prologues of VD 1&2 and DA? Do the set of events
correspond as I have set them out above? Do they coincide as a reaction not
only to Osborne but also take into account William’s reticence to mention
the ‘Elephant in the room’?

It seems fair to assume in 1127-8, it is hoped William can be brought on-
board to express the view of the current newly invented Glastonbury
polemic that Dunstan was translated at the time of the Danish incursion
from Canterbury to Glastonbury. This does not happen for reasons
explained above concerning William’s integrity. While William of
Malmesbury was writing VD 1, it is realised by Henry Blois that William is
not going to be cajoled, therefore, DA is envisaged as a compromise to
overcome William’s moral rectitude in refusing to accept the translation
rumour. Instead of counteracting Osbern’s accusation or expecting William
to substantiate a rumour through a work on St Dunstan a more simple
strategy of proof of antiquity of the abbey is commissioned.

The non-interpolated part of DA not only confutes Osbern’s accusation,
but establishes antiquity prior to Augustine by inclusion of the 601 charter

447 Cicero.
448 VD ii prologue
449 VD II 35. 2
which came at the beginning of William’s original DA before all Henry’s interpolation. This in essence is the goal of DA, ‘the original plan’.

VD1 refers forward to the DA and both can be seen to have been written simultaneously. William finishes VD1 quickly and concentrates on the new task of DA: *And so I have made haste to obey your command, and in my anxiety to win your favour and that of the saint, I have perhaps laid myself open to the teeth of backbiters…. I have applied my pen to this topic simply to do you a favour.*

William continues to finish his *second book of the life of Dunstan from the birth of King Edgar* taking up chronologically from where the VD I had left off. VD II however, was written later than the main body of DA and refers back to it: *I have dealt in another work, as well as God allowed me, with the antiquity of this most holy monastery at Glastonbury in which I profess my heavenly service. If anyone is desirous of reading about it, he will be able to find it elsewhere in my output.*

This indicates that DA took priority after VD I was set aside while DA was researched and composed. Yet both books of the VD were finished by the time William wrote the prologue to DA. By then Henry is Bishop of Winchester. William in VD II refers to GR as written some years ago: *but anyone who cares to read of such matters may wish to look out the history of the English Kings, (GR) which I published some years back.* So, we may conclude VDI was started 1127-28, and DA 1128-29. When complete DA was presented to Henry anytime between 1129 and 1134 before Henry’s brother became King. It seems that Henry Blois paid for the services of William in producing DA as the book was referred to him by the monks at Glastonbury; the implication being he was already bishop of Winchester and the single monograph copy rested with Henry Blois at Winchester.

With those events explained, I aim to show that Eadmer was alive and the letter he wrote was written just after the new abbot joined because Eadmer inferred that it was a newly concocted story. I believe the Eadmer’s letter refers to the time of Henry’s arrival in 1126 and was written in the three years before he went to Winchester. One passage hints that William is
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450 VD I prologue,
451 VD II prologue. This is the root cause of the *matter of Britain*. Because DA was a book written for Glastonbury and delivered to Henry Blois himself; no-one in Henry’s era got to see the DA (his output) in the form that he left it. However, others did see it with the first interpolations regarding apostolic foundation as it was used in the 1144-1149 campaign to establish a metropolitan for Henry.
452 VD II 15.4
referring to Eadmer as Osbern’s defender at Canterbury in what seems to be an ongoing theological debate which otherwise has no relevance to our inquiry: Now with the help of God’s grace I shall try to clear up something I promised in a letter prefacing book one. For some people find fault with me for condemning the biographer of Dunstan because he said that the mother’s womb swelled with the sacred unborn child.\textsuperscript{453}

Winterbottom and Thompson posit that this might refer to Eadmer. However, there is far more pertinent information in the letter itself which implies that Eadmer must be writing his letter to Glastonbury after Henry’s arrival.

The reason for labouring this point is to show from the outset, even before composing his pseudo-history which led to the \textit{Primary Historia (the pre-cursor of HRB)}, that Henry Blois was prone to fabricate tales. I have included the whole of Eadmer’s letter in appendix 33. The letter is interesting in that Eadmer turns around the story or rumour which was supposed to glorify the abbey by the fact that Dunstan’s remains were at Glastonbury…. into Glastonbury being a den of liars and grave robbers: There are some among you, \textbf{recent members of your community, as I am aware, who claimed that your fathers of old were thieves and robbers.}

Eadmer is making clear that by spreading these lies, the Glastonbury establishment also implicate the former monks and abbot as grave robbers and liars. Eadmer makes it a general accusation of rumours emanating from Glastonbury: \textit{whose name is unknown to those who put about the story….} What no one is about to do is accuse Henry Blois the grandson of William the Conqueror and Nephew of Henry I of being responsible for the untrue rumour… neither William or Eadmer.

The reason for me to implicate Henry is that he is a known fabricator of legends as we have seen as author of HRB. Again Eadmer makes the point that the rumour is only a recent development: \textit{A hundred and more years have passed since they left this present life, those men whom these now claim to have been thieves and robbers. And now only at this late stage is such a grave reproach brought against them, and most unhappily they are now newly consigned to eternal punishment….}

Eadmer cannot accuse Henry directly but makes out that the modern youth of Glastonbury have invented this lie: \textit{But it is not we who says so;}

\textsuperscript{453} VD ii 35. 1
rather it is their own modern brethren at Glastonbury. Assuredly we know for certain that those men are not guilty of this sin. What does this matter to the fellows who accuse their own brethren, nay, their own fathers, with such silly concocted lies.

By modern brethren read ‘recently joined.’ Eadmer almost says this must be a Norman invention as an Englishman would have more respect for the relics and anyway this sort of fabrication is more suited to the continentals: Your reverence must understand how, writing this, I am confounded by such patent stupidity, worthy of everyone’s scorn, especially because it is said that these tales were made up by Englishman. Alas, why did you not look overseas, where they have more experience, more learning, and know better how to make up such stories? You could even have paid someone to make up a plausible lie for you on a matter of such importance.

It is poignant that Eadmer directs his invective to the youth of the Abbey: So, my lords and my brethren, to whom God has opened the means of understanding matters of reason, bridle the wanton violence of your foolish young men who open their mouths only in order to seem to know how to speak, on whatever the flightiness of their hearts lead them to, thinking that they are something because others are innocent enough to listen to what they say.

It seems rather poignant that when Eadmer refers to how the body of Dunstan was miraculously taken from Canterbury, he is full of sarcasm suggesting it might have to do with a disgraced abbot of Glastonbury; when he knows perfectly well there were no monks from Glastonbury who came to take up the body. I call him former Abbot because as a general synod of the English church he was deposed of his abbacy by Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, and he was placed under such confinement at Canterbury as fitted his position. The reference is designed to cast a slur on Glastonbury and the fact that in the past there had been an unscrupulous abbot and his deeds are recorded. The implication might be understood to be directed at the present abbot continuing this tradition.

The point of discussing this was to show that many details which were ‘put about’ by Glastonbury and recorded only in Eadmer’s rebuttal letter are refuted mainly on the evidence of the Glastonbury story not standing up to scrutiny. Most of these obvious flaws in the Glastonbury concoction are left out of DA where we know the reference to the Dunstan translation rumour exists in the interpolated part of DA. DA provides a general
synopsis of the translation episode. It is a fact that, the translation did not take place. But, it is my opinion that Henry Blois re-iterated his initial concocted rumour which he had put about as a youth just starting out at Glastonbury when he himself interpolated William’s work which we now exists in the interpolated chapter 23 of DA.

We can assume this must be a later addition by Henry, as it was so easily confuted and would not have been in the first set of interpolations of DA in 1144. A later redactor has added to Henry’s explanation and reiteration of the translation rumour for the benefit of the abbey after the fire in 1184.

As we have touched on already, Henry planted the supposed body of Arthur between the piramides at Glastonbury to be found in the future.... so one logically might assume the site of Dunstan’s grave was his doing also. We can therefore draw the conclusion that the translation of Dunstan account in DA is Henry’s work also.... and as I shall cover, extrapolated by a later interpolator adding to DA after the fire. As we have covered, the inspiration for planting a body to be found in the future comes directly from Melkin’s prophecy.

However, the idea for the leaden cross (found in Arthur’s grave) stating that Glastonbury is Avalon and that the body was that of King Arthur’s, was oddly enough initially inspired by Eadmer’s letter. Eadmer in his confutation of the translation of Dunstan provides evidence of the earlier movement of Dunstan’s relics when Eadmer was a boy at Canterbury: With it was found in inscription on a lead tablet which clearly stated that there lay the body of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury. Basically, this object substantiates a truth for Eadmer just as it substantiated a confirmation of Arthur’s existence and connection to Glastonbury for every contemporary after Arthur’s disinterment and for those gullible researchers in the modern era who believe Avalon is not fictional.

Henry Blois adapted the idea and used it for his biggest deception. As a ploy, it is the proof positive that convinced the world at Arthur’s disinterment firstly that the chivalric King Arthur existed in history as physical bones and Guinevere’s hair were found; but also that because Arthur was buried at Glastonbury....Glastonbury was certainly the old Isle Avalon.

Much like the composition of HRB can be traced to various sources (as clearly explained by Tatlock), we also see Henry’s inspiration from other
sources, as the leaden cross found in Henry Blois’ manufactured grave is in reality one of the nucleic components of the *Matter of Britain* in defining Avalon at Glastonbury. Yet the reader is aware now that the Island of Avalon in HRB was named after the Burgundian town in the region of Blois lands just as Arthur’s continental battle scene had been said to have taken place in the same region of Autun and Langres which of course Henry Blois knew well and all its topography….and every historian knows that this battle never took place.

Eadmer makes plain that his proof is established by the lead tablet which states it was St Dunstan that lay in the grave. Henry uses as inspiration from that example of proof, and in effect changes history by implying his alter-ego was buried in Avalon. From thenceforth the world has been duped…. yet the naïve are still fascinated at how it is that there is a semblance of history which follows where ‘Geoffrey’ said Arthur was last seen.

If modern scholars were truly correct in their analysis of events they would realise that what Henry implied in the colophon of Perlesvaus about Arthur and Guinevere being buried together at Glastonbury and also confirmed that both of them were buried between the *piramides* in DA; that this fact was reiterated as such by Gerald of Wales in his two reports…. they would realise Coggeshal and the Margam Chronicler and Camden’s version of what was written on Leaden cross was not the original. What was written on the cross had to have included the name Guinevere because Henry is responsible for composing Perlesvaus and is surely responsible for the manufacture of the grave which had her hair included….. and Henry Blois is the interpolator which indicates to the world where to dig in the cemetery in DA.

Scholars tend to shoot their own theory in the foot. If as they contrive their theory, the Perlesvaus and its colophon was written after the disinterment; the colophon would surely follow the hymn sheet and concur with the propaganda upheld by those writing after the dig who thought if more pious if Arthur were not buried with a soiled wife. In reality they expunged her name from what was on the cross originally. Obviously since there was no later interpolater who gives account of the unearthing of the grave in DA because it was Henry Blois who points to the position of the grave in DA, Gerald’s account should be the more trusted as it concurs with
what the manufacturer of the grave put in the grave and originally engraved on the cross. But, scholars have a certain way of constructing theories backwards and so the only person who does give an eyewitness account of the disinterment is summarily ignored.

Anyway, we shall get to this further on in the chapter on Gerald!!!
Chapter 20

Henry Blois’ interpolations and impersonations

There are several tracts composed by Henry Blois which fall under our investigation before Henry left England in self-imposed exile to his old monastery at Clugny in 1155. There are additional later interpolations to certain manuscripts i.e. DA.... and others entirely composed from scratch. All the manuscripts are very different. The impersonation which concerns us for the moment includes the books supposedly written by Geoffrey of Monmouth. These, as we have covered, are Henry’s Primary Historia deposited at Bec which is followed by the First Variant and Variant version with an early set of prophecies resulting in the eventual production of the Vulgate HRB with fully updated prophecies.

Henry writing as Gaufridus entitled his work De Gestis Britonum and he refers to it by this title rather than by what it is termed in the Vulgate version. Presently modern scholars assume little difference between those editions. They do not understand the evolving progression of the Historia in its three forms (or four if one includes the initial pseudo-history) and why
the First Variant is less anti-Roman and contains more biblical\textsuperscript{454} references than the Vulgate version. Nor can they account for the modification of several speeches made by Geoffrey’s characters. Scholarship has not understood the progression and warping of the prophecies from an original \textit{libellus} through to the inclusion of prophecies which spoke of events in the Anarchy which date to around 1149 and the further warping of those prophecies and the addition of new ones up until 1155.

Another impersonation by Henry Blois is evident in Caradoc of Llancarfan’s \textit{life of Gildas} where Arthur is brought into association with Glastonbury and so is Gildas. The two other tracts which concern us are by William of Malmesbury. There are small scale Glastonbury interpolations into William of Malmesbury’s \textit{Gesta Regum} which I will show complement the interpolations in DA.

The very influential interpolations are found in the first 34 chapters of DA. The interpolations into DA constitute two phases of interpolation at different times and for different purposes…. both by Henry Blois. Henry Blois’ first agenda is simply in pursuit of metropolitan status for himself. Henry combines interpolations in DA with his other interpolations of William’s work which concern Glastonbury found in GR3 and were composed pre-1155. A second set of interpolations are seen in DA and involves the glorification of Henry’s own invention in HRB in the persona of the chivalric Arthur.

Henry’s latter agenda also concerns Joseph of Arimathea. The introduction of Joseph into Grail lore and his presence in Glastonbury lore was a consequence of Henry’s knowledge of two factors. Firstly, Henry knew Cornish tradition concerning Joseph of Arimathea.\textsuperscript{455} Secondly, Neil Wright has the backward premise when referring to Geoffrey’s First Variant writes: \textit{his fondness for biblical allusion lends the First Variant in many passages (especially speeches) a tone rather more moral than that of Geoffrey’s original. In sum, the first variant does not abbreviate its source slavishly, but often recasts the historia freely in a manner quite different from that of Geoffrey himself.} The old adage remains that ‘if one starts with a faulty premise the conclusion is going to be even more inaccurate’. Does Neil not think Geoffrey wrote the First Variant. This ridiculous premise (Hammer’s) exists solely because scholars have never put ‘Geoffrey’ in context. Neither Wright nor Crick will change their stance or ever accept Henry Blois as ‘Geoffrey’ even when Wright commences his analysis of the Variant with: \textit{there has thus far been no consensus of opinion on such fundamental issues as exactly how the texts of this Variant relates to that of the vulgate, when and with what motives the Variant was composed, and who was responsible for it.} I have supplied motive, who wrote it, and how it relates to Vulgate.

\textsuperscript{454}Looe Island was appropriated by Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ tenure before 1144 when it appeared in a list of the abbeys possessions, found in a confirmation of pope Lucius II.
Henry had seen the prophecy of Melkin which made mention of the future discovery of Joseph of Arimathea on Ineswitrin.

Henry knew that Ineswitrin was in the old Dumnonia as the 601 charter plainly reveals. This was deduced on the fact that a Dumnonian King had donated an island with the same name in the 601 charter to the Old church at Glastonbury. Glastonbury was never part of Dumnonia. Henry believed what the prophecy foretold was true, but could not unlock its meaning. He had gone looking for the body thinking it really was at Montacute (guided by the same ‘carefully hidden’ information which much later Father Good confirmed); and Henry had also thought the body might be on Looe Island as this had an extant Joseph tradition in his era and it was in the old Dumnonia when Devon and Cornwall were one. We must remember Henry Blois knew he was looking for an island because it was him who swapped the name of Ineswitrin on the prophecy for Avalon.

Henry had demeaned himself with his previous petitions to Rome and its popes... in an attempt to gain metropolitan status. He had once thought of setting up a Gregorian state in Britain with his brother as King.

Ever since, he had been thwarted by his brother over the position of Archbishop of Canterbury and subsequently lost his ‘Legation’, he had been struggling to establish his own powerbase. Henry understood that if the body of Joseph of Arimathea was found, Rome would no longer have the self-professed primacy and authority over the church in Britain. This factor should be considered when (as I covered earlier), Henry Blois is the first person to define that the ‘New Jerusalem’ is in Britain. This, again, is partly intonated in the Prophecy of Melkin. It must have been Henry who made the addition to his VM, (a copy of which is no longer extant) but from which John of Glastonbury copied when quoting a verse from VM which likened Glastonbury to the New Jerusalem through the implication that Glastonbury Tor is the holy hill. ‘This was the New Jerusalem, the faith’s refinement, a

456 Per multum tempus ante diem Judioalem in iosaphat erunt aperta haec. & viventibus declarata.
457 Leland saw the copy that John of Glastonbury probably quotes from: Vita Merlini Sylvestris carmine scriptore Galfredo Monemutensi. Carley says about the extra three lines: My suspicion is that they were added to Glastonbury’s copy of the VM in the mid-twelfth century, at approximately the same period as the interpolations about Avalon were made in DA. 1) DA’s interpolations concerning Arthur and Joseph were made before Henry Blois died in 1171. 2) Avalon in the form of Insulam pomorum was in the VM in 1155. For Carley to maintain the above i.e. in the mid-twelfth century is in direct contradiction to everything he has stated before because he has held that Avalon only materialised after the Leadens cross was revealed c.1190. But by making this statement it puts Henry Blois in an era where he could indeed be responsible for the construct of Avalon becoming the New Jerusalem at Glastonbury.
holy hill, celebrated as the ladder of Heaven. He scarcely pays the penalty of hell who lies buried here'.

My point is that Henry did believe the Melkin prophecy and the fact that the ‘Uncle’ of Jesus brought an object to Britain and that Joseph’s sepulchre was on an island somewhere. Once he had invented his Avalon in HRB, inspired indirectly by the prophecy from the ‘Ines’ or Island of ‘Witrin’ found in the original Prophecy; Henry then converted both Ineswitrin and his name for Arthur’s island i.e. Avalon to be commensurate with Glastonbury. Henry’s second agenda entailed introducing Joseph into Glastonbury lore; just as he propagated Joseph material into continental Grail literature and orally implanted storyline elements at the court of Champagne. These elements were then confirmed and partially corroborated through his interpolations in DA.

As we covered, Henry decided he would provide a noble pre-history for the Britons which ran contrary to what he knew from Roman annals. His pseudo-history, (originally destined for Matilda) was expanded to include the Arthuriad. He set out to expand and romanticize the briefly mentioned Celtic Briton hero of Arthur found in the saints lives, the echo of which remained in popular culture in the form of an oral tradition of the ‘hope of the Britons’. Henry used as a template for the Life of Gildas the genuine life of St Cadoc, one of the few saint’s lives mentioning Arthurus. Henry also knew of the French rumours of a descendant heritage from Troy (after all, Henry’s father was the Count of Troyes). Henry also had read Nennius’ slim mention of Arthur and the brief reference in AC and probably Lambert’s work; and it is upon this flimsy foundation that the chivalric Arthur of HRB was constructed along with the bogus inter-relation of Ambrosius from the insular annals of Bede and Gildas.

One must understand that if ‘Geoffrey’ was in mid flow in the composition of his historia (in reality), when Alexander pressed him to translate the prophecies of Merlin, (and we know the composition of the prophecies are entirely a medieval construct).... how is it that the prophecies so neatly align with the second half of Geoffrey’s history?

Geoffrey sets us up in the Vulgate version by saying: I had not come so far as this place of my history, when by reason of the much talk that was made about Merlin, my contemporaries did on every side press me to make public an edition of his prophecies, and more especially Alexander, Bishop of
Lincoln, a man of the highest piety and wisdom. Nor was there none other, whether he were cleric or layman, that did retain so many knights or nobles in his household, whom his gentle holiness of life and bountiful kindliness did allure into his service. Wherefore, for that he it was whom I did most earnestly desire to please above all other, I did translate the prophecies and did send them unto him along with a letter unto this effect.

There are few other contemporaries that pressed Henry Blois on every side. Henry detested Alexander. Simply by backdating the ‘translation’ of the prophecies to appear to have been written under Alexander’s commission he averts suspicion that some prophecies were more modern and were current in Alexander’s lifetime. The flattery is entirely a ploy. Henry hated and mistrusted Alexander.... so how could any one suspect him of authorship of VM or HRB, especially when the commission is so adeptly retro dated by years backward from 1155 when dedicatees of Vulgate HRB were also produced.... knowing Alexander died in 1148.

Similar ploys are utilised in the colophon establishing contemporaneity with Caradoc and are found in the GS where Henry Blois implicates himself in attempting to bribe the keeper of Henry Ist treasure\textsuperscript{458} at Winchester.... to avoid suspicion of authorship. We can see the same obfuscatory device being used in that.... the last person who would be suspected of earnestly desiring to please Alexander i.e. Henry Blois. Again in another version, who would ever be suspected of writing:

*The affection I bear unto thy nobility, Alexander, Prelate of Lincoln, hath compelled me to translate the Prophecies of Merlin out of the British into Latin before I had made an end of the History I had begun as concerning the acts of the British Kings; for my purpose was to have finished that first, and afterward to have published this present work, for fear lest, both labours hanging on my hands at once, my wit should scarce be sufficient for either.*

Henry Blois may be responding to general inquiry about why there was no Merlin or prophecies mentioned in the *Primary historia* and how come they were now spliced into the Vulgate HRB.

It need not be explained that it would be truly fortuitous that Alexander’s commission transpired at the very point in the text at which we chronologically reach Vortigern. As I have maintained, Geoffrey had constructed his *Historia* to that point and adjoined (or more probably

\textsuperscript{458} William de Pont de l’Arche.
expanded) the Arthuriad after having been to Wales in 1136 and while taking care of troubles in Normandy in 1137.

The resultant *Primary Historia* was deposited at Bec in 1138 and discovered in January 1139. Merlin or his prophecies did not exist in the copy seen by Huntingdon. We know that Henry Blois was back in England at this time at the siege of Bedford probably 1138 from the eyewitness detailed descriptions in the GS. Merlin and the prophecies existed as a separate *libellus*. The First Variant version (not dedicated) which dates from 1144 probably existed with the first set of prophecies which did not include the prophecies connected to the later part of the Anarchy and certainly not the ‘sixth in Ireland’ prophecy and certainly not the dedication to Alexander.

What we can conclude from this is that the exemplar from which all the eight subsequent copies of the First Variant derive, have had the latest set of prophecies added which must post date 1155. There is no doubt that that the Exeter copy has had later additions at the beginning (1-3) and with the dedication to Alexander (109-110) which could not have been in any manuscript until after Alexander had died in 1148. The Cardiff manuscript has the full prologue dedication to Gloucester so is most likely a correction. Because Alexander is not mentioned in the Exeter, Trinity College, Harley or Panton First Variant manuscripts....they were written before Alexander died. However, Henry could have made any adjustment (Variant) or added the updated prophecies to the First Variant at any stage post 1155.

In Huntingdon’s précis of the *Primary Historia* there is no mention of Archflamens.... only the twenty eight bishops; and certainly no mention of Phagan and Deruvian. The reason for this is because as far as Henry Blois knows, when he is writing the *Primary Historia* in 1137 and at the time he deposits the book at Bec in 1138.... he is going to be Archbishop of Canterbury.

Therefore we can deduce the subsequent mention of Archbishops (archflamens) is bound up with his polemic of a third archbishopric at Winchester. We can also deduce that if Phagan and Deruvian had been mentioned in the *Primary Historia* Huntingdon would definitely have related to his friend Warin who was responsible for proselytising Britain. Huntingdon, in the entourage of the newly appointed Archbishop Theobald, on a trip to pick up the pallium from Rome, was the first who commented on the *Primary Historia* which had been put there just six months before by
Henry; either secretively, or donating it as having been written by one Galfridus Arthur.

We can assume Robert of Torigni had already read it and commended its contents to Huntingdon. We do not know how Henry Blois delivered his *Primary Historia* to Bec. It could have been secretively deposited by Henry Blois while staying there or passing through on his way back to Britain in 1138. I have an unfounded speculation that Henry had left it there not thinking that anything would transpire out of the Normal. But with the return of Theodore of Bec as Archbisop to the Monastery of Bec in January 1139 along with Huntingdon who was very keen to know where Galfridus had got his information things got complicated.

What is certain is that Huntingdon dislikes and mistrusts Henry Blois, but even if he did know that Henry was the one who delivered Galfridus' work to Bec and had later suspicions regarding Henry Blois as the Author, a mere cleric would not accuse the brother of the King or the grandchild of William the Conqueror. Since Huntingdon died in 1157 and the seditious prophecies surfaced 1155-56 the connection may never have been made as Henry Blois was at Clugny and ‘Geoffrey’ was dead. What is for sure, the seditious prophecies were out and Henry II wanted to see a copy and find out who had written them. So any scholar thinking that I have implied that scripts have been altered by Henry Blois without sound reason should really understand that Henry Blois was in a precarious position and needed to be sure that his entire backdating scenario was watertight.

The banality of providing the author of the *Primary Historia* with a surname of the main protagonist of HRB is indicative that Henry Blois never expected he would employ the tract in a fraud of such huge scale later in life or spend time having to cover his own tracks as the author of the prophecies and HRB by inventing such a detailed proof of a persona in ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’. Hence, Henry’s later attempt to put flesh on Gaufridus’ bones as ‘Geoffrey’ and the more respectable and credible author, the bishop of Asaph.

Both Phagan and Deruvian and the three archflamens only become useful to the polemic of the storyline when the First Variant version was presented at Rome putting forward a case for metropolitan. This could only be done once Malmesbury was dead. The First Variant showed that there had been three metropolitans at an earlier date. Phagan and Deruvian were obviously put forward in the Charter of St Patrick and their existence
corroborated elsewhere in DA. Only when Henry is in pursuit of metropolitan status does he contrive St. Patrick’s charter in DA along with Phagan and Deruvian; and then insert their names into First Variant HRB along with the precedent of an ancient and third metropolitan in Caerleon/Menevia. So, no third metropolitan is an issue at the time of composition of the *Primary Historia* and therefore: archflamens do not appear as a topic (just 28 bishops) in Huntingdon’s letter to Warin.

We will never know the exact chronology of when St Patrick’s charter was written because in the GR3 (Glastonbury interpolations) Henry sets out an apostolic foundation at Glastonbury as grounds for metropolitan status in the early successful petition to the pope in 1144.

The several attempts at gaining Metropolitan status are the reason for contradictory Glastonbury foundation material in DA. The Apostolic foundation followed by the Phagan and Deruvian foundation was again later contradicted as Henry introduced Joseph into lore post 1158 and thus, we have three separate foundation possibilities for Glastonbury.

It is therefore probable that Henry presented (the first time) his case to pope Lucius with his initial gambit of an apostolic foundation at Glastonbury interpolated into DA. It is surely the reason for the GR3 (version B) Glastonbury interpolations. Phagan and Deruvian’s names as envoys and citing the three archbishops which are included in the First Variant (not in *Primary Historia*) is a direct result of Henry Blois’ agenda in gaining metropolitan.

First Variant was presented and was combined with corroborating evidence in DA. The First Variant probably contained a prophecy foretelling of the reinstatement of the third metropolitan also. There is a possibility that the initial form of the First Variant was presented to papal authorities without Merlin or prophecies included but these were then added to that evolving exemplar after 1144. Whether or not Merlin was a part of the (first) First Variant can only be conjectured. Certainly at some stage after 1139 Merlin and his prophecies were added to *Primary Historia* to become part of the evolving First Variant.

It was probably after the metropolitan was denied by Eugenius that the Patrick charter was concocted. The only reason I posit this is that the GR3...
apostolic foundation seems to illogically contradict the grounds for Lucius’ need to send missionaries. But, as it stands, Phagan and Deruvian are the ‘restorers’ of an existing Church and part of Henry’s original interpolation meant to convince the pope of Glastonbury’s early establishment which would confirm its Primacy over Canterbury.

I will cover this in detail under the chapter on DA, because another fact would indicate the St Patrick charter was not put forward to the pope as evidence. Firstly the ridiculous indulgences found therein and secondly the fact that the pope could check records whether a grant was given. At least we know the charter of St Patrick was originally a Blois invention by use of his names Phagan and Deruvian inserted in HRB.... and the charter actually existed (in gold lettering). Most commentators have thought Wellias’s name relevant to the dispute of the Bishop of Wells’ authority over Glastonbury. Even that is uncertain.... as Wellias provides substance to the supposed antiquity of the charter in that it gives the eponym of a town nearby to Glastonbury. One thing we know about Henry in his impersonation of Geoffrey.... is his love of providing eponyms in HRB.

However, it is entirely possible that the St Patrick charter was only produced at Glastonbury and was never used as evidence, but this is slightly illogical as the charter was said to have been ‘copied’ in gold lettering so it would seem as if it existed (as a copy) but was originally a composition of Henry’s.

Scott’s assessment that the keeping of two copies indicates a date of composition after the fire does not hold as definitive. Scott assumes the reasoning behind stating a copy was made, explains how the St Patrick charter had turned up at Glastonbury abbey. Presumably (in reality), we are supposed to believe the copy was found after William searched the chest of old charters. Logically, the St Patrick charter could not be posited as having come from the St Michael chapel on the tor from such an ancient date and therefore the need for a copy and its survival, because it was written in Gold.

One certainty is that it is Henry Blois who includes the St Patrick Charter in DA.... just as it is Henry that coalesces its postscript concerning Avalon when he does his final consolidation in DA.... after his introduction of Joseph lore at Glastonbury and his final consolidation of the various agendas which are witnessed in chapters 1&2 of DA.
Henry had heard much about Arthur and read a vague tradition concerning him in saints’ lives and in Nennius while researching his initial pseudo-history for Matilda. Originally, for the recently conquered populace in Britain, Arthur was someone who was a warlord who Henry Blois transposes from Gildas and Bede’s account of Ambrosius Aurelianus to a King of Briton. Even though many readers of ‘Geoffrey’ were descendant of the Saxons and Normans, Henry is careful to relate that his Arthur was against the Romans. This change from the First Variant (where there is little anti-Roman sentiment witnessed in the speeches) is opened up to vitriolic national pride in several speeches in the later Vulgate. It is not coincidental that this change of attitude is reflected to incorporate the Gauls as party to Arthur’s efforts against the Romans and could be a reflection of why Henry (when impersonating Wace by writing the Roman de Brut), finishes what he had already started (a French vernacular versified version) by completing his vernacular edition with the Vulgate version of speeches and anti Roman sentiment etc. This storyline would have been more inclusive toward the continental audience to which the work was aimed.

Henry’s original pseudo-history (destined for Matilda) would probably have been less detrimental to the Saxons as Matilda’s mother was one; and obviously references such as the German worm found in the prophecies were not even thought of at that stage. The original pseudo-history evolved to the Primary Historia. With the introduction of the prophecies once Stephen became King, the Saxons were looked upon with such scathing distain. Henry presents the Normans as the saviours of Britain in the early prophecies when King Stephen is alive. After his death in the recently updated set of prophecies in 1155 when he incites a rebellion against Henry II by the Celts, it is predicted the Normans will be replaced by the original inhabitants i.e. the Celts with their adopted son (Henry Blois) in charge. This becomes painfully obvious in the JC version, which I shall cover in chapter 30.

Henry aggrandises Arthur’s status and embellishes his acts and purposely conflates his persona with Gildas’ and Bede’s Ambrosius. This could only be achieved by someone who knew that there was little more information to be collated than that found in GR and who had the

---

461 Bede reiterates Gildas’ account of Ambrosius Aurelianus in his Ecclesiastical History, but in his Chronica Majora he dates Ambrosius’ victory to the reign of the Emperor Zeno (474–491).
education, craft, wit, artistic temperament and opportunity to carry out an
endeavour which innocently started as a romanticized history of Britain
destined for the future Queen. Eventually it turned into a fraud, especially,
by assuming the authorial pseudonym of Galfridus Artur.

The creation of the persona of ‘Geoffrey’ and the background details to
cover Henry’s tracks was probably due to Henry having written the
updated prophecies c.1155. Certainly ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ is a
subsequent appellation invented after Galfridus Artur. It seems a
remarkable coincidence that ‘Geoffrey’ dies the same year that the most
recent prophecies are proliferated which incite rebellion. No-one prior to
1155 mentions Geoffrey of Monmouth by that name. As we covered, the act
of ‘Geoffrey’ signing all those charters in Oxford in 1153 transpired after
Wallingford.

Alfred of Beverley writing in 1148-51 calls ‘Geoffrey’ ‘Brittanicus’
probably because of the ‘Brito’ reference and the fact that Henry appears to
be taking the partisan view of a pro-Briton by recording such an illustrious
history for the Britons. We could speculate that ‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed
elevation to Bishop in 1152 and his death in 1155 were brought about and
deemed timely, because the final Vulgate version was born with newly
reworked prophecies along with the incendiary calls for insurrection by the
Celts against Henry II. Also Ganieda’s prophecies in VM were just too
incredible about recent events in the Anarchy. I feel sure Geoffrey was
being held to account but no-one could locate him.

Hence, when the finalised and updated version of the prophethia (i.e.
inclusive of the sixth in Ireland) were spliced into the present Vulgate
Historia (which was in essence an evolved re-crafted Primary Historia and
First Variant), the ‘bona fide’ and respectable, but untraceable Bishop of
Asaph as author had already expired. In other words, post 1149 (Henry’s
last attempt at metropolitan) the First Variant became less ‘highbrow’ and
‘churchy’ and more of a history novel in the form of the Vulgate in which
the fiction came to be a history which was pro-British along with pro-Celtic
prophecies.

Henry disregarded the necessity to chime with previous histories and
his attempt to parallel known chronologies and events in annals as he had
tried to maintain in the First Variant. He re-worked the religious tone and
quotes and the speeches were re-crafted to a more fictional history where
no consideration was taken to avoid offence to Roman sensitivity.
Furthermore, what innocently started as an innocuous endeavour as a pseudo-history c.1128-29, was first employed as evidence in gaining metropolitan and latterly used by a disempowered Henry Blois between the years of 1155-1158 as an attempt (through the Merlin Prophecies) to dethrone Henry II without any trace of such a design or culpability sticking to him.

Henry was in an opportune position to make it appear as if the HRB was written by Gaufridus Artur (who had then become known as Geoffrey of Monmouth) who had subsequently become bishop of Asaph and was a party to the signing of the Winchester treaty. It was believed by most due to the backdating process of citing dead dedicatees that the prophecies must have been translated by ‘Geoffrey’ as they were dedicated to Alexander before 1148, but both Alexander and the Bishop of Asaph were now dead. The dedications in the HRB proved ostensibly that the book had been written long before 1148. But, there were no dedications in the First Variant simply because the dedicatees were still alive, but importantly, Henry at this stage had only produced a few copies. It was only at the inclusion of the malicious prophecies that Henry really started to cover his tracks.... as the author was now already dead.

Henry’s cleverness at back dating was the main reason no suspicion ever fell upon him during his lifetime and because he made a very believable persona for Geoffrey. He had also substantiated in several ways the credibility of some of the History in HRB by corroborating it in other tracts. However, when we look at the Blois-Glastonbury interpolations in version B of GR3 we can see they pertain to a period straight after William’s death and coincide with the earliest corroborative interpolations in DA which posit an apostolic foundation. The cause of much of the confusion is that in two of the charters in the C version of GR3 there is even later interpolation after Henry’s death which adds even further leaf to the salad.... and this is why modern scholarship has apportioned all interpolations in DA after the fire, never considering the author of Arthuriana and interpolated Glastonburyana in DA were by the same man. To put things in historical perspective; there were no less than eight popes from the time Henry Blois was made Bishop of Winchester.

1)15 December 1124– 13 February 1130:  Honorius II
2) 14 February 1130– 24 September 1143: Innocent II (Anacletus)  
3) 26 September 1143– 8 March 1144: Celestine II  
4) 12 March 1144– 15 February 1145: Lucius II  
5) 15 February 1145– 8 July 1153: Eugene III  
6) 8 July 1153– 3 December 1154: Anastasius IV  
7) 4 December 1154– 1 September 1159: Adrian IV  
8) 7 September 1159– 30 August 1181: Alexander III

Henry held the post of Legate from 1139-43 granted by Innocent II. Before the news arrived in England of Innocent’s death, Henry was holding a legatine council in London in November but then set out immediately for Rome in the hope of renewing the legation. Archbishop Theobald had already set out having had enough of his suffragan bishop as legate and tried to obtain the Legation for himself. Pope Celestine had been educated amongst the inhabitants of Anjou and designed to strengthen their hands by the abasement of King Stephen; on which ground he was excited to a dislike of Henry Bishop of Winchester.

Henry was not given the legation and stayed at Clugny for a while probably annoyed at events and those of the Cistercians that conspired against him. However, Celestine lived just a short while and Lucius II was more amenable to Henry Blois. Henry of course wanted the legation but realised that it was only for the life of the pope and to be more secure in his powerbase, attempted to raise Winchester into a metropolitan See over Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, and Chichester, Hereford and Worcester and also creating a new bishopric for Hyde abbey. Now, to convince pope Lucius of Henry’s worthiness to be granted metropolitan status, certain proofs would be necessary and this is the main cause of Henry’s interpolative endeavour into William of Malmesbury’s GR and DA. I shall cover why and when certain interpolations were added to William’s work in the next chapters.

GR3 (with interpolations) and DA (with apostolic foundation interpolations) were produced in a case put forward as a proof of antiquity. Further evidential support probably backed up by much which was written about Winchester and its early monastic roots (in HRB) and the fact there
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462 In 1130, just after Henry Blois was elevated to the Bishopric of Winchester, Peter the venerable, Henry’s mentor and confidant was the most prominent to acknowledge Gregorio Papareschi (Innocent II) against Anacletus otherwise known as Cardinal Pietro Pierleone, thus averting a long-term schism in the Roman Church.

463 John of Hexham .22
were three Archflamens etc. found in First Variant were duly provided as evidence of primacy.

Pope Lucius, as well as granting Henry his metropolitan over the western part of England, also conferred papal privileges at the same time on Glastonbury itself, obviously convinced of its great antiquity by the written evidences put forward by Henry of Western Britain’s right to primacy.\(^\text{464}\) So as John of Hexham relates: *Bishop Henry found favour in his sight, and refuted the criminal charges of those whom the empress had sent against him, but nevertheless, he did not continue to hold the title and office of legate.*\(^\text{465}\) Lucius II however, denied the legation to Theobald also, because of the endless enmity that existed between them. As I covered earlier, the enmity was initially caused by Henry’s brother Stephen having given the Archbishopric of Canterbury to Theobald of Bec in late 1138, after Henry had stood in as Archbishop since 1136 since William of Corbeil had died. The blame for this underhanded *volte face* by his brother and the pique it caused Henry could not be suppressed, as we saw in GS. The cause was the Beaumont twins, whispering in the ear of Stephen, guarding him against giving Henry too much power. Henry felt, after having installed his brother as King, that he deserved the highest position in the church as they had initially agreed.

Now, we must just deviate slightly, because, as I have maintained, Henry Blois wrote the *Life of Gildas*. We know that Henry is the one who commissioned the ‘Kidnap of Guinevere’ engraving on the Modena Archivolt….. and the Cathedral itself was finished by 1140 (according to the experts). William’s unadulterated DA had not proven such a success in providing adequate proof of Antiquity for Glastonbury except for the evidence provided by the 601 charter. So, an earlier date of antiquity could be more easily believed if a datable Gildas was known to be at Glastonbury and preceded Augustine’s arrival.

The *Life of Gildas* also provided the added benefit of building more of an authenticated credible historicity for the chivalric King Arthur by the testimony of another author validating the existence of chivalric Arthur with wife. These illusions were easily fabricated by using the name of a now dead Caradoc. ‘Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* was written before 1144\(^\text{466}\) and

\(^{464}\) Monasticum Anglicanum. I, 37
\(^{465}\) John of Hexham 22-23
\(^{466}\) According to the date of completion for Modena, one must assume *Life of Gildas* written 1139-40
because Henry’s interpolation into GR3 casually mentions Gildas at Glastonbury as if such a detail were inconsequential Malmesbury id dead. We know the GR3 interpolations were realised to coincide with the apostolic foundation interpolations in DA in 1144. Gildas at Glastonbury was expanded upon in DA, but let it be understood that Gildas was never at Glastonbury writing his *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*. Gildas had already emigrated to Brittany where he founded a monastery known as St Gildas de Rhuys. The 9th century *Rhuys Life of Gildas* is generally accepted as being an accurate account of Gildas’ life and Caradoc’s version should be looked upon as having no validity at all.... but is an invention of Henry’s.

The point of mentioning this is that if the date for the completion of the archivolt is correct, Henry must have drummed up his Melvas and Arthur concoction in which Gildas intervenes in the fictional episode at Glastonbury, prior to when he had the opportunity to interpolate William’s work after his death in 1143. So, we can deduce that the fabricated *Life of Gildas* was concocted in response to Canterbury taunts about the abbey lacking antiquity. *Life of Gildas* originally was composed then as a rebuttal to ostensibly prove an ecclesiastical establishment at Glastonbury (with an abbot) in antiquity.... but opportunely bolstered the historical persona of the chivalric Arthur.

Logically, the *Life of Gildas* must pre date the 1144 interpolations of William’s work if the dates for the archivolt completion of 1140 are correct. Also, one telling sign that the *Life of Gildas* was fabricated as one of the first of Henry’s forays into the dark art of forgery is the fact that the etymology of Ineswitrin can be easily recognised as an addition to the main *Life of Gildas* manuscript. The last paragraph which contains the bogus etymology is a later insertion, tagged on to a previously written *Life of Gildas*. The last paragraph only has one use.... and that is to substantiate the 601 charter. Because, in effect through the etymology, Ineswitrin becomes an estate on the island of Glastonbury; the charter donating a Devonian Island, appears to relate to the locality of Glastonbury. The same polemic concerning Ineswitrin at Glastonbury is obviously re-introduced later by Henry at the concoction of the charter of St Patrick just for the appearance of continuity. In other words in 1144, the 601 charter was hugely important in establishing the antiquity of Glastonbury, but only if it were understood that Ineswitrin was the old name for Glastonbury. However, it was not!
Initially the reasoning behind the composition of the Life of Gildas had nothing to do with a pursuit of metropolitan. At this early stage William of Malmesbury would have uncovered the 601 charter around 1127-34 and only later was the etymological corroboration employed in Life of Gildas to substantiate the 601 charter. So it appears that Life of Gildas was employed before William’s death and after William’s researches at Glastonbury were concluded. In my opinion Life of Gildas was written after William had moved away from Glastonbury between 1135-9.

However, after William’s death, Henry had the time to interpolate William’s most recent version of GR. This is the version which contains the Glastonbury interpolations in version B of GR3 which modern scholars naively believe are William’s words. Henry also concocted an amazing array of evidence in DA showing the pre-existence of a church in Western England prior to St Augustine’s arrival. The arrival of Augustine in 597 AD is what Canterbury’s primacy was founded upon.

Since Pope Lucius II only held the post of pope just over a year from 1144-1145, it shows that there was ample time to concoct evidence in William’s GR3 and DA before a presentation in Rome. It required only a few insertions into GR and in all probability Henry had the only copy of DA to exist after William had presented it to him. Bishop Henry...set out for Rome, the year of his departure I cannot definitely place. But he obtained from the pope that the bishopric of Winchester should be created an archbishopric, the abbey of Hyde a bishopric and the bishop of Chichester should be subject to him. He did this on account of the incessant strife which continued between the bishop and the archbishop of Canterbury. For the legate wished to be considered greater than the archbishop and the archbishop greater than the legate.467

The continual struggle between Theobald and Henry went on for years each time the pope changed: before the completion of this year the archbishop of Canterbury having had ordinary jurisdiction over the bishop of Winchester and he exercising the power of his legation from Rome over the archbishop, these two persons clashed against each other; and the peace of the churches being disturbed, they repaired to the Roman pontiff, bringing a

467 Annales Monastici, II, 53
question grateful to the Roman ear, in proportion to its weight. One of them indeed gained the cause; but neither returned without exhausted purse.⁴⁶⁸

Ralph de Diceto relates that pope Lucius sent a pall to Henry bishop of Winchester to whom he had proposed to assign seven bishops.⁴⁶⁹ Roger of Wendover puts the year at 1143, but this hardly seems time enough to rearrange William of Malmesbury’s work in DA and GR to provide a convincing case for metropolitan: To this Henry, pope Lucius sent the pall, wishing to erect a new archbishopric at Winchester, and to place under him seven bishops.⁴⁷⁰

When Lucius died on February 25th 1145, Eugenius III, a Cistercian and friend of Bernard of Clairvaux was against Henry’s struggle for metropolitan. Metropolitan status had been instituted officially but the investiture had not transpired before pope Lucius’s death and it was certainly not going to happen under Eugenius III.

When Eugenius summoned all the bishops to a council in Rheims in March 1148 King Stephen had the pope’s envoys delivering the summons expelled from England. It was also Pope Eugene III who presided over Canterbury’s claim to primacy over the Welsh in Theobald’s term of office. Eugene III decided in 1148 in Canterbury’s favour against Henry’s friend Bernard who was after the same metropolitan status.

Bernard died in 1148 and this is why both Sees are mentioned in the prophecies updated version of 1155 because they had existed in the version which was present in the First Variant. However, King Stephen went to Canterbury and tried to prevent archbishop Theobald attending the council at Rheims. Gervaise rightly attributes this intervention to Henry Blois. Henry obviously got his way for a time, as Archbishop Theobald was banished and a rapprochement took place between Henry and his brother Stephen. Theobald slipped out at night and crossed the channel to attend the council even though Stephen had the ports watched. Those that did not attend were suspended from office by Eugene III. Even though the other insular ecclesiastics were reinstated by Theobald the archbishop when he returned to England.... Henry Blois was singled out and could only be absolved by the pope. He therefore had to make another trip to Rome. Henry Blois’ other brother, Count Theobald of Blois, was on friendly terms.

⁴⁶⁸ William of Newburgh. 415
⁴⁶⁹ Radulti de Diceto 255
⁴⁷⁰ Roger of Wendover
with the Cistercians and he negotiated that Henry would be able within a six month period to seek absolution from the pope for his meddling.

So, Henry arrived in front of the pope in 1149 and received absolution, but his plans to revive the already granted metropolitan were refused. Henry requested that he be freed from the jurisdiction of Canterbury obviously showing the evidence of proofs of primacy in support of his metropolitan with which he had convinced Lucius. On this second attempt in 1149 he may have thought it prudent to add more flesh to the claim by adding St. Patrick’s charter to DA. This is the most probable reason it seems to follow subsequently a previous apostolic polemic found posited in GR3 and fully embellished in DA i.e. this was the reason Phagan and Deruvian were employed in a second attempt.

The Patrick charter would of course coincide with author B’s tentative testimony of Patrick at Glastonbury. Henry would of course have Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* testimony with the Ineswitrin etymology which substantiates the 601 charter. There would also be corroboration of Phagan and Deruvian from the First Variant HRB. If one adds this to both interpolated works of William of Malmesbury it must have made a compelling case.

However, Eugene III was not going to dilute Canterbury’s primacy or authority and Henry Blois was refused. Because of the personal envy between Henry and Theobald, Henry then asked for personal exemption from Theobald’s jurisdiction but this was also refused and it was obvious Eugene III was out to curb Henry’s power and ambitions spurred on by Bernard of Clairvaux. John of Salisbury writes on Henry’s trip to Rome in 1149: After being publicly received back into favour, he began to intrigue with Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia471, Gregory of St Angelo472 and other friends.

---

471 On September 23, 1149 Eugenius III consecrated Guido de Summa Bishop of Ostia. He died in 1151.
472 It would be interesting to know the relationship between Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia and Gregory of St Angelo and Henry Blois; and especially, of what their ‘intrigue’ consisted. How were they originally to help Henry? Is it that Gregory of St Angelo was so named after the Mausoleum of Hadrian, usually known as Castel Sant’ Angelo in Rome? Hadrian’s ashes were placed here in 138 AD along with his first adopted son, Lucius Aelius, who also died in 138 AD. Now it would not surprise me that Gregory of St Angelo’s involvement had to do with the planting of evidence in the mausoleum which had something to do with an apostolic foundation in Britain or at least Lucius being made to appear as the King Lucius in Bede. (A King Lucius biography in Britain is entirely concocted in HRB as we shall cover and has no historic truth). Gregory of St Angelo having anything to do with Henry Blois’ substantiation of King Lucius is of course speculation. Let us not forget that not only was Henry Blois set on being metropolitan bishop of Western England, he also would have had one eye on the position of pope and this may have been the intrigue.
(as they afterward confessed) to secure a pallium for himself and become archbishop of western England.

Just before this, (as I mentioned).... because Archbishop Theobald had disobeyed King Stephen’s orders and attended the council of Rheims, he was ordered to leave the country upon his return.... and this was all driven by Henry Blois not obtaining his metropolitan and as John of Salisbury records for this period; Henry was believed to be instigating his brother the King against the church.\textsuperscript{473}

Archbishop Theobald, through much wrangling and possible threats from the pope concerning the succession of King Stephen’s son Eustace, was allowed to return to England. However, Theobald was also granted the legation by Eugene III. It was during these turbulent times that the DA took on its first interpolations to comply with what I have called Henry’s ‘first agenda’.

To think the First Variant was not presented as a proof to papal authorities would be silly given that Henry had already written the \textit{Primary Historia} and with a few changes.... it could act as historical evidence in his case for metropolitan. Glastonbury was not mentioned in HRB; Caradoc was a known historian, and William of Malmesbury’s work was well respected. Who would suspect Henry’s authorial input as the author/interpolator of these tracts?

In many places, Henry refers to Winchester in HRB so that its antiquity is established. It was even founded at the same time as Canterbury should that be an objection in the contention over primacy: \textit{After him, reigned his son Hudibras nine-and-thirty years, who, after the civil dissensions, did restore concord among the people and founded Kaerlem, that is, Canterbury. He also founded Kaerguen, which is Winchester.}\textsuperscript{474}

That Winchester had an ancient church was attested to by Henry’s bogus History: \textit{Constans, the eldest born, he made over to the church of Amphibalus in Winchester.}\textsuperscript{475} If popes Lucius II or Eugenius III had any doubts about whether the metropolitan should be granted, the most famous of British prophets had predicted such an occurrence: \textit{Hither, thou Cambria, and bringing Cornwall with thee at thy side, say unto Winchester: 'The earth
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shall swallow thee: transfer the See of the shepherd thither....

Examples of Henry's polemic are many in both the prophethia and the narrative of HRB, but one should not forget he actually could show a very archaic 601 charter which proved the pre-existence of a religious institution at Glastonbury prior to Augustine.

After all his attempts had been thwarted, post 1158 to re-establish his power in Britain, Henry hatched the plan to create a history that would challenge the primacy of Rome itself.

One of the main tasks of this investigation is to answer the question; how did Henry Blois light upon the name of Joseph of Arimathea? Joseph of Arimathea lore at Glastonbury did not materialise as the present scholastic community assumes. Joseph lore at Glastonbury originated from the prophecy of Melkin. But if the stupidity persists in denying the existence of the validity of the prophecy, the blind will continue to lead the blind. But, in Melkin’s prophecy is the twist of fate that until now has prevented anyone finding Ineswitrin, yet (through Henry Blois’ authorial inventions) has perpetuated the original reason for Joseph’s connection with the British Isles.

Ineswitrin was not a known or identifiable location until Henry associated it with Glastonbury. So, Henry posing as Caradoc in his Life of Gildas had stated Ineswitrin is the ancient name for Glastonbury. However, Henry changed the truth of what the Melkin prophecy originally stated, purely in association with his ‘second agenda’, which concerns Avalon. So, what was in essence a real Island in Devon called Ineswitrin with the remains of Joseph buried within it, became a fictionally named Insulla Avallonis which was now commensurate with Arthur’s last known location then Glastonbury. The initial objective of composing the etymology in Life of Gildas was to add credence to the 601 charter. However, what can also be seen is Henry’s cleverness in his interpolation of William where he provides a proof and reasoning behind the etymological swap by having us believe that when the Saxons came they initially grabbed land that they were later to give back; and hence (we are led to understand) the reasoning that the five cassates on Ineswitrin were in fact at Glastonbury originally.

476 HRB. VII, iv
477 DA. Chap 35… although that estate (Ineswitrin) and many others were granted to Glastonbury in the time of the Britons, as is plain from the preceding, yet when the English drove out the Britons they, being pagans, seized the lands that had been granted to the churches before finally restoring the stolen lands....
This in effect nullifies any enquiry into why no-one refers to Glastonbury by the name of Ineswitrin in any previous manuscript. In effect, Henry had trans-located Ineswitrin in Devon to be understood as synonymous with Glastonbury. As we covered earlier, not even Grimmer is duped by Henry Blois’ translocation of the Devonian island to Glastonbury.

Henry’s initial propaganda which converts Glastonbury as synonymous with Ineswitrin became a problem of consistency later for Henry, especially when he set about his second agenda; the establishing of Avalon to be synonymous with Glastonbury. Logically, if Avalon were the previous name of Glastonbury at the time of King Arthur, and St Patrick, how had it become Ineswitrin in the 601 era soon after it was supposedly called Avalon?

Let there be no further misunderstanding; Henry Blois is the instigator behind locating a fictionally named Avalon at Glastonbury. It is his change of agendas which has caused such confusion, his coalescing and consolidating evidences in DA which tie together contradictions.... not the work of a later consolidating editor. If Gildas was at Glastonbury in the bogus Life of Gildas and Ineswitrin was established as Glastonbury therein in a rendition by Henry Blois’ (supposedly by Caradoc).... the St Patrick charter as well as corroborating this fact converts it back to Avalon to fulfil the second agenda i.e. the St Patrick charter corroborates Henry’s previous insinuation by seamlessly making all three names appear to be in one location.

This appears more unclear than it really is. Henry’s second agenda was to have HRB’s chivalric Arthur found at Avalon which would be made clear (confirmed for posterity) by the discovery of the leaden cross. However, as we have established, Henry had based his Avalon Island idea in HRB from the Island found in the prophecy of Melkin. The real problem arrives when Henry starts to integrate Joseph into Glastonbury lore in the first two chapters of DA, which were added last. It is this coalescing of different agendas in Henry’s lifetime which has confounded modern scholars in the assessment of interpolations in DA.... which they assume is dependent upon the emergence of Grail stories from the continent after Henry had died.

The prophecy of Melkin is the key, but Henry did not want to be found holding it or associated with it, as much of his inspiration came from it. If the link was discovered, it would lead back to him. However, since the Melkin prophecy itself was the root cause of inspiration to Henry’s muses in
the evolving construction of the ‘Matter of Britain’ and Henry understood the prophecy was not a fake; he was not going to destroy it, but placed the Melkin prophecy in some literature which has not come down to posterity. This is how it came to be recorded by John of Glastonbury.

The one auspicious change in fortune is that it has now got Henry’s handprint on it with the change of name to his fictional Avalon. The invented name of Avalon had first appeared in Henry’s concoction of the First Variant and variant HRB.

After the introduction of a Joseph foundation at Glastonbury in Henry’s second agenda, it was necessary to change the name on the prophecy from Ineswitrin to comply with Henry’s completely concocted Avalon, which as we know, was based on a town name in Burgundy. Hence, this is why we have a completely fictitious name on an absolutely accurate set of directions to Joseph’s tomb. The reasons why Henry did not include the Melkin prophecy in the DA are many but all have to do with the traceability to him and I will deal with this under the section on DA.

It is safe to assume that the ‘Matter of Britain’ and specifically Joseph lore at Glastonbury did not happen as a fortuitous set of circumstances as certain scholars attest. Also on Giraldus’s testimony it becomes evident the tomb of Arthur was planted by Henry Blois long before its discovery. The reader should be aware that St. Patrick’s charter predates any mention of Joseph as his name is not in the charter. Certainly the charter pre-dates the inclusion of Joseph into DA…. (It is not at all certain that the St Patrick charter was part of Henry’s evidence provided to papal authorities, however it seems likely).

We can posit therefore Joseph would not have been in Henry’s earlier redaction of William’s DA which was presented to the pope. However since a passage in chap 21 of GR3 exists which is the same in chap 31 of DA where Arthur’s burial place is posited; it seems unlikely that Henry, while pursuing metropolitan status at Rome, had decided at that era, to plant a set of bones in a grave at Glastonbury. By the casual addition to the similar passage which states where Arthur is located in DA… it evidences that the planting of Arthur’s grave to be discovered in Avalon is all part of Henry’s second agenda. Yet, the initial interpolations had been composed anyway in GR3 and DA by Henry for the earlier agenda. Confirmation of this reverse in chronology is evidenced in that…. the two first chapters in DA which
essentially consolidate all previous contradictions were inserted last and introduce Joseph into Glastonbury Lore.

It is plain from the St Patrick’s charter and Alfred of Beverley’s mention of Avalon that before 1150, Henry had come up with the name Avalon and we know it was in the First Variant which preceded Vulgate. As we have discussed Huntingdon would have mentioned Avalon if it had been in the *Primary Historia* and is a definitive indicator of the two agendas of Henry separated over time.

However, the *Primary Historia* was not the finished product of what is now commonly understood as the Vulgate HRB. The Vulgate edition stems from c.1155 (certainly the updated prophecies found within it cannot be earlier) and we can understand through what Alfred of Beverley relates that up until that date the *Historia* was in a state of transition. As we have said, the pseudo-history, (the pre-cursor to the *Primary Historia*) was started as a potential presentation copy to the future queen Matilda. William’s GR was similarly destined to her. The difference between GR and *Primary Historia* was one volume was interesting and a highly entertaining novel and portrayed a bogus precedent of past queens in insular history.... the other was a serious conscientious account of History. One indicator for the commencement of the pseudo-history work is the inclusion of the traitor Anacletus. Antigonus and his comrade Anacletus found in book one of HRB helps us to find a date not before 1130. The fact that Anacletus died in 1138 has little to do with the pseudo-history’s development into the *Primary Historia*; as we know in 1138 Henry was splicing his Welsh Arthuriad into an already completed pseudo-history which had been put on hold since Henry Ist death because it had become redundant now Stephen was King.

William’s GR completion and his relation to Henry Blois at Glastonbury were probably the germs for Henry’s planning and undertaking the similar

---

478 The First Variant is in fact a misnomer in that it is not a variant on what is presumed to be the Vulgate which scholarship assumes preceded it. The First Variant evolved from the Bec *Primary Historia*

479 Anacletus II an Antipope who ruled from 1130 and died January 25, 1138. He became the Antipope in a schism against the contested, hasty election of Pope Innocent II. One can be sure that if Henry’s pursuit of Metropolitan was possible to be obtained, he would have gone to Anacletus as he had also been at the abbey of Cluny. It was not until William of Malmesbury had died in 1143 that the evidence provided in DA and GR could be concocted. In 1130, Pope Honorius II lay dying and the cardinals decided that they would entrust the election to a commission of eight men, led by papal chancellor Haimeric, who had his candidate hastily elected as Pope Innocent II. He was consecrated on February 14, the day after Honorius’ death. On the same day, the other cardinals announced that Innocent had not been canonically elected and chose Anacletus.
endeavour of the pseudo-history. This then evolved into the *Primary Historia*. Henry had written part of the book i.e. the pseudo-history before going to Normandy in 1137-8. It was in 1137-8 Henry concocted or expanded the Arthurian epic and spliced this onto a Brutus history up to Vortigern. Yet after the Variant versions Arthur material was further expanded. Henry ended his history to where the recently dead Caradoc had started his chronological history. Caradoc died c.1129-30. As we have mentioned, the Welsh topography and geography displayed in HRB was derived from Henry Blois’ travails against the warring Welsh in 1136.

Henry had thought he was going to be metropolitan archbishop of Canterbury after William of Corbeil had died. Orderic Vitalis relates: *Henry was elected as metropolitan. But since by canon law a bishop can only be translated from his own see to another church by the authority of the pope*.... In order to get consent in 1137 for his translation from Winchester to Canterbury from pope Innocent, Henry set off to meet the pope at Pisa, but luckily for us, he was side-tracked into acting as vice-regent or envoy in Normandy for King Stephen sorting out the rebellious Baldwin who was being supported by Matilda causing mayhem to supporters of Stephen. If it had not been for this twist of fate, I doubt we would have had a *Primary Historia* deposited at Bec.

Anyway, because of this twist of fate and the Beaumont’s jealousy of Henry, Theobald was elected and the rest is history. We could speculate that the reason Stephen passed over Henry’s election as Archbishop is because of what transpired in Normandy. It is a possibility that Henry might have done some deal while in Normandy with Matilda. This is hinted at in various chronicles and Henry spends his time in GS dissuading us from this point of view. We know Henry was at Bedford anyway, so, what I am suggesting is that because Henry was delayed seeing the pope he got wind in the first half of 1138 that events were happening behind his back and returned to England to be present at the siege.480 Just before his return to

---

480Bedford castle was controlled by Simon de Beauchamp, the son of Hugh de Beauchamp. Simon died in 1137, and King Stephen agreed that Simon’s daughter should marry Hugh the Pauper. The castle would be passed to Hugh, in exchange for King Stephen giving Miles certain compensation and additional honours. Miles and Payn de Beauchamp, the children of Simon’s brother, Robert de Beauchamp, refused to hand the castle over to Hugh saying that the castle was rightfully Miles’. Even though Miles de Beauchamp declared himself in support of Stephen, in the contention with Matilda, the King decided to take Bedford Castle before marching north to deal with the invasion of David from Scotland. Stephen besieged the castle but Miles was prepared for a long siege. Stephen could not enter the castle so left a force to starve it into submission whilst he went north to tackle
England Henry must have deposited the *Primary Historia* at Bec and coincidentally (or not), it was Theobald of Bec that was given his position as Archbishop. Henry could not believe his brother could have been so ungrateful and deceitful especially as he thought they were working as siblings in trust. Without Henry’s efforts, the crown would never have lighted upon Stephen’s head.

If Henry could show that ‘Western England’s’ first church was founded by Eleutherius’s preachers in 166 AD, because this had been researched by a credible historian, the value of Henry’s first agenda which included a Phagan and Deruvian foundation is openly exposed in its intent because and their names were added as an addition to the First Variant. Phagan and Deruvian had not been mentioned in *Primary Historia* in Huntingdon’s synopsis.

For clarity’s sake, it is worth noting that what I have termed Henry’s first agenda can be classified into two portions. It involves Henry’s obsession with obtaining metropolitan status for western England. The lines are slightly blurred in that the purpose behind the concoction of *Life of Gildas* concerning Gildas and the abbot at Glastonbury at the kidnap of Guinevere did not have anything to do with Henry’s metropolitan agenda in its initial composition. The reason for Henry’s composition and impersonation of Caradoc of Llancarfan may have been incidentally to substantiate Arthurian lore from his recently finished *Primary Historia* but the main purpose of composition originally (without etymological later addition) was to counter Osbern’s claim that Dunstan was the first Abbot just by association Gildas.

Caradoc’s concocted account makes plain through its polemic that there was an abbot in Gildas’ era. The other two parts to what I have termed Henry’s ‘first agenda’, specifically constitute the interpolations in GR3 and DA concerning an apostolic or disciplic foundation at Glastonbury. This took place in 1144 after William of Malmesbury’s death. However, there is a second part of Henry’s ‘first agenda’ which took place in 1149 and most likely specifically includes the fabrication or addition to DA of the St Patrick charter.

David’s Scottish invasion. Henry intervened to produce a negotiated settlement. Henry reached an agreement whereby after five weeks, the castle finally surrendered. The occupants were allowed to leave, but the castle was handed over to Stephen. Miles and Henry had made an agreement, but in 1141 Miles retook the castle and because of this Henry as author of GS has little favourable to say of Miles.
What I have termed Henry’s ‘second agenda’ transpires post 1155 and apart from Henry’s efforts to cause rebellion as seen in the Merlin prophecies, the secondary agenda concerns itself mainly in the transposition, translocation, or conversion\(^{481}\) of Henry Blois’ invention of a non-locational Avalon from HRB to locating Avalon at Glastonbury. The ultimate fulfilment of this illusion is of course Arthur’s disinterment and the very reason for planting the leaden cross near to Arthur’s supposed bones and then pointing out the location where to dig between the *pyramides* in DA. Also the ‘second agenda’ includes the propagation of Joseph lore at Glastonbury and Joseph’s role in the ‘*Matter of Britain*’ propagated through DA and corroborated in Grail literature, which was retold through Robert de Boron and Chrétien de Troyes directly from ‘Master Blihis’ who they had witnessed at the court of Champagne.

It could be that Henry in a very clever sleight of hand attempts to show that the GR was already finished before 1126 (which it was but not with Glastonbury additions) and before Henry’s own arrival at Glastonbury; so he has William advocating an apostolic foundation and yet saying in GR3 he has no idea of the later missionary’s names. As we covered, this is an indication of a later introduction of their names in First Variant.

Yet Henry’s polemical intention would be to create the appearance that William having searched out all the old charters while researching and compiling the DA, he is now in a position to state the names of the missionaries having found the Patrick charter as appears to be the case in DA because they are named on it. Maybe the First Variant version which includes their names was only used in Henry’s application case for Metropolitan subsequently at Rome in 1149 in conjunction with the St Patrick charter and DA. (I shall cover this later).

I have been criticized already by modern scholars who think what I claim is Henry’s output would be too much to accept for the Bishop of Winchester as he is commonly perceived; i.e. the amount of interpolations I am claiming were made by Henry seems impossible. Don’t forget that most of the tracts I claim were interpolated could have just had a few folio’s rewritten and inserted. The largest output is that of ‘Geoffrey’ i.e. the

\(^{481}\) What Henry actually accomplishes, in effect is trans-locating Ineswitrin to be synonymous with Glastonbury and yet the name Avalon (which is fictitious), is itself based on Ineswitrin from the Melkin Prophecy; and Henry Blois is more concerned in his second agenda with converting the fictional Avalon to appear as synonymous with Glastonbury.
prophecies of Merlin in HRB and VM and the faux history in HRB. The material from HRB versified is his most skillful endeavour in what is accounted as Wace’s work. The only other lengthy tome is GS which is more a chronicle of the Anarchy. The works of Robert de Boron most definitely are accountable to Henry but we shall discuss their propagation in progress.

The B version of GR3 is undoubtedly interpolated by Henry Blois and may only have been used in the first metropolitan case put forward which attempted to posit an apostolic foundation of Glastonbury. The insertion in GR3 tells us that the names of the missionaries sent by pope Eleutherius to King Lucius are lost in the mists of antiquity. But in the DA their names are given as Phagan and Deruvian, on the authority of the Charter of St Patrick and the First Variant. There is another indication that the GR3 interpolations indicating apostolic foundation for Glastonbury were made before the invention of the St Patrick charter; the St Patrick charter applied to the later metropolitan attempt in 1149. The two sets of interpolations in DA and GR run together and for the most part concur; the GR obviously understated without the later invention of St Patrick’s charter says: ‘and there he (Patrick) became monk and abbot, and after some years paid the debt of nature’. Once GR3 was interpolated to coincide with the first disciplic or apostolic foundation fraud, it was not updated thereafter in stark contrast to the DA which was updated on two further occasions while Henry was alive. We must conclude that the consolidation of DA was carried out later and the possibility that the St Patrick charter (copy) may have been presented as a separate faked document in Rome and then only later to have been included in DA by Henry.

Essentially, there is a contradiction between the Eleutherius missionaries coming to an already apostolically established church. It is difficult to see if one preceded the other or they were used to together. It seems to me, one is a reflection of the 1144 attempt and the other which included the addition of the Patrick charter pertains to Henry’s 1149 attempt with pope Eugenius. William of Malmesbury does not elsewhere in his historical works refer to the mission sent by Eleutherius at the request of King Lucius. Henry sourced their names (as they may originally have been the founders of Winchester) and attached a date to their bogus deeds

482 Version C of GR has later interpolations made after Henry’s death.
i.e. A.D. 167 in DA at Glastonbury. Phagan and Deruvian’s names were attached to the storyline of the request of King Lucius which came from Bede’s mistaken identity of Britain in a misinterpretation of the *Liber Pontificalis*, which I will get to.

Essentially, Henry’s attempts to reinstate his legation had failed and he was annoyed at being subordinate to archbishop Theobald. A legation only survived the life of a pope before it was consigned to another or reappointed. Henry and Theobald of Bec sought to be Legate to counter each other’s power. Henry’s best strategy, since the popes at this period seemed to die in quick succession, was to obtain a metropolitan which was permanent and did not involve further supplication upon the death of each pope.

Henry, also, being a Cluniac had the Cistercians against him. But, pope Lucius liked Henry Blois and Bernard of Clairvaux’s ‘Whore of Winchester’ letter did not stop Henry Blois being granted the Metropolitan at last. *Bishop Henry...set out for Rome, the year of his departure I cannot definitely place. But he obtained from the pope that the bishopric of Winchester should be created an archbishopric, the abbey of Hyde a bishopric and that the bishop of Chichester should be subject to him. He did this on account of the incessant strife which continued between the bishop and the arch bishop of Canterbury; for the legate wished to be considered greater that the Archbishop and the Archbishop greater than the legate.*

Through St Patrick’s charter and by their introduction into First Variant, Phagan and Deruvian became the founders of Glastonbury as recounted in DA. It is not by accident that Phagan and Deruvian are named in HRB.... nor is it by accident that the names of the preachers of Eleutherius are feigned to have been lost in time in GR3. Does it not seem odd that our interpolator even has to mention that their names are lost and then produce them in DA? Therein is the adage ‘by hiding the truth is the hidden truth revealed’.

Yet, only the gullible would believe that, William who composed his VSD II after DA.... (this new information supposedly found out while researching DA), reveals nothing of the illustrious foundation of Glastonbury in that composition. VSD II was completed after the main

---

483 *Annales Monastici*, ii, 53. However, the writer has confused Innocent II with pope Lucius.
484 The common opinion is that it was written by William and then a later interpolator supplied the names. Not so, as we shall cover later.
content of DA was already finished. It should be made clear to the reader that William was never aware that he was in the future to be the witness of an apostolic foundation or that there were named missionaries from Rome or even that he has found a charter of St Patrick.

It is ludicrous to think so and once scholarship understands Henry Blois’ device of writing history retrospectively, a greater insight will be achieved concerning GR3 and DA, HRB and the prophecies of Merlin.

There is no concern for the old church’s ‘rude’ construction of wattle, or its apostolic foundation found in VSD II. The only reference is not to apostolic or the Phagan and Deruvian foundation, but merely that the first foundation transpired before Dunstan which is the main thrust of the argument against Osbern’s accusation: *It was an ancient place as I have said, going back well beyond his time; but though it owes its first foundation to earlier benefactors, it is indebted to Dunstan for its new pre-eminence.*

Henry keeps his threads of evidence and propaganda separated so they do not lead back to him. This has caused much confusion in the scholastic community. Henry makes no mention of Joseph until his post 1158 second agenda. Joseph is grafted as part of Grail lore on the continent to meld into Glastonbury lore. Melkin is never associated with Joseph by Henry in his propaganda but Melvas is associated with Arthur and Arthur with Avalon and Avalon with Joseph and Joseph (in reality) with the prophecy of Melkin…. without the connection of Ineswitrin to Joseph (originally in the prophecy). So the veil of confusion blurs the association of the 601 charter of Ineswitrin with the genuine Island in Devon on which Joseph’s relics reside…. by Henry’s ingenious etymological farce found in Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* which transposes Ineswitrin to Glastonbury

No commentator has suspected Henry Blois as the prolific interpolator of DA. Most scholars assume the DA interpolations were concocted after the fire, but none explain the various contradictory foundation myths. The clever construction of the Patrick charter is clearly evidenced in the backdating through Patrick which leads back to Phagan and Deruvian who appear and are apparently corroborated in the First Variant. What is evident in VM, written between 1155 and 1158 is that Henry had given up continuing his quest for metropolitan status; as neither Merlin, Ganieda nor

---

Taliesin in their predictions in VM mention the word metropolitan, yet it appears 11 times in First Variant and Vulgate.

Once Henry had given up on obtaining a metropolitan, his attitude to Rome was subsequently unveiled in the Vulgate version of HRB. Anti-Roman sentiment which was not present in the First Variant is now displayed as part of the invective in speeches. We have Hoel’s speech as an example. This, for obvious reasons is not in the Variant version but it would seem that with Henry’s dealings with the Roman Church he no longer courted favour with the papacy and thus included such insults against Rome as:

_For if, in accordance with thine argument, thou art minded to go to Rome, I doubt not that the victory shall be ours, seeing that what we do justly demand of our enemies they did first begin to demand of us. Wherefore, since the Romans do desire to take from us that which is our own, beyond all doubt we shall take their own from them, so only we be allowed to meet them in the field. Behold, this is the battle most to be desired by all Britons. Behold the prophecies of the Sibyl that are witnessed by tokens true, that for the third time shall one of British race be born that shall obtain the empire of Rome._

We also witness another example in Auguselus’s speech: _...that we have done to me seems as nought so long as the Romans and the Germans remain unharmed, and we revenge not like men the slaughter they have formerly inflicted upon our fellow-countrymen._ One of the most interesting concoctions which Henry cleverly devises is found in the next piece below which will be well covered in the following chapters.

Henry Blois provides us in HRB with the same story line as that found in DA. Supposedly, the Christianity of the Britons flourished because of the mission of Pope Eleutherius.... mistakenly posited by Bede. The original foundation myth of Glastonbury is fabricated on this with Phagan and Deruvian added for good measure along with the disciplic foundation.

After 1158 an apostolic foundation became a Josephian foundation. Henry’s second agenda is cleverly built upon his first agenda of the apostolic/disciplic foundation for Glastonbury. Henry’s gambit is to show the Britons were not subject to Rome or Augustine (read Canterbury):

---

486 HRB IX, xvii
487 HRB IX xviii
Meanwhile Augustine was sent by the blessed Pope Gregory into Britain to preach the Word of God unto the English, who, blinded by heathen superstition, had wholly done away with Christianity in that part of the island which they held. Howbeit, in the part belonging to the Britons the Christianity still flourished which had been held there from the days of Pope Eleutherius and had never failed amongst them. But after Augustine came, he found in their province seven bishoprics and an archbishopric provided with most godly prelates besides a number of abbacies wherein the Lord's flock held right order. Amongst others there was in the city of Bangor a certain most noble church wherein was said to be such a number of monks that when the monastery was divided into seven portions with a prior set over each, not one of them had less than three hundred monks, who did all live by the labour of their own hands. Their abbot was called Dinoot, and was in marvellous wise learned in the liberal arts. He, when Augustine did demand subjection from the British bishops, in order that they might undertake in common the task of preaching the Gospel unto the English people, made answer with divers arguments, that they owed no subjection unto him as of right, nor were they minded to bestow their preaching upon their enemies, seeing that they had an archbishop of their own, and that the nations of the Saxons did persist in withholding their own.

I will cover in progression that Wace's Roman de Brut was started in translation from Latin to vernacular verse by Henry Blois using the template of the First Variant and since the Variant was used to gain Metropolitan the Archbishopric and seven bishoprics are first seen here. Wace's version which used as a template the First variant version does not mention the altars of Jove and Mercury when Brutus consults the oracle of Diana. This is simply because the First Variant is aimed at the Roman Christian audience of the Vatican and Henry started to compose his versified version of HRB before the final expanded Vulgate version was composed. Also in the First Variant, there is a general toning down of sexuality. For example Membricus's homosexuality is not mentioned and

---

488 It just so happens, Henry attempted to raise Winchester into a metropolitan See over Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, and Chichester, Hereford and Worcester and also creating a new bishopric for Hyde abbey. Not by coincidence, Ralph de Diceto relates that pope Lucius sent a pall to Henry bishop of Winchester to whom he had proposed to assign seven bishops.
489 HRB XI,xii
other religious details which would offend papal authorities such as souls being sent to ‘ad tartara’ are also omitted.

Henry Blois tailored the First Variant copy using more Biblical allusions and phraseology, omitting offensive material on homosexuality and rape and even gory details, and generally presenting a copy which had less anti-Roman sentiment than the succeeding Vulgate version. Instances of these attempts to tone down unpalatable details can be witnessed in the conversation between Bedwer, Arthur’s butler and Helen’s nurse and also in the omission of the fantastic story of Brian cutting off a slice of his thigh, roasting it and serving it to King Cadwallo in place of venison. These were additional fictional parts of the storyline to fascinate and were embellishments in the yet unfinished Vulgate version, not omissions from a latterly composed Variant!

The alterations of many of the speeches and sections regarding personages in history is primarily due to the fact that Henry in 1144 is attempting to concord or parallel as closely as possible to known facts in annals. At the same time he is also trying to skew history so that the fictitious semblance of his history is maintained so that his propaganda about the Britons is tenable. Such variances involve the transference of power from the Britons and so Gormandus is invented to bridge from known history to Henry’s fanciful portrayal of it.

‘Geoffrey’ in the First Variant version, curtails some of the speeches that have anti-Roman rhetoric found in Vulgate HRB…. such as we saw in Hoel’s speech. In the Variant version some of the speeches are thought to be slightly abbreviated or paraphrased, for example, the short speech of Membricius, or the plea of Conwenna; but these are examples of less

---

490 To give a few examples of the variant version’s fondness for biblical phraseology: King Dumwallo fought so bravely that “terra . . . siluit in conspectu eius.” In speaking of Belinus, “nec cessavit gladius eius a mane usque ad vesperam Romanos caedere.” King Morwinus meets the invading enemy “cum manu valida.” To the envoys of Cassibelaunus who plead with Androgeus to arrange peace for him with Caesar, Androgeus replies that he does not intend to repay him with “malum pro malo” and pleading Cassibelaunus’ cause with Caesar he implores him not to punish Cassibelaunus “iuxta sua scelera.” King Uther’s love for Igerma is compared to that of King David for Bathsheba and the army of Aurelius Ambrosius was so great “ut arenae maris comparari posset.” All these biblical allusions are absent in the vulgate text.

491 It is not silly to speculate that the later Vulgate version, which has such blatant anti-Roman speeches in it, are a reflection of the time when Stephen had attempted to have his son Eustace crowned King and was denied by Rome. Henry himself as a Cluniac had little allegiance to Rome and the Vulgate version of HRB may reflect an attitude of British independence from Rome. In this case since Winchester was long established as a monastic house in antiquity by what was written in HRB, if Rome’s authority were excluded, Henry would have precedence over Canterbury.
embellishment (not yet fully expanded), not a case of a cut down First Variant as is assumed by modern scholars. Other speeches are omitted like that of Maurice, son of Caradoc, duke of Cornwall, to Maximianus, inviting him to come to Britain because Henry has not completely developed this historical transition as yet.

Anything that blatantly runs contrary to Roman annals or might offend Roman sentiment is omitted rather than polemically expanded as in the later Vulgate version. In the Vulgate text Maurice, upon arriving at Rome, delivers an address to Maximianus in which he points out all the reasons why Maximianus should accept the crown of Britain. In the Variant it is vastly unexpanded (rather than reduced). The lack of manuscript evidence for the First Variant indicates it was the precursor of the massively copied Vulgate.

In the Vulgate Historia, ‘Geoffrey’ implies that about 250 years have transpired between the death of Cadwallader and the exile of the Britons to Armorica which marks the end of British dominion. Henry makes out that definitive Anglo Saxon rule is in Athelstan’s reign from 924-39 which is at variance with the gist that British dominion ended around the seventh century. For obvious reasons Henry Blois in the First Variant has to keep Cadwallader at the Arthurian end of the Historia but he changes chronology between the end of British rule and beginning of the Saxon by having the tenth century Athelstan as a contemporary of Cadwallader. This whole rethink is from a Primary Historia framework which allows all sorts of anachronisms to a First Variant which was going to be scrutinised by Papal authorities as Henry Blois tries to bring the Bedan chronology of Anglo-Saxon dominion to synchronise with his case for the Early Christian church in Britain. It is plainly the reasoning behind such changes. However, as we shall discuss in the chapter on Henry Blois’ impersonation of Wace, we can see why Wace attempts to reconcile ‘Geoffrey’s’ Vulgate HRB with the First Variant by providing Aethelstan with the correct Genealogy. Also, we can see traces of ‘Wace’s’ chronology attempting to reconcile Henry’s first storyline of Stonehenge with Uther Pendragon found in the Primary Historia related by Huntingdon in EAW.

What may have been Henry’s initial storyline needs adjusting for purpose… that of convincing the pope to award Henry the metropolitan. It is for this reason the speech of Caradoc to King Octavius, advising him to appoint Maximianus his successor is omitted on these grounds also. The
speech of archbishop Guithelinus metropolitan of London to his countrymen is omitted as the similarity to Henry Blois is too obvious. Guithelinus formed from Guitolinus in Nennius is the statesman and ‘Warrior Ecclesiastic’ like Henry himself and coincidentally a man of great eloquence. Other addresses in First Variant such as that of Gorlois, duke of Cornwall and the speech of Auguselus, King of Albania are so different (unexpanded) both in form and content that they hardly resemble their counterparts in the fully developed Vulgate text.

Since the aim of Henry Blois is to convince papal authorities of Western England’s long tradition of Christianity, he follows more closely the historical annals of Bede and introduces pertinent extracts based on Landolfus Sagax which help to substantiate his case and also follows Roman Annals more closely. The only problem with trying to align with known history in the storyline of the First Variant is that it throws up some contradictions which are then ignored in Vulgate HRB as Henry no longer becomes a slave to corroboration, liberalising the storyline from historical sources.

Modern scholars are still bemused as to why the First Variant version follows closely known sources. Henry Blois is merely falling in with the annals so that the pseudo-history seems to parallel the histories and chronicles seeming less like a concoction, but a true historical account. In the Vulgate text the opening lines of the fourth book read as follows: Interea contigit, ut in Romanis reperitur historiis, Iulium Caesarem, subiugata Gallia, ad litus Rutenorum venisse.

The text of the Variant Version reads: Interea contigit, ut in Romanis reperitur historiis, Iulium Caesarem, subiugata Gallia, in Britanniam transisse; sic enim scriptum est anno ab Urbe Condita sescentesimo nonagesimo tertio, ante vero Incarnationem Domini sexagesimo anno. Iulius Caesar, primus Romanorum, Britones bello pulsavit, in navibus onerariis et actuariis circiter octoginta adventus.

The Variant Version adds the date of Caesar’s invasion of Britain and the number of his ships. The source is obviously Bede, Eccl. Hist. 1.2.

Henry is just reiterating known events to establish his historicity for HRB. The idea of a source book had not yet revealed itself to Henry Blois’s muses as the providential source of the HRB. Archdeacon Walter dies in 1151. We know therefore that if any Variant has a dedication to Robert Duke of Gloucester it must post date 1147. If any copy of HRB mentions
Walter it must postdate 1151 or have corrections if written beforehand. Hammer’s version\textsuperscript{492} has the dedication at the beginning and so must have had it added or been distributed later than 1151.

However, there is no Alexander dedication affixed to the updated set of prophecies now in the Cistercian fourteenth century copies. As we have said, the most likely reasoning is that there was a basic early set of prophecies in the First Variant (not dedicated), which, as a block, was updated at a later date. As we have covered, to have the ‘Sixth’ (which is Henry II), in Ireland can only occur after the council which Henry attended in 1155 at Michaelmas in Winchester.

The tendency of the Variant to go back to older sources is purely so that Henry’s dubious yet unexpanded Arthuriana splice and concocted history seems more plausible to those considering the merits of awarding the metropolitan status for Southern England based on this fabrication of history. This is clearly witnessed in the description of Britain; the composition of which ‘Geoffrey’ used passages from Bede, Gildas and Nennius which he had skilfully woven together with elegance and style. A comparison, however, between the description of Britain in the Vulgate text with that of the First Variant version shows that, except for a few phrases in the Vulgate text, the First Variant version is an almost literal transcript of passages from Bede.

Of the eight MSS of the First Variant…. they can all be put down to redactions stemming from Henry’s changing agenda’s. Of the five pure and three conflated First Variants when compared to the Vulgate; virtually the only part remaining constant are the prophecies. This backs up my summation which harks back to the late insertion of the updated prophecies in the exemplar of the First Variant to the time the updated prophecies were spliced into the Vulgate. But this throws up further complications (concerning the Durham cathedral chapter Library MS C.iv.27), (which will be discussed in the chapter on Wace), as the versified Merlin prophecies which accompany Wace (even though he says he has not

---

Hammer’s view is that the Variant version arranged for a papal eye was written by some other than ‘Geoffrey’: who, then, is responsible for this recension which heretofore found shelter sub umbra Galfredi? Who is this mysterious writer who adorned his product with so many biblical quotations who knew Terence, Vergil, Bede and others and who must have had access to some Welsh material as well? That he must have been a man of learning cannot be denied. The facility with which he quotes the Scriptures suggests a cleric who, fascinated by Geoffrey’s Historia and sharing its point of view, decided to refashion it in his own way and in the process of doing so, left on the new product the imprint of his own personality.
bothered to translate them) can be seen to be a versified form emanating from Henry Blois of what was the separate *libellus Merlini* before it was updated. What makes this dateable is that the allusions to Henry Blois and his agendas are many regarding Metropolitan but there is no mention of the Sixth in Ireland in the versified Durham set.

The First Variant has no dedications, (except one which is probably a later correction) and no reference to Walter. Passages from Orosius and Landolfus Sagax dealing with the Roman period are nearly verbatim as papal authorities can verify (or would know) synchronicity. The Variant in many cases employs reported discourse rather than the more dramatic direct speech in the Vulgat *HRB*. This again, would provide more the air of a history than a good read. It also lends to the proposition that the Vulgate *HRB* was created more as an interesting historic novel for entertainment rather than the more formal First Variant which tried to pass itself off as historically accurate.

It would be silly, given the fact that Henry composed the First Variant version specifically for his case of metropolitan (and given that we know the Vulgate was not fully completed until 1155), to assume that the First and hybrid Variants are anything other than a less developed and less expanded earlier version of the Vulgate. Hammer’s notion that the variants were not written by Henry (Geoffrey) is as blind as not understanding that the French vernacular version was started (by Henry before he later posed as Wace), based upon the First Variant storyline as a template, because it was a work in progress; and therefore Henry finished off *Roman de Brut* with the later Vulgate version some years after having originally commencing his huge task of verifying the Latin First Variant. Once he had expanded Arthuriana in Vulgate and the speeches etc. he then completes his Wace version mirroring Vulgate in the latter part of his versification process. It is ridiculous to think Wace could plagiarise such a recently composed and expanded Arthuriana section. Crick and her previous mentors should have understood that Wace’s versified *Roman de Brut* was composed by Henry Blois and the reason most commentators believe Gaimar’s *Roman de Breton* did not survive (because it was outclassed by Wace’s work) is a scholastic rationale. *Roman de Breton* was never written. This is the reason every Geoffrey scholar needs to stop being so naïve regarding what is a glaring interpolation (or even bogus composition), known as Gaimar’s epilogue.
It was 1156-7 when Henry completed Wace’s *Roman de Brut*. Henry had already completed the Vulgate, as the *Roman de Brut* parallels it in its second half. The First Variant is not an inferior recension of the Vulgate, it was composed for a different audience (in 1144) under different circumstances and earlier than the 1155 finalised Vulgate. It is illogical to think that ‘Geoffrey’ would remove his artistry rather than build upon it as the *Historia* evolved.

The Vulgate is a reflection of a portrayal of the *Primary Historia* mixed with the First Variant slant, fully developed with no constraint in its language or attitude. As we covered already, Adrian IV published the Papal Bull *Laudabiliter*, which was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland and apply the Gregorian reforms, and therefore…. since we know Henry Blois was at the meeting at Winchester, we can date the version of prophecies in the Vulgate to after that date. Henry had refined First Variant to Vulgate in the years 1149 (Alfred’s copy?) to 1155, when the updated prophecies were added. The updated version of the prophecies (as we have covered) also included the prophecies which incite rebellion against Henry II.

As long as we know to disregard Gaimar’s testimony, which is another of Henry’s ploys…. one can confidently say that Walter never gave a fictitious ‘Geoffrey’ any old book in the British language or obtained it from Brittany. Walter was dead and ‘Geoffrey’ never lived.

Henry, it seems, was under pressure as the seditious prophecies were published. Henry devised a plan to make it appear that ‘Geoffrey’ had worked with others of reputation like Walter, Robert of Gloucester and Alexander. The last thing Henry Blois wants is a witness who is alive. Therefore, Walter is not mentioned at the start of Chapter eleven or 177 in the First Variant because Henry has not conceived of Walter as a corroborative and collaborative witness, from whom the source book was obtained.

No blame can be foisted upon the dead bishop of Asaph for having merely translated an old book or an archdeacon for supplying it. Unfortunately no-one has ever been able to verify what HRB pretends…. because by the time the First Variant has evolved to Vulgate HRB, there is
no-one alive to whom a sceptic might enquire.\textsuperscript{493} After 1155 when ‘Geoffrey had been consigned to death, those that did make enquiries assumed he had resided in Asaph.

Walter’s role is fabricated in the Vulgate: \textit{Geoffrey of Monmouth will not stay silent even about this, most noble earl, but according as he has found it in the British book mentioned before, and has heard from Walter of Oxford, a man familiar with many histories, he will tell in his own mean style of the battles which that renowned King upon his return to Britain after this victory did fight with his nephew.}\textsuperscript{494}

We know the First Variant was employed earlier than 1151 and thus we can conclude that because Walter’s name is absent from the First Variant text; he is alive and his fame as provider of the book is not yet bestowed upon him. Henry only uses Walter as his stooge after he is dead.

I must remind the reader that no-one ever met ‘Geoffrey’ and his work was not widely read until post 1155, except for the one recorded copy provided by Henry’s nephew (which found its way to Beverley) and since this existed c.1147 certainly ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ as a name had not yet been concocted. A few other variants probably circulated in this era before the expanded Vulgate got widely copied. Admittedly Henry’s friend Abbot Suger had been passed some prophecies and Alfred of Beverley had procured his copy from William of York, but to think any version was widely distributed before 1155 is inaccurate. Alfred when re-cycling HRB merely names the author as Britannicus because he knows \textit{Galfridus Artur} is a pseudonym and the author is obviously pro- the Britons.\textsuperscript{495}

The modern concept of the proliferation of ‘Geoffrey’s’ work is simply misunderstood and is based entirely on the date parameters of when the dedicatees lived and the assumption that a Vulgate version appeared in 1139 at Bec. Modern scholars also need to accept that Merlin is not a prophet. To maintain such a position is foolish given that most of the

\textsuperscript{493} The only exception to this rule is Robert de Chesney as dedicatee of VM. However, since Henry outlived de Chesney (D.1166), the prologue in which the dedication is found could well have been added after his death or we can assume since ‘Geoffrey’ was dead at the advent of VM, the new bishop of Lincoln accepted the honour without complaint following a previous Alexander tradition of patronising ‘Geoffrey’.

\textsuperscript{494} HRB, XI, 1.

\textsuperscript{495} Geoffrey’s seemingly pro-Briton stance mainly comes from the origins of HRB having been written as a faux history inclusive of the many queens not forgetting it was aimed at currying favour with the potential new queen Matilda; and not forgetting The Empress Matilda was the daughter of Matilda the wife of King Henry I and she was the daughter of the English princess saint Margaret and the Scottish king Malcolm III.
content of the prophecies revolves around looking backward to events close to Henry Blois and his family and the anarchy.

It is a madness to think that the chief aim of the First Variant is to abbreviate HRB. It appears less expanded because it is earlier and the frequent reminiscences of the Bible and classical texts, independent of the Vulgate.... indicate that it was tailored to an ecclesiastical audience, written with a more moralising tone. It is simply not feasible that the First Variant was written by someone other than ‘Geoffrey’. Considering that the Vulgate version was in progress of being written before 1155 we might conclude it evolved through the copy that Alfred of Beverley possessed and as such had material that Alfred relates which is exclusive to Vulgate and also to First Variant. In other words Alfred’s copy was neither. The original First variant (1143-44) was written 10 years before the final Vulgate Version and may explain some differences in style, but essentially, they were composed for two different audiences. It is obvious that the Wace version because of its composition and because of the time involved in versifying HRB that it was composed over a long period of time where the transition to include the expanded Arthuriad took place.

Hammer considered the Variant to be a reworking of the Vulgate for which Geoffrey of Monmouth was not responsible; but as soon as the motives for the Variant are established, there is no doubt as to who composed and was responsible for it. If the frequency of incompatibility which exist in Huntingdon’s synopsis were expanded from the short précis that constitutes the letter to Warin.... it could not be thought possible that a Vulgate version was the same as that found at Bec. Huntingdon’s précis never mentions Avalon.... and Alfred, in his reworking of the passage concerning Caliburnus (where it is forged in the island of Avalon in HRB) omits mention of Avalon. It shows Henry has not yet evolved his plan and his aggrandisement for Avalon.

Caldwell said that the Variant looks like an early draft put together from original sources. He misunderstands the Variant was an evolving work toward Vulgate HRB, but had been employed at one time for a specific purpose. Caldwell argued that the absence from the Vulgate of some material found in the Variant and the inclusion in the Variant alone of some passages drawn directly from prior sources i.e. Bede and Landolfus Sagax could be explained if the Vulgate were regarded as a reworking of the Variant. In other words, the Vulgate was a deliberate revision. He was right,
but he did not understand why historical personages are changed and 
chronological episodes re-aligned or the difference in moral tone; British 
anti-roman sentiment in speech was redacted and battle scenes from 
Vulgate appeared to be removed, and that Wace, Variant and Vulgate had a 
single author. The difficulty of our experts have is that they do not 
understand that the Vulgate version was not published in 1138, but the 
book found at bec was a first edition ‘Primary Historia’. It is silly to think 
that the Variant represented a version of the Historia composed by an 
unknown author at some time before Geoffrey compiled the Vulgate as 
some scholars suggest.

Pierre Gallais, another commentator duped by Henry’s fraud, thought 
Caldwell’s claim that the Variant version preceded the Roman de Brut, saw 
Caldwell’s position as a serious challenge to Wace’s originality.... since it 
threatened to reduce the status of the poet to that of a compilateur or 
copyist. Again just Scholastic rationalisation!!

Pierre Gallais reckoned the Variant’s style signalled it could not have 
been written by Geoffrey himself.... but, trying to fit the jigsaw together, he 
rejected the proposition that an unknown author could produce such a 
version prior to the appearance of the Vulgate text. So, Gallais thought the 
Variant must have been composed after 1138 when he though Vulgate 
appeared; which led him to believe that the author of the first variant drew 
on Wace’s Roman de Brut and therefore must be the latter composition. As 
Wright\textsuperscript{496} states: The diverse nature of these various hypotheses serves to 
underline the great difficulties with which questions about the date, 
authorship and purpose of the First Variant version present us. I just do not 
understand given the differences found in EAW why every scholar blindly 
follows the assumption that EAW is a synopsis of Vulgate.

\textsuperscript{496} Neil Wright after pages discussing the self-contradictory arguments of Calwell and Gallais concludes: the combined weight of the preceding arguments must tip the scales conclusively against Gallais and in favour of 
Caldwell’s assertion that the variant version of the historia was Wace’s source. Hence the variant was in 
existence in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s lifetime, since he died probably in 1155, the year of the completion of the 
Roman de Brut. What I have never understood about researchers into Geoffrey’s work is how one could accept 
that firstly Geoffrey was real when nearly everything he states, or is circumstantially established in a personal 
context, falls apart under scrutiny; yet all and sundry accept there is little truth in his historical fact in HRB. 
Secondly, how is it that commentators think Wace or the supposed author of the Variant and Geoffrey all seem 
to interchange each others work at will all before 1155 when Geoffrey supposedly died. There are no scales to 
tip as Wright puts it, because Henry started the Roman de Brut c.1149-50 with a cross over between Primary 
Historia and Variant versions as his source and finished the versified version with the expansions found common 
to Vulgate; all versions common to one man as is evident in this analysis.
The situation will never change until scholars free themselves of several *a priori* positions which (if maintained) obscure the right conclusions to the three genres of study under investigation!!!

It is silly to think that a revision of the *Historia* by an author other than Geoffrey would have been made so soon after the publication of the Vulgate text. Especially, if we consider modern scholarship’s view that the Vulgate was the same edition as the *Primary Historia* and was first seen in 1139. Why would one think another author would replicate the Vulgate with minor differences giving a much reduced First Variant version…. even if we genuinely believed ‘Geoffrey’ had existed as a real person?

Another confused commentator, Hans Erich Keller, thought that the Variant was not written by Geoffrey but ante-dated the Vulgate. Keller thought that Gaimar referred to the Vulgate as *le livier* of Walter Espec and to the Variant version as the ‘good book of Oxford’ by Walter the Archdeacon. Therefore, Keller’s logic concluded that the source of the HRB was not as Geoffrey alleged i.e. an ancient Briton or Breton book in the possession of Walter Archdeacon of Oxford, but it was the Variant itself and composed before 1138. To complete the jigsaw of ignorance; Keller reckoned the Variant must have been written by Archdeacon Walter himself. Until it is understood that Henry Blois interpolated Gaimar, no correct conclusion will be found. The Gaimar epilogue is purposeful misdirection and is the key to unlocking the evolution of Geoffrey’s work in making plain that Wace’s work was written by Henry Blois.

Wright hits the nail on the head: *a comprehensive approach must be directed to answering three questions. Was the variant version composed before or after the vulgate? Was the variant written by Geoffrey or by another author? And was the variant used by Wace or does it rather reflect the influence of the Roman de Brut and consequently postdate that text?*

The Variant was written beforehand in 1144 so it was the template for the *influence of the Roman de Brut*. All HRB texts including that of Wace and Vulgate were authored by Henry Blois before his death. No further textual analysis by Crick or Wright will contradict this position.

Let it be established once and for all, Walter never had a book and never had any association with the composition of the *Historia* and his name was never seen in the Vulgate until after his death. Henry Blois is the author of HRB and the prophecies of Merlin.
As we shall see in the next section, Gaimar’s epilogue, upon which Keller attaches his reasoning’s, is most certainly written by Henry Blois, along with several other small interpolations into Gaimar’s work which corroborate the historicity of HRB. After stating that Wace’s work (which was lengthy labour in time) was composed by ‘Geoffrey’, I will surely be accused for citing Gaimar’s epilogue as a Henry Blois interpolation also; but, by comparison to several years work in versifying the Historia, Gaimar’s epilogue and associated minor interpolations could be made in less than a day

Leckie also thought the First Variant was a later recension compiled by an unknown redactor. Yet he recognised that the Roman de Brut could not have arisen independently. He thought it must represent an attempt to modify the Variant. One of the reasons Henry Blois created Wace’s Roman de Brut in the first place apart from opening up his sensational book to a wider audience, was so that ‘Geoffrey’ remained ostensibly Welsh. The fact that ‘Wace’ found the Merlin prophecies incomprehensible may portend that Henry Blois completed Roman de Brut when there was no efficacy or further use of the prophetia. Therefore, I believe Henry released the Roman de Brut c.1158 when he returned to England probably after having met Wace at Caen.

The conclusion is that the Wace’s Roman de Brut was started before the fully evolved Vulgate HRB and hence it follows the Vulgate version more closely at the end where the expanded Arturiana is an obvious addition to the Variant. We might propose that Henry found it too difficult to include the prophetia without exposing himself by translating them i.e. by versifying the prose. Much of the skimble skamble and obfuscatory content would be too difficult to portray without exposing his obvious understanding of their content. There are many other alternative scenarios as to why Henry makes a point of omitting the prophecies when he impersonates Wace. However, we will see that Roman de Brut was written later than is normally thought and therefore the prophecies have no further use as Henry completes the vernacular edition of Roman de Brut in 1158-59 and certainly Marie of France at the court of Champagne has heard of Avalon and the round table c.1165-70. Shoaf’s unyielding position in maintaining that Marie of France who composed the Lais is different from the Marie of France who became Marie of Champagne married to Henry
Blois’ nephew is typical of the blindness of modern scholarship. I will get to this in the chapter on Marie of Champagne.

However, to grasp the finer points on the reasoning behind why the prophetia were left out in Wace I will discuss later also, but it is necessary to understand that both Wace and Gaimar were impersonated by Henry Blois, yet were both poets already. Neither of them in any way as artful as Henry Blois which is obviated in Wace’s sluggish Roman de Rou and Gaimar’s plodding L’Estoire des Engles.

Another astonishing thing is that no commentator has ever remarked at how sedentary the Roman de Rou comes across. One would think that with all Gallais’ praise for Wace, he might have noticed that the author of Roman de Brut could never be the same mind; even though Wace is supposedly using a contemporary ‘Geoffrey’ as a source for his material. It is not the material at fault it is the versification!!!

How is it possible that after spending years putting the Historia together a comparative dullard is allowed with supposed complete knowledge and co-operation from ‘Geoffrey’ up in Oxford, to versify the best literature since Cicero; especially if we take into account the scarcity of references to Geoffrey’s work before 1150. This whole shambolic mess regarding Geoffrey’s work starts with Lloyd and Petrie and Chambers and Griscom amongst many others and is now perpetuated by Crick.
Chapter 21

Geffrei Gaimar and the L’estoire des Engles

Geoffrey Gaimar claims to have written a version of the Brut based upon Geoffrey of Monmouth's HRB. No copy of Gaimar's Brut, or, (as it is better known), L’Estoire des Bretons has survived. This is simply because it was never written. It is by no accident that Wace's Roman de Brut is found along with all four manuscripts of L'Estoire des Engles. I have maintained that Wace's Roman de Brut was written by Henry Blois to spread his HRB to a wider audience in the French Vernacular on the continent and to entertain nobles at court.

Wace's Roman de Brut was combined with a manuscript i.e. together with L'Estoire des Engles and distributed by Henry Blois when Gaimar had already completed the L'Estoire des Engles. Gaimar’s epilogue does its job in deflecting the obvious connection between the two works. Most commentators believe Gaimar's Roman de Breton did not survive as it was outclassed by Wace’s work and thus it was relegated to obscurity to be replaced with a superior work. This view is largely based on the fact that L’Estoire des Engles is not an artful work (at least this is Gallais’ position and all and sundry have accepted it).
Gaimar wrote *L'Estoire des Engles* and Henry Blois then interpolated it with a few Arthurian insertions after Gaimar’s death. However, the point of this was so that the epilogue could state what it does about the source material of HRB. The point of this is so that Walter is implicated…just as the HRB states and Henry’s authorship is hidden; and ‘Geoffrey’ becomes merely a translator not inventor of HRB’s contents.

The creation of ‘Gaimar’s’ epilogue is Henry Blois’ main purpose behind impersonating Gaimar. ‘Gaimar’s’ epilogue provides an erroneous conflationary and misleading provenance for HRB. The epilogue could not carry out its function unless *L'Estoire des Bretons* was supposedly to have been ‘apparently’ written by Gaimar. Without the proposition that Gaimar wrote the *L'Estoire des Bretons*, how would the ‘good book’ be mentioned? It is for this reason all four copies of Gaimar’s genuine work, interpolated slightly by Henry, have another of Henry’s works attached; Wace’s *Roman de Brut*. It is entirely wrong to think the *L'Estoire des Bretons* ever existed.

It was again an extremely clever ploy by Henry Blois. Gaimar’s statements in the epilogue ostensibly are employed by Henry Blois to mislead, which ultimately only corroborate the proposition of the fraudulent source book when put under scrutiny. This is especially evident when we consider there are no dedications in the First Variant except where Robert’s name is added subsequently to a copy\(^\text{497}\) and there is certainly no mention of Archdeacon Walter. The proposition, by ‘Geoffrey’, that Walter supplied his source book only becomes relevant to Henry Blois at the advent of the publication of Vulgate and its seditious prophecies…. as more people scrutinized the appearance of a supposed translation of a history found in an old book and of course read the Merlin Prophecies.

At the time the First Variant was employed in 1144, Robert of Gloucester was still alive and therefore no dedication could be used. However his name is in one copy of the First Variant as it was probably employed at Rome in 1149 just after his death. It may however be a later correction.

Anyway, Gaimar’s epilogue was concocted and employed to establish certain corroborations of Vulgate HRB’s historicity, thereby adding credence of what was maintained in HRB by a third party author.

\(^{497}\) Once we have established the reasoning behind the construction of First Variant we can date it to 1144-1149. There is absolutely no way Robert of Gloucester would have received a copy of First Variant.
‘Gaimar’s’ epilogue provides independent witness to ‘Geoffrey’s’ statement concerning the mythical book obtained from Walter. The intention was to show that a book from which Vulgate HRB was supposedly translated actually existed as witnessed by ‘Geoffrey’. The old book ex *Britannica* did not exist. Most scholars realize that the *Historia* is a composite and could not be a translation of an old book. Some scholars are still naive enough to believe a source book exists because a few puzzling attributes of the *Historia* are more easily dispensed with by a tentative acknowledgement. Keller has Walter as the inventor of the First Variant to rationalize this position.

Logically, Walter could hardly give any book to the invented persona of Geoffrey of Monmouth and far less when he is dead at the advent of the Vulgate edition. Ingeniously, Gaimar’s witness fraudulently establishes Robert of Gloucester as having *had this historical narrative adapted and translated in accordance with the books belonging to the Welsh*.

Henry Blois might have known Walter, but we should not forget that Henry signed six or seven charters as *Galfridus Artur* and the bishop of Asaph while in the scriptorium at Oxford in c.1153, two years after Walter had died. Archdeacon Walter’s name was upon some of the charters, but in all probability Walter and Henry had previously met as Stephen visited Oxford castle at various times when used as a base in the changing fortunes of the Anarchy.

Henry Blois only employed Walter as a ‘decoy’ for providing the source of his history after Walter’s death and only in the Vulgate version. Logically, he must have known Walter had died and it was safe to use his name. The reason Henry Blois went to such an elaborate extent in laying a false trail is that people were looking for Geoffrey of Monmouth and starting to ask where this man existed and how he got hold of the information for the extensive historical account found in HRB and where this mysterious source book came from and why had the Merlin prophecies seen by some previously in the *Libellus Merlini* version now changed.

This was especially relevant also to Henry Blois distancing himself from composition and authorship of the prophecies which incited rebellion against Henry II. By the time any of these fictions like the contemporaneity of Caradoc mentioned in the colophon of Vulgate or Walter and his mysterious book or the erroneous dedicatees and phony patrons came to be inquired of by sceptics; they could not respond because they were dead. The
exception is Waleran who died 1166 and may have been added as a dedicatee after that date. Since ‘Geoffrey’ died in 1154-5 what difference would it make anyway if he had supposedly made Waleran a dedicatee between 1155-66?

Henry’s ploy of backdating made it appear as if the Vulgate HRB had been published at least 15 years earlier in 1138-9. Quite simply any avenue of enquiry could not be made because all supposed witnesses were now dead.

We know the First Variant gradually circulated with no dedication or mention of Alexander or Walter. It was only after Walter’s death in 1151 that Henry would have needed to have found a solution to the growing question of how ‘Geoffrey’ had an account of history at variance to Roman annals and how his history varied from Gildas’s diatribe and Bede’s history.

As I have maintained, with the gradual proliferation of the First Variant with such as Alfred of Beverley commenting on and re-cycling HRB, it seems fair to posit that in 1153, while at Wallingford, and at the time the Treaty of Winchester was agreed.... that Henry visited Oxford to scribble *Gaufridus’* signature on the six charters found in the scriptorium picked at random. He also came up with the idea of a Geoffrey from ‘Monmouth’ based on the name of Ralph of Monmouth found also on some of these charters as we covered earlier.

Henry also at this same time portrayed the progression of an aspiring man dutifully flattering patrons and exasperated at his lack of promotion waiting to become a bishop. The only real problem with this scenario is that if ‘Geoffrey’ really was complaining to Robert de Chesney in VM for further reward than that which had been given earlier by Alexander, (and VM was supposedly written in 1155), Geoffrey is already a bishop and dead. So, Geoffrey would hardly be seeking a better reward as is posited in the prologue of VM. Logically, he must have started the poem at least a year previously to accomplish the task before 1155. We know by use of the Variant in Wace’s versified version that Henry had started the vernacular version of the *Roman de Brut* before 1155 and completed it once Vulgate was a finished composition. Henry was not idle while in voluntary exile at Clugny.

Henry signs ‘Geoffrey’s’ name on the treaty of Winchester as the bishop of Asaph to complete the trail of charter signatures of a bogus persona left to posterity. At what date this was done we cannot say as the treaty was
probably in Henry's keeping at Winchester and the signature may have been added long afterward. What is sure is that no 'Geoffrey' witnessed the signing of the treaty and no other Bishop ever met Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Hammer’s First Variant gives the name *Galfridus Arturus Monemutensis* only in the Colophon. This runs contrary to my theory that the Monmouth appellation is late. This would however most likely be a later correction or insertion if my theory is correct that Henry Blois signed the six charters in 1153.

It seems to me that Ralph of Monmouth’s name inspired Henry to change from *Gaufridus Arthur* to Geoffrey of Monmouth in 1153 when Duke Henry, King Stephen and Henry Blois met at Oxford castle.

The late interpolation into Gaimar’s work is determined by the fact that the book of Oxford is mentioned. The mention of Walter is definitely a part of Henry’s device that could only be employed after 1151 when Walter had died. A clear motive is seen in Henry Blois’ impostor of Gaimar. Pressure mounted on Henry Blois and he tried to distance himself from authorship of HRB yet maintain its credibility. It must certainly have been known that his name was linked to the *Historia* as he had presented it as evidence in Rome and doubtless could be connected to its proliferation and copying.

*L'Estoire des Engles* or the ‘History of the English people’ was written by Gaimar originally and it is upon this manuscript Henry weaves his web just as he does with Wace’s work. Essentially, until Henry Blois got his hands on *L'Estoire des Engles* .... it was the ASC in poetic form which also could be said to have more insight toward the northern regions i.e. written by someone in the North of England.

*L'Estoire des Engles* was certainly (but only slightly) interpolated with Arthurian lore by Henry Blois. The fact that Belinus is mentioned.... we know that Gaimar has been interpolated by someone concerned with corroborating part of ‘Geoffrey’s’ bogus history. On this point, modern scholars have suggested that both Gaimar and Geoffrey were working from the same sources. This position is only tenable if we believe the veracity of what is stated in the epilogue in that Gaimar actually composed *L'estoire des Breton*. He did not!!! It is vital that scholars studying Geoffrey’s work understand who composed the work in reality; otherwise ridiculous and contrived rationalisations are dreamt up and these are then expanded upon with even more ingenious nonsense until we actually believe the ‘good book’ existed.
This is what we are supposed to believe when some interpolations into Gaimar’s original *L’Estoire des Engles* refer to Arthuriana. The reason Henry has lighted upon Gaimar’s work for a front, to implant his propaganda, is that Gaimar has (to an extent) versified the ASC for Lady Constance.... and therefore could be accountable as having produced a poetical rendition of Walter’s book. This is the implication we are led to believe by the reference to *L’estoire des Bretons*.

Let there be no mistaking.... before any reference to Walter was made in the Vulgate HRB, Walter was already dead. So, the *Primary Historia* that spawned EAW and in the First Variant, there is no Walter mentioned as both these were composed while Walter was alive. Walter’s book was called upon as a dramatic prop, employed to give the air of authenticity to ‘Geoffrey’s’ source material, but more importantly to distance the author of HRB from the accusation of having fabricated it from his own imagination.

Originally Gaimar wrote his adaptation of ASC as a chronicle in octosyllabic rhymed couplets and he opens with a brief mention of King Arthur whose actions affect the plot of the interpolated tale of Havelok the Dane. Basically, the first 3,500 lines are translations out of a variant text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and subsequent portions are a mix of more of Henry’s fantastic invention and Gaimar’s genuine work. Henry’s guile is unsurpassed here (and we know what is on his mind) as the opening lines declare: *Heretofore in the former book, if you remember it, you have heard how perfectly Constantine held the dominion after Arthur*...

Why would we not remember it if, as the epilogue makes out, Gaimar is writing a continuous history from Troy to William Rufus. What Henry Blois has cleverly done in the epilogue is infer firstly that Gaimar wrote *L’estoire des Bretons* and that the Trojan epic and the Arthuriana were in other works used by Gaimar. But by mentioning the ‘good book of Oxford’ he shoots himself in the foot and provides a proof positive for those that are not gullible that the good book never existed, because we know that Gaimar’s testimony must be after Walter died.

Walter does not feature in the earlier First Variant. The whole farce is initially concocted in the Vulgate.... therefore, we can definitively say Gaimar’s epilogue was composed not only after Walter’s death but subsequent also to his name’s inclusion in the Vulgate.

*L’estorie de Wincestre* was the copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which supposedly Gaimar used and refers to in the text. It is not wildly speculative
to assume that Henry had placed that book chained in Winchester and interpolated it with Arthurian lore and this is the reason we are led to believe that ‘Gaimar’ lends credence to it as an independent source. In effect, creating the aura that what the ‘Winchester book’ contained was genuine. Also, one can speculate that the ploy was also meant to show that this book was at Winchester before Henry became bishop.

What needs to be understood is Henry’s vast wealth and influence over many disparate scriptoriums. This enabled him to have interpolated copies run off by various monks in differing locations where no cause for suspicion was involved in a wealthy bishop requesting a copy be made of a certain manuscript. No one scriptorium aware of what others under Henry’s instruction were up to. These did his bidding and became the main way he was able to propagate HRB through the monastic system and disseminate through his contacts at court.

As long as we know Gaimar’s testimony in the epilogue is a fake, there is nothing to say that the name Geoffrey of Monmouth even existed before 1153 or the Vulgate (unless in a corrected copy). In 1153 Gervaise was 12 years old, so his testimony regarding the Bishop of Asaph is hardly reliable and Henry Blois might have planted evidence of Geoffrey’s consecration by Theobald while Theobald was out of the country, temporarily banished by Stephen. The most powerful prelate in the land could plant any evidence he wanted anywhere in the church records system.

Henry Blois, posing as Gaimar, makes out that the L’Estoire des Bretons and L’estoire des Engles were commissioned by Constance, wife of Ralph Fitz-Gilbert, a Lincolnshire landowner using a manuscript obtained from Robert of Gloucester. Scholars have assumed therefore, it was written 1134-36 as Henry Ist does not appear (by what is stated) to be alive. One of the points of constructing the Gaimar epilogue pantomime is to pre-date the publishing of the Vulgate before its discovery at Bec, where obviously, Henry Blois had been in early 1138.

Gaimar is the original writer of L’estoire des Engles and probably did have a connection to Ralph Fitz-Gilbert who also had a wife called Constance. Henry’s gambit is always to stay aligned with what might seem the truth. He relies totally on obfuscation.

As pressure to find who had invented this work of HRB increased, Henry saw a need to portray that Gaimar also wrote about Brutus and Arthur prior to Huntingdon’s discovery. One can be sure that people
suspected Henry as author of HRB. Especially, since the *prophetia* foretold of one bishop’s wish….which was destined to come true regarding a metropolitan; even though a sixth century prophet had foretold it to a time when the audience could read an verify his words.

The various individuals who are posited to have played a part in making the books available to Gaimar is purely a devise employed by Henry Blois to achieve his goals by employing the mis-directional epilogue. No fewer than nine contemporaries are named to set the scene: Constance, wife of Ralf Fitz-Gilbert; Walter Espec of Helmsley; Robert, Earl of Gloucester; Ralf Fitz-Gilbert of Lincolnshire; Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford; King Henry Ist; Queen Adeliza of Louvain; David; and Nicholas de Trailly. The four written sources Gaimar refers to are Walter Espec’s book, the ‘Good book of Oxford’, the Winchester history, and an English book from Washingborough; all mentioned for a specific reason polemically.

Walter Espec who lent Lady Constance some of the books which supposedly Gaimar used, was the founder of the Abbeys of Kirkham, Rievaulx, and Wardon, and is well known for his gallant conduct at the Battle of the Standard in 1138. He was as an old man, High Sheriff of Yorkshire who died and was buried at Rievaulx Abbey in 1153 or 1155….leaving no issue, as his son was killed by a fall from his horse. Walter Espec’s three sisters inherited his estates, of whom the second, Albreda, married Nicolas de Trailli, and had four sons by him, Geoffrey, William, Nicholas, and Gilbert. The Nicolas de Trailli appealed to by the poet is Albreda’s husband a canon of York while Henry Blois’s Nephew was re-instated as Bishop as I have covered already. We should not forget that in all probability Henry’s evolving First Variant to Variant version arrived in York by way of Henry’s nephew and this is how Alfred of Beverley obtained a copy. So, it is not by coincidence that Henry weaves his twisted propaganda around landowners in the north who he knows are dead using his usual retro-scenarios; as Gaimar probably mentions them in his non interpolated original text as he was also from that area.

It is not coincidence that Walter Espec had just died. It is not coincidence that Henry Blois uses Walter Espec’s name in connection with Ralph and Lady Constance who had probably been the real patron of Gaimar. It is also worth noting Henry Blois had previously met Walter Espec when Henry Blois signed a charter with King Henry Ist granting permission to build Rievaulx abbey.
Nicolas de Trailli is appealed to by Gaimar to substantiate his claims about whether he is speaking the truth…. and in an unusual manner. The truth is that Gaimar was commissioned by Lady Constance. Why we should need to appeal to Nicolas de Trailli if it were really Gaimar writing is not clear, but as a polemic authored by Henry the reason becomes evident. One would think that Henry would hardly appeal to someone alive to substantiate his cock and bull story. Henry, in fact, invents how Gaimar came upon his sources (a most unusual declaration), so we can take it that Nicholas de Trailli was dead already.

The only real scenario which fits is that Gaimar did write a rendition of ASC in poetic octosyllabic. Henry then interpolated Gaimar’s own work with a small amount of corroborative Arthuriana and then added an epilogue. He constructed it as part of his devise to add credence to ‘Geoffrey’ having translated from Walter’s book and also to backdate Gaimar’s work (with interpolations) by affixing dates of known personages of the generation before. The inter-dispersed interpolations also had the added benefit of substantiating completely fictional people unheard of before ‘Geoffrey’ invented them in HRB, such as Belinus.

Let us look at how Henry Blois wraps up Gaimar’s original story by tacking on his disinformation in the epilogue:

*Let him who does not believe it go to Winchester, there he will hear if this can be true. Here will I end about the King (William Rufus).* We can then witness what Henry establishes:

*This history caused to be translated by the gentle lady Constance commissioned Gaimar on it, March and April, and all the twelve months, before he had translated about the Kings.*

Here, Henry is splicing into Gaimar’s original work which may have mentioned March and April and combines this obfuscation with the fact that he had written the *L’estoire des Bretons* beforehand…. which as we will see was never written.\(^{498}\)

\(^{498}\) The usual rate for versifying was 3,000 to 5000 lines a year. Gaimar supposedly wrote 6,000 lines in the Fourteen months. As we shall cover shortly, if Wace had genuinely finished his *Roman de Brut* in 1155 as stated it would mean he had started it in around 1152-3 before Geoffrey was supposedly dead. Strangely in reality this is true in part as Henry Blois commenced composing *Roman de Brut* using the First Variant version. As he expanded Arturiana from Alfred of Beverley’s era c1147, Wace/Henry Blois uses this latterly expanded form in the *Roman de Brut* as found in Vulgate HRB. After 1155, when the Vulgate was complete, ‘Wace’ finishes off the last half of his versified HRB mirroring the expanded Arthuriana contents found in the Vulgate version. As we shall cover the *Roman de Brut* was probably published c.1158-60 and again Henry is back dating. But the
He procured many copies, English books and books on grammar, both in French and in Latin, before he could come to the conclusion. If his lady had not helped him, he would never have completed it. She sent to Helmsley for Walter Espec's book. Robert earl of Gloucester had this historical narrative translated in accordance with the books belonging to the Welsh which they had on the subject of the Kings of Britain. Walter Espec requested this historical narrative, Earl Robert sent it to him, and then Walter Espec lent it to Ralf Fitz-Gilbert; Lady Constance borrowed it from her husband whom she loved dearly. Geoffrey Gaimar made a written copy of this book, and added to it the supplementary material which the Welsh had omitted, for he had previously obtained, be it rightfully or wrongfully, the good book of Oxford which belonged to Archdeacon Walter, and with this he made considerable improvements to his book; and this historical narrative was improved by the Winchester History, and a certain book of Washingborough, in which he found a written account of the Kings and of all the emperors who had dominion over Rome and tribute from England, and of the Kings who had held these lands of their lives and deeds, what happened to them and what deeds they performed, how each one governed the land, which ones loved peace and which ones’ war. Anyone willing to look into this book will be able to find there all this and more, and let anyone who does not believe what I say ask Nicholas de Trailly.

One can only feel sorry for scholars who are so naïve that they are taken in by what is so obviously designed to mislead and substantiate what is not true.

One does not need an explanation to understand why ‘Gaimar’ mentions the book of Robert of Gloucester rather than mentioning by whom the book was authored. The author Geoffrey of Monmouth is kept well out of the picture and it is to the dedicatee that Walter Espec makes his request. Modern scholars studying ‘Geoffrey’ do not understand that Henry Blois is adeptly corroborating what ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ had written.

So, in this ingenious explanation as to how we have a copy of Wace connected to L'Estoire des Engleis; now we are led to understand by what Gaimar states above .... is that the version of Wace i.e Gaimar’s L'Estoire des

scholastic conclusion is again backward; because of their belief that the Bec copy was the Vulgate version and so Variant is assumed the later version. This would mean the supposed Wace starts his book with the unexpanded first Variant (a supposed later version) and then reverts back to the expanded earlier version thought to be Vulgate. Total Nonsense!!!!! Just look at the discrepancies in EAW by comparison with Vulgate.
Bretons was originally a Welsh book that Robert of Gloucester had commissioned a translation from which supposedly Wace and Geoffrey’s work derived from. Incredibly Geoffrey Gaimar made a written copy of this book, and added to it the supplementary material which the Welsh had omitted, for he had previously obtained, the good book of Oxford which belonged to Archdeacon Walter, and with this he made considerable improvements to his book; and this historical narrative was improved by the Winchester History. What an amazing song and dance routine for contemporaries in search of Geoffrey and our modern scholars to swallow. ‘Geoffrey’ got his information from the Welsh book!!!!! So how is it that the most lucid of scholars i.e. Tatlock who knows and identifies Geoffrey’s work as a composite with a definable provenance constituting episodes and speeches and HRB’s historicity ....does not see that what Gaimar writes could in no way be true.

What Henry hopes to convey is that ‘Geoffrey’s source for HRB originated from Robert of Gloucester, but it was Gaimar who added to it that which the Welsh had left out and to confuse us further.... it is Gaimar by his own admission that also possessed Walter’s book which Geoffrey attests to...so now it must be real !!!! The main purpose is to prove independently that a book from Oxford existed and probably to have us confuse the provenance of that book between the Archdeacon Walter and Walter Espec.

The Gaimar epilogue is meant to confuse and has the desired effect. It obscures rather than elucidates any useful meaning, but the ‘seed’ of doubt is again planted. To an unperceptive reader, the book ‘Geoffrey’ translated from, is forever more thought to have existed in reality, adding credence to ‘Geoffrey’s’ claim. It is not by accident that Gaimar’s supposed work L’Estoire des Bretons is substituted by Wace’s, and he like Geoffrey made considerable improvements to his book.

At Winchester, there obviously existed a book into which Henry Blois had interpolated substantially. Henry is by means of the epilogue, (for the benefit of the gullible), showing that in that book was new material which was supposedly put in Gaimar’s L’estoire de Bretons, which of course does not exist and is Wace’s version of HRB versified. Don’t forget, L’estoire de Bretons is thought to have the same contents as HRB. The existence of the Winchester book, which was probably a vastly interpolated rendition of ASC, also needed to be substantiated as having been chained in Winchester
of old. Hence, by total confusion ‘Gaimar’ who is purposely ante-dated by Henry Blois to c.1136,\(^{499}\) is made to appear as if he is using the Vulgate book which has drawn so much attention which Henry needed to deflect or risk being exposed. Therefore, supposedly ‘Gaimar’ let it be known that the book of Oxford had material that Robert of Gloucester’s book did not contain. Therefore, any inquirer as to how the Primary Historia or First Variant evolved into the Vulgate, without the accusation of fabrication, is now appraised that ‘Gaimar’ made these additions by way of stating he made **improvements to his book** which in essence we are to believe is Wace’s version.

The Washingborough book is somehow meant to mislead us into thinking that Geoffrey’s Vulgate, which has Alexander’s dedication in it, was in existence while Alexander was Bishop of Lincoln. Washingborough is less than two miles from Lincoln. It may be Henry’s intention that the book of the Merlin’s prophecies is implied as having come from Washingborough as Alexander supposedly possessed it and chose (pressed) ‘Geoffrey’ to translate it.

The fact that Ralph Fitz-Gilbert was benefactor of Kirkstead abbey, to whom Earl Conan made a grant of land in Washingborough between 1156-58, (the precise time which I assume Gaimar’s original work was rehashed by Henry).... may have some bearing on what was intended. Conan as we know at this time was at odds with Henry II and Henry Blois is specifically trying to incite rebellion through Conan and Cadwallader in the prophecies. However, ...*from an English book of Washingborough, wherein he found*

---

\(^{499}\) Henry Blois makes it appear Gaimar is writing just after the death of King Henry I as *La raine de Luvain* Adeliza remarried William d’Aubigy in September 1139. The intent is to ante-date Gaimar’s work to this period. We know Archdeacon Walter in the Primary Historia and also in the First Variant does not feature. Walter only becomes necessary later when questions are being asked and herein is the reason for the production of Gaimar’s charade by Henry Blois. The real intent of the production of Gaimar’s work and the mention of Walter Espec and Robert duke of Gloucester is to ostensibly provide evidence that both ‘Geoffrey’ and Gaimar had accomplished their works before the Anarchy. The way this was done was to show that Gaimar’s use of Geoffrey’s *Historia* would have been in *L’Estoire des Breton*. In other words in reality, Henry had already written the *Roman de Brut* and to save duplicating ‘Wace’s’ *Roman de Brut* again in another version called *L’Estoire des Breton* by Gaimar....*Roman de Brut* was merely substituted. Hence, Wace’s work is found alongside in all four MSS of Gaimar. What we are supposed to think is that it was Robert of Gloucester who deposited his dedicated copy at Bec in 1137 when he left England. Huntingdon does not mention his name in EAW and nor do the First Variant’s except for the Exeter MSS; and as we have mentioned this is either a late insert by Henry or a later correction or since it is a cut down version of the dedication; it may well be the first to have a dedication. But it still would date after 1147. There were definitively no dedications before 1147....even in Alfred’s copy. However, this is the very point Henry Blois is trying to make by saying in the most contrived fashion that Gaimar’s project took 14 months to compose... and we are led to believe Gaimar wrote c.1136.
written of the Kings, and of all the emperors who were lords of Rome and had tribute of England... hardly sounds as if it is the book of prophecies supposedly translated for the Bishop of Lincoln, but more along the lines of ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-historia. Anyway, the passage about the various books in Gaimar’s epilogue is intended to be unclear and cause obfuscation. *Geffrei Gaimar cel livere escrit* in line 6453 and then in 6460, *Si en emendant son livere bien*, just adds to the purposeful obfuscation; so it becomes unclear who is translating or adding to, or redacting, or who composed which book.

It would seem the real problem was that First Variant version (except those versions corrected subsequently), had no dedications in them and people were suspecting fraud when the Vulgate appeared. One can be sure this was a concern, as some of the prophecies in the Vulgate were seditious toward the new King. Why would Gaimar c.1136 have us refer to Nicholas de Trailli when we could just ask Archdeacon Walter if a ‘good book’ ever existed.... or reference the ‘good book of Oxford’?

One would have to be extremely dim witted, to accept without question Gaimar’s epilogue, considering that which we have discussed previously concerning Archdeacon Walter’s late appearance in the Vulgate Version. One should ask why Gaimar appeals to Nicholas de Trailli. The probable answer is that the author (Henry Blois), obtained his copy of Gaimar from Nicholas de Trailli.

Gaimar’s epilogue was composed as a reaction to the fact that the Vulgate HRB was published, so it cannot be early as scholars presume.... as we know the Vulgate (with its prophecies) was published in 1155. In reality, Walter would have been inundated with enquiries about the ‘good book of Oxford’ (ex-Brittania, ex-Brittany, ex-Briton or however one wishes to be misled), if Walter’s name had existed in the First Variant.

The fact that Lady Constance borrowed the book from her husband whom ‘she loved dearly’.... is inconsequential personal piffle meant to deflect from the lie being propagated. The anecdotal comment is supposed to induce us to believe some personal observation was made by Gaimar about Lady Constance to indicate the epilogue was written by Gaimar himself. Whether we are supposed to believe that the ‘He’ in.... *he had previously obtained, be it rightfully or wrongfully, the good book of Oxford*.... referred to Walter Espec, Ralph Fitz Gilbert or even Gaimar is a moot point, for Gaimar’s ambiguous reference is employed just to show an independent knew of the book also. The point is, the ‘good book of Oxford’ becomes real
by being referred to by another writer.... or at least that is what we are being led to believe. Henry even throws in a little subterfuge as to whether the book was obtained rightly or wrongly. This supposedly adds narrative credibility to his concoction.

The epilogue continues: *Now, says Gaimar, if he had a patron, he would go on to tell of King Henry, for if he is willing to talk about the King even briefly and write an adaptation of part of his life, he will be able to recount thousands of things that David never had copied down, nor did the Queen from Louvain ever hold in her hand any book recording this sort of material. She did have a large book made however and the first verse of which she had embellished with musical notation. David is a good narrative poet, and he composed good verse and constructed his song well. Lady Constance owns a written copy of it, and she often reads it in her chamber; and for the copy she gave a mark of silver burnt and weighed. The material of which this book was composed has achieved some circulation and reached several places. But as for the festivities that the King held, - and still today Henry, that Christian man of blessed memory, ranks as the best King that ever was, but as for the drinking and bouts of boasting, the courting and the love affairs in which he carried on, David's book has hardly anything to say.*

‘Gaimar’s’ statement of intent to write about Henry Ist followed by the immediate retraction of the intent is purely to show Henry Blois knows of the book that David wrote. This in effect sets us in the era in which the epilogue is supposed to have been written. People knew of David’s book in Latin, so the point for Henry Blois to make was that Gaimar also, ‘long ago’ i.e. in that period, had that same book of Oxford that ‘Geoffrey’ claims to have had. The purpose of the seemingly irrelevant anecdote is all about backdating.

The remarkable thing about Henry Blois is that he slips into character so easily. We see this in the grovelling show of flattery to Robert of Gloucester and Alexander, both whom in reality he disliked, but Henry never loses sight of the fact that writers needed a patron. Henry makes a pantomime of farce, pretending to be an equal of David (whoever David is) seeming to be concerned with the petty things poets of his ilk should be concerned about i.e. how much payment is received and if he had a patron etc.

I would hazard to guess that there was such a book written by a certain David and Henry Blois knew of it and he makes a show of intimacy with Lady Constance and affirms her bookishness by giving the ridiculous
anecdote of how much she paid for a copy. Who would not believe this is Gaimar writing? All this is dressed up to convince us that the author of the epilogue is in reality the person called Gaimar. Henry Blois, the author of the epilogue, pretends to be concerned with what David wrote and ostensibly says that David should not have left out the bits which truly would have been more interesting regarding what he had written about Henry Ist. The whole is a ploy to convince contemporaries and us in posterity that the epilogue was written by Gaimar.

Finally, the last part of the epilogue is as follows: Now, says Gaimar, he passes it over. But if he would take more trouble He could compose verses about the fairest deeds (of Henry Ist), namely the love affairs and the courting, the hunting sports and the drinking, the festivities and the pomp and ceremony, largesses and riches, the entourage of noble and valiant barons that the King maintained, and the generous presents which he distributed. This is indeed the sort of material that should be celebrated in poetry, with nothing omitted and nothing passed over. I call on David, then, to continue his narrative if he so wishes, and not leave it as it is, for if he was willing to compose a sequel, he could greatly improve his book. And if he is unwilling to turn his mind to this, I will go and fetch him myself and have him imprisoned; he will never again get out of my custody until he has completed the song. Now we are at peace / reconciled, and let us be glad. Gaimar’s narrative goes [all the way] from Troy as far as here; he began it at the point where Jason left in pursuit of the [Golden] Fleece, and has now, at this present moment, brought it to a close. God’s blessing on us all! Amen.

The quite preposterous proposal that Gaimar is going to fetch David and have him imprisoned is purely a device to ostensibly provide contemporaneity with David. David obviously wrote for Adeliza who is the Queen (from Louvain) and the author David is also now dead. That such a book existed is provided by a description of its first verse. That Adeliza is mentioned is to show that Gaimar’s work was on a par with David’s and thus ostensibly back-dated contemporaneously. We know from Hildebert of Le Man’s comments that Adeliza was only concerned with serious studies and histories.

Henry Blois’ guile should not be overlooked. The opening lines of Gaimar are a prime example. Henry Blois refers to the book which in reality he has not written as the livere bien devant and purposefully misleads us.... because the statement that Iwain was made King of Murray and Lothian
does not tally with Geoffrey’s account in First Variant version or Vulgate. The point is to convince us that a similar book to Geoffrey’s with different content existed. In the last line of the epilogue he says Gaimar’s narrative goes from Troy as far as here. 

Now, we know Henry’s devises are based largely on obfuscation and confusion. So, here he has established that Gaimar is not the same author as Geoffrey (in case any should suspect fraud) because the accounts contradict each other. The reader should keep in mind that the inventor of the whole Brutus history (because we are not referring here to Nennius’ brief mention) is Henry Blois. So, Gaimar in reality could not have written any book to do with a history from Troy without ‘Geoffrey’s’ Historia. It is from this knowledge we can conclude that the sham of an early publication by Gaimar, (especially concerning the epilogue), is as equally untenable as ‘Geoffrey’s’ fabricated persona…. and ‘Geoffrey’s’ insistence that he used an old book from which he has translated. Gaimar’s epilogue is a contrived fake which is tacked on to Gaimar’s work by the artful author called Henry Blois. No wonder he equates himself with Cicero!!

Modern scholars will find this hard to accept, because it is still believed that ‘Geoffrey’ lived in reality and Walter had the ‘exceeding ancient book in the British tongue’ mentioned by him…. which Gaimar now seems to corroborate. Most modern scholars have understood that ‘Geoffrey’ has concocted as a compilation the whole HRB and they can even see that the prophecies are spliced into it, but none have evaluated that Huntingdon’s EAW storyline is not the same as the Vulgate HRB. Even with its very numerous and considerable variations, it is still considered that the Bec Primary Historia is the same as the Vulgate edition of HRB.

One wonders how it is that scholarship has been so easily duped regarding the ‘good book of Oxford’…. but where is ‘Geoffrey’ going to get a ‘book on the exile of the Britons’ that neither Huntingdon nor Malmesbury has ever seen: Many of them betook them in a mighty fleet unto Armorican Britain, so that the whole church of the two provinces, Loegria\textsuperscript{500}, to wit, and Northumbria, was left desolate of all the convents of religious therein. But of this will I tell the story elsewhere, when I come to translate the Book of their Exile.\textsuperscript{501} 

\textsuperscript{500} Geoffrey obviously formed Arthur’s territory of Loegria in the Latinized version from Logres as it was otherwise known from the French L’ogres by extension land of the Giants

\textsuperscript{501} HRB XI.x
Gaimar gives the name of one of his sources as the History of Winchester. He tells us that it is a volume of history, compiled on Aelfred's orders from information furnished by monks and canons in various parts of England, and was chained up like a church Bible in Winchester Cathedral. In reality there probably was a book as described full of Henry's propaganda.... but if Gaimar has a copy, why is he telling us to go to Winchester to verify his history?

This cannot be the volume known as the *Annales Wintonie*, now in the British Museum which is of later date. But we may speculate that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which Gaimar is referring us to, is an interpolated copy of ASC and which obviously did not tally with any extant copy which we now possess.

We can see Henry Blois has scarfed in the interpolations into Gaimar's text and it becomes obvious that Gaimar is being used in the same way that Henry Blois had used William of Malmesbury's DA and GR. Whereas, Henry, while interpolating DA, is fabricating material as a proof of antiquity for Glastonbury and to substantiate his first and second agendas; in Gaimar's work, he makes small inconsequential changes in the main text that Gaimar has written. He interpolates small inserted passages which corroborate some of his Arthurian lore found in HRB.

The real accomplishment however, is the epilogue concerning Walter and his 'good book'. Henry Blois did at first write a different epilogue based upon lines Gaimar had written which we shall also cover here. There are several parts in Gaimar's text which mirror the fabricated HRB, but just to highlight the method employed.... we will look at some of the more blatant Arthuriana. The highlighted black print is indicating what was originally in Gaimar's work and one can see the passages flow if one takes out the insert.

*L'estoire des Engles* starts with an improvisation which gets right to the point of the introduction.... which is to provide another source which backs up the phony Arthurian history created in HRB.

*Heretofore in the former book,*
*If you remember it,*
*You have heard how perfectly*
*Constantine held the dominion after Arthur;*
*And how Iwain was made King*
Of Murray and of Lothian.\textsuperscript{502}
But afterwards he fared right ill.
All their best kindred died,
And the Saxons spread themselves,
Who had come with Cerdic,
From the Humber as far as Caithness.
Modred the King had given it to them.
So they seized, and wholly occupied
The land which once Hengist held.
This they claimed as their heritage,
For Hengist was of their lineage.
Behold the occasion,
By which the Britons came into great trouble,
So did the Scots and Picts,
The Welsh and the Cymri.
Such war the outlandish folk made,
Britain came to great grief.
The English every day increased.
For they often came from over sea.
Those from Saxony and Almain
Joined their company
For the sake of Dan Hengist, their ancestor,
The others made them lords.
Every-day as they conquered
From the English, they explored the land.
The land which they went on conquering,
They called it England,
Behold a cause
By which Britain lost its name.
And the nephews of Arthur reigned,
Who warred against the English.
But the Danes hated them much.
Because of their kindred, who had died
In the battles which Arthur fought

\textsuperscript{502} Gaimar, \textit{L’estoire des Engles}, 5. Wace does not say that Muref and Loeneis were given to Iwain, but Scotland (Brut, ii. 226). Geoffrey of Monmouth (ix. 9) says that Mureif was given to Urien, Iwain’s father.
Against Modret, whom, he afterwards slew.
If that is true that Gildas said
In the Geste, he found written
That there were two Kings formerly in Britain
When Constantine was chief.
This Constantine was the nephew of Arthur,
Who had the sword Caliburc.  

One of the Kings had for his name Adelbrit.
He was a rich man, also he was a Dane.
The other had for his name Edelsie.
His were Lincoln and Lindsey.
From the Humber to Rutland
The land was under his command.

Alvine was her name: She reared me.
Well she cared for me while she lived,
She brought me up. So said my mother,
I was the daughter of Grim, a companion of hers.
But it happened in your land,
That King Arthur came to conquer it,
For his tribute, which they withheld from him,
With many men he came to the land,
To King Gunter he seemed an enemy,
Near the sea he gave him battle,
Slain was King Gunter,
And many knights on both sides.
The land gave what Arthur would.

But the queen, because of the war,
Could not remain in the land,
So she fled with the right heir.
You are he, as I believe
Dan Haveloc, the King's son.

Who then was a powerful King
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Over the other folk in this land.
On account of his lord, who was dead,
By the power of Arthur the strong;
Whom he had by treason sent for,
And had given him this country.
Because he was treacherous and cruel,
Many took counsel together,
That they should never hold with him,
Nor take land of him,
Until they knew of the right heir,
The truth about his life or death.
This King who then was in the country,
Was the brother of King Aschis
Who met his death for Arthur
Where Modred did him such wrong,
His name was Odulf the King;
Much was he hated by his Danes.

Afterwards Eadgar, his brother, reigned.
He held the land as an emperor.
In his time he bettered the land.
He had peace everywhere, there was no war.
He alone ruled over all the Kings,
And over the Scotch and the Welsh.
Never since Arthur departed
Had any King such power.
The King much loved Holy Church.
Of wrong and of right, he knew the manner.\footnote{Gaimar, L’estoire des Engles 3573}

One can see these are simple insertions to the text which serve no other purpose than to propagandise the Arthuriana maintained in HRB and to appear as if Gildas bears witness to Arthur. We know the only place this takes place is in Henry’s impersonation of Caradoc of Llancarfan’s concocted Life of Gildas.
There is an earlier Gaimar epilogue in manuscripts D&L which also show Henry’s hand and it is mainly identified with his agenda in pursuit of Metropolitan status and backing up the authenticity of fabrications found in HRB:

_The tenth is Cornwall._

_The men are valiant in battle._

_Corineus settled it;_

_He who drove out the giants._

Henry’s concern in the later epilogue is purely defensive. The later epilogue is constructed ostensibly so that Gaimar appears to know of the ‘good book of Oxford’. Thereby, ‘Geoffrey’ was not found to be bearing false witness by insisting he had merely translated an old book; rather than what many suspected had been fabricated.

_But I will speak of the Welsh._

_I will tell of the people there._

_In Wales there are many cities,_

_Which were highly renowned,_

_As Caerwent and Caerleon,_

_And the city of Snowdon._

_And there are five bishoprics,_

_And a master archbishopric._

_Of these there are none left_

_But three, of which, I will tell you the sees._

_One is at St. David’s,_

_Which before was at Caerleon._

_This was once the archbishopric,_

_Now it is a poor bishopric._

_The other is settled at Bangor._

_Glamorgan is the third._

_They are not in any city,_

_In consequence of war they are deserted._

_But still we know well_

_That the bishop has the pallium_

_Of St. David, as he claimed it._

---
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We know well he went to Rome.
Now there is no city left,
For all the country is destroyed,
First by the Saxons,
Then by the war of the Britons;
On the other side, since the French
Have defeated the English
And conquered the land
By fire, by famine, and by war,
They have passed the water of Severn,
And waged war on the Welsh,
And spied out the land.
They conquered much of the land,
And set very grievous laws on it;
For they drove out the Welsh,
They settled in the land;
They built many castles there,
Which are right good and fair.
But Nathless often times
Well have the Welsh avenged themselves.
Many of our French have they slain,
Some of our castles they have taken;
Openly they go about saying,
Fiercely they threaten us,
That in the end they will have all;
By means of Arthur they will win it back;
And this land all together
They will take from the Latin folk,
They will give back its name to the land,
They will call it Britain again.
Now we will hold our peace about the Welsh,
And speak of the roads
Which were made in this country.
King Belinus had them made.
The first goes from the east
Until it comes to the west.
It crosses the country.
Ikenild the road is called.
The second, according to the Saxons,
Ermingestreet still we call it.
This road is well known.
From the north it goes straight to the south.
The third is far famed.
Watlingstreet it is called.
At Dover this road begins.
Right at Chester it ends.
It takes the length of the land.
The fourth is very wearisome.
This road is called Foss.
It goes through many cities.
It begins at Totness,
And goes as far as Caithness.
Seven hundred leagues is it reckoned.
This road is far famed.
Belinus who had them made
Placed them in great freedom.
Whoever was outlawed
Should have his peace on these roads.
We have described to you the counties
Of the land, and the bishoprics,
And the names of the four roads
Now thus will we leave it.
Here ends the history of the English.

Realistically, St David’s was never a metropolitan\textsuperscript{509} and it was mainly Henry Blois’ friendship with Bernard which prompted the third archflamen to be included in the First Variant as Bernard had the same aim as Henry. It was entirely an invention that a metropolitan once existed at Caerleon and this was introduced into Arthurian lore to show that in King Arthur’s era metropolitans which had once stood, no longer existed. Hence, Henry’s ploy was that both Winchester and St David’s should be reinstated. St David’s on merit that it had been an Archbishopric previously, Winchester because it

\textsuperscript{509} We should disregard Rhygyfarch’s Life of St David as his allusion is not to metropolitan specifically, ‘Saint David, archbishop of all Britannia’.
had a monastery (as attested in HRB) long before Augustine’s Canterbury was given the honour of primacy. Giraldus also took up the mantle later after Bernard died.

This aside, we know that Belinus did not exist historically. He is a fictional character re-invented here in Gaimar by Henry Blois. As Tatlock suggests, his name is based upon a vassal of Henry Blois’ brother Count Theobald of Blois. There was also a fictional King Belinus in Nennius at the time of Caesar (not mentioned in Roman annals) and so he too might be ‘Geoffrey’s’ inspirational source.

Brennius the Gaulish invader of Rome however, is based on historical fact and appears in Bede. Henry Blois as usual mixes fact with fiction, so their conquest on Rome seemingly has a basis in history. Henry Blois envisages Belinus as a great builder. After founding Caerleon, he has Belinus as the builder of the Tower of London in the fourth century BC. The Tower was instigated by Henry Blois’ Grandfather and Henry knows full well who built it.... so, it is no wonder the same Belinus builds the roads in Britain.

The point is that Belinus is ‘Geoffrey’s’ invention. We know that the person who envisages the great engineer Belinus in Gaimar’s earlier epilogue is one and the same with the writer of HRB. Henry only later changes the epilogue to suit the purpose at that time.... just as he added the last paragraph to Caradoc when it suited his purpose. The Early epilogue corroborates his historicity in First Variant and acts as corroborative evidence on the Metropolitan issues. The latter epilogue acts as a confusion of sources, material and authors as to how the Vulgate HRB might be found credible in its assertion that it is a translation from an old book. The investigator into what has transpired here should inquire how Wace’s *Roman de Brut* is mirrored in a work supposedly to have been written by Gaimar and put forward as the unwritten *L’estoire des Bretons*.... which just happens to also use the same source as ‘Geoffrey’ in his translation.... which supposedly constitutes Vulgate HRB. Modern scholarship’s understanding that Wace’s *Roman de Brut* replaces the unwritten *L’estoire des Bretons* on

---

510 In the prophecies Henry even refers to the three predecessors of Stephen: *Thereafter shall a tree rise up above the Tower of London, that thrusting forth three branches only shall overshadow all the face of the whole island with the spreading breadth of the leaves thereof*. Henry knew the tower was built by William the Conqueror. We know from William of Mamesbury’s GR where he tells of Edward the Confessor’s prophetic vision in which a tree is split and symbolises the English royal house. Not by coincidence.... so too does ‘Geoffrey’ have Merlin see the Norman royal house as a spreading tree growing from the tower of London symbolising his Grandfather.
literary merit and accompanies all the copies of Gaimar (because of this fact) is naïve. It is Henry who put the two together and distributed the manuscripts.

Henry loves to provide answers giving eponyms or how things came into existence to amaze his readers. As I have maintained, Henry Blois spent time in 1136, just after his brother was installed on the throne, putting down rebellion in South Wales. This is where he gets his knowledge to write concerning the topography and archaeology of Wales and what would have been in GS (if the pages were not missing from the manuscript); but his personal observations about castles in GS always stands out, as he himself is a builder. It is no surprise then we find in Gaimar’s first epilogue the observations found in GS: They built many castles there, which are right good and fair.

Again the hope of the Britons is expressed in the earlier epilogue:

```
Openly they go about saying,\(^5\)
Fiercely they threaten us,
That in the end they will have all;
By means of Arthur they will win it back;
And this land all together
They will take from the Latin folk,
They will give back its name to the land,
They will call it Britain again.
```

One part of ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-history which has baffled scholars is why there is the flattering imperialism in Vulgate HRB which appears to be toned down in the First Variant. For all ‘Geoffrey’s’ mad claim to imperialism there is but one witness. It seems safe to speculate that Haveloc the Dane was composed by Gaimar and Henry Blois just inserts small interpolations so that the claims of conquering Denmark in HRB are conveniently substantiated by an independent source or at least we are supposed to think this.

Again, we can see where the Blois Arthuriana is inserted into existing text:

```
I will relate you the adventure.\(^6\)
Haveloc was this King named.
```

---

\(^5\) Gaimar’s earlier epilogue written by Henry.

\(^6\) Gaimar, Haveloc the Dane ,16
And Cuaran is he called.
Therefore, I mean to tell you of him,
And recall his adventures,
Of which the Bretons made a lay.
They called it from his name
Both Haveloc and Cuaran,
Of his father I will tell first.
Gunter was his name, he was a Dane.
He held the land, he was King.
At the time that Arthur reigned,
He crossed the sea towards Denmark.
He would make the land submit to him,
And have tribute of the King.
With King Gunter he fought.
And with the Danes, and conquered.
The King himself was killed.
And many others of the country.
Hodulf slew him by treason,
Who always had a felon heart.
When Arthur had ended his war
Hodulf gave him all the land,
And the homage of his barons.
When he departed with his Britons;
Some by constraint, some by fear,
Most of them served Hodulf.
Some there were who sought his ruin
By the advice of Sigar the Stallere,
Who was a good and rich man,
And well knew how to war.
He had the horn to keep
Which no one could sound
Unless he were right heir of the lineage,
Which was over the Danes by inheritance.
Before King Arthur came.
Or had fought with the Danes,
Gunter had his castle
On the sea shore, strong and fair.
Again, this last Arthurian reference is inserted purely to back up what is written in HRB:

_Your father was King Gunter,_
_Who was lord over the Danes;
Hodulf slew him by treason,
Whoever had a felon heart._
King Arthur enfeoffed Hodulf,
And gave him Denmark.
_Grim, our father, fled,
To save you he left his land._
_Thy mother died at sea;
For our ship was attacked
By outlaws, who seized us._

Lastly, to show there is no end to the devices which Henry employs, this next section is also found in _L’estoire des Engles_:

_Then was Cirencester besieged._
But by the negligence of the Britons
It was set on fire by sparrows,
Which carried fire and sulphur into the town.
And set light to many houses.
And the besiegers who were outside
Made an assault with great courage.
_Then was this city conquered,_
And Gloucester was taken.
As far as the Severn they conquered all.
They killed all the best Britons.
And from the sea, to which they came,
As far as the Severn, they took to themselves
All the country and the Kingdom,
And they drove out the Britons.

As we have discussed already the burning of the castle at Cirencester and the sparrows is fabricated entirely by Henry after having seen the fort

---

513 Gaimar, Haveloc the Dane, 597
514 Gaimar, _L’estoire des Engles_ 858
burn in 1142 with his brother. Yet he mentions this in the VM: *This wolf will lay siege to Cirencester and by means of sparrows raze its walls and houses to the ground. He will then set off for France with a fleet, but will die by a King’s spear.*

Henry also delights through Wace by giving the *Sparewencestre* etymological rubbish. There is no stopping his muses of invention, but here we have three tracts, Wace, Gaimar and VM…. all written by Henry Blois with this story from personal experience.

Henry has his ‘book at Winchester’ and in his interpolation into Gaimar, he concocts a story of how this marvellous book which contained cross reference material to Geoffrey’s HRB came to be found chained up at Winchester so that his faux history could be ‘authenticated’:

*The sixth Oswald, the seventh Oswiu.*
*But the land did not go thus.*
*So that no man, except by war,*
*Knew how went the land.*
*Nor at that time did anyone know*
*Who belonged to each King.*
*But monks and canons of abbeys,*
*Who wrote the lives of Kings.*
*Each applied to his companion*
*to show the true account*
*Of the Kings; how long each reigned,*
*How he was called; how he died;*
*Who was killed, and who deceased.*
*Who are preserved, and who decayed.*
*And of the bishops also*
*The clerks kept record.*
*Chronicles, it is called, a big book.*
*The English went about collecting it.*
*Now it is thus authenticated;*
*So that at Winchester, in the cathedral,*
*There is the true history of the Kings,*
*And their lives and their memorials.*
*King Alfred had it in his possession,*
*And had it bound with a chain.*
*Who wished to read, might well see it,*
But not remove it from its place.  
The eighth King was named Ceawlin.  
He had the West Saxons with him.  
He was King of one part.  

This book of Chronicles, supposedly written by clerics from around Britain in Alfred’s time, would have made a brilliant read. It was obviously put together on the basis of ASC by Henry Blois and hereby given credence in antiquity by Gaimar. Unfortunately, it is no longer extant, but must have been vastly corroborative to the pseudo-history and Arthuriana found in HRB.

We would be foolish to believe in Walter’s knowledge of an old book which was given to Geoffrey. ‘Geoffrey’s’ work was received and propagated in Wales and much of the phony corroborative evidence for Henry Blois’ concoction of HRB, (like Geoffrey’s date of death etc.) is established by interpolations in the Book of Llandaff after Geoffrey’s supposed death.

Ironically, it is suggested by modern scholars that Caradoc is suspected of helping substantiate parts of Geoffrey’s HRB in the Book of Llandaff, because they think he was a contemporary being duped by the colophon in HRB.  Henry Blois obviously had Welsh monks known to him in monastic houses. ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB would have to be the source of chivalric Arthuriana in Wales rather than any Welsh warlord Arthurian tradition. Henry puts the final icing on the cake regarding ‘Geoffrey’s’ and Walter’s relationship, so that every investigator to date has believed Henry’s ruse.

In the Welsh history known as Tysilio’s Chronicle, (identified ridiculously by Flinders Petrie as the source used by Geoffrey of Monmouth), Henry Blois has a script written in Welsh which pretends to be written by Saint Tysilio, a Welsh bishop who died 640. At the end of the chronicle Walter Archdeacon of Oxford supposedly writes: I, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, translated this book from the Welsh into Latin, and in my old age have again translated it from the Latin into Welsh.

The very concept is ludicrous.... of a man translating from Welsh into Latin and then carrying out the same exercise in reverse. There would be no point. As a fabrication, what Henry is establishing here is that Walter’s
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book was first written in Welsh, (which of course we are led to believe or understand to be the ancient Briton language).... and therefore, could be the book from which ‘Geoffrey’ is supposedly translating. Through this ruse we are made to believe that ‘Geoffrey’ did have an ancient book to translate from, since anecdotal HRB material is found in the chronicle. Regardless of the futile act that Walter is supposedly carrying out in old age, his name is now connected to the Vulgate Version of HRB and corroborated from an exterior source; just as Henry portrays through Gaimar’s epilogue. The illusion has remained for nearly 900 years.
Chapter 22

Caradoc of Llancarfan

Since the name Ineswitrin suddenly appears as an afterthought in Caradoc’s Life of Gildas, it is obviously bound up with substantiating the 601 charter and the business of obtaining metropolitan status and countering Osbern’s false statement. One would think it un-necessary of William of Malmesbury to dismiss Caradoc’s work concerning his kidnap of Guinevere episode, by referring to Arthur’s renown as idle tales of the Britons; especially, if Caradoc and William really were contemporaneous at Glastonbury (as the colophon in Vulgate HRB implies).

Is it strange that William of Malmesbury does not mention Caradoc.... if he really had been a contemporary at Glastonbury and was writing a flatulent recast of his own life of St Cadoc? Caradoc was never at Glastonbury and was certainly dead when Henry Blois came across his chronicle and his Life of St Cadoc while in Wales in 1136. Henry Blois based his own Life of Gildas on Caradoc’s genuine Life of St Cadoc and makes it appear as if Caradoc has taken up the mantle of continuing ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB by writing the Brut y Tywysogion.

This supposed contemporaneity is in fact carried out retro-actively by back dating HRB (from 1155). So, why is Caradoc singled out so favourably in the Colophon? The reason is that he is not in reality contemporaneous and we are being led to believe he is. The subtle point of this is that we must remember the colophon is being written c.1155-58 and Henry Blois
ostensibly demonstrates that the author of HRB (i.e. himself) could not be impersonating a dead Caradoc by producing corroborative evidence of Arthur at Glastonbury found in the *Life of Gildas*. We are led to believe Caradoc is supposedly alive in 1143 when William of Malmesbury was still alive. Also, we should remember Henry has no axe to grind with Caradoc.... he merely impersonates him as author of *Life of Gildas*. Contrarily, Henry Blois (as we have covered) has been slighted by both Malmesbury and Huntingdon in their outputs and so with an air of importance he dismisses their authority.

Of the lives of Dunstan written prior to William’s own VSD I and VSD II which include material from author B’s edition of the life of Dunstan, Adelard’s, Osbern’s and Eadmer’s and in William’s other saint’s lives, and in GP..... there is no mention of Ineswitrin. An odd occurrence if it really were the old name for Glastonbury. The name featured no-where else in previous hagiographic accounts.

So, we can take it as a fact that Ineswitrin was not the old name for Glastonbury. We can also accept it as a truth that its name was lost in time like the old language that William so detested. More important and the very reason for this present investigation is the question of what was deposited on the island of Ineswitrin in a bygone age. If the bodies in the cave on Burgh Island are found to be the relics of Jesus and Joseph, it will rock the foundation and destroy the Catholic Church.

If Caradoc’s brief little volume of the *Life of Gildas* existed while both William and Caradoc were supposedly contemporary at Glastonbury, William of Malmesbury would have mentioned Ineswitrin (excepting the 601charter) or referred to Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas*.... but, William had left Glastonbury to attempt receiving some form of recompense for his endeavours c.1134 by presenting his DA to Henry at Winchester. All that ostensibly exists (regarding what we are supposed to think was William’s view of Gildas at Glastonbury) is the interpolation in GR3 (version B) and DA, regarding Gildas’ stay at Glastonbury.

This is a direct indication that the 601 charter and Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* are intricately linked and were utilised in the 1144 gambit for metropolitan.... where the 601 charter was the main physical evidence of the proof of antiquity for the abbey at Glastonbury and HRB’s professions of longevity for Winchester. The 601 charter would only withstand scrutiny as long as it could be shown that the name Ineswitrin applied to Glastonbury.
The St Patrick charter which has both Ineswitrin (and Avalon mentioned in the postscript in DA), was employed latterly in 1149 and employs the further embellishments stated in that charter. The postscript to the St Patrick Charter mentioning Avalon in DA is part of Henry’s second (post 1158) agenda.

It is through Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* that Henry Blois convinces us that William of Malmesbury’s 601 charter concerning Ineswitrin was the previous name for Glastonbury and he also re-iterates this same position as he employs the St Patrick charter in his second attempt at gaining Metropolitan status in 1149. William, (except in Henry’s interpolations in DA and through Henry’s authorship of *Life of Gildas*), does not in any way infer that Ineswitrin is synonymous with Glastonbury. William of Malmesbury is merely including the 601 Charter in GR3 along with a few other up-dates which we shall cover shortly. If Henry Blois had not written the final paragraph in the *Life of Gildas* establishing Ineswitrin as the old name for Glastonbury; the charter would be referring to an estate of five *cassates* existing on an island somewhere unknown (which in reality it does).

It was more important to establish Glastonbury as synonymous with the Ineswitrin mentioned in the 601 charter for credibility’s sake…. as the physical evidence of the antiquated charter itself was unchangeable. The 601 charter was to be handed to papal authorities in evidence which was to help Henry acquire Metropolitan status for Winchester, but by consequence the whole of south west England (including Glastonbury). It is the charter itself which comprises a substantial part of Henry Blois’ case in Rome and the first question would be concerning the 601 charter’s authenticity…. where is Ineswitrin?

If, in any way, the *Matter of Britain* was accountable to a ‘fortuitous set of convergent factors’ (as Lagorio ludicrously proposes) they are these: Firstly, that Henry Blois was much younger than Theobald and Stephen (his brothers) and therefore was a Grandee in England for a considerable time through his family connections after they had died. Secondly his appointment to Glastonbury and Winchester was only through these family connections. Thirdly it was his comfort at court and his knowledge of how history records only Kings and Queens which allowed him to commence the *pseudo-history* as a fabricated history (which was in fact the precursor of
the *Primary Historia* found at Bec which had had the Arthuriana added onto it).

It was Henry’s intricate knowledge of court affairs and the anarchy which gave Merlin his insight in the prophecies and to know the intricate details of his family’s forebears. Who else would take the liberty to invent such a fraudulent edifice? Lastly, the most fortuitous circumstance was that Melkin’s prophecy existed at Glastonbury where Henry Blois had started his authorial career in the composition of the pseudo-history; the Melkin prophecy acted as a template for his propaganda concerning Joseph.... and the legend of the Grail spread abroad on the continent under the guise of Master Blehis.

However, once Henry had used Melkin’s prophecy as inspiration conjuring up the name of the mythical island where Arthur was last seen, it became part of a future agenda for Henry to convince us that Avalon was Glastonbury and this was done in DA.... in Henry’s third redaction of DA after 1158. It was also achieved (futuristically) by what was maintained in the colophon to Perlesvaus and would be confirmed when Arthur was disinterred and the leaden cross found (because it was Henry Blois who had manufactured the gravesite). By that time, the translocation of Avalon had already been surreptitiously worked toward. Evidence of this can be seen as early as 1155-58 in VM. The island of apples would be at Glastonbury and so was the *Isle de Voirre* in its connotation connection it to the *Glas of Glastonbury*. One can speculate that William’s original DA was a monograph manuscript which had pages added to it.

Scott is basically correct in that the first 34 chapters of DA are not William’s work. It would not seem stupid to speculate that folios were adeptly forged which matched William’s text and style and inserted at the beginning of the extant account of DA where William commences his proof of antiquity at 601 AD.

Therefore, the body of William’s work has remained relatively untouched in the latter half of DA.... This becomes apparent in that Henry’s probable format (following William’s original) is still held in our current DA where Henry’s last consolidating additions concerning Joseph are at the beginning.... inserted into the monograph copy (and subsequent to his own previous interpolations).

Both Gaimar’s epilogue and Wace’s *Roman de Brut* were written by Henry Blois. However, Wace says that Arthur was mortally wounded but
the Briton’s believe him still living in Avalon and destined to return from
there. This development is Henry Blois’ alignment with the ‘Briton Hope’
posited in EAW by Huntingdon’s précis of the *Primary Historia* and a
sentiment which prevailed amongst the population with a Celtic heritage....
and latterly amongst the integrated Saxons who had suffered similar defeat
from the Normans. The ‘Briton Hope’ was later developed by Henry to
include an Island location called Avalon from which Arthur would return.
Realistically the hope of a return was better accepted if the location where
Arthur was taken (when wounded) was unknown. The mystical quality of a
return seems more believable if Arthur was in some kind of otherworld...
where he exists until the return.

We have discussed already the variation in storyline and the unlikely
omission by Huntingdon to mention Avalon in his précis which constitutes
EAW. If it had been originally mentioned as part of the storyline in the
*Primary Historia*, Huntingdon would have commented on it while
mentioning the hope of the Britons/Bretons with which he concludes EAW.

The *Primary Historia*, as we have seen, was developed into the First
Variant. We can deduce then the time at which the Island of Avalon became
part of Henry’s inspiration. It was between the discovery at Bec of the
*Primary Historia* in 1139 and the arrival of the First Variant in 1144. First
Variant HRB, as I have covered, was composed for a specifically Roman
ecclesiastical audience to incidentally augment the historical proofs
of Winchester and Glastonbury’s antiquity in the case for Henry Blois’
metropolitan status with pope Lucius.

Henry Blois knew of Caradoc’s *Brut y Tywysogion* and ends his HRB
where Caradoc starts his.... in the era of Cadwallader and Pope Sergius, who
was Pope from 15 December 687 to his death in 701.

The impersonation of Caradoc of Lancarfan was chosen by Henry Blois
because (contrary to the current understanding of modern scholarship) the
body of *Brut y Tywysogion* was written by Caradoc prior to the *Primary
Historia*. Let me make this perfectly clear: Caradoc was dead long before the
*Life of Gildas* was written c.1140.

The *Brut y Tywysogion* chronicle commences A.D. 680. It does not give
the events under each year, but under each decade as 690, 700, 710 etc. and
registers a series of occurrences without comment until six or seven years
prior to 1100. This historical section must obviously have been taken from
another source by Caradoc or is his own compendium of events. Just prior
to 1100 in the tract, one can witness Caradoc takes over in his own narrative in an era from his own experience and memory.

About 1100 AD, the *Brut y Tywysogion* commences the use of the phrase "Y vlywydyn rac wyneb," (the ensuing year,) before each year, under which events are recorded, until the next decade, successively.... and the narrative is carried on in a uniform style to the year 1120.

Now, the editors of the History and Antiquities of Saint David's, referring to *Nova Legenda Angliae*, fol. iv, as their authority, place the death of Caradog in 1124. This may be explained logically in reality by the death of Caradoc at that time. (We know ‘Geoffrey’s’ contemporaneity is a sham).

Also, at this period, again, a remarkable alteration is very evident; in that, the narrative of the events of the twenty years between 1100 and 1120 occupies a space double to that devoted to the history of the period which elapsed between 1120 and 1164 (Henry died 1171). So it is not unfounded to assume that this is the period naturally expanded upon by Caradoc in his own time while writing. But, there is also something else which might indicate that Caradoc actually died in 1129.

After continuing the history recorded in the *Brut y Tywysogion* we come to a point where the manuscript weirdly records itself as having nothing to record in 1130: *Four years after that, that is to say, one thousand one hundred and thirty was the year of Christ, when there were four successive years without any story to be found, that could be preserved in memory.*

This in itself is already strange in that, a chronicle written by someone supposedly alive says nothing happened.... quite ridiculous for a chronicler to make such a statement. if someone is taking over a chronicle at a point four years after the previous author died and trying to continue the same format he would have to be aware of what transpired. So, from 1130 to 1134 the world stands still in Wales. Following this we enter into a history about the struggles of the Welsh with Stephen and under the year 1134: *And the ensuing year, Henry, son of William the Bastard, King of England and Wales, and of all the island besides, died in Normandy, on the third day of the month of December. And after him his nephew, Stephen of Blois, took the crown of the Kingdom by force, and bravely brought all the South of England under his sway.*

Now, if the author who has picked up Caradoc’s *Brut y Tywysogion* refers to Stephen as brave, this is strange from a Welsh point of view. There is
nothing to say that a Welsh speaking continuator continued the journal from this point onward.

My suggestion is that Caradoc’s death coincided with the period where there was nothing to report before the next author takes up the continuation. I am suggesting that Caradoc died c.1129 and Henry Blois used his name to write the propagandist polemic in the Brut y Tywysogion and the life of Gildas. Life of Gildas initially was an innocuous work which put Gildas at Glastonbury with King Arthur, but essentially was a work designed to add credence to the antiquity of Glastonbury abbey before the Metropolitan issue arose in Henry being snubbed by his brother in appointing Theobald of Bec as Archbishop.

Many commentators drawn into Henry Blois’ clever devise of backdating Vulgate HRB, assume Caradoc took up the mantle passed to him by ‘Geoffrey’ after completion of HRB. It is made plain in the colophon that Caradoc is supposedly ‘contemporary’ with ‘Geoffrey’. Henry imposters Caradoc’s name... simply because Caradoc had written Brut y Tywysogion. If Caradoc had not written Brut y Tywysogion, and Geoffrey had not picked it up in Wales there would be no point or grounds for impersonating him when producing the polemic provided in Life of Gildas.

There would be little point in carrying out the charade in the colophon which portrays Caradoc as a continuator of HRB if ‘Geoffrey’ did not already know there was a continuation from the date that Caradoc starts his account. That is the whole point of ‘Geoffrey’ supposedly ‘supplying the materials’ for the continuation so that it appears so.

Is Caradoc really supposed to have the book which informs him more perfectly than the other two historians and enables his continuation? The effect of the use of Caradoc’s name in the Colophon was twofold. Firstly, a real chronicler with an already composed work was made to appear to have carried out Geoffrey’s wishes. Secondly this work also added credence to the other volume (the Life of Gildas) into which Henry Blois impostures Caradoc’s name who had composed Life Of Cadoc. Both Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury and of course Caradoc were dead at the time this colophon was written. The reason for inclusion of their names
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516 Henry (as ‘Geoffrey’) constructs the HRB to end where Caradoc’s Brut begins. Caradoc may have died as early as 1126-29 when Henry was at Glastonbury. The fact that he is hailed as contemporary to ‘Geoffrey’ in the Colophon is irrelevant… as this could only have been written after 1155 (defined by the updated prophecies in the Vulgate version).
was to put Caradoc on an equal footing being accounted as a comparative historian. This in effect contributed more authority to the *Life of Gildas* which Henry had himself produced to highlight the prominence of Glastonbury. By seeming to have granted permission to a named continuator in the person of Caradoc.... Henry also adds to ‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed authority as a historian.

The fact that ‘Geoffrey’ calls Caradoc his contemporary is purely a device which implies Caradoc is alive. The obvious intention of this was to back date the Vulgate version of the HRB from 1155 by twenty years or so.... to when William of Mamesbury was alive. Henry’s illusion gave the appearance that, in the interim, the *Brut y Tywysogion* had been written.

We covered above, at the end of the chronicle called *Brut Tysilio* the following statement: *I, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, translated this Book from Welsh into Latin, and in my old age I translated it a second time from Latin into Welsh...*

Henry Blois’ ploy is more evident in trying to provide a personal detail of contact between himself (Geoffrey) and Caradoc in his ongoing promotion and is witnessed in the two copies, which are printed in the Myvyrian Archaiology, vol. ii:

*The princes who were afterwards successively over Wales, I committed to Caradog of Llancarvan; he was, my contemporary, and to him I left materials for writing that book. From henceforward the Kings of the English and their successors I committed to William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntington, to write about, but they were to leave the Welsh alone; for they do not possess that Welsh book, which Walter, archdeacon of Oxford, translated from Latin into Welsh; and he narrated truly and fully from the history of the aforesaid Welshmen’.*

In other words, we are led to believe ‘Geoffrey’ provides the materials to Caradoc. It is plain common sense that once Henry Blois’ fraud is unveiled that there is no ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’. No-one but Henry Blois would make such a statement, (i.e. no later continuator or interpolator), as there is simply no advantage, except in showing that Caradoc is alive. Therefore, Henry has not only backdated the HRB, but has us unequivocally believe that Caradoc is the continuator of HRB as Geoffrey is supposedly supplying the materials to carry out the composition. We even have the composition!!
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We are left with a ridiculous anachronism if scholarship’s views are adhered to. Especially, if we consider the old book from which ‘Geoffrey’ was supposedly translating is non-existent. If Caradoc really was the continuator, how is the *Brut* so different in format from what we know he actually wrote? Why does the difference in chronology start when others attest he died at that time? We must assume Caradoc dies c.1129.

‘Geoffrey’ really does not do dates. ‘Geoffrey’ just distributes throughout his work synchronicities with other contemporaneous events to give the appearance of truth and the seeming appearance of sound chronology. The only reason that Walter’s book is ever posited is because ‘people’, after 1155, were starting to wonder who *Galfridus Arthur* or *Geoffrey of Monmouth* was…. and how he was able to give such specific information, of which other ancient chroniclers were unaware. An authority was invented in the form of a fictitious book *ex Brittanica* to prevent accusation to the author ‘Geoffrey’ of invention.

What was initially aimed at being an informative and interesting history had caused a stir, but now in 1155 with the malicious prophecies (which had recently come to light), people were asking questions. The accusation was that HRB was termed fabulous or pseudo-historical. To counter this accusation and to avoid the blame of inventing a book of lies (which essentially HRB is)…. Walter’s book was the source, and any-one who lacked it and professed to be a historian, was ill-informed without the book. Now we see why Gaimar’s epilogue becomes an important part of Henry Blois’ empirical edifice of lies and misdirection. The simple fact is that Geoffrey brought his epic to a close at Calwallader because there already was a Welsh history written from that date until 1129 (compiled by Caradoc). Henry Blois is the continuator who adds the fiction about ‘Geoffrey’s’ details.

Now, if we accept the First Variant was not widely circulated and there were even fewer copies of the *Primary Historia* which preceded it…. it would be hugely advantageous if the author ‘Galfridus’ becomes deceased. At this time, the much copied and propagated Vulgate (by its newly titled author Geoffrey of Monmouth) who had become the respectable Bishop of Asaph retrospectively, is disseminated while Henry Blois is at Clugny. So that the *Historia* appeared to have existed in its present Vulgate form (i.e. with the updated prophecies) since the time it was first discovered…. past
grandee’s such as Robert of Gloucester, King Stephen and bishop Alexander were shown to have been readers and even patrons of the history.

To secure its place as a genuine history, Robert of Torigni was told in 1155 that it was written by a (now dead) Geoffrey of Monmouth who had subsequently become a bishop of Asaph (I presume on an encounter with Robert in Mont St Michel)…. as we must not forget it was Robert who first alerted Huntingdon to the Primary Historia at Bec when he was a monk there. Henry Blois might have passed comment: ‘Oh you know that history written by that author Galfridus Arturus, that you showed Huntingdon back in 39…. well you know he became bishop of Asaph……’

The one important point to make about this meeting is that at this stage Henry Blois is concerned with making sure that everyone thought that ‘Geoffrey’ had got his information from another source. By doing this the author of HRB is not to be blamed for outright fabrication or seditious material found in the changing prophecies or evolving redactions of Variant HRB. Hence it was Robert of Torigni who innocently informs us that the new bishop Geoffrey Arthur had translated the HRB from ‘British’ into ‘Latin’.

No-one could make a single enquiry to any person referred to in Vulgate HRB. There was no-one to answer any questions…. and Caradoc, who was ‘Geoffrey’s’ appointed continuator, is known to be dead also. Giraldus Cambrensis informs us that Caradoc was buried in the north transept of St. David’s Cathedral, near the altar of St. Stephen. He was canonized by Innocent III c.1161-2 at the insistence of Giraldus wierdly enough; who had Henry Blois as his patron. Caradoc the saint…. who would disbelieve Caradoc’s work?!!!

The effect is to give the appearance that in 1155, both Vulgate HRB and its updated prophecies were extant 20 years ago. Also the Arthurian and Gildas connection with Glastonbury posited in Life of Gildas by Caradoc (Geoffrey’s continuator), should not be doubted and nor should ‘Geoffrey’s’ word concerning Walter’s book. Walter, supposedly in his own words, says he has translated the same. It is a clever illusion which could only be carried out by one man, when we consider the manufactured history of personas by Henry.

However, Henry Blois’ stroke of genius is that through the colophon in HRB, we are made to believe there is going to be a future continuation set down in writing by Caradoc. Because such a chronological continuation
exists, it follows that scholars are led to believe Caradoc dutifully accepts ‘Geoffrey’s’ invitation....especially, as we are told it is ‘Geoffrey’ who is supplying the materials. But, as we saw above, it is written in the past tense: he was, my contemporary and to him I left materials for writing that book. Time has apparently moved on. Whereas I hand over in the matter of writing unto Karadoc of Lancarvan, my contemporary... which once was a future exercise of continuation of a completed composition (i.e. HRB).... is now openly exposed as it transpired in reality. However, we are still made to believe that Caradoc is the continuator, following on from HRB.

It is quite preposterous that Caradoc’s chronicle could be considered a continuation from the same book ‘Geoffrey’ supposedly used. The Book of Hergest has a similar colophon, but Henry’s vague description of ex Britannicus is now understood as Walter’s book having originated from Brittany: The Kings that were from that time forward in Wales, I shall commit to Caradog of Llancarvan, my fellow student, to write about; and the Kings of the English to William Malmesbury and Henry Huntington. I shall desire them to be silent about the Kings of the Britons, since they do not possess this Breton Book, which Walter, archdeacon of Oxford, translated from Breton into Welsh, which is truly a collection of their histories, in honour of the said princes.

Now, if the Vulgate version resembled the copy found at Bec, what happened to Avalon, Merlin, and Archflamens in the Bec copy? What was the point in producing the First Variant version in a less expanded form than an already written Vulgate, as is proposed by modern scholars? It is a madness to think HRB was disseminated in its Vulgate form before 1139. Why has Alfred of Beverley not mentioned Caradoc, Walter or any of the dedicatees?

‘Amazed’ is Huntingdon at Galfridus Artur’s history, but as a historian (or even as one possessed of common sense), the first thing Huntingdon would do is to locate Walter’s book, if it were possible....and ask Alexander for the ‘Original’ of the Merlin prophecies. But, as discussed, the Prophecies or the mention of Merlin were definitively not part of the Primary Historia which Huntingdon witnessed at Bec. The ‘good book’ as the source of the later Vulgate HRB, had not yet been employed. If any of the dedicatees names had appeared or Walter’s book had been mentioned in the Bec copy which Huntingdon saw, surely one of them would be mentioned even in a synopsis. But no!
Not even Merlin warrants a mention by Huntingdon and he is mentioned many times in Vulgate and is integral to the arrival of Stonehenge. Yet Huntingdon, the first historian to mention and to name Stonehenge (before ‘Geoffrey’) gives another account of Stonehenge in his chronicle without Merlin being mentioned. Are we supposedly to accept the viewpoint of Modern scholars that EAW omits mention of Merlin because of a proclivity of Huntingdon’s. He would have related the story found in Vulgate if it indeed existed in the Primary Historia.

This is the genius of backdating and the very reason why c.1170 we hear the first criticism of ‘Geoffrey’ from Newburgh and later from Gerald 30-40 years after the Vulgate’s publication. It is only in Henry II’s era that the Vulgate HRB version starts to become popular and propagate. We know that the chronology of HRB is based upon confusion and conflation, but Malmesbury and Huntingdon are told to leave well alone for they do not possess that Welsh book, which Walter, archdeacon of Oxford, translated from Latin into Welsh; and he narrated truly and fully from the history of the aforesaid Welshmen’. But, how is it that if it is a Welsh book from which Geoffrey is supposedly translating (as he avers).... do we then have the same book translated back into Welsh by Walter? What would be the point if it already existed in Welsh? Who is writing this false testimony and for what reason?

We know Caradoc of Llancarfan also wrote the second version of the Life of Saint Cadog in which Arthur also figures in a subsidiary role and which Henry employs as a template for his composition of the Life of Gildas. Caradoc obviously wrote in Latin otherwise Henry Blois would not have understood his history and decided to end his Primary Historia at that point; and we know the Brut y Tywysogion has survived from an original Latin version, which has not itself survived. One could assume that Henry Blois had a Welsh monk translate them both from Latin into Welsh (with additions) but it is just not important to our study considering the salad that already exists.

Archdeacon Walter never had anything to do with or ever possessed any book from Wales or Brittany, or translated any ancient book proposed as the source book for HRB. Archdeacon Walter’s sole claim to fame was that, like Ralf of Monmouth, his name was affixed as a witness on the charters which already existed at Oxford when Henry Blois attended a meeting there in (late 1153) or 1154 (13 of January) when Duke Henry met.
King Stephen. Shortly before, in late 1153, *Gafridus episcopus sancti Asaphi* had supposedly signed on the Winchester treaty. The name Geoffrey of Monmouth had not been envisaged before January 1154. The name Ralf of Monmouth, Geoffrey’s supposed compatriot on the said charters, had not yet been associated with Gafridus, but now became the reason for ‘Geoffrey’s provenance from Monmouth. Do not forget Alfred of Beverley c.1150 does not refer to a Geoffrey of Monmouth (not once) but to Britannicus. He avoids using the obvious pseudonym of *Gafridus Artur*.

Henry had the HRB translated into Welsh and then had the history attached as if Caradoc had obeyed Geoffrey’s wish. All the Welsh manuscripts have ‘Geoffrey’ as bishop of Llandaff, so it is not out of character for Henry to confuse us further. It seems apt that the *Peniarth Brut* gives the date of ‘Geoffrey’s’ death as 1154 as he had signed the Treaty of Winchester just before Christmas in 1153…. along with his puppeteer Henry Blois as the Bishop of Winchester.

It really makes no difference if ‘Geoffrey’ supposedly died in 1155, but what this shows is that it was time to kill off Geoffrey of Monmouth soon after his new appellation was envisaged and evidence of his having actually lived could be verified by his scribble on the charters. So, at the very same time his new title of Geoffrey of Monmouth was being added to Vulgate HRB, along with the other dedicatees, Henry consigns ‘Geoffrey’ to death and lets Robert of Torigni know of Geoffrey’s elevation to the Bishop of Asaph when he lands at Mont St Michel.\(^{518}\) Once Geoffrey is consigned to death anyone trying to find him gives up and alleviates pressure on Henry Blois. Galfridus Arthur, the charter signer who became bishop in waiting and then a signatory on the treaty of Winchester, alas had died before he received his title of provenance from Monmouth; and he had died at the very period his work was finally published in the Vulgate form when the seditious prophecies were also published.

As I have maintained throughout, Caradoc is impersonated as the author of the *Life of Gildas*. He was however, the author of the second *Life of St Cadoc* and it is obvious that Henry Blois has modelled his entirely fictitious *Life of Gildas* by basing it on Caradoc’s genuine *Life of St Cadoc*. The *Life of

\(^{518}\)Robert of Torigni’s quote under the year 1152 in the Bern MS is that: ‘*Geoffrey Arthur, who had translated the History of the Kings of the Britons out of the British into Latin, is made Bishop of St. Asaph in North Wales*’. Does it not seem odd that Walter does the same thing and then back into Welsh?
St Cadoc was originally written by Lifricus, son of Bishop Herwald of Llandaff and himself Archdeacon of Glamorgan and Master of St. Cadog of Llancarfan. Lifricus of Llancarfan (probably before 1086) had written his concoction which overtly pertains to land rights. After the Norman incursion, Llancarfan suffered greatly and land was being usurped by Norman overlords. But Lifric concocted a precedent which he maintains must remain inviolable: according to the agreement which had been previously made with Maelgon and Arthur....

We can now see the reasons Caradoc was employed as a persona through whom Henry propagates his web of lies. Firstly, Caradoc is dead. Secondly, he has already written a saint’s life which includes anecdotes on Arthur. Thirdly, because Caradoc has already written his part of Brut y Tywysogion, he is now recommended as the reliable witness to continue the history of the Kings of Britain by the same person farcically appealing to him as a continuator who possessed the fictitious source book and to whom ‘Geoffrey’ was supplying the materials.

In Caradoc of Llancarfan’s genuine account of the Life of St. Cadoc we hear that St. Cadoc:

In the days of Lent, Saint Cadoc was accustomed to reside in two islands, Barren and Echni and on Palm Sunday, he came to Nantcarvan, and there remained, performing Paschal service, feeding daily one hundred clergymen... It happened that at another time the blessed Cadoc on a certain day sailed with two of his disciples, namely Barruc and Gwalches from the island of Echni, which is now called Holme, to another island named Barry. When therefore he prosperously landed in the harbour, he asked his said disciples for his Enchiridion, that is his manual book; and they confessed that they, through forgetfulness, lost it in the aforesaid island. Which on hearing, he immediately compelled them to go aboard a ship, and sail back to recover their book, and burning with anger, said, "Go, not to return." Then his disciples, by the command of their master, without delay quickly went aboard a boat, and by sailing, got to the said island. Having obtained the aforesaid volume, they soon in their passage returned to the middle of the sea, and were seen at a distance by the man of God sitting on the top of a hill in Barry, when the boat unexpectedly overturned, and they were drowned. The body of Barruc being cast by the tide on the shore of Barry, was there found, and in that island buried, which from his name is so called to the present time. But
the body of the other, namely Gwalches, was carried by the sea to the island of Echni, and was there buried.’

All of Caradoc’s *Life of Cadoc* is in the same vein as many other hagiographic accounts and as we can see St Cadoc in the account is only thirty miles distant from Glastonbury just across the Severn. It is in *Life of Cadoc* however, where we first meet personalised information concerning Arthur: *three vigorous champions, Arthur with his two knights, to wit, Cai and Bedwyr, were sitting on the top of the aforesaid hill playing with dice.* It is certainly the account from which Henry Blois gets the names to have engraved upon the Archivolt at Modena.

The sole purpose of Henry impersonating Caradoc of Llancarfan and composing the *Life of Gildas* is to establish pertinent facts relative to Glastonbury’s antiquity. It establishes that in the time of Gildas there was already an abbot. Osbern is instantly confuted. St Gildas, because of his contrived connection to Glastonbury is supposedly buried there and this helps the coffers at the abbey; especially when confirmation of Gildas at Glastonbury is intonated in GR (version B ) and then firmly confirmed as buried there in DA.... as a grave was probably appropriately manufactured.

Henry Blois was clever enough to make it appear as if the author of HRB was entirely different to the person who bears witness of Arthur at Glastonbury (and supposedly what William of Malmesbury wrote concerning Arthur in DA). Again, Henry’s skill at the choice of person upon which to make the conflation is witnessed where Gildas is connected to St Cadoc in the *Vita Cadoci*, but in that tract written by Caradoc there is no connection between Gildas and Glastonbury.

Henry Blois, posing as a now dead Caradoc, would have us believe about Gildas that: *He crossed the Gallic Sea and remained studying well in the cities of Gaul for seven years; and at the end of the seventh year he returned, with a huge mass of volumes, to greater Britain. Having heard of the renown of the illustrious stranger, great numbers of scholars from all parts flocked to him. They heard him explaining with the greatest acuteness the science of the seven rules of discipline.*

Undoubtedly, one of these volumes, in Henry’s mind, contained the history from Brutus, but we are stuck with the fact that Gildas did not mention Brutus or Arthur in *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*. If the reader remembers, Taliesin in VM is also returned to Merlin having been
with Gildas. All is totally contrived and really shows that the author of VM is the same as he who connects Arthur to Gildas at Glastonbury!!

Gildas apparently crossed over to Ireland, but we hear:

*St. Gildas was the contemporary of Arthur, the King of the whole of Britain, whom he loved exceedingly, and whom he always desired to obey*.

However the high spirited Arthur kills one of Gildas’ twenty three brothers:

*Gildas, historian of the Britons, who was staying in Ireland directing studies and preaching in the city of Armagh, heard that his brother had been slain by King Arthur....... meanwhile, the most holy Gildas, the venerable historian, came to Britain, bringing with him a very beautiful and sweet-sounding bell, which he vowed to offer as a gift to the Bishop of the Roman Church. He spent the night as a guest honourably entertained by the venerable abbot Cadocus, in Nant Carban. (Henry Blois/Caradoc, Life of Gildas)*

We have a different storyline on the bell that we first heard from Caradoc of Llancarfan as Henry Blois conflates Caradoc’s *Life of St Cadoc* with the present piffle.

In the concocted storyline, Gildas wants to give the bell to the pope but St Cadoc covets it: *The latter pointed out the bell to him, and after pointing to it, handled it; and after handling it wished to buy it at a great price; but its possessor would not sell it. When King Arthur and the chief bishops and abbots of all Britain heard of the arrival of Gildas the Wise, large numbers from among the clergy and people gathered together to reconcile Arthur for the above-mentioned murder. But Gildas, as he had done when he first heard the news of his brother's death, was courteous to his enemy, kissed him as he prayed for forgiveness, and with a most tender heart blessed him as the other kissed in return. When this was done, King Arthur, in grief and tears, accepted penance imposed by the bishops who were present, and led an amended course, as far as he could, until the close of his life.*

The main point of this whole preamble is to connect Gildas and Cadoc by including the bell scenario and an incidental trip to Rome, but now Arthur is firmly woven into the story thus far in connection with Gildas.

At Rome, Gildas revealed to the pope *that the most holy Cadoc, abbot of the church of Nancarvan, had wished to buy the bell* and the pope says he can have it. It is all really mindless babble which is meant to seemingly coincide with Caradoc of Llancarfan’s genuine account of St Cadoc.
So that the reader can witness Henry's ingenuity, I have included the whole of Henry Blois' impersonated concoction of the *Life of Gildas* in appendix 33.

However, back to Gildas: *Being thereby exceedingly distressed, he could not remain there any longer: he left the island, embarked on board a small ship, and, in great grief, put in at Glastonia, at the time when King Melvas was reigning in the summer country. He was received with much welcome by the abbot of Glastonia, and taught the brethren and the scattered people, sowing the precious seed of heavenly doctrine. It was there that he wrote the history of the Kings of Britain.* Glastonia, that is, the glassy city, which took its name from glass, is a city that had its name originally in the British tongue. It was besieged by the tyrant Arthur with a countless multitude on account of his wife Gwenhwyfar, whom the aforesaid wicked King had violated and carried off, and brought there for protection, owing to the asylum afforded by the invulnerable position due to the fortifications of thickets of reed, river, and marsh. The rebellious King had searched for the queen throughout the course of one year, and at last heard that she remained there. Thereupon he roused the armies of the whole of Cornubia and Dibneria; war was prepared between the enemies.

When he saw this, the abbot of Glastonia, attended by the clergy and Gildas the Wise, stepped in between the contending armies, and in a peaceable manner advised his King, Melvas, to restore the ravished lady. Accordingly, she who was to be restored, was restored in peace and good will. When these things were done, the two Kings gave the abbot a gift of many domains; and they came to visit the *temple of St. Mary* and to pray, while the abbot confirmed the beloved brotherhood in return for peace they enjoyed and the benefits which they conferred, and were more abundantly about to confer. Then the Kings reconciled, promising reverently to obey the most venerable abbot of Glastonia, and never violate the most sacred place nor even the districts adjoining the chief's seat.

When he had obtained permission from the abbot of Glastonia and his clergy and people, the most devout Gildas desired to live a hermit's life upon the bank of a river close to Glastonia, and he actually accomplished his object. He built a church there in the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity, in which he fasted and prayed assiduously, clad in goat's hair, giving to all an irreproachable example of a good religious life. Holy men used to visit him
from distant parts of Britain, and when advised, returned and cherished with
delight the encouragements and counsels they had heard from him.

He fell sick at last, and was weighed down with illness. He summoned the
abbot of Glastonia to him, and asked him, with great piety, when the end of
his life had come, to cause his body to be borne to the abbey of Glastonia,
which he loved exceedingly. When the abbot promised to observe his requests,
and was grieved at the requests he had heard, and shed copious tears, St.
Gildas, being now very ill, expired, while many were looking at the angelic
brightness around his fragrant body, and angels were attending upon his
soul. After the mournful words of commemoration were over, the very light
body was removed by the brethren into the abbey; and amid very loud wailing
and with the most befitting funeral rites, he was buried in the middle of the
pavement of St. Mary's church; and his soul rested, rests, and will rest, in
heavenly repose. Amen.

Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British
inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin (made
of glass). But after the coming of the English and the expulsion of the Britons,
that is, the Welsh, it received a fresh name, Glastigberi, according to the
formation of the first name, that is English glass, Latin vitrum, and beria a
city; then Glastinberia, that is, the City of Glass.

Caradoc of Nancarban's are the words; Who reads, may he correct; so
wills the author.

In the so called dialogue of Arthur and Gwenhwyfar discussed by Evan
Jones and Mary Williams it cannot be established who in fact say's what.
The fact that Melwas may be in Devon or Arthur is there in Devon in
disguise, as some believe the poem alludes to.... or Gwenhwyfar has seen
one or the other in Devon; it makes no difference:

Gwenhyfar
I have seen a man of moderate size
At Arthur's long table in Devon
Dealing out wine to his friends

Melwas
Gwenhwyrvar of facetious speech
It is woman's nature to banter:
There it is thou didst me see.

The fact that it has Melvas, Arthur, Guinevere, and Devon in this
dialogue is indicative that it is a Blois invention. More importantly, Melvas
says he is Melwas from Ineswitrin (not Avalon), so, it does not take much imagination to deduce who the author is and why Devon is mentioned. It is because of its link to Ineswitrin on the 601 charter. We know that the kidnap episode is an invention in which Melvas and Arthur are at Glastonbury; and we know the fabricator of the *Life of Gildas* which mentions this story is Henry Blois. The one person who is entirely culpable of changing the Devonian island of Ineswitrin into a location at Glastonbury is Henry Blois as we discussed earlier when scrutinising what William had written about the 601 charter. Therefore, even if the sense has now been misunderstood, the original dialogue was undoubtedly composed by Henry and the long table obviously preceded the advent of the round table.

We now have Arthur at Glastonbury and the St. Mary dedication of the old church extended to the time of Gildas and Arthur. We are deluded into thinking the ‘virginem adorandam’ of the Melkin prophecy or the Chapel of ‘our lady’ in Perlesvaus (*the Isle of Avalon, to a chapel of Our Lady*), is synonymous with the ‘Old church’, now referred to as the oratory in an attempt to mirror the words in the Melkin prophecy. Both coincidentally appear to refer to the same place i.e. Glastonbury. In the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas* (we are led to believe) is the explanation of how Ineswitrin becomes synonymous Glastonbury. Ineswitrin is the Devonian Island being misconstrued as Glastonbury by Henry to establish antiquity from the Charter. The 601 charter refers to an island in Devon named after its connection with tin (as we covered earlier). This in reality links to Joseph of Arimathea; to which island Melkin’s geometry locates…. and which Melkin says Jesus (Abbadare) and Joseph are buried upon. Abbadare is the mysterious Grail…. and its connection to Joseph is derived from the prophecy of Melkin.

Through the Monk of Ruys’ account of the *Life of Gildas*, plausibility is set up for the confusion of Gildas’ island being connected to Glastonbury. Neither Caradoc’s account of St. Cadoc, nor the Monk from Ruys’ *Life of Gildas*, mention Glastonbury or put either of the saints there. After concocting the *life of Gildas*, Henry, always taking liberties with the truth thinks: why not have Gildas buried at Glastonbury as well? It is not so much an officine de faux but un homme de mensonges.

Henry was in Wales in 1136. He must have obtained a copy of Caradoc’s Latin versions of the *Vita Cadoci* and the ‘Chronicle of the Princes’ or *Brut y Tywysogion*. The topography learnt on that trip and the inspiration gleaned
from the *Vita Cadoci* about Arthur was put to good use while Henry was acting as vice regent for his brother Stephen in Normandy in the entire year of 1137 and the first half of 1138. Of course this is how the *Primary Historia* was given to Huntingdon by Torigni at Bec the following year.

We witnessed in GS that Stephen chases Baldwin to the Isle of Wight and afterward, Baldwin is exiled and crosses to Normandy. William of Corbeil dies on 21\textsuperscript{st} of November 1136 and Henry Blois becomes Archbishop of Canterbury in waiting. Orderic informs us that in Advent of 1136 Henry Blois went to Normandy and was content to stay there while he sent envoys to search out pope Innocent at Pisa.

We know also from Gervaise that Henry: \textit{was elected metropolitan. But since by cannon law a bishop can only be translated from his own see to another church by the authority of the pope...}\textsuperscript{519} Henry gets way laid and Stephen then joins Henry in Normandy from mid-March until the 28\textsuperscript{th} of November 1137.\textsuperscript{520} Stephen departed from his brother in Normandy and Henry still thought that when he returned to England he would be Archbishop of Canterbury.

It was while Henry was still in Normandy and after Stephen had returned to England that the backstabbing Beaumont twins counselled Stephen to curb Henry's increasing power. Sometime between December 1137 and the start of the siege of Bedford Henry returned to England. Waleran of Meulan, the lay patron of Bec was attempting to put his own man in the second most powerful position in England. Waleran and his twin brother Robert, Earl of Leicester, were Henry's chief rivals for Stephen's favour. Henry looked on them as unreliable toady flatterers. Both were disliked by Henry Blois intensely. Probably not by coincidence, Theobald of Bec travelled to England in 1138 to supervise the monastery of Bec's lands in England; a trip which took place shortly before his selection as the new Archbishop of Canterbury in 1138.

So, just before Christmas in 1136 (after having been in Wales at Kidwelly) Henry crossed the channel and stayed all of 1137 in Normandy on his brother's behalf to quell the Angevin strife in Normandy stirred up by Baldwin and the Empress. It is in Normandy during this period that the (not fully developed) Arthurian legend is spliced onto an already constructed

\textsuperscript{519} Gervaise of Canterbury

\textsuperscript{520} Gesta Stepani. Potter and Davis p.46
faux-Historia which had originally been written for Henry’s uncle and his daughter Matilda, (but subsequently the concocted history had become redundant as his brother had usurped the throne).

We could speculate that Henry stays at Bec abbey in the first half of 1138 where he deposits his Primary Historia under the newly invented nom de plume of ‘Galfridus Artur’. At this stay at Bec, we might speculate that Henry Blois relates to Theobald (still abbot of Bec at that time) what plans he has in store for the English Church once he becomes Archbishop. As I have mentioned before, it was Henry’s intention to set up a state based on Gregorian values with himself head of the church. It seems just too coincidental that Theobald becomes Henry’s replacement and that Theobald did not have something to do with Henry being snubbed by King Stephen for that position. The question is: did Theobald scupper Henry’s plans by relating to Stephen (through Waleran) some confidence or other which Henry had discussed with Theobald in relation to Henry’s future plans? If this is the case, it might explain the coincidence that Theobald was duly rewarded with the Archbishopric.
Chapter 23

Wace and the Roman de Brut

In the composition of the *Roman de Brut*, Henry Blois has employed similar devices to those which we have discussed already by the impersonation of Wace. The stamp of Henry’s authorship is on the *Roman de Brut*. Henry Blois has usurped the persona of Wace; just as he did with Gaimar, ‘Geoffrey’, Caradoc, William of Malmesbury etc. The genuine writer of the *Roman de Rou* and the hagiographic accounts of Lives of *Sainte Marguerite*, *St Nicholas* and the *Conception de notre Dame* were written by a genuine person called Wace.

It is commonly accepted by modern scholarship that the reason why *L’estoire des Bretons*, (purportedly written by *Geffrei Gaimar*), has been overshadowed, is because of the superiority of Wace’s poetry, as Gaimar’s *L’estoire des Bretons* was supposedly of similar material. This, we are lead to believe, is because ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB, from which the versified *Roman de Brut* is derived, is thought to stem from the same source book as the mythical *L’estoire des Bretons*. It is rationalised by modern scholars as adequate explanation as to why *L’estoire des Bretons* is no longer extant. The presumption is that *L’estoire des Bretons* was supposedly derived also from the ‘good book of Oxford’. This conclusion is deduced from the fact that there is no part of ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo history (except the few anecdotal interpolations) in Gaimar’s *l’Estoire des Engles* and yet the epilogue refers to Walter’s book just like the HRB does. Therefore *L’estoire des Bretons* is assumed to have contained much of ‘Geoffrey’s’ material. Until scholars wake up and realise that was the point of composing the Gaimar’s epilogue, I expect this rationalisation will remain intact; and Gaimar’s information regarding the ‘good book’ will be believed along with the erroneous
assumption that the fully developed Vulgate version of HRB existed in 1138 at Bec.

As I have noted, in all four manuscripts of Gaimar’s l’Estoire des Engles, Wace’s Roman de Brut has supposedly taken the place (or substituted) L’estoire des Bretons’ supposedly written by Gaimar as stated in the interpolated/added epilogue in Gaimar’s l’Estoire des Engles. It is rather the case that there was never any L’estoire des Bretons composed and Henry’s work of Roman de Brut has been added as a complimentary work. As I have made plain, the point of Henry Blois using Gaimar’s work was to implant the ‘epilogue’ and a few corroborative Arthurian interpolations in l’Estoire des Engles.

Now, if ‘Geoffrey’s’ Historia was already versified by Henry Blois (as we know it was because Roman de Brut commences mirroring the First Variant and therefore was commenced before 1155), in reality, there would be little to be gained by composing another version in French vernacular i.e. Gaimar’s Brut. Especially if Gaimar had written it much earlier as we are led to believe. We are led to believe the Roman de Brut by Wace and the L’estoire des Bretons by Gaimar were both derived from the same ancient source book (one as a versified account of Geoffrey’s work .... the other supposedly having been obtained by Gaimar).

We know, Henry Blois started his versification (supposedly written by Wace) at an early stage (i.e. around the time Alfred of Beverley is recycling ‘Geoffrey’s’ work c.1150).... as he is using the First Variant version as the template at the beginning of the Roman de Brut. Not forgetting that the latter half of the Roman de Brut follows the Vulgate version of HRB which was only completed in 1154-5 (or at least that is when the updated Merlin prophecies which included the ‘Sixth in Ireland’ were added).

It seems highly unlikely that all four of the present manuscripts containing Gaimar’s work (from different institutions) would have expunged L’estoire des Bretons in favour of Wace’s Roman de Brut in such a synchronised fashion. This specific conundrum can only reasonably be solved if the Gaimar MSS all derived from one exemplar. If so, is it not more likely that the substitution was purposeful?.... accepting that no L’estoire des Bretons has ever turned up and the epilogue of the l’Estoire des Engles makes us believe that Gaimar’s other work started with Brutus. It is far more plausible if a versifier of the Historia (like ‘Wace’) composed his work after the ‘original’ author’s death (i.e.’Geoffrey’); and this is why Henry Blois
has ostensibly given us the date of composure for Wace’s work where he concludes with a date of completion in the year 1155.\textsuperscript{521} However, Wace is not the author of the \textit{Roman de Brut}, but he is in reality the author of the \textit{Roman de Rou}. It should be noted that if the \textit{Roman de Brut} was genuinely completed in 1155, it must have been started in Stephen’s reign and indicates Henry’s intention to propagate his \textit{Historia} on the continent before his brother’s death.

Henry Blois, again, as in his impersonation of the invented persona of ‘Geoffrey’, provides us with the impression of a poet looking for wealthy patronage; but this time it is genuine in the guise of Wace. Wace really was a struggling versifier and translator into vernacular of previous Latin chronicles: \textit{I address myself to rich people who possess revenues and silver, since for them books are made and good words are composed and well set forth.}\textsuperscript{522}

In reality events concerning Wace are very different from that perceived by modern scholarship. What we know of Wace is derived from his \textit{Roman de Rou} (i.e. Rollo), where he says: \textit{“If anybody asks who said this, who put this history into the Romance language, I say and I will say to him that I am Wace of the isle of Jersey, which lies in the sea, toward the west, and is a part of the fief of Normandy. In the isle of Jersey I was born, and to Caen I was taken as a little lad; there I was put at the study of letters; afterward I studied long in France. When I came back from France, I dwelt long at Caen. I busied myself with making books in Romance; many of them I wrote and many of them I made.”}

One supposes by Wace’s comments in the \textit{Roman de Rou} that he was a \textit{clerc lisant} before 1135.\textsuperscript{523} In time, presumably his writings won for him preferment to the position of canon at Bayeux from Henry II. It is an odd coincidence that Rouen (the founder is Rou) and Caen (where Henry’s Grandfather and Grandmother were buried, and where the treasury of the Ducal house of Normandy was situated) are not mentioned by Henry Blois when writing as Geoffrey and passed over in preferment in favour of Bayeaux. Bayeaux is given the special privilege of being the city of the Dux of Normandy by ‘Geoffrey’ but this is totally against the obviously known facts.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[521] Roman de Rou 14865-6
\item[522] Roman de Rou.
\item[523] Roman de Rou. I saw and Knew three King Henry’s; in their time I was clerk lisant.
\end{footnotes}
Just as the entire *Historia* never once mentions Glastonbury it is Henry’s ploy not to seem connected or be seen to promote anything which links his family relationships to his authorship. It is not by coincidence that Henry Blois chose Wace as the person who was to have written the *Roman de Brut*. It is obvious from what is portrayed in the *Roman de Rou* that the real Wace has read the *Historia* and the prophecies. We can discount the reference in the *Roman de Brut* to ‘Wace’s’ unwillingness to translate them. That Wace has genuinely read the *Historia* is made clear from the decasyllabic appendix (in Holden’s edition) which used to preface Holden’s part II until Henry Blois interpolated the *Roman de Rou* by adding the current preamble known as the *Chronique Ascendante*. As we shall cover shortly Henry Blois also interpolated and reconstructed the introduction to part III of the *Roman de Rou* also.

Wace was approximately the same age as Henry Blois. He received a prebend at Bayeux by King Henry II which he refers to twice. As to Wace’s existence, we have four documents which contain reference to him. One is a charter which Bishop Henry II of Bayeaux (1165) signs and Wace is one of the witnesses as *Magister Wascius*. Another is an agreement c.1169 between the bishop of Bayeux and abbot Gilbert of Troarn where Wace is designated as *Cononicus*. So it would seem he was appointed cannon sometime between 1165-1169. Wace’s name is also on a document confirming possessions and privileges for the abbey at St Etienne in 1172, and lastly in another charter in 1174.

It is plain therefore that Wace outlived Henry Blois so the usual backdating process which Henry Blois employed in the past is not applicable here. There are two factors which need to be taken into account before we can determine the precise manner in which Henry Blois introduced and propagated the *Roman de Brut* into the public arena. Firstly, as we shall see, when we cover the *Roman de Brut* that the writer of the *Historia* has the same mental image on several occasions as the writer of the *Roman de Brut* yet the words are different. So, the *Roman de Brut* is not an improvised and versified translation of the *Historia* with a few points expanded or introduced as is commonly thought. It is not written by Wace, but the several additions or changes from the First variant and Vulgate are Henry Blois’ own additions. Secondly, if Henry was impersonating Wace, we must look at the *Roman de Rou* to find out what changes he introduced into that text and for what reason; and how is it that in the 1160’s we hear
no objection from Wace. The relationship between Henry Blois and Wace is unsure but given their mutual interests and the fact that Henry would have passed by Caen several times before 1160 it is not hard to assume they knew each other or their paths crossed. The permutations and possibilities are endless as to what their relationship was and whether Wace was aware that his work had been interpolated while he was alive. Let us assume for the moment that the date given for the *Roman de Brut* of 1155 is fallacious and meant to misdirect.

The most propitious method of determining what might have transpired given the amount of permutations possible is to describe a viable scenario of events before we look at the interpolations in the *Roman de Rou*. Without going over that which G.S Burgess has adequately covered in the history of the manuscripts we shall refer as he has done (like Holden before him), to the four portions of what constitutes the *Roman de Rou: The Chronique Ascendante* classified as Part I, Part II, Part III and what Holden called the Appendix. *The Chronique Ascendante* is written in twelve syllable lines arranged in stanzas known as *Laisses*. Part II is written in the same using ‘Alexandrines’, but slightly different in that he employs assonance rather than rhyme. The Appendix and Part III are written in octosyllabic. The Appendix and Part III were once part of the same work i.e. Wace’s continuation due to his commission from Henry II, but the Appendix has been set aside by an interpolator.

What I believe transpired next is the crux of the puzzle to unravelling the various puzzling comments made by Wace in the *Roman de Rou*. It is my guess that Henry Blois met Wace returning to England in 1158. Henry while passing through Caen meets Wace, a struggling clerk who has written a few hagiographical pieces and Henry Blois offers to try to find a patron for Wace’s newly completed *Le Romanz de Rou et des Dus de Normendie* i.e. Part II both written in Alexandrine verse.

Henry Blois presents this to King Henry II who rewards Wace with a prebend and asks for the history to be updated from where Wace had terminated his chronicle in part II at the confirmation of peace between King Lothar of France and count Richard I of Normandy. Henry Blois would have had especial interest in this work as it gives account of the history of his family name and the struggles of his forebears on his father’s side in the

---

524 The History of the Norman people. Wace’s *Roman de Rou*. Boydell press
foundation of the region of Blois and mother’s side through William the Conqueror. The family of Blois was associated with Champagne Province, the House of Châtillon the Dukes of Brittany and, later, with the French royal family, but the family resided in Blois. Wace’s chronicle recounts the disputes between Theobald I, Count of Blois and King Richard I. Theobald I, served as Regent to Drogo, Duke of Brittany. Bertha of Blois, the daughter of Odo II of Blois as we have covered earlier, became Duchess Consort of Brittany through her marriage to Alan II, Duke of Brittany. Many commentators have never understood why ‘Geoffrey’ so favoured Brittany in the Historia.

Anyway, news arrives to Wace of the favour bestowed upon him along with a gift and payment and a request (commission) to further his work. Wace in his own words was not at court.525

Wace then continues the enterprise by composing part III in octosyllabic rhymed couplet verse up to the battle of Tinchebray in 1106. Originally it existed with what is now the appendix, but as we shall see shortly Henry Blois has concocted his own preamble to Part III up to the point where Wace’s original script starts: We have dealt with the history of William Longsword....

One problem for Wace has arisen in the interim between Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine promising further reward for a continuation to Part II. Henry Blois, who originally started composing his versified Historia some years previously mirroring a pattern of the information supplied in the Primary Historia, First Varian and variant; completes Le Roman de Brut finishing the work with the recently composed Vulgate version of the Historia with the expanded Arthuriana. Henry impersonates Wace as the author; and based on the title of Wace’s original work, (the Roman de Rou) calls the poem Le Roman de Brut. This finds its way to court through Eleanor.526 Because of the incitement to rebellion which was found in the Merlin prophecies which enticed rebellion against Henry II (which were evident in ‘Geoffrey’s’ Vulgate HRB), Le Roman de Brut is not well received

525 Speaking of the King and Eleanor of Aquitaine, Wace says at the beginning of the Chronique Ascendante: They do not let me waste my time at court; each of them rewards me with gifts and promises. Henry Blois impersonating Wace using the same tactic as a struggling ‘Geoffrey’ looking for acclaim and compensatory wherewithal says: the king soothes me with gifts and promises, but I am often in need; need that comes very quickly and obliges me to put a penny and a pledge.

526 Layamon says that Wace finally dedicated the leaves of his great poem to Queen Eleanor but she is not mentioned in the text so I would image le Roman de Brut was given by Henry in the name of Wace.
(even without the prophecies\textsuperscript{527}) and Wace not knowing his ‘fault’ is shunned as versifier for the further commissioned history which he has been working on (as promised) and King Henry’s patronage goes to Maistre Beneeit.\textsuperscript{528} Beneeit de Sainte- more did not continue Wace’s work but Henry Blois will have known he was writing Estoire des Dus de Normandie.

We might suppose that Wace hears this news via Henry Blois who then procures his unfinished journal into which he then interpolates. Henry interpolates and intertwines what was a preamble to Part III i.e. Holden’s Appendix and constructs a piece which now replaces that, but still is a reworked preamble to part III. In effect Henry Blois employs parts of the material (Trinovantum, Neustria, etc.) which Wace had derived from the Historia which originally had been part of what is now termed the Appendix. He creates a preamble to Wace’s part III. Thus, corroborating through Wace’s chronicles certain aspects of the pseudo-history posited in the Historia.

Henry Blois now composes The Chronique Ascendante as an introduction to Part II. It is my belief that this was constructed from a dedicatory or edificatory piece by Wace which somewhat was intended to flatter Henry II which is no longer extant while mixing it with material found in the Appendix. The strange thing is that if we look at the last few lines of the Appendix, we shall see that it might have been connected to what Holden has called part II: Bjorn set off with his ships, I do not know whether to

\textsuperscript{527} The Durham Cathedral Chapter Library MS.C.IV.27 may at one stage have been attached to the Roman de Brut. The preamble and many of the prophecies are written in decasyllabic rhymed couplets and show an uncanny ability to change the sense of the prophecies. For example Les Venedoz entisant de Bataille (v.454) is a slant on the HRB prophecies we have not encountered before i.e. enticing the Venedoti to make war. We have already discussed that Henry Blois is the driving force behind the ‘enticing’, but it is odd that it is explicitly exposed. In Fact once the sense of the ever morphing ‘font Galaes’ Galabes or Fontes Galahes is realised as Henry’s original hocus pocus appellation for the region of Gwent, we can see in these prophecies (which are sometimes much clearer than the HRB prophecies) that Henry might well be trying to slander his arch enemy Matilda even in the 1160’s: She will join herself to the spring of Galabes full of treachery and wickedness. From her will be born, without a doubt many treasons, enticing the Venedoti to make war (v.450-454). Certainly the Merlin of HRB never spoke of the Welsh being ‘enticed’, but it was the author of John of Cornwall’s prophecies who can be clearly seen as the instigator. Another such example which shows the composer of the verse prophecies might have been Henry Blois himself (calling himself Helias), is seen in depicting the standoff at Wallingford where he, as the Bishop, along with Theobald (the staffs) intervene: Two Kings will fight and struggle dealing each other blows like champions at the Ford of the Staff for the sake of the Lioness. Most importantly of all in that the invasion of Ireland did not take place as Henry Blois had envisioned after the conference at Winchester in 1155; we now see the prophecy written probably sometime c.1160 stating: the Sixth will be banished from Ireland (v.164)

\textsuperscript{528} The writer referred to is Benoît de Sainte-Maure who died in 1173 and composed in the 1160’s the lengthy Roman de Troie or what we now call the Chronique des Ducs de Normandie.
Scythia or to Hungary, and Hasting came to the King of France and took up residence with him. The King, on the understanding that he would maintain peace, and defend him against other peoples, gave him Chartres and the Chartrain which he had in his power at the time. Hasting remained there for a long time, and France had been at peace for some time when Rou arrived in Rouen, bringing men from the north; they were called Normans because they had been born in the north.

If we remove the interpolated bridge which is the first five lines of Part II which reads: *We have reached the figure of Rou and we will speak to you about Rou; the tale we have to tell begins at this point, but to speed our task, we will reduce the number of lines in each Stanza; the road is long and hard and we fear the toil;* the last line of what is deemed the appendix runs straight into the start of Part II which begins: *Hasting, who never did anything but harm was in France....*

It is plain to see that someone has been interpolating the text and has purposefully given a bogus reason for the *Chronique Asendante* (now in Alexandrine which was constructed from the dedicatory or eulogy note and preamble to what was part III originally in octosyllabic) inordinately changing to the Alexandrine of part II.

The last sentence to Part III also seems to be based on what Wace might have written or on how someone knew he felt. I am very suspicious that the author of the last paragraph is attempting to have us believe that Wace is writing after 1170529 with reference to Henry the young King530: *Let he whose business it is continue the story. I am referring to Master Beneeit who has undertaken to tell the affair, as the King has assigned the task to him; since the King has asked him to do it, I must abandon it and fall silent. The King in the past was very good to me. I could not have it, it did not please the King; but it is not my fault. I have known three King Henry’s and seen them*

---

529 Wace in the *Chronique Ascendante* supposedly dates the work in the first sentence: *One Thousand, one hundred and sixty years in time and space had elapsed since God in his grace came down in the Virgin when a clerk from Caen by the name of Master Wace undertook the story of Rou and his race....*

530 He was known in his own lifetime as "Henry the Young King" to distinguish him from his father. His Coronation was in 1170 and 'reigned' until 1183. Because he predeceased his father, he is not counted in the numerical succession of Kings of England. Nonetheless, he was an anointed King and his royal status was not disputed.
all in Normandy; all three had lordship over Normandy and England. The second Henry, about whom I am talking, was the grandson of the first Henry and born to Matilda, the empress, and the third was the son of the second. Here ends the book of Master Wace; anyone who wishes to do more, let him do it.

The last paragraph does not seem natural, but seems to be giving a free permission (to whom it may concern) to take up Wace’s text. There is another puzzling insertion in Part III where verse 5296 reads: When the King had died, it was Philip, his eldest son, who was crowned after him; the Duke was a very close friend of his. The verse chronicle would then naturally lead into the next section at verse 5319: The story is a long one before it comes to an end, about how William became King....

Instead, midway through Part III for no apparent reason ‘Wace’ has seen it necessary to implant his personal details in what seems to be an interpolation with seemingly innocuous details concerning the composition of his many other works from verse 5297-5318:

The history of the Normans is a long one and hard to set down in the Vernacular. If one asks who said this, who wrote this history in the vernacular, I say and will say that I am Wace from the Isle of Jersey, which is in the sea toward the West and belongs to the territory of Normandy. I was born on the Island of Jersey and taken to Caen as a small child; there I went to school and was then educated for a long time in France. When I returned from France, I stayed in Caen for a long time and set about composing works in the vernacular; I wrote and composed a good many. With the help of God and King- I must serve no one apart from God- a prebend was given me in Bayeux (may god reward him for this). I can tell you it was Henry the second, the grandson of Henry and the father of Henry.

This, in my opinion, seems highly suspect, not only by its position in the text but by the facts that it ostensibly portrays. The most essential piece of the Roman de Rou which clearly shows an interpolator has been at work is witnessed at the beginning of Part III. Originally Part III began with some sort of dedicatory piece some of which has been absorbed into the present preamble which is mostly composed of what is now termed the Appendix. Originally Wace started part III with the Appendix but it has been reworked to the point where the story resumes from part II: We have dealt with William Longsword, up to the time when the Flemish, as the wicked do, killed him treacherously.
The *Chronique Ascendante* and part II were separated from Part III and it was Andre Duchense in the early seventeenth century who rescued them from oblivion by copying them in his own hand from a now lost manuscript. So, it may be that Henry Blois only tampered with part III.

Just to be clear, the introduction to part III is constituted from what was Wace’s original dedication to Part III and the first part of the Appendix, which as we have covered, was Wace’s original preamble and introduction to what is Holden’s part II.

In the part which Holden has now termed the Appendix it is evident that Wace has read the HRB. He regurgitates Geoffrey’s invention that London was called Trinovant and before that New Troy along with other previous names of places.

However, in the new composition to Part III (written by Henry Blois) and rearranged from Wace’s original work we have some startling new additions which are clearly not elucidated in the HRB. But the mind which composed the introduction of Part III has a good grasp on the geography of Wales. He states that Demetia was southern Wales and North Wales was Venedocia, just as ‘Geoffrey’ had understood it, but never clearly defined it in HRB. Also, the area of Burgundy is made clear to be that of the Allobroges which is defining the region of Blois. The Allobroges were definitively the Burgundians, but for the reason of secreting Henry’s authorship, it was not made clear in the HRB either.

Why Autun is equated with ‘Cacua’ is obvious in the fact that nowhere in the Roman annals was a great battle fought at Autun as ‘Geoffrey’ posits in Arthur’s continental campaign. This anomaly is Henry Blois’ biggest deviation to known history, because when he composed the *Primary Historia* and invented the Arthurian campaign in Autun (while he was in Normandy in 1137-8); Henry never once thought that he would need to corroborate his epic battle scene near Autun to coincide with the annals. He never envisaged a First Variant being scrutinised by Rome.

Henry, obviously can’t rewrite the Roman annals so that they concur with the continental battle at Langres and Autun in his original *Primary Historia*.... so he does the next best thing. In Wace he posits that Autun is synonymous with Cacua. It never was nor could be; but in the annals in 151 BC (Second Spanish War), the Roman general Licinius Lucullus (not quite Lucius Hiberius) attacks and captures the town of Cauca, of the tribe known as the Vaccaeii.
Also found in the introduction to Part III is the same sentiment found that Wace had commented upon in the original Appendix when talking of Caesar and Alexander: *Only what people say about who Alexander and Caesar were, according to what they have found in books; all that remains of them is their names.*

Now, when Henry Blois, reiterating the same sentiments as Wace, lays bare his real reason for why he has gone to such great lengths to create his pseudo-history: *I understand completely and am fully aware that all men die, cleric and lay, and after their death their fame is short lived unless it is set down in a book by a cleric; it cannot survive or live on in any other way.* (v.113-42)

Essentially, what Henry Blois has done is concoct the preamble to Part III using much of Wace’s original text from what is now termed the Appendix to make it seem as if it is Wace’s own preamble to Part III. It is possible he has also done likewise with the construction of the *Chronique Ascendante*, however, some later redactor has added in the later interpolation regarding the siege of Rouen. Logically these could not be Wace’s words if he had resigned himself to letting Beneeit resume his chronology if Beneeit died in 1173 and the siege of Rouen took place in 1174. Why would Wace revise his text to incorporate this event?

Henry interpolating or rather composing the *Chronique Ascendante* from Wace’s words on the subject of Matilda and Stephen has also reiterated his feeling from GS.

Henry’s assessment is now put into the mouth of Wace as to why Stephen’s reign failed: *he accepted bad advice and bad advice harmed him.*

However the very next sentence is so wholly inaccurate that it could only be an *apologia* written by Stephen’s brother: *The King so harried her that she recognised his right and gave him the Kingdom as an inheritance; this was greatly to the advantage of both those whom the war pleased and those whom peace pleased; he was King for nineteen years, after which time he died.*

The main point of the rearrangement of the Roman de Rou is so that the authorship of the *Roman de Brut* is never left in any doubt in that it is made to seem as if Wace had written it in 1155. The date given for the *Roman de Brut* seems highly unlikely because the VM had not been written at that date. In the *Roman de Brut ‘Teleusin’* is introduced foretelling of Christ’s

---

531 Henry Blois’ reference to the Beaumont twins.
birth. Henry had just based much of the VM on old Welsh material and Taliesin is introduced to interact with Merlin Celidonius/Sylvestris. To aid the many anachronisms concerning Merlin and Taliesin, Taliesin is now able to appear at different points in time and therefore ‘Wace’ has him predicting Christ’s birth.

Strangely intuitive is Mathews in his ‘Norman literature and Wace’ and he says: *We may believe that Wace began his long adaptation of ‘Geoffrey’ on speculation, aware that the folk around him were ready for this kind of narrative in popular form. Henry of Blois, abbot of Glastonbury and bishop of Winchester was at the height of his influence at the time. The Brut is a subject that must have suited his tastes. It was the forerunner of the romance in form and style.*

Does Mathews have suspicions of the same theory that I am proposing in this thesis? Why would Mathew’s pick our Henry Blois in particular to single out as being interested in Geoffrey or Romance. Wace’s *Roman de Brut* IS the forerunner of Romance form and style….. but how does Mathews know it must have suited the tastes of Henry Blois????
Chapter 24

The Roman De Brut

It was Henry Blois who gave the *Roman de Brut* to the English court. This is how Henry managed to disseminate the popular *Historia* in England and on the continent. Neither ‘Geoffrey’ nor ‘Wace’ would have had such access to nobility and have had the capacity to spread the Arthuriana quickly through the Crusader community and Royal courts on the continent. Henry Blois had started the *Roman de Brut* or his vernacular *Historia* with the First Variant (as template) which points to the fact that it was in progress before the Vulgate version reached its final completion. As we have maintained throughout, the Vulgate HRB only started to disseminate after 1155 when the dedications, mention of Archdeacon Walter and the updated prophecies were added. ‘Wace’ claims he was not the source of the Round Table. Supposedly Wace credits its story to the Bretons and Layamon follows. It is quite ridiculous that any scholar would not see that the introduction of the round table is a Henry Blois device based upon a solution to the problems that Stephen had at court with rowing barons.... all trying to curry favour with the king; especially when Wace writes: *Arthur made the round table about which the British utter many a fable.*\(^{532}\) Before Wace there was no Round Table, but Henry can assert this about the British because the *Roman*
was proliferated mostly on the continent. Certainly Marie of France and Chretien had it in their work and of course Robert de Boron.

Throughout the *Roman de Brut*, Henry makes out that the tales of Arthur are everywhere, but it was only through the HRB that the ‘chivalric’ Arthur found renown. Hence, for ‘Wace,’ who is using the First Variant to make the claim, while understanding that the First Variant was not circulated widely, can only mean that ‘Wace’ and ‘Geoffrey’ have something in common in their promotion of Arthur. We now know it is Henry Blois.

Layamon’s claim of Cornish carpenters constructing the ‘Round Table’ might have some weight if my assumption is correct that Henry Blois went over to Mont St Michel in 1155 from Cornwall, when leaving the country without the King’s permission to avoid Normandy. It was here we recall that he met Robert of Torigini to give him the news of ‘Geoffrey’s’ elevation to be Bishop of Asaph.

The fact that the Wace version of the *Historia* seems to follow the First Variant for the first half indicates that Henry Blois was composing the versified French version probably before he left for Clugny in 1155 and thereafter finished off the Arthuriana section when he had already completed the Vulgate HRB, since he had recently re-worked it. Henry then presented the *Roman de Brut*, so named in contrast to Wace’s unfinished original Roman de Rou, (even though ‘Wace’ refers to it as the *Geste des Bretons* (“History of the Britons”), and probably presented it innocuously to either Eleanor or Henry II on his return.

To me, it seems strange that throughout Henry Blois’ façade in secreting his authorship where he has chosen only dead people to implicate as witnesses, he should now turn to someone alive. Why, if he is responsible for rearranging the text of the *Roman de Rou* is he bent on backdating the *Roman de Brut* to 1155, if Wace was alive and still signing charters as we discussed above. It is a puzzle.... as it is the complete opposite of what we have been used to.

However, commentators are convinced by Wace’s long life simply because of what is written in the *Roman de Rou* (concerning the siege of Rouen and this cannot be accountable to Henry Blois) and the fact that there is also a charter witnessed by Wace at Frécamp. We have already seen the use of charters to substantiate the created persona of Geoffrey of Monmouth. It would not be surprising then that a charter would be signed
at Frécamp abbey in 1162 to substantiate a living Wace where Henry's Nephew Henry de Sully was abbot.\(^{533}\) (Eustace at one stage was the favoured nephew as he was being groomed for when he eventually became King, but he was now dead).

However, on balance, since Wace is still signing charters after Henry Blois is dead, we might assume that Henry Blois propagated the *Roman de Brut* without Wace's knowledge or Wace was not in a position to deny such a work. It would seem that Wace had given up on the *Roman de Rou* and since we can see interpolation regarding material common to HRB within it and we can conclude Henry wrote the *Roman de Brut*.... it is not silly to suppose Henry Blois bought or obtained the Part III and rearranged the whole work.

The point of this charade and impersonation of Wace was bringing the *Historia* to an entirely new continental audience, the whole pseudo-history was now able to be enjoyed (and propagated) by a vastly increased Anglo-Norman audience who would not have read the more formal Latin *Historia*. In its vernacular form, it opened the work of HRB up to a hugely increased audience.

It really makes no sense that for some unknown reason King Henry II later transferred the honour of that which was obviously a commission to another poet. We know that King Henry would have read Part II in order to commission Part III and if our speculation is correct about Henry Blois being the interpolator of the *Roman de Rou* we might assume that Henry Blois is somehow the go between. Maybe Wace and the King never met. Wace's comment that Eleanor and Henry II *do not let me waste my time at court* may imply this.

We are led to believe Wace laid aside his pen, left his work incomplete, and probably soon after died: "Since the King has asked him to do this work, I must leave it and I must say no more. Of old the King did me many a favour; much he gave me, more he promised me, and if he had given all that he promised me, it had been better for me. Here ends the book of Master Wace; let him continue it who will."

---

\(^{533}\) We should remember Henry de Sully was nominated in 1140 by Henry of Blois to be Bishop of Salisbury, but the nomination was quashed. As compensation, Henry of Blois then named Henry de Sully the abbot of Fécamp Abbey. Again in 1140, Henry de Sully was nominated to become Archbishop of York by Henry Blois but his election was again quashed by Pope Innocent II.
One would not think that after his efforts he was going to hand it over to an anonymous continuator. In Henry’s mind however, it was not about the money.... and the Roman de Rou was drab and really not worthy of a continuator. We might suggest that Wace’s only claim to fame is that fortuitously the Roman de Rou fell into Henry Blois’ hands.

The Roman de Brut, was based initially on the First Variant, but Henry Blois at the time he impersonated ‘Wace’ c.1160, is no longer interested in the campaign for Metropolitan. He is interested in propagating the Arthuriana which he had invented back in 1138 and had developed over the years.

‘Wace’ in the Roman de Brut abridges passages originally devoted to gaining Metropolitan status in the production of the First Variant. Passages on religious history are therefore shortened in the Roman de Brut including narrative about the evangelisation of Britain (which had featured so much to coincide with DA). When speaking of Vortigern there is no mention of the Pelagian heresy which became such a vital part of the First Variant’s portrayal of a pious Briton at Rome in evidence....and of the Briton church’s early establishment. Henry as Wace now omits details concerning the martyrdom of St Alban where he sacrificed his life for the founder of Winchester, his confessor Amphibalus and the list of bishops etc.

Much of Henry Blois’ artistry is in the fact that he has never been discovered as the author of so much material which comprises the Matter of Britain. So that Wace appears entirely independent of ‘Geoffrey’, Henry Blois calls the Severn river Habren and the river Avon which he knew so well (which met the sea at Christchurch), the Avren. All of these tricks confuse commentators, but were employed ostensibly to give the aura of independent authorship.

‘Geoffrey’ in the Historia makes a pretence of not knowing the distance from Barfleur to Mont St Michel where he takes on the Giant (because supposedly he is a Welsh Geoffrey from Monmouth living in Oxford), but Wace assigns a full night for the journey as Wace should have known. Henry Blois takes on the character of the author he is impersonating.

It has been remarked that Wace knew many nautical terms probably learnt from living in Jersey, but Henry Blois crossed the channel at least twenty times if not more and so he would have a good grasp of the sea. Henry would have been as able as Wace to describe a storm at sea. It is often remarked upon that ‘Wace’ was able to describe so vividly the hustle
and bustle of the scene at Southampton or ‘Geoffrey’s’ Hamo’s port. More importantly legend has it that in 1144 Gosport received its name from Henry Blois landing there after a storm at sea. Henry allegedly after inquiring of the name of the town decreed that from then on it should be called ‘God’s port’. If Wace was not as well travelled by sea, certainly Henry Blois was.

That Wace was a translator into vernacular is clearly established in his Life of St Nicholas: For those who have not learned their letters and have not been intent upon learning them, for those people the clerks must demonstrate religion, telling why the feast of each saint has been established. Also: I wish to write a little romance about something we hear in Latin, so that lay people may understand this, people who cannot understand Latin.

We can see that the Roman de Rou is written by a genuine Wace who is less inspired to put it mildly than the writer of the Roman de Brut. In the forest of Broceliande, where fays and many another marvels were to be seen, a genuine Wace determined to visit it in order to find out the truth of these stories. I went there to look for marvels. I saw the forest and I saw the land; I sought marvels, but I found none. A fool I came back, a fool I went; a fool I went, a fool I came back; foolishness I sought, a fool I hold myself.

So mundane an attitude makes us wonder whether Wace ever composed truly imaginative verse in the Romanz.\(^534\) Does not the Roman de Brut run contrarily to this prosaic attitude toward imaginative detail like the Round Table?

If one connects all the dots we can see for instance Broceliande forest, with its fountain is first related by the genuine Wace in the Roman de Rou. Chrétien de Troyes then uses this in Yvain, but as we will see later in this enquiry, Chrétien de Troyes has heard of Henry’s propaganda concerning Arthur and the Grail. Robert de Boron, likewise at the same court, has heard Henry’s tales and then employs Henry Blois’ own invention of the ‘round table’ from ‘Wace’s’ Roman de Brut. Henry Blois is not bothered with consistency or accuracy as each troubadour apparently develops Henry’s original stories in his own way. The overall effect has been that our scholars have believed many of Henry’s inventions to have substance seemingly having derived from such varied accounts.

---

\(^{534}\) Mathews. Norman literature and Wace p.63
The Round Table, out of the many places it could surface, just happens to turn up at Winchester and no-one can say who put it there or when it arrived. Our Scholars have puzzled over its sudden appearance. It is not silly to suppose that the inspirational idea for the Round Table as an icon was derived from Henry’s own experience at court witnessing the pecking order of the barons. He simply wanted to find an idealistic solution and found it in the Round Table.

Henry’s ideal Arthurian world was to prevent a hierarchy by all barons having an equal place… as he presents it in the Roman de Brut: Arthur made the Round Table, so reputed of the Britons. This Round Table was ordained of Arthur that when his fair fellowship sat to meet their chairs should be high alike, their service equal, and none before or after his comrade. Thus no man could boast that he was exalted above his fellow, for all alike were gathered round the board, and none was alien at the breaking of Arthur’s bread. At this table sat Britons, Frenchmen, Normans, Angevins, Flemings, Burgundians, and Loherins. Knights had their plate who held land of the King, from the furthest Marches of the west even unto the Hill of St. Bernard. (This like Geoffrey’s Geography is the Aravian mount. It is too coincidental to see geographical Alps as similarly accounted by Wace and Geoffrey).

That the Round Table was an emblem of some Pan Celtic tradition as many commentators have determined, because of the various references of supposedly independent source, is pure piffle. It was Henry Blois who had witnessed the ingratiating favour shown by barons toward the king at banquets. Henry Blois thought; ‘what if’ all the barons had not competed with each other, there may not have been a nineteen year Anarchy.

In 1976, the Winchester Round Table became the subject of scientific investigations. It was first recorded at Winchester in 1463 and had probably been painted with a likeness of Henry VIII in 1522. Our tree-ring ‘experts’ and radiocarbon dating methods and a study of carpentry practices reveal by expert consensus that the table was constructed in the 1270’s. Winchester Castle dates from the reign of William the Conqueror (1066-1087). By the end of King John’s reign in 1216 the castle and its royal palace needed extensive repair. It was where Matilda was besieged at the rout of Winchester.

Between 1222 and 1235 the Castle’s hall was replaced by the building which stands today. And yet of all possible places in Britain, Arthur’s Round Table exists in Winchester. It is inside the magnificent Great Hall, the only part of the former Winchester Castle that remains intact. It has this inscription: “This is the round table of Arthur with 24 of his named knights.” Are the ‘experts’ right? They could well be a hundred years out. It would not be the first time expert opinion fitted with perceived historical convention.

It just seems a coincidence too far that Wace’s Roman de Brut evidently written by Henry Blois, just happens to posit a round table and then it appears at Winchester where Henry was Bishop without any record of how it got there. I am sure Henry commissioned it. Who else would and why house it at Winchester?
‘Wace’ would have us believe that most of the account Geoffrey has told is not without foundation but based on history: ‘I know not if you have heard tell the marvellous gestes and errant deeds related so often of King Arthur. They have been noised about this mighty realm for so great a space that the truth has turned to fable and an idle song. Such rhymes are neither sheer bare lies, nor gospel truths. They should not be considered either an idiot’s tale, or given by inspiration. The minstrel has sung his ballad, the storyteller told over his tale so frequently; little by little he has decked and painted, till by reason of his embellishment the truth stands hid in the trappings of a tale. Thus to make a delectable tune to your ear, history goes masking as fable.⁵³⁶

The evidence is all there when Master Blehis is at last recognised as Monseigneur Blois, the propagator of the Grail stories. ‘Wace’ says he omits the prophecies of Merlin from his narrative, because he does not understand them. I am not willing to translate his book, because I do not know how to interpret it. I would say nothing that was not exactly as I said. The prophecies were now redundant!

Many have thought by this passage that Wace has a scrupulous regard for the truth. Henry simply has no use for the prophecies anymore post 1158-60. This is pure misdirection as Henry Blois uses the same gambit of seeming probity in DA while interpolating William of Malmesbury. In the DA he crucially says, he omits to tell of Arthur, but lets the world know that Arthur lies between the pyramids at Glastonbury. How is this possibly reconcilable with the William of Malmesbury in GR 1,⁵³⁷ who states he has no idea where Arthur’s grave is? For this reason our scholars have thought any mention of Arthur in DA is an interpolation after his disinterment. This is simply not correct as Giraldus plainly attests.

Wace, the writer of the ‘Lives’ and the Roman de Rou, is doubtless a different writer from the Roman de Brut. Such sedentary plodding reflections with which he begins his Life of St. Nicholas are not worthy of the inspirational or poetical writer of the Brut: Nobody can know everything, or hear everything, or see everything ... God distributes different gifts to different people. Each man should show his worth in that which God has given him.

---

⁵³⁶ Wace Roman de Brut
⁵³⁷ GR 287, Arthur’s grave however, is nowhere to be found, whence come, the traditional old wives’ tales that he may yet return.
‘Wace’ makes some few additions to ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arthurian history; a liberty which would not have been taken if ‘Wace’ was really composing the *Roman de Brut* in 1154 while the fictitious Geoffrey of Monmouth was supposedly still alive. The common understanding that parts of these tales originated with Breton poets is pure misdirection. I shall cover this in the chapter on Marie de France where the same mis-direction is used for the same reasons.

‘Wace’s’ real contribution to the Arthurian legend is the new spirit which enabled French *conteurs* to transmit the chronicle of Arthuriana in the swift-moving metrical octo-syllabic couplet. In Arthur’s ‘European’ campaign, the continental forces were aligned with Arthur. The HRB was therefore opened to a wider audience (with a common anti Roman sentiment).…more than ‘Geoffrey’s’ high-sounding Latin prose which propagated through the monastic system. ‘Geoffrey’s’ VM and the *Roman de Brut* of ‘Wace’, bridge the transformation between the prose Vulgate HRB and the later Romances. It is these later Romances which occupy Henry Blois and I shall refer to his involvement in their propagation as his ‘second agenda’, on which he worked in the latter half of his life post his return to England in 1158.

While impersonating Wace, Henry Blois is always aware to hide the fact that he himself is the main propagator of Arthuriana; but he has us believe that Wace was conversant with stories of ‘chivalric’ Arthur quite independent of the *Historia*. Fables about Arthur he himself says that he had heard. Henry Blois’ craft is a pretence that he is merely adding to an existing body of material. ‘Wace’ highlights the ‘Hope of the Britons’ which Huntingdon alluded to in regard to the Bretons. This may have been implied in the original *Primary Historia* or it is merely commented on by Huntingdon in EAW.

What modern scholars have misunderstood is the fact that Henry Blois is merely the embellisher of oral fables which William of Malmesbury refers to in GR1. Apart from the Life of Cadoc and a few other saints’ lives, Arthur barely featured in writing before Henry Blois came up with the idea of a ‘chivalric’ Arthur based on Norman values. We are led to believe that just at the time ‘Geoffrey’ considers writing about the history of the Kings of Britain, low and behold, Archdeacon Walter turns up with just such a book. It is a marvel to me, as I mentioned before, that the scholastic community has rarely discussed this absurd coincidence…. supposedly ‘Geoffrey’ did
not make it all up, but found it in a book.... which merely needed translating:

Often at times turning over in mine own mind the many themes that might be subject-matter of a book, my thoughts would fall upon the plan of writing a history of the Kings of Britain, and in my musings thereupon it seemed to me it a marvel that, beyond such mention as Gildas and Bede have made of them in their luminous tractate, nought could I find as concerning the Kings that had dwelt in Britain before the Incarnation of Christ, nor nought even as concerning Arthur and the many others that did succeed him after the Incarnation, albeit that their deeds be worthy of praise everlasting and be as pleasantly rehearsed from memory by word of mouth in the traditions of many peoples as though they had been written down. Now, whilst, I was thinking upon such matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, a man learned not only in the art of eloquence, but in the histories of foreign lands, offered me a certain most ancient book in the British language....

Our scholars know HRB is a fraudulent pseudo-history, yet still discuss the relevance of Archdeacon Walter’s book as if it were independent of the fraud. Of course they are easily misled because their naivety leads them to believe that Gaimar’s testimony in his epilogue refers to the book. That is the point of the impersonation of Gaimar and the interpolations into his text.

What scholars should have scrutinized is why there is no mention of Walter in the First Variant or EAW. Of course there is no book.... and therefore, Gaimar’s epilogue is also part of the fraud. How can one reconcile, knowing that HRB is a constructed pseudo-history (as Tatlock clearly demonstrates), with the existence of a book in which is all that information ready to be translated, and exists prior to ‘Geoffrey’ and turns up at the precise moment Geoffrey has a mind to write on the subject!!! If Walter had such a book already, how come Huntingdon was ‘amazed’????

Does it not seem strange that the author of Roman de Brut starts to versify with the First Variant Historia and then finishes composing the Arthuriana of the Roman de Brut with the Vulgate prose version? This to me indicates the Roman de Brut was completed in two phases.

It would not take a cryptologist to work out that the First Variant preceded the Vulgate. If scholars were correct in their assessment of the Vulgate preceding First Variant.... why, one must ask, would ‘Wace’ compose his work with an existing Vulgate version (half way through a
work) and then swap to a (supposedly) later but inferior exemplar to record the beginning of the account? *Roman de Brut* was started before Henry had to leave England in 1155 and subsequently finished with the Vulgate version after Henry had encountered Wace at Caen on his return in 1158.

We could speculate that in Wace’s *Roman de Brut*, Henry Blois introduces Guerguesin Count of Hereford because he realises that there is no noble at Arthur’s coronation from Southern Wales where Arthur supposedly has his stronghold and powerbase. This invented anomaly could have something to do with the death of Henry’s arch enemy Miles. Miles, who became the Angevin grandee of the region after the death of Robert of Gloucester was, 1st Earl of Hereford. We can see from GS, Henry dislikes Miles intensely and therefore is using the same ploy as used in the dedications by introducing people with whom he is actually at odds.

Unlike the HRB, ‘Wace’ starts his *Roman de Brut* with Constantine at Totnes. Constantine takes a wife and has three children the eldest was called Constant who *he caused to be nourished at Winchester, and there he made him to be vowed a monk*. The other two sons were Uther and Aurelius whose surname was Ambrosius. We know why Aurelius has a surname Ambrosius…. so that he parallels with the insular annals of Bede and Gildas. Ambrosius Aurelianus is one of the few people that Gildas identifies by name in his sermon *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*.

Now we have also understood the First Variant was used as a basis for the first half of the Brut, we can safely assume the *Roman de Brut* was started earlier than the completion of the Vulgate. Therefore, given the early date that Henry first started to compose the *Roman de Brut*, we can see Henry Blois is following his own creation of the First Variant which was aligned with his desire of metropolitan. He had undertaken to versify it before completion of a Vulgate addition.

We see that Constant was a monk at Winchester and Henry establishes that Christianity flourished in England. The logic is that Winchester should be granted metropolitan if monks were there long before Augustine’s arrival in Britain.

There should be no doubt that Henry Blois is impersonating Wace as the author of the *Roman de Brut*. Henry Blois dates Constantine to Vortigern’s era by having Wace say: *But many a time have I heard tell that it was Vortigern who caused Constantine to be slain*. In HRB Constantine aligns with the dates in the annals.
Henry Blois, posing as Wace, purposefully informs us in a seemingly innocuous deliberation about who Constantine's successor should be; that the eldest in that era was residing at the existing abbey, which, without overstating his case, is at Winchester: *As to Constant, the eldest son, who was of more fitting years, they dared not to pluck the habit from his back, since all men deemed it shame and folly to hale him forth from his abbey.*

We would be naïve if we did not realise that there is only one person who is intent upon having us believe that there was an abbey at Winchester in the sixth century. We would be silly to believe this is not the same man who inserted the biblical allusions in the First Variant *Historia.* The most prominent interpolator of DA is the same as the man requesting a metropolitan in 1144 from the pope; the very same man to whom the DA is dedicated.

Henry's gambit is to highlight Winchester as an existing Abbey in the time of Vortigern: *Vortigern, purposing evil in his heart, took horse, and rode swiftly to Winchester. He sought Constant at the abbey..... If anyone should be in doubt that Winchester was well established as a bishopric long before Augustine's arrival, Arthur's dragon supposedly resided there: One of these dragons he caused to be borne before him when he went into battle. The other he sent to Winchester to be set up in the church of the bishop.*

The next piece may even be semi-autobiographical, reflecting the very sentiments of Henry Blois, as Constant is offered the Kingship: *Very desirous was Constant of the lordship, and little love had he for his abbey. Right weary was he of choir and psalter, and lightly and easily he made him ready to be gone.*

The story is close to Henry's heart as it involves the usurpation of a crown: *Constant reigned in his father's stead. He who had betrayed the commandment of God, was not one to hold his realm in surety; and thus he came to an evil end.* This sentiment was held about his own brother and the author of GS makes this very clear.

There are also other traces of experience from Henry's time in the Anarchy where it is evident in GS that Henry laments his brother's actions: *Draw now together thy men, to guard the realm and thee. Set food within the strong places, and keep well thy towers. Above all, have such fear of traitors that thy castles are held of none save those true men who will hold them to the death. If you act not after this counsel right speedily there must reign another King.*
‘Wace’ expands upon how it was that the mother of Merlin became pregnant by an Incubus and expands upon how these spirits live, but when ‘Wace’ comes to the prophecies, he deals with it in a different way than ‘Geoffrey’. It should not be forgotten that the first draft of prophecies were initially written while Stephen was King. Merlin dealt in generalities foreseeing the future and the advent of the Normans. Later, Henry Blois expanded and got more specific in the Vulgate HRB by continuing to enumerate the Kings.

‘Wace’ completes Roman de Brut after Stephen is dead and post 1158, therefore, Henry has no political advantage of the Merlin prophecies to include them in the Roman de Brut. His hope of a seditious Celtic uprising has now been extinguished, but this is not to say that the Durham versified prophecies were not at one time to accompany Wace’s work.

In the Roman de Brut, he therefore chooses not to translate them with the pretence of not understanding them. One thing he does understand is that they are about the various Kings but it is highly probable that what was obtuse skimble skamble in prose would be difficult to transpose into meter except by giving away some unintended understanding of the sense. For whatever reason, Henry chose not to include the prophecies. The most likely explanation is that Henry published his Roman de Brut c.1159-60 when the prophecies were no longer relevant to his political agenda. King Henry II was established and any thought of unseating him was now lost.... so why not just finish off and propagate his invented Historia through the impersonation of Wace to the insular and continental courtly aristocracy and the lay people on the continent.

In the Vulgate HRB, it was the dragons which symbolised the Saxons and the Britons; the dragons did not prophecy in HRB. In the Roman de Brut: These dragons prophesied of Kings to come, who would yet hold the realm in their charge. I say no more, for I fear to translate Merlin’s Prophecies, when I cannot be sure of the interpretation thereof. It is good to keep my lips from speech, since the issue of events may make my gloss a lie.

‘Wace’ makes a statement entirely contrary to his deeds being the most prolific fabricator in history. If ‘Geoffrey’ was still alive and the Roman de Brut was supposedly in composition prior to 1155; how does ‘Wace’ take such liberties with another man’s work and declares what he does above? Only a fool would believe there is any truth in the statement, yet scholars for years have lauded ‘Wace’ with praise for his honesty. ‘Wace’ cannot
even follow ‘Geoffrey’s’ rendition of events without embellishing. It is bizarre that by using this method, Henry Blois has persuaded us that ‘chivalric’ Arthuriana in the form in which he presents it in the *Roman de Brut* and HRB was widespread. The only person propagating his own personal edifice of fabrication is Henry Blois himself.

Wace in reality was a clerk at Caen, yet Henry Blois was a bishop knight who saw so much carnage and witnessed many sieges in the Anarchy alongside his brother. He even saw Winchester burn!! It seems a bit odd that our *clerk lisant* is so able to embellish what was already written by a man who had witnessed warfare first hand. Henry Blois is the author of the *Roman de Brut* composing for a different audience and in a different style from the prose version of ‘Geoffrey’; but at all times secreting his identity as author: *Aurelius and Eldof laced them in their mail. They made the wild fire ready and caused men to cast timber in the moat, till the deep fosse was filled. When this was done they flung wild fire from their engines upon the castle. The fire laid hold upon the castle, it spread to the tower, and to all the houses that stood about. The castle flared like a torch; the flames leaped in the sky; the houses tumbled to the ground.*

When Henry first wrote the *Primary Historia* he had no notion that he would be facing a power struggle in the church or even contemplating the necessity of fabricating evidence in the case for a metropolitan. However, he did want to add credence in as many ways as possible to the myth he had created around the chivalric Arthur in his pseudo-history.

Huntingdon’s explanation in EAW of Uther Pendragon is just remarked upon as a name denoting Dragons head. In the interim period between the *Primary Historia* and the production of the First Variant version, we could speculate that Henry Blois had a Gold dragon fabricated of some description, cast from gold which was housed in the Cathedral to add witness to Uther’s supposed two dragons in the First Variant and HRB. One was supposedly kept at Winchester as we are told in the *Roman de Brut*:

*In remembrance of the dragon, and of the hardy knight who should be King and a father of Kings, which it betokened, Uther wrought two golden dragons, by the counsel of his barons. One of these dragons he caused to be borne before him when he went into battle. The other he sent to Winchester to be set up in the church of the bishop. For this reason he was ever after called Uther Pendragon. Pendragon was his name in the Britons’ tongue, but Dragon’s head in that of Rome.*
In HRB we have the same story: *From that day forth was he called Uther Pendragon, for thus do we call a dragon's head in the British tongue. And the reason wherefore this name was given unto him was that Merlin had prophesied he should be King by means of the dragon.*

This then becomes Arthur’s battle standard in the continental campaign: *he set up the golden dragon he had for standard...*

We should only look to John of Worchester to find out where Henry obtained the gold to fabricate the dragon which one must assume he placed in the cathedral at Winchester. After the burning of Winchester (which John reports was on Henry Blois’ orders\(^{538}\): *After these events, bishop Henry’s anger was slightly appeased, though his greed knew no limits, and at the suggestion of the prior of the recently-burned down New Minster, recovered from the ashes of the burnt cross fifty pounds of silver, thirty marks of Gold...*

In 1141, after the Rout of Winchester, it is the most likely time that the dragon was fabricated as physical evidence at Winchester. This would have corroborated the story which was subsequently to surface in the First Variant and thereafter in the Vulgate.

We have maintained that Henry went to Southern Wales in 1136 to help Stephen subdue the Welsh rebellion. Modern commentators have been confused by ‘Geoffrey’s’ contradictory attitudes concerning the Welsh. GS is ample witness to Henry’s thought about the wild and savage Welsh. ‘Geoffrey’s’ distaste for the Welsh came from suppressing the uprising; and it was Henry’s advice to his brother to let them fight against themselves rather than trying to quash them outright and spending a fortune on the endeavour. ‘Geoffrey’ portrayed the current Welsh in his day as unworthy descendants of the Britons in HRB. Henry Blois could not suppress his own feelings about the Welsh. Therefore, there is a conflict as he set his glorious (but fabricated) Arthurian epic in Wales....which, in his mind, was now full of savages.

We can understand from GS that Henry was at Kidwelly and this is his Lidelea. But the writer of the First Variant and the *Roman de Brut* could not know the lay of the land unless the same author is common to both. How possibly (if Wace were not Henry Blois) could Wace know of the lay of the land not spelled out in the First Variant or Vulgate HRB?

---

\(^{538}\) John of Worchester ...the bishop is reported to have said to the earl of Northampton, ‘*Behold earl, you have my orders, concentrate on razing the city to the ground.*’
Yet ‘Wace’ understands the topography also: ‘fields round about are hid’. What Henry Blois (posing as Wace), is subconsciously describing is the miles of tidal marshes south of Kidwelly in the marsh flats. However, Wace could not know this..... as his description (if he were genuinely copying Geoffrey’s work) is not in HRB: ‘Moreover,’ he said, 'another lake is there in the parts of Wales nigh the Severn, which the men of that country do call Linligwan, whereinto when the sea floweth, it is received as into a whirlpool or swallow, in such wise as that the lake is never the fuller for the waters it doth engulf so as to cover the margins of the banks thereof. Nonetheless when the sea ebbs again, it spouts forth the waters it hath sucked in as it were a mountain, and slashes over and covers the banks. At such a time, were the folk of all that country to stand nearby with their faces toward the lake and should be sprinkled of the spray of the waves upon their garments, they should scarce escape, if indeed they did at all escape, being swallowed up of the lake. Nonetheless, should they turn their back to the lake, they need have no fear of being sprinkled, even though they should stand upon the very brink. \[539\]

Wace’s description unwittingly portrays eyewitness details which could only be known by someone having visited the same spot as ‘Geoffrey is describing: This lake is close by the Severn in the land of Wales. The sea pours its tide into this lake. Yet empty itself as it may, the waters of the lake remain ever at the same height, never more and never less. The ocean itself may not suffice to heap its waters above the lake, neither to cover its shores. Yet at the ebbing of the tide, when the sea turns to flee, then the lake spues forth the water it has taken to its belly, so that the banks are swallowed up, the great waves rise tall in their wrath, and the wide fields round about are hid, and all is sodden with the foam. The folk of that country tell that should a man stare upon the wave in its anger, so that his vesture and body be wetted of the spray, then, whatever be his strength, the water will draw him to itself, for it is mightier than he. Many a man has struggled and fallen on the brink, and been drowned in its clutch. But if a man turn his back upon the water, then he may stand safely upon the bank, taking his pleasure as long as he will. The wave will pass by him, doing him no mischief; he will not be wetted even of the flying foam.

\[539\] HRB. IX, vii
Regardless of the local superstition, it seems improbable that ‘Wace’ would know that there were fields/fens in the same location ‘Geoffrey’ is describing.

As ‘Wace’ is using the First Variant, we expect to find Dubricius as one of the three Archflamens: being Archbishop of Caerleon and Legate of Rome..... as this was highly relevant to why the First Variant was composed. We know that when the Primary Historia was completed in early 1138, Henry was not concerned with metropolitan issues and does not mention the Archflamens. Huntingdon in EAW just relates: He established twenty-eight bishops in Britain, following the number of pagan priests.... So Henry initially in the Primary Historia based his storyline on Gildas’ number of cities. Not until the metropolitan issue comes to the fore does Henry get interested in embellishing the script with Archflamens.

Now, as we have discussed, Huntingdon travelling with the Archbishop of Canterbury would have found it worthy of mention that there were three archbishoprics in Britain, if it had been written in the Primary Historia found at Bec. The three archbishoprics were not found in the storyline of the Primary Historia simply because Henry Blois thought he was archbishop of Canterbury in waiting at the time. There was absolutely no agenda for the inclusion of three Archflamen’s which were only latterly posited in the First Variant, when Henry took his case to Rome. Hence the ecclesiastical bent where anti-Roman rhetoric is toned down and accepted history in the annals is followed more closely.

The Historia was evolving and Avalon and Arthur’s last whereabouts are not developed as yet. If Avalon had been mentioned in the Primary Historia, Huntingdon would have mentioned it out of fascination because of his ignorance of its location. Avalon is however mentioned in the First Variant, yet there is still no mention of Walter simply because he is still alive.

We need to understand that by 1153-4 people were starting to wonder who Galfridus Arthur was and how he knew so much British history that no previous historian had recorded. Hence the verification by signing charters of a person named Galfridus Arthur.

It is only when the source book is needed to explain Galfridus’ insight into insular history that Walter’s name is presumed upon; and therein is the explanation of why Walter is not in the First Variant version. The good book of Oxford nor the Archdeacon of Oxford who supplies the old source book
are not mentioned in First Variant in 1144. It is only while Henry is at Oxford while signing those seven charters, that ‘Geoffrey’ obtains his Monmouth connection because Henry sees Ralph’s provenance; and therein also lies the explanation as to why only in the Vulgate HRB is Galfridus named as Geoffrey of Monmouth and thus that particular appellation dates after 1153.

As we have previously discussed, The First Variant has no Alexander dedication, but this does not negate the fact that the early set of prophecies existed in the First Variant. Once Merlin was spliced into the First Variant version, it is easy to see without any change to the structure of the text how up-dated prophecies were added after 1155 to replace the old set. We can see the progression of reasoning to the First Variant version which is here recorded and paralleled in Wace as the metropolitan issue becomes the main agenda for Henry. But there is no mention of Faganum and Duvianum in the Roman de Brut as Henry had long since given up the quest for metropolitan by the time he had finished the version c.1158-60.

We could possibly speculate that in the Vulgate HRB was Henry’s final attempt at Metropolitan, where the unabashed Briton polemic is aimed at the only English pope in 1154 where Dubricius is incontestably Primate: Dubric of the City of Legions. He, Primate of Britain and Legate of the Apostolic See...

There were no legates to sixth century Britain but Henry Blois himself was Legate from 1139-43. It was in fact Henry’s own persistent use of Legatine councils and their powers which he had instituted in referring problems to the pope, which eventually backfired on him and he became subject to, once he had lost the Legation when Innocent II died.

‘Wace’ (as in the Vulgate), tells of the coincidental similarities at Arthur’s crowning to another circumstance where Henry Blois and Bernard similarly escort The Empress Matilda as bishops, one each side, as in GS.540

Now telleth the chronicle of this geste, that when the morning was come of the day of the high feast, a fair procession of archbishops, bishops, and abbots wended to the King’s palace, to place the crown upon Arthur’s head, and lead

---

540 Gesta Stephani: Matilda was publicly welcomed into Winchester. She took up residence in the Castle and Bishop Henry handed over to her the keys to the Treasury and the Royal Crown. He then arranged a large meeting of the citizens of Winchester in the Market Place so they could salute her as "their Lady". From here, the party entered the cathedral with great pomp. Matilda led the procession with Henry of Blois to her right and the Bishop of St. David’s to her left. Relatives of the Bishops of Salisbury, Ely and Lincoln were also present and Henry sent for Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury who arrived a few days later.
him within the church. Two of these archbishops brought him through the streets of the city, one walking on either side of his person. Each bishop sustained the King by his arm, and thus he was earned to his throne.⁵⁴¹

We might speculate that if there were no Archbishops in the Primary Historia and no Phagan and Deruvian in the passage where Lucius is mentioned, the processional of Arthur’s crowning would not be present either.... as Matilda’s crowning had not yet taken place when Primary Historia was written and we can speculate that Henry based the version of the crowning on this incident.

So as to appear an independent author, ‘Wace’ has Lucius, the Emperor and lord of Rome in his decree to King Arthur saying: I will cross the Mont St. Bernard with a mighty host, and pluck Britain and France from your hand. Earlier ‘Wace’ had alluded to: Knights had their plate who held land of the King, from the furthest Marches of the west even unto the Hill of St. Bernard. The Hill or Mount St Bernard is mentioned 5 times in Wace and not at all in HRB. The Mont Bernard pass is just over 100 miles from Clugny and after one has passed through the ‘Aravian range’ (which ‘Geoffrey’ prefers to use as the border description), it was the main track to Rome. The point is, if Wace is a clerk lisant at Caen and ‘Geoffrey’ is a magister at Oxford, it seems too coincidental that both of their defining geography involves descriptions of Arthur’s empire north of the Alps. We know that Henry must have gone this route approximately 10 times to get to Rome and we should recall ‘Geoffrey’s’ allusion to Matilda and the reference of her marriage to the Emperor of Rome as pertaining to this border with Rome: Eagle build her nest upon Mount Aravius...

It is no coincidence ‘Wace’ and ‘Geoffrey’ appear to think in similar terms geographically yet both use different terms to define the same border of mountains and places upon them defined correctly by different names; yet both Wace and Geoffrey vastly geographically removed seem capable of interchanging nomenclature for something that could and should be stated as the Alps. Yet we know why this is! It is because originally before Wace versified about the St Bernard pass, the Aravian mountains were used mystically as the nomenclature for the alps and thus Rome because the vision was seen by Merlin in the prophecy concerning Matilda. Do you really think the reason Wace refers to the Alps as the Bernard pass is

⁵⁴¹ Wace. Roman de Brut
because he alone understood what the Aravian mountain prophecy referred to? To this day there was not a modern scholar who even knew what the Aravian mountain term meant. Nor did any attempt at elucidation of the prophecies ever unravel its meaning; yet Wace knows exactly what it refers to. A Freudian slip I would say proving one mind wrote both the prophecies of Merlin and *Roman de Brut*.

We should also consider Geoffrey’s *shadow of him that weareth a helmet* is himself as legate to the pope.... on the other side of the mountains, to which ‘Wace’ is also using as a Geographical divide. We may assume that Mont St Bernard is being employed mentally as the equivalent of the Aravian/Alps Mountains. Some commentators have been foolish enough to think Mont St Bernard is Mont St Michel, but Wace confirms his geography: *Maximian, King of Britain, after he had conquered France and Germany, passed the Mont St. Bernard into Lombardy*.

It just seems beyond coincidence that ‘Wace’ defines the border of the Alps just as ‘Geoffrey’ does, but with a different name. If ‘Wace’ is following the First Variant prophecies of Merlin where Mont Bernard is never mentioned, how is it that he thinks just like ‘Geoffrey’? Thankfully we know ‘Geoffrey’ is constructor of the Merlin prophecies and Wace’s *Roman de Brut* was written by Henry Blois.

While on the subject from this oft made journey to Rome; if we mark the points on the map, we will see that there are two routes that Henry Blois has taken to and from Rome in his travels. After leaving Rome and passing through Modena and then across the Alps.... the right hand route is the one discussed by Henry Blois in the letter with Abbot Suger (through Flanders)\(^{542}\) and goes through Montbéliard where Robert de Boron supposedly comes from; Meuse, where Henry commissioned the Mosan plates and Tournai from where the many marble fonts\(^{543}\) derive.... and onto Froidmont where Helinand resided. The left hand route would bring Henry up through the Aravian range to Clugny, Autun, Langres Troyes and on up to Bec and Caen before crossing to England. As one can see in note 4 the chance of Wace and Geofffrey referring to two different places so close to each other.... both defining what Henry Blois sees as a geographical border is a coincidence too far. Great St. Bernard Pass is the most ancient pass

---

\(^{542}\) See Note 4

\(^{543}\) There are only seven in England. The fact that four of the seven are in Hampshire leads to the conclusion that they were the gift of Henry de Blois; the finest example being at Winchester
through the Western Alps and is the route one would have taken from Clugny through the Aravian range and on through the St Bernard pass (so named by Mont St Bernard) on a journey to Rome.

At this point in the investigation, it is worth reiterating that the Merlin prophecies were in a state of flux. As we have discussed, there were changes in nuance and the updating witnessed between Suger’s *Libellus Merlini* version, the JC version, the Vulgate version and those in the VM are seen to be squewed by Henry Blois. Eckhardt’s three modes of transition are basically correct in that there was a separate ‘first’ set of prophecies which circulated separately. Abbot Suger, amongst others, would have possessed a set. These came out while Stephen was alive.

These were then updated after the death of Stephen to include such updates as found in the Vulgate (with the incitement to rebellion and the Sixth in Ireland prophecy) while the sense of some of the original verses were twisted, so that these looked like the previous prophecies. These were added to and updated in VM where some prophecies concerning the anarchy which were not in the first set were included (specifically those by Ganieda). Some were malicious in intent with the usual skimble skamble imagery. Some, which were previously established to apply to historical events and personages of known history in the original set, were subtly changed to apply to current events. Numbers were added to identify the Kings from William the conqueror (i.e. no number five with direct reference to Matilda but a sixth regarding Henry II). Cadwallader and Conan were being employed in the modern era of 1155, where most probably, previously, Cadwallon would have referred to Cadwallon ap Cadfan (died 634). As we have learnt Henry Blois was trying to unite and incite the Celts to rebellion against Henry II as can be seen clearly here: *Cadwallader shall call unto Conan, and shall receive Albany to his fellowship. Then shall there be slaughter of the foreigners: then shall the rivers run blood: then shall gush forth the fountains of Armorica and shall be crowned with the diadem of Brutus. Cambria shall be filled with gladness and the oaks of Cornwall shall wax green. The island shall be called by the name of Brutus and the name given by foreigners shall be done away.*

The fact that Henry referred to the Normans as foreigners was the ultimate cover. In this instance we can tell this prophecy dates from 1155 - 1158, where he is trying to unite the Bretons, Scots, Cornish and Welsh.
What is plain is that in none of the prophecies discussed by Abbot Suger (shown below) is there any hint of sedition. Why would there be. Henry was not in self imposed exile and his brother was King when these prophecies were published: *The Lion of Justice shall succeed, at whose warning the towers of Gaul and the dragons of the island shall tremble. In those days shall gold be wrung forth from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall flow from the hooves of them that low. They that go crisped and curled shall be clad in fleeces of many colours, and the garment without shall betoken that which is within. The feet of them that bark shall be cropped short. The wild deer shall have peace, but humanity shall suffer dole. The shape of commerce shall be cloven in twain; the half shall be round. The ravening of kites shall perish and the teeth of wolves be blunted. The Lion’s whelps shall be transformed into fishes of the sea, and his Eagle build her nest upon Mount Aravius.*

It should be understood that the copy of prophecies which Abbot Suger possessed were merely established to show that Merlin had seen into future and the prophecies were in essence innocuous. Their main purport was to establish that the Normans (as saviours) had been foreseen and therefore, so had Stephen's reign. This as we discussed gave the appearance that Stephen's reign was fated and so was the loss of the crown by her of the ‘broken covenant’. Modern scholars should grasp that the prophecies in the Vulgate HRB were not finalised until 1155. The incitement to rebellion and its intent, so clearly defined in JC’s prophecies, could only benefit one ‘adopted son’ and that is Henry Blois; who, at the time, was in self-imposed exile. John of Cornwall’s set of prophecies were full of malicious intent, but end with a vision of Henry returning gloriously as an adopted son to Britain.

One might suggest that a set of prophecies which originally accompanied the text of the *Roman de Brut* may be the explanation as to why Henry II puzzlingly withdrew his patronage from ‘Wace’ but this seems doubtful considering the date of publication c.1159-60.

There are a set of twelfth century prophecies which it is worth covering not wishing to bore the reader. Of the 19 MSS of the *Roman de Brut*, 9 are Anglo Norman and 10 French. But, it is 3 of the Anglo-Norman texts which have the set of prophecies written in meter attached. These may be the residue of prophecies which were originally destined to be attached to the early copy of Wace which Henry had prepared before Stephen died. There
is a fragment of these verses in octosyllabic rhymed couplets which would tie in with ‘Wace’s’ *Roman de Brut*.

‘Wace’s’ claim concerning his reluctance to reiterate the prophecies in essence is self-evidently ingenuous as many other of his fabrications in the *Roman de Brut* expand on top of ‘Geoffrey’s’ fabrications. So, the versifier of these prophecies seems to have an uncanny precise understanding of the meaning of the prophecies given that they were in their original form oblique and vague at best to the average reader. If these had indeed been part of the original ‘Wace’ *Roman de Brut* they would certainly have caused offence to Henry II as the interpretation in translation is more clearly detrimental to Matilda and King Henry than those by Merlin in the *Historia*. Subconsciously also the versifier seems to have an uncanny likeness of understanding of Henry Blois’ agenda. I will use Jean Blacker’s Durham MS translation of some of these prophecies to highlight my point.

When speaking of Arthur as the boar of Cornwall:

*Rome will tremble from his cruelty;
He will have a truly mysterious end.
He will have honours from the mouths of nations;
His deeds will be food for storytellers,
Six men will follow his sceptre;
They will be those of his line.*

Of course there is nothing that resembles this in HRB directly but each line can be linked to Henry through JC or Wace or the hope of the Britons, the six kings etc. Again, concerning Henry Blois’ argument that the Briton church was long established before Augustine, our versifier seems to avow the same position:

*Among the seats of primacy there will be change:*

---

544 In the *Roman de Rou* a genuine Master Wace mentions an epic tale but does not continue it: *I have heard minstrels in my childhood who have sung about William long ago blinded by Osmunt and dug out the eyes of Count Rialf and how he caused Ansketil to be slain by trickery, and Blazo of Spain to be guarded with a shield. I know nothing about these, nor can I discover anything further about them. When I have no corroboration of detail I do not care to repeat, nor do I wish to affirm that lies are true.* This hardly sounds like the composer of the *Roman de Brut* and it is for this reason Henry Blois adds comments seemingly written by Wace.

545 One other reason Wace might have had his patronage withdrawn may be that after reading the *Roman de Brut*, an interested patron such as Henry II would expect a lot more than what is found in the prosaic and rather monotonous *Roman de Rou*.

546 Anglo-Norman verse Prophecies of Merlin.
Canterbury will be decorated
In the dignity that belongs to London.

Our master Gregorius was intent on having us believe that the unknown bronze horseman at Rome was Maximian. Our versifier also paints a similar picture of possibility:

He who will do this will occupy London
As a Baron of bronze and will sit proudly
On a horse of bronze.

Our versifier is even clearer than Merlin in his meaning. This man understands the meaning of the prophecies:

The offspring this Lion will have
Will be turned into fish in the sea
And a female Eagle which will be born from him,
Will make her nest on Mount Aravius.

Until it is understood that the prophecies of Merlin in their various forms were manipulated by Henry Blois over time, they will never be understood definitively as they are never consistent. We cannot cover all the prophecies in the Durham MS; but one thing is clear, the time of Henry’s previous set of prophecies are past. Insurrection is no longer an option. If I am correct that these once were destined to coexist with Wace’s Roman de Brut, before they were separated and ‘Wace’ declared he did not understand them, we can see that Henry Blois refers to his futile beginning (i.e. crowning his brother) but has not given up on the idea that he might unite the Celts and be crowned with the head of a lion and will make a metropolitan of Winchester and St David’s.

This one will arrange the parts in one whole
And will be crowned with the head of a Lion
For a time his beginning will be futile,
Then his end will soar to the highest ones,
For he will renew the holy sees;
He will put pastors in suitable places.
He will clothe two cities in archbishop’s palls.

Further, after what happened at the rout of Winchester Merlin now cleverly predicts (which he does not in Vulgate prophecies) about what happens to the pastoral see:

Of Winchester: all will fall down
And the earth will swallow you up
The pastoral see there will be razed.
As we have noted before, The Hedgehog is Henry's own reference to himself:

A hedgehog which will be loaded with apples
Will rebuild her (Winchester)
To their odour sweetly, for they will smell sweet,
Birds from many woods will fly
And a grand palace will be built
Which will be surrounded with six hundred towers

Nowhere else in the various formats or versions of the prophecies are the next two lines found. I believe they were put there to deflect the notion that many suspected the Bishop of Winchester of having fabricated the Merlin prophecies as just possibly his castle at Winchester had six hundred crenulations.

Each tower will have six guards,
Who will give laws to those of their charge.

Even though the Roman de Rou was probably put out in 1160, if these prophecies originally accompanied the Roman de Brut, we would now see why it was necessary to assert that the Brut was written c.1155.
Chapter 25

The Gesta Regum Anglorum by William of Malmesbury

The current authority on the *Gesta Regum* are the two volumes by Mynors, Thompson and Winterbottom. Much of the information used here is derived from their analysis. There is however a difference between their conclusions and mine concerning the B & C versions of GR. It seems fairly obvious that the interpolations pertaining to Glastonbury for the most part in GR3 have been added as part of Henry Blois’ attempt to gain metropolitan status for Western England as we have covered. However, there are obviously parts of versions B & C of GR3 which are not interpolations and are from William’s pen.

The GR is transmitted in four main versions; the T, A, C and the last version B. The strange fact, as we will cover shortly, is that the C version has been interpolated last, but in general is a more recent update on A. In one of the cases where chapter 35 is concerned, parts of a genuine charter has been re-modelled for reasons that become clear as long as we are not blinkered. T is our most basic copy which we shall call *Gesta Regum* 1 which gets updated to a version A which we shall call GR2. But GR3 has genuine
updated material by William from the T and A versions as Thompson and Winterbottom have called them.
For instance the expanded version of the burial of Edmond Ironside is found in the C version and reflects new insight gained while William of Malmesbury was researching DA. A purely stemmatic analysis would make versions C and B twin offspring of GR3.

GR3 is as Thompson and Winterbottom assume, William’s last redaction. The twist is that there are additions and alterations to the C version which are made after William’s death by the Glastonbury establishment in the time of contention with Bishop Savaric. These are nothing to do with Henry Blois’ alterations. However, the B version also has other corrections and alterations and these are what concern us here. These are the Glastonbury interpolations made by Henry Blois in pursuit of his metropolitan. It is these which are cleverly used in conjunction with the DA.

I realize that most people reading this will see me attempting to analyse a script that I am again stating was interpolated by Henry Blois. Let me just say for the record that by deduction from Malmesbury’s other work we can see that interpolations were made. We just need to look at the content of those additions now Henry Blois is posited as a serial interpolator. If Henry can interpolate DA and author the apologia of GS, he would certainly find it easy to insert a small amount of corroborative Arthurian evidence in GR3. This is the man who concocted HRB and invented prophecies as is plain by what we have already divulged. By comparison Henry Blois has only added but a spec to GR3 so please accept that this expose is equally valid in unscrambling the mess that Henry has left to posterity.

The GR acts as a bridge for greater and subsequently more expansive fabrications in DA. The reason for this is GR3 Glastonbury version was interpolated first and then left unadulterated. From the four versions there are various stemma derived from each version which are elucidated by Thompson and Winterbottom. The T version appears to be the earliest and the various stemmas originate in France or Flanders. The original is thought to be the presentation copy to the Empress Matilda; a letter to whom prefaces the Tt version. The original A version would appear to be a

547 Thompson and Winterbottom GR, 144.3
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later redaction of William of Malmesbury’s working copy of T with references back and with later additions. Thompson and Winterbottom, have concluded that the C version was a manuscript presented by William of Malmesbury to Glastonbury and is a result of discriminating corrections made by William during his researches at Glastonbury while writing his accounts of the saints there and while writing the DA.

My supposition is that the Glastonbury interpolations in the B redaction of William’s work are carried out by Henry Blois; which compliment his goal of metropolitan status for Western England. The original B version was the product of his efforts to supply a proof of antiquity for papal approval. Henry Blois carried out at least two recorded attempts to obtain metropolitan status, one in 1144 and the second in 1149. Henry’s alterations to William’s work spread his polemic through the Glastonbury institution and to similar minded monks bent on the aggrandisement of the abbey after his death. Henry’s alterations were made in DA and GR for a specific purpose after William of Malmesbury had died. Over time, when B & C versions were copied in continental and insular monastic scriptoriums, sometimes these interpolations were corrected against T or A stemma or against manuscripts already corrected or interpolated. This is what has led to the eventual corruption of William’s words found in T and his expanded and corrected version of A.

There are many hypothesis put forward by Thompson and Winterbottom but none take into account fraudulent Glastonbury changes made by Henry Blois in the text just after William died. We can assign only some of the material pertaining to Glastonbury found in C & B versions to William. Some are Henry’s Blois’ additions and some are later Glastonbury additions concerning Bishop Savaric’s intervention at the abbey after Henry had died. GR3 interpolations in parts corroborate material found in the first 35 chapters of DA (and a few subsequent places) and most of that is material interpolated by Henry Blois, except where the contention with Wells is concerned.

Opinions held in A are probably William’s generally held beliefs and several passages of the Glastonburyana found in C & B were added later after William died just as in DA. It is for this reason that it is unlikely, as most scholars have assumed that the C version in totality is an unadulterated reflection of William’s new understanding after having carried out his researches at Glastonbury.
The GR composition was started by William before Henry’s arrival at Glastonbury and the T version was published c.1126. If we assume that the monks had employed William to give an account of the saints (specifically Dunstan) at Glastonbury shortly afterward and then extended William’s mandate to write DA….. it seems certain that William was still at Glastonbury when Henry had moved to Winchester. This is intonated by the dedication in the prologue of DA.

It was the monks who commissioned the lives of the Glastonbury saints, but VSD especially was commissioned to counteract the false accusation put out by Osbern that Dunstan was the first abbot at Glastonbury. Shortly after Henry arrived at Glastonbury, Henry’s shake up of the abbey with a mind to increase revenues involved putting out a rumour that Dunstan’s bones resided at Glastonbury. We have covered this in connection to Eadmer’s letter along with the accusation against the ‘youth’ of Glastonbury for starting this rumour about Dunstan’s relics at the abbey.

Henry Blois and William of Malmesbury would have had contact and a lot of interests in common. As I posited earlier, it may just have been that relationship which sparked Henry to write the pseudo-history that was the precursor to *Primary Historia*, as he became aware of the swathes of blank canvas in insular history. It may even be that he wished to belittle the dour attempts of Huntingdon and Malmesbury’s histories by creating a far more interesting and entertaining read.

Henry Blois boldly corrects both William and Huntingdon’s facts when he writes as ‘Geoffrey’. For example, Huntingdon in his chronicle writes that there are four main highways which bisect Britain and Henry Blois purposely ‘out does’ him by naming the British ruler…. Henry’s own fictional Belinus previously unheard of in British History (who I mentioned previously), who ordered the construction of the highways in HRB. This is how we divine Gaimar’s work has been tampered with. The same goes for William where he cautiously records an inscription as being relevant to a Roman victory. Henry Blois as ‘Geoffrey’ sets him straight that the inscription and its erection was due to a triumphant British King. Does ‘Geoffrey’ really with all his authority sound like a meek cannon at oxford because surely when he started writing, there was no mention of a book from which all this information was supposedly derived. The idea of a source book came later as sceptics started to question the authority with which ‘Geoffrey’ wrote.
If Winterbottom and Thompson could accept B & C versions have been interpolated by Henry Blois immediately after William’s death and subsequently by Glastonbury monks long after William’s and Henry’s deaths, many of their hypotheses will become less entangled.

The sense and propagandist intent of the interpolations in GR3 corroborate with Henry’s ‘early agenda’ for metropolitan. It is by this method we should determine which parts of GR have been interpolated at which period and for what purpose. In the past scholars have assumed relationships between GR3 and parallel material found in DA is evidence of authenticity, but this is not a notion which works when both manuscripts have been interpolated at such an early date after William’s death... and by the same person in both manuscripts. We need to figure out which are genuine updates which constituted William’s redaction of GR3 after his research at Glastonbury and differentiate those interpolations which have been spliced on top of the later redacted material. The confusion has arisen because some chapters found in the B & C versions are also similarly found in DA. This has cemented the belief that both interpolated portions, because they are found in both books, originate from William. This belief is only tenable if no fraud is suspected. Scholars believe this to be the case unequivocally with GR. Thus convoluted reasoning is employed to marry the two scripts.

It seems safe to posit that the DA would not have had wide interest except to those at Glastonbury. It was conceived originally to provide proof of antiquity for the abbey and to counter Osbern’s inaccurate statement that Dunstan was the first Abbot at Glastonbury. We will cover the obvious tension between monks and William shortly, evident in the prologue to DA. We will see that in all probability the DA was presented to Henry Blois at Winchester. It is fair to speculate that Henry Blois once having received the DA manuscript had indicated to William that he would have copies of DA written up. But it is likely he did not. Therefore Henry Blois was at liberty to insert whatever he liked into DA after William’s death. This opportunity was ultimately put to good use when William died.

So, Henry’s first written concoction in the pursuit of a proof of pre-Augustine antiquity for the abbey was when Henry himself composed the Life of Gildas impersonating Caradoc. His first oral fabrication when he arrived in 1126 at Glastonbury as abbot however, was spreading the rumour that Dunstan’s bones resided at Glastonbury. This we have covered
under the section on Eadmer's letter. The *Life of Gildas* was seemingly an
innocuous tract in the same format as some of the other Celtic saint's lives.
A few manuscripts had previously and cursorily mentioned the more
rebellious persona of Arthur. It was upon these very brief appearances as a
named warlord in saint's lives, a small passage in Nennius and AC from
which Henry built the persona of the 'chivalric' King Arthur with Norman
values. There existed an oral tradition concerning 'warlord' Arthur to
which William refers in the T version of GR1.

We will just take a deviation here to put GR in context. The last
paragraph in the *Life of Gildas* is an addition to the *life* and was added after
the initial composition of the *Life of Gildas*. We can deduce why the
etymology of Ineswitrin was introduced into the *Life of Gildas*. Firstly, if no-
one knew where Ineswitrin was, it renders the 601 charter suspect. The 601
charter was the most substantial proof of antiquity for Glastonbury. In
William's original unadulterated DA, the book commenced with a copy of
the charter which has now become chapter 35 of DA. Until it was
established that Ineswitrin was synonymous with Glastonbury (so it
appeared an estate was being donated), the 601 charter did not act as a
definitive proof which was required to establish antiquity.

In other words, without knowing the location which is being donated, it
dilutes the credibility of the charter. There were two reasons to establish
antiquity. The earlier reason was to counter Osbern's assertion. The second
reason was to show that an abbey and Church existed at Glastonbury which
was pre-Augustinian and thereby supplying adequate reason to grant a
metropolitan to Henry Blois. The problem was that no one had previously
heard of Ineswitrin before at Glastonbury. The 601 charter had lain
dormant in a chest. That is until William of Malmesbury, through his
researches, while compiling DA, uncovered it.\(^{549}\) Hence, it was easy for

\(^{549}\) I would suggest the 601 charter and the prophecy of Melkin were found in the same chest of documents at
Glastonbury by William. To William, the prophecy would have made no sense at all, since the only recognisable
names were Joseph of Arimathea and the prophet Jesus and where Ineswitrin was located did not concern
William. It was the fact that a charter donating an island to the Old church at Glastonbury (even though it
referred to the same Island as the prophecy; Ineswitrin)… the charter had a date of 601 on it which was the
essential proof, which he needed to demonstrate the antiquity of Glastonbury. So William before Henry became
Bishop stated his proof of Antiquity by beginning his DA with the 601 charter.

Henry Blois based the HRB's Avalon on the island of Ineswitrin in Melkin prophecy. Henry Blois was hardly
going to include the name of Ineswitrin in HRB, especially if William, as the finder of the documents, could
recognise who the author of HRB might be. However, because HRB's mystical Isle of Avalon (Ineswitrin), is
where Joseph relics are buried, it is ridiculous for Lagorio to argue: *If the abbey had possessed a genuine*
Henry Blois to insert the last paragraph into a tract that Henry himself had composed only recently. The etymological trickery provided in the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas* would have far reaching ramifications. We may speculate that before the exact location of Ineswitrin became an issue and the name needed to be established as synonymous with Glastonbury (in *Life of Gildas*), Henry had already commissioned the engravings on the archivolt at Modena.... invented as an Arthurian event in *Life of Gildas*.

It is probable that the last paragraph of the *Life of Gildas* was added only when the 601 charter was used as evidence at Rome in pursuit of metropolitan status c.1144, (when Looe Island was appropriated); the original *Life of Gildas* script (before the addition) ostensibly proving antiquity to Gildas' era. Certainly William of Malmesbury was ignorant of the fact that Ineswitrin was posited as being synonymous with Glastonbury while he was alive (regardless of what has since been interpolated in DA).

The Archivolt engravings coincided and corroborated Henry's recently written legend concerning Arthur in the *Life of Gildas* i.e. it seemingly sprouted on the building from another independent source apart from Caradoc. The short tract of *Life of Gildas* would be easy to compose for someone of Henry's literary ability. The fact that William of Malmesbury...

account of Joseph of Arimathea, the monks would have hardly waited until the twelfth century to establish their claim, nor would they have it publicized in secular Grail romances. Monastic audacity and inventiveness would seem to be the operative factor with Joseph, as it was with Arthur. At least she recognises in this instance that there was a Joseph tradition in the twelfth century! This is precisely the point; the reference to Joseph of Arimathea did not refer to Glastonbury but Ineswitrin.... and monastic inventiveness was not the operative factor, but it was Henry Blois. Lagorio goes on to say with expert aplomb that: *In Joseph's case, however, the claim was not exploited beyond the interpolation (in DA), as there is no Joseph legend in the abbey's documents or in the vernacular literature such as chronicles or saints' lives, until the end of the fourteenth century. She had just previously explained that 'eminent critics' held that Robert de Boron had based his text on a Latin text at Glastonbury and Nitze and others see a Glastonbury origin for the Perlesvaus. So, how can she aver the opposite if the latest possible date for *Joseph de Arimathie* is 1180 (but we know it is c.1165).... and still hold that there is no Joseph legend except for that in William’s DA until the end of the thirteenth century. Lagorio continues on with even more contradictory statements trying to rationalise how all these coincidences occurred concerning Joseph at Glastonbury: *yet they (the monks) were obviously reluctant to propagandize him, owing to his sudden appearance on the abbey scene after centuries of alternate legends*. The only reason Joseph appeared suddenly was the fact that Henry Blois had died and Joseph’s name appeared in DA as the founder of Glastonbury; and Robert de Boron’s romances (originally written by Henry Blois) confirmed Joseph was in the west at Avalon.... and the writer of both had converted Glastonbury into Avalon. It was only after Henry’s death that all these elements coincided in the discovery of Arthur’s body. Finally, the Leaden cross bore out that Glastonbury was Avalon, but amazingly, all these coincidences seemed to Lagorio to be a *fortuitous convergence of factors*. All this was arranged by Henry Blois. Lagorio, like Carley, thinks the Melkin prophecy is a product of Glastonbury and the prophecy’s only significance is that it was included in John’s *Cronica*. Both of them have no conception of the fact that the entire *Matter of Britain* edifice is built on the truth behind the prophecy of Melkin.
supposedly corroborates in DA that Gildas once resided at Glastonbury is due to Henry's interpolation concerning his pursuit of metropolitan status in 1144. The Life of Gildas was probably accomplished c.1139 just after the Primary Historia was completed in early 1138. As we have covered, while Henry Blois was on the continent in Normandy in 1137-8 (after having spent time in Wales in 1136), he spliced the Arthur content onto an already existing history of the Britons or what I have termed pseudo historia which initially had been destined for his uncle and Empress Matilda. The Primary historia at Bec having had the Arthuriana spliced in or enlarged upon from the pseudo-historia.

The Life of Gildas must have been written before 1140 if the historians are correct about the completion date of Modena. It was certainly written before Henry's journey to Rome through Modena on his way to plea for Metropolitan status in 1144. It is possible the Modena archivolt may have been commissioned as Henry passed through Modena when he became legate in 1139.

The idea of an Archivolt remaining unadorned and seeking a benefactor for the engraving is the most likely scenario to explain the depiction of the kidnap of Guinevere. It is important to understand the reasoning behind the Ineswitrin etymology as a later insertion into Life of Gildas. It establishes through the evident etymological contrivance that the 601 charter was part of William's genuine additions to GR3 and the charter really existed rather than it being one of the interpolations in version B.

There is no other logical reason for adding the last paragraph to the Life of Gildas. The etymological contortion resolves the problem that if the charter is to add weight as a proof of antiquity under scrutiny... it is best if Ineswitrin is a known location i.e. we are led to believe the Island in Devon actually now refers to an estate on the Island of Glastonbury.

If the 601 charter were merely a concoction and inserted like the other interpolations into GR3 in Henry's attempt for metropolitan in 1144; what would be the point of concocting the name Ineswitrin and inserting an etymological explanation in the last part of Life of Gildas. It is because the 601 charter existed that the last paragraph in Life of Gildas was added. Henry had this charter in hand at Rome in 1144.

No-where previously, in any manuscript, had the name Ineswitrin been known or seen. We should be aware that the prophecy of Melkin and the 601 charter both refer to Burgh Island in Devon obviated by the geometry
we covered earlier. The reason for substituting the name of Ineswitrin on the prophecy of Melkin for *Insula Avallonis* becomes evident when we discuss Henry Blois’ second agenda and the introduction of Joseph of Arimathea to Glastonbury in its new guise as Avalon; as this is the essence of Lagorio’s uncertainty as to how Joseph lore all coalesced into place at Glastonbury.

Melkin’s prophecy itself provided the basis and inspiration for Henry’s mystical island in HRB and the 601 charter itself was included in William’s genuine additions found in GR3. The Glastonbury interpolations in GR3 (version B) by Henry are concerned with acquiring metropolitan status in 1144. These interpolations ostensibly take us further back in time from Gildas to Eleutherius, but the mention of Freculphus’s referral to St Philip leads us more readily to accept the assertion of the disciples of Christ being the founders of Glastonbury.

William never posited such an un-historically attested and tantalizing possibility concerning St Philip. If William was not willing to concede to the existence of Dunstan’s relics at Glastonbury in his VSD, because he knew the rumour to be false, he was hardly going to use Freculphus for an authority for a tentative proselytization of Britain or posit the original founders of the ‘old church’ were the disciples of Christ. Freculphus had confused the Galatians with the Gaul’s anyway.

Henry’s mystical Island where ‘Geoffrey’ had brought Arthur for his healing in the storyline of HRB was based (inspirationally) on the real location of Ineswitrin drawn directly from the prophecy of Melkin. The name Ineswitrin was originally the subject island named in Melkin’s prophecy. This had to be changed for the sake of consistency c.1155 to accommodate Henry’s second agenda changing from his first agenda which concerned petitioning for metropolitan. The reason we can substantiate this as a fact is because the data in the prophecy leads to the tin island of Ictis. As we have covered this was latterly known as ‘White tin Island’ in the

---

550 Avalon, as we know, was not mentioned by Huntingdon in his précis of the 1139 version of HRB. The first we hear of Avalon is in the First Variant HRB and Alfred’s of Beverley’s recycling of ‘Geoffrey’s’ work c1147-50. It must be understood that HRB’s dedications were written retrospectively and the First Variant and variant versions precedes the Vulgate Historia. When Henry wrote the Primary Historia he had not developed the idea that Arthur would be taken to a mystical island. As we have covered, Huntingdon gives a completely different rendition of the battle with Mordred and if Arthur’s return was expected as Huntingdon alludes to, then the site of Arthur’s last known location, (if indeed Avalon had been recorded in the Primary Historia), would definitely have been recorded in EAW.
Brythonic/ Dumnonian or ancient Briton tongue. It is the same island which is named in the 601 charter and it was donated to Glastonbury by a named Devonian King. The King’s signature was illegible as Malmesbury maintained, but as a document of proof the 601 charter would surely withstand scrutiny; its age would be evident when presented at Rome to the pope.

Henry has two agenda’s which both concern the interpolations into DA. His first agenda is concerned with convincing papal authorities of both Winchester and Glastonbury’s pre-Augustinian antiquity; Winchester, through ‘Geoffrey’s’ work and Glastonbury through the interpolations into William’s GR3 and DA. Both locations are shown to exist before Augustine’s arrival and are witnessed by Henry’s polemic; with the intended outcome of gaining metropolitan status for Henry.

I am just trying to put things in perspective for continuity’s sake, so forgive the deviation for a moment from the present study of the interpolations into the B&C versions of GR3, to introduce another major factor of Henry Blois’ second agenda. Joseph of Arimathea in DA is never mentioned until Henry’s second agenda comes to the fore after 1158 i.e. Joseph lore in chapters 1&2 of DA is a subsequent addition, long after DA has been presented at Rome.

Melkin’s prophecy is never mentioned in DA simply because Henry would be uncovered as the author of HRB and the instigator of Grail legend and suspected of interpolating DA. However, we know Henry Blois supplied much of JG’s material as we covered already, (possibly posited in Henry’s/Melkin’s De Regis Arthuri rotunda).

Henry Blois had also invented the prophecies of Merlin and if the prophet Melkin were inserted into DA, suspicion would also fall on Henry. The duo fassula in the prophecy of Melkin was the basis of Henry’s inspiration for the Grail. The Grail was linked to Joseph (in reality) and therefore back to Glastonbury through the change of name on the prophecy and through Henry’s convincing efforts.... which eventually end with Avallon commensurate with Glastonbury. To hide his authorship of the many attributes of the Matter of Britain, Melkin’s prophecy was not included in DA.

As witnessed in the composition of HRB, Henry’s expertise in passing off HRB’s historicity is based upon tentative connections in a murky conflated history. Whatever ‘Geoffrey’ posits is never far removed from credulity, but
he leaves his readers to deduce. He expects his audience and posterity to connect the dots. As witnessed in HRB and the Grail stories, Henry cares not for anachronisms concerning his characters. Henry depends upon the reader's credulity allowing for the vagaries of time.... thus his apparent disregard for accuracy.

Chapters 1 and 2 which mention Joseph of Arimathea are in the earliest known manuscript of DA as part of the text which can be definitively dated to 1247. Scholars who misunderstand the role played by Henry, should not eliminate Henry Blois as the person who is responsible for creating Avalon; especially as Giraldus knew Glastonbury as Avalon c.1191-93, only 20 years after Henry’s death. It seems a little presumptuous and nonsensical as a priori that Joseph at Glastonbury was derived from continental influence through a ‘fortuitous’ set of circumstances. Let me be clear, Joseph’s connection to Glastonbury is only from the fact that the Island upon which he is buried was donated to Glastonbury.

The Melkin prophecy concerning Joseph’s burial site was discovered along with the 601 charter by William. On only two documents is the name Ineswitrin found. Firstly, on the 601 charter. We know this is genuine as William starts DA with it at chapter 35 and it was used in evidence as proof of Glastonbury’s antiquity. Secondly Ineswitrin was the name originally on the prophecy of Melkin which Henry Blois substituted later for Avalon. We know this by the Geometry. We can deduce if the 601 Charter is genuine then the Melkin prophecy which originally had the Ineswitrin name on it is genuine also. This can only be true otherwise the geometry would not work as it does for Burgh Island in Devon and most emphatically not in Avalon/Glastonbury.

The fact that the purport of the content of Melkin’s prophecy was not understood could be one of the contributory factors that it was not mentioned in the Glastonbury cartulary or in DA. The prophecy (with substituted name) was most probably included in a book supposedly written by Melkin (De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda) from which JG transposed it into the Cronica. In reality the book (said to be authored by Melkin) was actually composed by Henry Blois the inventor of chivalric Arthur and the Round Table. The Melkin prophecy has remained meaningless up until the present era. Henry knew the prophecy was real and Henry tried to locate Ineswitrin. He did not achieve his goal. But,
without the prophecy we would not have the Grail stories as will become apparent in progression.

In reality, Joseph came to Britain. If Lagorio had understood this maybe the present set of aging scholars would have unpeeled the layers a different way without setting erroneous \textit{a priori}s which we all now have to manoeuvre around, getting further not nearer a solution. However, it was the Joseph in history which potentially challenged the Roman monopoly on Christianity in early British history. Any notion of Joseph’s link to Britain was expunged during the Roman occupation or possibly it may have been purposefully secreted by the early Britons.

As long as established assumptions are reconsidered in the light of Henry Blois’ interpolative interference, we will see as we progress that fictionally, King Arthur’s Avalon is based upon the reality of Joseph of Arimathea’s Ineswitrin. Before any fraud from Henry Blois transpired, we must not forget what is recorded in Bede, who, attests to the quarrel between St Augustine and the Britons, who ‘\textit{preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world}’\textsuperscript{551}. Also Gildas says the first dawn of evangelical light appeared in this island about the 8\textsuperscript{th} year of Nero c.60 A.D.\textsuperscript{552} and a quick look through Butler’s lives of the saints see many early ones in the old Dumnonia.

The church at Glastonbury was already ‘Old’ which William stresses. There certainly was Christianity in Briton prior to Augustine’s arrival\textsuperscript{553}. Christianity’s early arrival in the South of England….evidenced in the Cornish saints names marking most towns and villages. There is one indisputable way to discover if Joseph of Arimathea brought Christianity to Britain. Unfortunately our experts believe there is no truth in the rumour, and the Devon Archaeological Society do not have the expertise to assess the viability of such a claim on Burgh Island; especially when the one scholar on Ictis (and Joseph’s obvious connection to it) can’t even recognise he has an account from Strabo elucidating why the tin ingots were found at the entrance to the River Erm.

\textsuperscript{551}Bede’s Eccl. Hist. Bk. ii. Ch2 see \textit{chapter 36}
\textsuperscript{552}Nero was Roman Emperor from 54 to 68 AD
\textsuperscript{553}Tertullian (AD 155–222) wrote in \textit{Adversus Judaeos} that Britain had already received and accepted the Gospel in his lifetime, writing, \textit{all the limits of the Spains, and the diverse nations of the Gauls, and the haunts of the Britons—inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ}. Henry would have not highlighted the connection of Joseph of Arimathea to Britain had he not had the Melkin prophecy in his possession. He more likely would have attached his propaganda to Aristobulus.
Once our experts understand who propagated the Joseph material both continentally and at Glastonbury, such assumptions on which they base their analysis of events concerning the *Matter of Britain* as a whole and concerning Arthur and Joseph at Glastonbury, will have to be re-assessed. Valerie Lagorio is the main instigator in leading modern scholars like Carley astray. But, she, by academic default had learnt misguided deductions from previous generations: *With this record of prosperity, Glastonbury had little need to enhance its Glory with Arthur’s counterpart, Joseph of Arimathea. Yet around 1250 the monks quietly incorporated Joseph into their founding legend, possibly succumbing to the fortuitous convergence of factors* supporting such a claim: the impact of traditional belief in Britain’s conversion to Christianity by an apostle; Joseph’s legendary status as an apostle and missionary; extant legends of the abbeys origins; and the Arthurian Grail cycle, which proclaimed Joseph as the apostle of Britain.\(^{555}\)

We have Giraldus’ testimony that Arthur’s resting place was known ....King Henry, for the King had said many times, as he had heard from the historical tales of the Britons and from their bards, that Arthur was buried between two pyramids that were erected in the holy burial-ground’...

It is emphatically stated in DA\(^ {556}\) where Arthur is buried by the man who manufactured Arthur’s grave and composed the engraving on the Leaden cross. We must not forget how we account for the reference to King Arthur in a charter written by Henry II granting concessions to Glastonbury, documented in the Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, where it refers to the many Kings connected to Glastonbury including the renowned King Arthur c.1184. So what gave the King, while still alive in 1189 (before the given date of the disinterment), the idea that Arthur was buried at Glastonbury? It could only be DA or GR3 Glastonbury version written by the person who wrote where Arthur was specifically located in DA. The same person who saw that king the day before he died and probably said to the King where Arthur was buried.

---

\(^{554}\) Joseph was mentioned in chapter 1&2 of DA and those chapters were written by Henry Blois. The postulation that in 1250 the monks quietly introduced Joseph into Glastonbury lore *succeeding to the fortuitous convergence of factors* is quite ridiculous.


\(^{556}\) DA chap 31
If one had spent an entire life creating history it would be a real shame if it went unsubstantiated, because how could one be seen comparable with Cicero if Arthur’s last act never came to final fruition. However, when GR3 interpolations were composed, no grave for Arthur was yet manufactured at Glastonbury.

Once Henry’s ‘Book of the Grail’ or forerunner to Perlesvaus, the missing link which is now lost and to which Grail legend refers (and which some attest was written by Master Blihis), is understood as part of the same propaganda as ‘Robert’s’ Joseph d’Arimathie. only then will the Matter of Britain be understood. We must also take into account that certain evidence which would have led to a more accessible investigation of the truth underlying the myth of Glastonbury was destroyed in the fire of 1184. Why would Adam of Damerham repeat what was written in De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda which obviously existed and from which JG obtained much of his information. Adam does not repeat what was in DA either. Instead Adam starts his account where DA ends in the chronology....with Henry Blois. The scholastic a priori which relies on the assumption that since Adam does not mention Joseph and assumes Joseph’s name was not in DA (before Arthur’s disinterment) is a totally unfounded premise which if taken as a fact corrupts any future theory on a ‘time line’ of what transpired and how concerning the advent of Glastonbury lore.

But no expert opinion can deny the inspiration or truth behind the Joseph legend, because the accuracy of the Melkin prophecy, in encrypted

---

557 William A Nitze, Glastonbury and the Holy Grail p.250. “I therefore venture to uphold Baist’s suggestion that the Perlesvaus originated in Glastonbury”.
558 Master Blihis is one of many variations of a misinterpretation of Monsieur instead of Monseigneur Blois and his name was referred to at the court of Champagne where Henry Blois spread his stories of the Grail to Chrétien de Troyes and Robert de Boron.
559 Lagorio attempts to rationalise how the events at Glastonbury relate to continental romances. Most ironically of all is that the interpolator of DA used a legend preserved among the Celts. Lagorio says: An eminent group of critics, including Alfred Nutt and Jean Marx, hold that Robert de Boron based his story on a Latin text at Glastonbury, while William Nitze and others see a Glastonbury origin for the Perlesvaus. Such scholarly support might seem to indicate that the interpolator of De Antiquitate and the romancers used a legend preserved amongst the Celts and brought back to Glastonbury during the later twelfth century. Yet all arguments for the authenticity of Glastonbury’s claim are negated by the lack of supportive evidence in the abbey records or elsewhere.

It certainly is a legend preserved by the Celts about an Island called Ineswitrin in the Prophecy of Melkin. Ironically the main contenders for negating the ‘supportive evidence’ are Lagorio and Carley in denying the existence of Melkin. There are none so blind as those who will not see; and modern medievalist scholars who concern themselves with the Matter of Britain are the ultimate case study of the blind leading the blind.
form, attests the genuine island’s location, long before scholarship had understood the prophecy’s purpose.

We have seen how Henry Blois impersonated Wace, but Henry Blois is the only person who knows he has based his Avalon in the HRB on the icon of Ineswitrin of the Melkin prophecy: *I know not if you have heard tell the marvellous gestes and errant deeds related so often of King Arthur. They have been noised about this mighty realm for so great a space that the truth has turned to fable and an idle song. Such rhymes are neither sheer bare lies, nor gospel truths. They should not be considered either an idiot’s tale, or given by inspiration. The minstrel has sung his ballad, the storyteller told over his story so frequently; little by little he has decked and painted, till by reason of his embellishment the truth stands hid in the trappings of a tale. Thus to make a delectable tune to your ear, history goes masking as fable.*

The irony is that the main propagator of the pseudo-history concerning a chivalric Arthur is Henry Blois himself. Obviously just after writing the piece above as Wace c.1158-60, Henry comes up with the idea of manufacturing Arthur’s grave so that on King Arthur’s disinterment with Guinevere his chivalric persona is recognised as a historical person buried in Avalon. Henry knew the grave of Arthur and Guinevere would be unearthed and had the foresight not only to tell us where the grave was located in DA and who we as posterity were going to find in it i.e. Guinevere and Arthur; but he also confirmed it in the colophon of Perlesvaus. Henry Blois is the architect of locating Avalon at Glastonbury not Henry de Sully.

William of Malmesbury in GR1 had affirmed the place of Arthur’s sepulchre was unknown and continued to believe the same until his death in 1143. Someone in the interim (before Giraldus) has converted Glastonbury into Avalon and William (who had been residing there while carrying on his researches) had no idea that Avalon even existed. William was only cognisant of a Devonian Ineswitrin and was not aware that Henry Blois had written the *Life of Gildas* in which Henry makes Ineswitrin synonymous with Glastonbury. William dismissed the prophecy of Melkin because it was unintelligible just as Carley has done. At least William of Malmesbury had the integrity to not pontificate upon a document he did not understand.

Ineswitrin is not mentioned anywhere by William except in connection to the 601 charter and we can assume he did not think the charter relates to
the location of Glastonbury. The bogus explanation which seemingly comes from William in DA which implies that Ineswitrin was synonymous with Glastonbury before the Saxons is of course Henry’s work. Radford says ‘the old church itself would probably not have existed in a vacuum and must be considered in the context of the whole island settlement’. So, it hardly makes sense that the ‘Estate’ of Ineswitrin is given to the old Church when ‘ynis’ means island and the old church existed on it already!!!

Likewise he states that ‘the oldest remains with those found in the ancient cemetery. Post holes were found belonging to at least four oratories of the wattle type... The best preserved was a small building 13 feet wide over 17 the long’. No one denies that there may well have been buildings of Wattle at Glastonbury, but it is William’s overstated excess on the old Church’s construction which demands our attention as to why the interpolation is focusing on this aspect with in-proportionate frequency (especially if there were other buildings of this construction method).

Anyway, author B says the old church was in wood.... why (but for compliance with cratibus from the prophecy) would Henry Blois focus on this point in what is an obvious interpolation in GR3 version B.

William’s un-interpolated work would not mention any part of the Life of Gildas as DA was completed before 1134. It is Henry’s interpolation in DA which places Gildas at Glastonbury and mentions Melvas. Ineswitrin was merely an unknown island location dedicated to Glastonbury. William’s reason for the inclusion of the 601 charter in GR3 is merely as an updated piece of information not known when GR1 was published in 1126, but it does prove the ‘old church’ was in fact old in 601AD.... and he makes that point, which is in essence what he has been tasked to do in writing the De Antiquitates.

The burial of a body to be unearthed in the future; the discovery of the Grail (in the guise of the duo fassula and its connection to Jesus); and the fact that these were on an island; all find their parallel in Melkin’s prophecy. Should we really be led to believe by Carley that these coincidences are a result of the Melkin prophecy being constructed to parallel these ‘earlier’ motifs? Or, we could ignore the expert who ignores the geographical data and evident geometry. He chooses to stay ignorant that the data mentioned in the prophecy (once decrypted), coincidentally forms a line which locates an island in Devon.... which by any assessment could possibly be the island of Ineswitrin donated to Glastonbury.
The directional data in the prophecy of Melkin was not known by the supposed fraudulent constructor of the prophecy, so it would be a huge coincidence if this too turned out to be relevant to an island donated to Glastonbury by a King of Devon.... and the said island connected to Joseph’s métier as tin Merchant.... just as Cornish (read Dumnonian) legend attests; especially when we can identify this island with Diodorus’ tidal island of Ictis.

If Melkin’s prophecy did not exist in Henry Blois’ lifetime and the monks around 1250 ‘quietly incorporated Joseph into their founding legend’, as Lagorio posits.... it truly would be a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’.

For modern scholarship to deny all mention of Arthur (and by extension Joseph) as only existing in DA as the product of later interpolation (i.e. after the 1191 disinterment) is plain ludicrous. It makes Henry II charter concerning Glastonbury which mentions Arthur a fake. It would mean that Gerald’s statement: Indeed, there had been some evidence from the records that the body might be found there,\(^{560}\) a pointless statement, if indeed it is not referencing DA. To what gain would the statement be made by Gerald? It seems mad for scholars to deduce that Gerald has not seen and read DA. Giraldus quotes from a passage in DA: In British it is called Inis Avallon, that is, insula pomifera (Latin: "The Island of Apples). This is because the apple, which is called aval in the British tongue..... This is not derived from VM or Life of Gildas.

Strangely though, Giraldus gives Fagan and Damian as names of Eleutherius’ preachers but does not mention the missionary’s connection to Glastonbury. But this can be rationalized by Gerald’s concentration and interest in the Welsh Arthur rather than general affairs pertaining to the foundation of Glastonbury. The fact that Giraldus does not mention Joseph has no bearing on whether chapters 1 & 2 existed as part of DA in 1191. Gerald’s concern was not for Glastonbury or the recently highlighted biblical Joseph of Arimathea mentioned in DA, but for Arthur and Avalon. Gerald’s interest is in the Arthur mentioned in HRB and the Arthur who had a splendid court in Wales who spoke of Dubricius and St David.

My assertion that Arthur’s burial location was stated in DA before 1191 is more understandable if one can accept that Henry (the instigator of the entire edifice of the Matter of Britain) has already planted a bogus set of

\(^{560}\) Giraldus Cambrensis. Liber de Principis Instructione
bones (some of them animal) and a lock of blonde hair and has seemingly, as if stating common knowledge, interpolated into DA: *Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks’ cemetery between the two pyramids.* If this were written after the disinterment…. why has the interpolator not covered the events of the disinterment as well?

We should assume that no-one saw DA at Glastonbury until Henry’s death. For the monks at Glastonbury it was probably not a shock when Henry de Sully decided to unearth Arthur. They had had twenty years to accept the fact. What would be shocking though is that so much in DA was ‘apparently’ true and therefore, they must also have assumed the St Patrick Charter, which attested that Avalon was synonymous with Glastonbury, must in fact be true also; before the proof *positif* was unveiled by what was declared on the leaden cross. Henry was abbot for 45 years and the generation which was there when William of Malmesbury was resident had probably all expired or moved on.

As I have already mentioned, most modern commentators also make the mistaken assumption that Joseph’s name could not have been in DA because Adam of Damerham makes no mention of him. Adam is just a continuator of DA not a critic nor extrapolator nor exponent of DA. He takes up his pen where William of Malmesbury supposedly finishes DA. This ironically enough is at chapter 83 regarding Henry Blois. Adam merely takes up a continuation of the history after Henry’s abbacy through the contentions with Wells etc.

The first scholar to realise the significance of the Glastonbury interpolations into GR3 was Newell and he along with Robinson tried to assess the authenticity of the work but neither suspected the motive behind the interpolations was Henry Blois’ ambition to gain metropolitan status. It is the Glastonbury material in GR3 which concerns us most as it serves as a bridge to more embellished assertions made in DA later. Most scholars believe GR3 is entirely Malmesbury’s work.

This obviously is the intention of Henry Blois, but for the most part, the interpolations discussed below are in fact just a reflection of Henry Blois’

---

561 This remarkable man, besides his splendid birth, is also distinguished for his literary skill and for the friendliness of his address…. This was written before William witnessed Henry Blois’ slippery antics changing sides to Matilda and then professing otherwise. If scholars like Carley and Crick cannot recognise Henry Blois literary skill in HRB as ‘Geoffrey’, or in Perlesvaus or Grail legends as Blihos Bleheris (H.Blois anagram) at least Henry himself does, as attested on the Meusan plates.
first agenda which sets up bogus evidence of antiquity in his quest for metropolitan status. The idea of interpolating GR written c.1125-6 (before Henry’s arrival at Glastonbury), leads papal authorities to believe the generally held perceptions in GR3 concerning Glastonbury are Malmesbury’s updated version, but who unfortunately has just died. ‘Supposedly’ some of these same views had been reiterated by a more informed William in DA earlier after his in depth research c.1134. For the most part both DA and GR3 would have concurred in 1144 about Glastonbury material with no other extraneous lore having yet been prévu for DA.

However, there is a Glastonbury interpolator who interpolates GR after Henry. He is responsible for the C version Glastonbury interpolations, some parts of the B version, and several subsequent additions after Henry’s death into DA. The Glastonbury interpolator after Henry is specifically interested in a polemic devised to deter Savaric, Bishop of Wells interfering in the affairs at Glastonbury. This was an issue which was mainly inherited as the product of the relationship between Robert Lewes and Henry Blois and both of their affections for Glastonbury. Robert of Lewes who had been Henry’s right hand man at Glastonbury and fulfilled certain duties when Henry moved to Winchester, also became (through Henry’s instigation) Bishop of Bath; both of them Cluniac’s. Both allowed the independent sanctity of Glastonbury and Henry Blois was still the abbot until Robert died. It was when Henry died that the interference from the diocese of Wells started.

The B version of GR3 is mainly concerned with presenting a history of antiquity for Glastonbury for papal approval. But herein is the confusion of the B and C stemma where they have been corrected by more recent copyists against GR2 & 1 in the thirteenth century. If GR3 had not been interpolated in versions C & B, much in DA would have been discounted as mere interpolative propaganda. Due to the fact that some of the material is mirrored in the two works, (some which is interpolated propaganda) has led scholars comparing the texts to think.... because they parallel each other in certain instances.... they both must be William’s genuine material.

Misguidedly, scholars have used GR3 as a basis for their understanding of what is authentic in DA and vice versa.... in conjunction with the assumption that GR3 is a genuine redaction from William’s new appraisal
of facts after his research at Glastonbury. The conclusion which followed this presumption is that GR3 (B version) is not interpolated. This method can only be reliably employed with T & A versions as I have said. Henry’s interpolative work concerning Glastonbury in GR3 leads the gullible to accept much which is written in DA as having been plausibly written by William. The current consensus is that the existence of Glastonbury material in GR3 is a result of William’s researches. This understanding, to a point, is true and governs why the later interpolations are infused amongst genuine updated material in GR3. Hence, we have the appearance of the Glastonbury additions of versions C & B in GR3 being accepted as authentic as the consequence of William’s later redaction.

Those that have a suspicion that all is not right, posit that the Glastonbury material is a consequence of a presentation copy by William to the monks. This is only a rationalisation and in reality, William is intransigent about the inclusion of doubtful material in his work so would not have embellished specially to ingratiate himself with a one off copy containing specific Glastonburyalia. If the opinion is that a Glastonbury copy was used to interpolate then I would definitely concur, but the first person to interpolate GR was Henry Blois.

To complicate things further, Thompson and Winterbottom believe all of C was written prior to William’s version of B or GR3 and this again to a certain extent is true. However certain interpolations in C were in response to Bishop Savaric’s interventions toward Glastonbury. This has led scholars to suggest that contention between Wells and Glastonbury existed prior to Henry Blois’ time because they have assumed William of Malmesbury is the sole author of B & C. There may be cause to believe contention existed before and possibly during Henry’s abbacy, but it is doubtful that such highly specific curses toward a Bishop intonated in Ine’s and Edgar’s charters would lead two Kings to be so poignantly directed against interference from Wells or any other bishop. Both charters smack of warning shots from Glastonbury against the bishop of Bath and Wells and both were interpolated by someone after Henry’s death becoming the second member of what my uncle referred to as the Officine de faux.

This, however, does not exclude the likelihood of a subsequent consolidating redactor of DA before our present T version. As I have made clear, Scott’s conclusion that a consolidating author is responsible for coalescing much of the work in DA’s first 34 chapters is misguided, because
it does not recognise Henry Blois as the main interpolator. It is not impossible that soon after William died, Henry borrowed from and never returned the latest copy of William’s GR which had been deposited at Malmesbury monastery. Henry had installed his own candidate as Abbot of Malmesbury. It may be that Henry had his own copy and Glastonbury interpolators of C or our consolidating author of DA had another.

Leland’s comment about the lack of knowledge about William at Malmesbury in Leland’s own era might indicate that if William had left his work at Malmesbury, it did not remain there. We can speculate that Henry Blois could have obtained William’s works from Malmesbury as we can see John of Worchester relates that in 1140-41 Henry installed his ‘man’ as abbot there: *Peter the monk, who was of great learning and knowledge was made abbot of Malmesbury by the bishop of Winchester, legate of the Holy Roman see. He had been a monk at Clugny, and for some time had been prior of La Charité (Karitia). Thence he became abbot of the monastery of the holy pope Urban in the diocese of Chálon-sur-Mer. When troubles arose and threatened him, he was forced to leave that house, and at the prompting of the bishop of Winchester, he came to England, and took over the rule of Malmesbury in this year.*

Just so there is no doubt in the reader’s mind about whether Bishop Henry could lie and fabricate so readily, I will just take another brief diversion before getting back to the analysis of GR.

Gerald of Wales does say that as well as ‘Art’, Henry was a collector of animals and actually had a menagerie at Wolvesey. But, it is to William of Newburgh’s reference to Henry having pet Greyhounds we should look. Below is an example as it shows Henry’s ability to fancifully enforce a story from an object which was obviously a fossil of some description: *When a huge rock was being split by iron implements in a quarry, two dogs became visible, filling a receptacle in the rock which was big enough for them, but which contained no air holes. They seemed to be a breed of dog called greyhounds, but they were ferocious in appearance, smelly and hairless. It is reported that one of them soon died, but the other, said to have had an astounding appetite, was kept as a pet for very many days by Henry bishop of Winchester.* And Newburgh thought ‘Geoffrey’ was the liar!!!
A living Greyhound cannot come from a rock fossil; nor can any live animal come from a split rock with no air holes. We might speculate why in Roman de Brut and HRB the dragons came from similar stones as it deviates from Nennius’ tents. As many commentators have remarked there is virtually no instance in the story line or plot of HRB which cannot be traced to some source. We have also witnessed this... as Melkin’s prophecy can also be deemed source material for the invention of the icon of the Grail based on Henry’s perception of the *duo fassula* and also the invention of the mystical island of Avalon. So, it also seems likely that Henry has spliced the allusion from Nennius’ of two un-encapsulated serpents to become in Wace: *At the bottom shall be found two hollow stones, and two dragons sleeping in the stones...* and in HRB: *two hollow stones and therein two dragons asleep...* What should be termed Freudian conflation but the trouble has been that scholarship has never thought of Henry Blois as the composer of HRB or of Roman de Brut.

Two agendas of Henry’s are clearly understood. The first features in GR3 and DA, the second only in DA. The earlier agenda was directed at obtaining metropolitan. Both GR3 and a copy of DA (probably not mentioning Avalon and certainly without Joseph’s inclusion) were used as evidential support in this endeavour while making a first presentation case to the pope in 1144. This possibly evolved to the inclusion of Phagan and Deruvian and the St Patrick's charter in a possible second attempt at metropolitan status in 1149.

Henry’s later agenda involved Avalon and the introduction of Joseph lore at Glastonbury while at the same time propagating Grail stories inclusive of King Arthur and Joseph. The same man and mind, from which the inventive composition of HRB was created, was the initial instigator of the Grail legends. Both HRB and Grail stories subtly tying back to two common denominators; Henry Blois and the prophecy of Melkin.

Henry’s second agenda was also concerned with convincing us that Glastonbury was Avalon and that Joseph was the original founder of the Old Church which connected to the death of King Arthur in the tract *Vera Historia de morte Arthuri* where Arthur’s grave is near to the St Mary Church and also connects through Avalon where Arthur was taken to heal his wounds in HRB. This did not start to evolve until after 1158 on Henry’s return from Clugny (not forgetting VM at this stage was getting us used to
the idea that *Insula pomorum* in Somerset was also Arthur’s last known location).

Therefore parts of DA were overwritten in what was an already twice completed and interpolated DA which had served its purpose in convincing papal authorities to grant Henry his wish. So, in all probability, there were two DA versions which had been completed and employed in pursuit of metropolitan status…. once in 1144 and the other in 1149. Afterward, when there was no further point in pursuing metropolitan status and at a time after 1158 when Henry returned to England, Henry then set about rearranging an already interpolated DA for a third time.

The aim was to incorporate material to support his secondary agenda of Joseph and Arthur ‘at’ Avalon. This will become evident as we progress through the GR3 Glastonbury material incorporated into Version B and then when we examine the DA in the next chapter. Eventually, GR version B was handed on to Glastonbury at Henry’s death, but during Henry Blois’ life, the B version may have been copied and propagated by Henry employing scribes at scriptoriums in Clugny, Winchester or Glastonbury.

We cannot be exactly sure of what William’s reconsidered opinions are concerning Glastonbury legend except by working out what is unadulterated in DA. Nor can we know exactly what has been spliced in by Henry Blois to meet his personal agendas except by looking at the latter half of DA and seeing what William has stated in VSD as that manuscript surely reveals his unadulterated work and positions held at the time of composition of DA.

The original GR3 though, was William’s latest model and Henry has spliced into that…. elements which were meant to convince the papal authorities of an early pre Augustinian Briton church at Glastonbury. The surest method is to assume in most cases that because Glastonbury material not in GR1 is in version B, it should be suspect. Yet, some portions are definitively the product of William’s later and final recension.

The best way of unpeeling the layers of this puzzle is to use the interpolations found in only B and C versions described by Thompson and Winterbottom in their appendix[^565] which are not found in T & A versions. T & A are indisputably William’s unadulterated work. I have used Thompson

and Winterbottom’s translation and chapter headings of GR to demonstrate that some of the material is the consequence of William’s researches and up-dates. The rest are Henry Blois’ interpolations. What is found in GR3 is highlighted in black to avoid confusion from other quotes.

Chapter 19 of GR3 B version:

Now, as we have reached the reign of Cenwealh, and the proper place to mention the monastery of Glastonbury, let me then from its birth tell thereof, the rise and progress of that house, so far as I can gather it from the formless mass of the documents. We are told by trustworthy annals that Lucius King of the British sent to Eleutherius, thirteenth successor of St. Peter, to beg that he would lighten the darkness of Britain with the rays of Christian preaching. O brave King, and worthy of all praise his undertaking! That faith which in those days nearly all Kings and people persecuted when it was presented to them, he went out of his way to ask for when he had scarce heard of it. So, preachers sent by Eleutherius came to Britain, where their work shall endure for ever, although many years’ oblivion has devoured their names.

At first, this seems entirely innocuous. Except Bede does not connect Eleutherius with Glastonbury and the connection is not in T or A version; yet William was entirely acquainted with Bede when he wrote both of those versions. Henry has chosen an appropriate place in the text to insert his propaganda. Starting off by saying: let me then from its birth tell thereof, the rise and progress of that house, and then arbitrarily attaching Eleutherius’ preachers to Glastonbury must be cause for suspicion. One might assume the fabricator of the St Patrick charter would make such an assumption. When we get to Lucius, it is virtually impossible to know if William wrote this or Henry did. I doubt it was introduced by William, but we should remember William is a fan of Bede and it is Bede who introduces the story in connection with Britain that Henry of Huntingdon even recycles from Bede. But, if one is not naïve of Henry Blois’ inventions; why state that oblivion has devoured their names here (c.1144) and then….. hey presto, we are told their names in DA and HRB; both manuscripts entered in evidence also in the case for Metropolitan.
One must then ask: why should it be in the supposedly updated content of GR3? It would not have been found by research specifically carried out at Glastonbury. Without the passage acting as an ‘intro’ we would not accept the natural progression to hear of Phagan and Deruvian later on in DA. It is the presumed attachment of Eleutherius’s preachers to Glastonbury which raises suspicions because such a lot is made of this connection later in DA and in St Patrick’s charter. The evidence for interpolation supports Henry’s output as author of HRB where Phagan and Deruvian’s names are introduced for the first time. Yet a remarkable coincidence, as we have already noted, is Huntingdon’s omission of the illustrious pair when mentioning Eleutherius in connection to King Lucius, not only in his redacted history but in the letter to Warin.

When presenting evidence to the pope in 1144 one can surmise that Fagan and Duvianus were also pointed out as they feature in the First Variant which evolved from the *Primary Historia*... where they should have been mentioned if only they had been included, but Henry’s muses at that point had not contemplated their roles. We should note Alfred of Beverley was aware of their names. It seems certain that the St Patrick charter is aimed at a second attempt at metropolitan. It is necessary to understand that the St Patrick’s charter was also employed in DA as a device which was produced for the visit to the pope.

Conveniently the preacher’s names are known in the St Patrick charter and in the First Variant, but for Huntingdon not to have mentioned such an influential pair in British history in EAW means they were not included in *Primary Historia* at Bec. Logically why would they be? Their sole *raison d’etre* was to attach Bede’s Eleutherius to the antiquity of Glastonbury and this is done through the missionaries and Lucius’ request. The pursuit of metropolitan status was not an issue for Henry Blois when the *Primary Historia* was being composed while Henry was in Normandy in 1137.

As I have stated, until the *Primary Historia*’s publication in 1138, Henry assumed he was going to be Archbishop of Canterbury. In fact, when Henry Blois left England to help quell the disruptions in Normandy, he was in effect Archbishop of Canterbury. It was, as we covered, while Henry was abroad, his brother Stephen elected the abbot of Bec to Henry of Blois’ treasured post. We know Henry was at Bedford when Stephen lays siege to Miles of Beauchamp at Christmas-time in 1138. In January 1139 Theobald is back at Bec accompanied by Huntingdon on his way to Rome.
Henry Blois on several occasions makes pretence of being ignorant of facts to deflect suspicion of authorship. The very fact that *many years' oblivion has devoured their names* makes one suspicious we are being led to believe that a charter had only been located recently. But to play out the pantomime.... the now dead but reliable historian, William of Malmesbury, had alluded to these missionaries. What we and the papal authorities are led to believe is that before Henry's arrival at Glastonbury this reliable chronicler had made reference to the preachers which are mentioned by name also in the First Variant.

The persuasive trustworthy annals to which William (or rather Henry) refers.... and specifically the mention of the Lucius myth, are from the 6th-century version of the *Liber Pontificalis*, Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and the ASC. However, it is my suspicion that the adopted son of Hadrian was the intrigue of which Henry and his accomplices were up to while at Rome which we came across earlier. His attempt at intrigue was to portray the adopted Lucius son of Hadrian as the same Lucius referred to mistakenly by Bede.

The main point is that where Henry states *many years' oblivion has devoured their names*; it could be just a ploy of Henry's to appear as if it is William writing GR much earlier i.e. by having us believe oblivion has devoured their names and thus explaining the uncovering of the Patrick charter as it was presented later in DA.

If my supposition is correct in that an early copy of DA was presented to the papal authorities in consideration of their granting metropolitan status, and an early edition of a St Patrick charter was evident also in DA, Henry might have excused William’s earlier lack of their names to the papal authorities as a proof of what William had only recently discovered i.e. the Patrick charter, a ‘copy’ of which is subsequently in DA. Do not forget the subtleties concerning the ‘good book’ and Walter.... found in Gaimar’s

---

566 He does this posing as Wace in pretence not to understand the Merlin prophecies.
567 John of Salisbury referring to Henry Blois states:...*After being publicly received back into favour, he began to intrigue with Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia, Gregory of St Angelo and other friends (as they afterward confessed) to secure a pallium for himself and become archbishop of western England.*
568 However, these may be William’s original words as he was respectful of Bede and also aware of ASC’s mention of Eleutherius (which one assumes is derived from Bede). This may on the other hand be where Henry puts these words to compensate for William making no mention before of Eleutherius in other writings, but at least conceding here that preachers came.
epilogue, before discounting to what extent Henry is willing to go to get what he wants and avoid discovery.

It is not by coincidence that the First Variant with its biblical allusions, just happens to have the preacher’s names as the envoys of Eleutherius also. It is Henry Blois’ Phagan and Deruvian from HRB which were honoured in DA which brings suspicion upon the connection between Glastonbury and the preachers.

In fact, once it is understood that Phagan and Deruvian are connected to a Lucius who never existed in Britain.... it highlights and lends credence to the fact that these are interpolations in GR3 by the man who invented the St Patrick charter and concocted HRB. At no time previous to the St Patrick charter or First Variant of HRB was there any mention of their names or connection to Glastonbury. So, where William appears to write ‘their work shall endure for ever’ it seems a bit obtuse.... since not only oblivion had devoured their names but their deeds. And since William was never aware of their deeds because we know the St Patrick charter is concocted and we know their names did not feature in the Primary Historia; or any of the saints lives or in William’s GP; logically, we can see they were employed as part of Henry’s fraud. Therefore, why would ‘their work shall endure for ever’ be a statement that William would make.

The only contrary evidence to what I have indicated above is that the two founders of the old minster at Winchester (Phagan and Deruvian) as Thomas Rudborne later tells us, were accorded that fame in the Winchester annals. If they really were the founders of the Old minster it is surely not by coincidence that they suddenly came to popular consciousness in the First Variant and DA as Eleutherius’ preachers.\footnote{We should remember that based upon how the pseudo-history is compiled, it is highly unlikely that these two were names picked out at random. Rather, Henry employed their names because they were in the book which Gaimar says exists chained up at Winchester. This may indeed be where Rudborne’s information originates.} Again, it is not coincidence that two previously, un-famous and ‘never heard of before’ founders of Winchester (their names obscured in the reams of annals found at Winchester) should also just happen to be the preachers who were honoured being part of the foundation lore at Glastonbury in DA in what is obviously a bogus St Patrick’s charter. I can not see a provenance for their names and believe Rudborne probably has the solution. Working on the principle that nearly all inventions in HRB have a birth or derivation for
Henry’s Muses, I would not be surprised if they were the founders of Winchester.

Now, the obvious advantage of this is that Winchester must (also appear to) be as old as Phagan and Deruvian if a charter of St Patrick shows they were the founders of the Glastonbury Old Church also. As the reader will remember in HRB, Lucius despatched his letters unto Pope Eleutherius beseeching that from him he might receive Christianity. For the miracles that were wrought by the young recruits of Christ’s army in divers lands had lifted all clouds from his mind, and panting with love of the true faith, his pious petition was allowed to take effect, forasmuch as the blessed Pontiff, finding that his devotion was such, sent unto him two most religious doctors, Faganus and Duvianus...

There are two scenarios on the appearance of Wellias in the St Patrick charter. One may be that his name was interpolated by our consolidating author of DA to demonstrate Wells’ subordination to the importance of Glastonbury as modern scholars seem to suggest. His name might however, be a ploy of Henry’s. We Know he loves to employ eponyms which would then lead the reader to more fully accept the St Patrick charter’s credibility, as Wells is so close geographically i.e. we are led to believe that Patrick’s friend Wellias went off and founded Wells. I doubt that a consolidating author or other than Henry Blois would have the effrontery to put forward such a suggestion as it is painfully obvious the town of Wells is named after its ability to reach the Water table rather than gaining its name from a certain Wellias. Moreover, St Patrick probably never set foot in Glastonbury. The name Wells comes from three wells, today dedicated to St Andrew one in the market place and two within the grounds of the Bishop’s palace and cathedral. As I cover later, it is commonly supposed by

---

570 Dom Watkin, regards the Charter of St Patrick as a 13th century fake based on the fact that Wellias is named. Without Henry Blois to connect the preachers to HRB, there is little benefit to be found in the invention of the St Patrick charter or its mention of Ineswitrin. Dom Watkin of course does not allow that a consolidating author of DA may have interpolated Henry Blois’ interpolations in the era of the contention with Savaric.

571 HRB IV, xix
commentators that the inclusion of Wellias’ name in the St Patrick charter infers that the Patrick charter itself dates from Glastonbury’s contention with Savaric. It is far more likely that Wellias is Henry’s invention so that Patrick is given proximity to Glastonbury through Wells being named after Wellias.

The Patrick charter would provide evidence for Glastonbury’s antiquity and a Phagan and Deruvian foundation when Henry was grasping for metropolitan status. It is one of the main reasons their names appear in the First Variant along with the more ecclesiastical tone by comparison with the Vulgate HRB version.

The chain of misrepresentation starts with a misreading of the Liber Pontificalis by Bede who thought ‘Britio’ in Turkey referred to Britain; Versions of the Lucius story based on Bede’s mistake, thus appeared in his Historia Brittonum, and HRB and ASC and the Book of Llandaff and Huntingdon’s Historia Anglorum. It is upon Bede’s mistake that Henry introduced his Phagan and Deruvian.

After having set out to reduce somewhat the muddle around the Lucius myth, we no sooner encounter another…. following on in the same interpolation in the same chapter 19 of GR3:

---

572 One observation should be noted about Huntingdon’s précis to Warin of the Primary Historia. One would imagine if Huntingdon had seen the names Phagan and Deruvian (as they are in the First Variant not Primary Historia) he would have commented. This is not to say that Eleutherius and Lucius were not part of the storyline of Primary Historia because they were mentioned in Bede. In his main text at the beginning of book viii after saying ‘Lucius was the first of the British to become a Christian’, Huntingdon by coincidence asks himself who the bishops of that time were. If he had heard in 1139 about Phagan and Deruvian he would have been interested in the names of the two people who are accounted as responsible for Christianising Britain. We know Bede did not mention them and as Rudbourne suggests their names far more likely derive from a Winchester foundation/source. This would probably have been the most important fact to relate to Huntingdon’s friend Warin… if their names had indeed existed in the Primary Historia.

573 Adolf von Harnack first proposed in 1904 that the Lucius story derives from a scribal error substituting Britanio, referring to Britannia, for Britio, referring to Birtha or Britium in what is nowadays Turkey which was in the old Mesopotamia. In 179 Birtha was ruled by the Christian-friendly Roman client King of Osroene whose full title was Lucius Aelius Megas Abgar IX. Henry Blois expands the same mistake originating in Bede and then in the Anglo Saxon Chronicle introducing Lucius into HRB. Henry employs Lucius as historical padding to take account of a historical period for which Henry wished to write his own historicity. The introduction of Lucius corresponded with Henry’s fabricated storyline of a mutual accord between the Britons and Romans. When speaking of the conversion of the Britons Logorio tells us: The widely accepted view was that in 167 AD, at the request of King Lucius of Britain, pope Eleutherius sent Phagan and Deruvian to convert Lucius and all his people. The first place we hear of Phagan and deruvian is in HRB. Are we to understand that Logorio accepted ‘Geoffrey’s’ testimony?
The ancient church of St Mary at Glastonbury was their handiwork, as the faithful tradition of succeeding century’s recounts. There is too that trustworthy record found in several sources, which declares that no other hands made the church of Glastonbury, but it was Christ's disciples themselves that built it.

If GR3 is a genuine reflection of William’s revised knowledge after his research at Glastonbury, supposedly written C.1140 (as most commentators agree), and the DA supposedly came out before 1134.....why would scholars insist that the St Patrick charter is a late invention.... as the reference above is to the two missionaries? This is obvious that their handiwork follows in direct reference to the preachers: (So, preachers sent by Eleutherius came to Britain, where their work shall endure for ever, although many years’ oblivion has devoured their names.).

We can probably account this sentence to the second attempt by Henry Blois to gain metropolitan status in 1149. The two visits to Rome take into account the previous attempt where an apostolic foundation seems to have been posited to pope Lucius II. Henry in his interpolation into GR3 leaves open to speculation who the builders of ‘old church’ were. He is not really bothered as long as metropolitan status is granted. The question is; why would he need to invent the St Patrick Charter if an apostolic foundation had been accepted already?

One scenario to explain the later invention of the St Patrick’s charter could be that apart from a suggestion that the ‘Old church’ was built by the Disciples of Christ, Henry concocted something a little more convincing that definitively took the ‘possible’ foundation from the disciples to something more concrete. The story of Eleutherius and Lucius, even though not in reality historical, yet the product of a misidentification on Bede’s part was accepted as historical because the venerable Bede had accounted it historically correct. In effect then, through Bede, the preachers were validated by ‘Geoffrey’s’ corroboration of their connection to Eleutherius;

---

574 DA chap 83. When William came to the end of DA, Henry’s claim to fame is as brother to count Theobald not King Stephen. Note also the references in this chapter 83 are still written as if addressing the monks themselves. But, we know from the prologue of DA that it was written after the completion of the main text of DA and after William had been deferred payment by the monks. William was referred to Henry Blois who was residing at Winchester. William then addresses Henry as bishop of Winchester. William’s prologue in DA is a flattering address designed part as apologia for any shortfall felt by the Glastonbury monks for William’s refusal to include rumour. Also, to see if he can gain some recompense and not be ‘deprived of the fruit of his labour’ by seeking to offer to Henry his ‘little work’... ‘whatever its worth’.
and the possibility of an apostolic foundation having existed before them.... and the fact that Fagan and Deruvian found an already existing church (as stated in the St Patrick charter). This confusing reconciliation gave credence to both positions, either apostolic foundation, or that accomplished by the preachers. We are led to believe by the discovery of the St Patrick charter how the sequence of the suggested foundation history has come down to posterity i.e. by the very concocted document of the St Patrick charter.

Henry posits both of his bogus foundation histories when reconciling his propaganda and leaves the confusion as deriving from antiquity. Henry leaves the foundation as ambiguous saying: *The ancient church of St Mary at Glastonbury was their handiwork* (referring to the un-named missionaries). In the charter of St Patrick it avers that the Disciples built it: *the brothers showed me writings of St Phagan and St Deruvian, wherein it was contained that twelve disciples of St Philip and St James had built that Old Church in honour of our Patroness.* Later, to incorporate the ‘additional’ evidence Henry adds: *So it was by the work of these men that the old church of St Mary at Glastonbury was restored, as trustworthy history has continued to repeat throughout the succeeding ages.*

It is quite ridiculous to think the St Patrick’s charter is not Henry’s work, but that of a later interpolator; especially considering it is ‘Geoffrey’ who adds Phagan and Deruvian’s names to the First Variant where they had not previously existed in the *Primary Historia*. More pertinent is the fact that the three archflamens’ are also missing in EAW also. As we have discussed, at the writing of the *Primary Historia* in 1137-8, metropolitan status was not an issue for Henry, so there was little point in mentioning any Archbishopric. The names of Phagan and Deruvian (originating from Winchester annals) are inserted by the bishop of Winchester into ‘Geoffrey’s’ First Variant version and William’s DA.... specifically for the attempt at metropolitan i.e. in 1144-1149. Coincidentally, the insert of Henry’s chapter 19 of GR3 comes just after William relates that Winchester’s old Minster was founded by Cenwealh!

*The faithful tradition of succeeding centuries’ can only be that evidence concocted in DA and based on the preachers names in HRB. Therefore, Henry is cross-referencing his own interpolated work. The persuasive words of ‘trustworthy record found in several sources’ is already not an accurate depiction from author B’s Life of St Dunstan account, which never mentioned the Disciples of Christ. In fact the inference is so clever that
Henry wishes us to believe that the ‘first neophytes of the catholic law’ in author B’s work refer to Phagan and Deruvian. But author B’s *Vita Dunstani* does not have them specifically in mind when he writes: *For it was in this island (Glastonbury) that, by God’s guidance the first novices of the Catholic law discovered an ancient church, not built by or dedicated in the memory of man.*

The discrepancy of the disciple legend may be based upon two different renderings of author B’s work: *nullis hominum recordationibus fabricatum ut dicatam-* not built by or dedicated in the memory of man. Another version (derived from Eng⁵⁷⁶) of author B’s passage: *nulla hominum arte (ut ferunt) constructam, immo humanae saluti caelitus paratam-* built by no human skill though prepared by heaven for the salvation of mankind.

The discrepancy is that the church in the first instance is not built in the ‘memory of man’ as author B most probably genuinely stated.…. and in the second, a supernatural foundation; or the possibility of an apostolic builder is allowed. If one was pedantic, this would then contradict the assertion it was built by disciples…. as disciples have human skill. This would coincide with the fabricated assertion found in DA concerning St David that the old church was consecrated by Christ himself and this particular story is only concocted by Henry to nullify statements found in the *life of St David* by Rhygyfarch, where it ascribes the foundation of Glastonbury to St David. But the link with St David will be discussed further in the chapter on DA.

We know William of Malmesbury used author B’s *Vita S. Dunstani* as a reference when writing his own VSD at Glastonbury. William does not include this particular passage of B’s in his own VSD. It seems fair to assume that if William set out in DA to show genuine antiquity for the ‘old church’ he would not have to rely on the 601 charter as definitive evidence of a pre-existing church as his strongest case of a foundation before Augustine. William would have cited the ‘trustworthy records’; especially if they were in ‘several sources’ as we are led to believe he has written above in GR3.

William is writing VSD at the same time as DA. One must assume, if an apostolic foundation were really known or even posited by William then it would have at least been anecdotally commented upon when the old church is mentioned at the arrival of Dunstan’s mother⁵⁷⁷ in VSD I or when

---

⁵⁷⁵ The early lives of Dunstan, Winterbottom and Lapidge. P.13
⁵⁷⁶ William of Malmesbury. Saints lives. Winterbottom and Thompson. xviii
⁵⁷⁷ William of Malmesbury. Saints Lives, VSD, vol I, 1,2
he refers back to the wooden church (incidentally and not surprisingly, with no emphasis on wattle construction): Dunstan was now assured of the King’s generosity and friendship and he proceeded to raise to new heights the monastery that God had seen fit to entrust to him. At Glastonbury, as I mentioned before, there is, next to the wooden church, a stone one, whose founder is said by an old and reliable tradition to be of King Ine.578

The point is; if VSD and DA were written simultaneously.... why is there no disciple foundation mentioned in VSD II which was written just after the main text of DA? Why therefore, if we know DA is vastly interpolated, do scholars still insist that the painfully obvious ‘Glastonbury’ interpolations in GR3 (version B) are the resultant consequence of a ‘new revelation’ to William during his researches at the abbey? Why would Newell be so gullible as to insist it is a conjecture of William’s and conclude: It was William, therefore, who invented the association between Philip and Glastonbury. If there were genuine evidence of apostolic foundation, one can be sure it would be cited elsewhere. Newell does not understand why Philip is mentioned and Freculphus is cited because like other commentators he assumes no fraud in GR3.

Henry (posing as ‘Geoffrey’) has used as his inspiration for Avalon, the Island mentioned in the prophecy of Melkin to which the directional data refers. The prophecy’s sole purpose is to indicate the location of Joseph’s of Arimathea’s body. Newell does not know this. But it is interesting to speculate that he possibly finds another reason apart from Freculphus’s reference, why Henry Blois (posing as ‘William’) has lighted upon Philip.579 The best that can be achieved by our Glastonbury interpolator of

579 Newell. William of Malmesbury. On the antiquity of Glastonbury p.469: What authority had the author for connecting Joseph with Philip? The only testimony yet discovered is a Georgian document, assigned to the eighth century, which undertakes to describe the erection of a church at Lydda, to Mary, mother of God. The Georgian book, which professes to emanate from Joseph himself, recites his captivity by the Jews, release by the risen Saviour, and collection of the sacred blood (received in the grave-clothes of Christ). At Arimathea the Redeemer appears to Joseph, breathes on the company present (which includes Seleucus and Nicodemus) the Holy Ghost, and commands Joseph to resort to Lydda, where he will meet Philip. Joseph obeys, and reaches Lydda, whither also proceeds Philip, who preachs with success, baptizing five thousand persons. The new converts wish Philip to remain, and he declares that they will be safe under the guidance of others, and pursues his way. A site is chosen for the new church, and Peter summoned from Jerusalem in order to preside over its construction. Hence-forward, Joseph plays a secondary part, and does not again come into contact with Philip. It will be observed that in this account Philip commends his disciples to the care of Joseph, as in DA; a story resembling the Georgian document would be sufficient to account for the latter. (Newell)
GR3 is to steer the gullible to accept his propaganda by way of citing Freculphus as the closest tentative and persuasive argument.

Understated assertions in William’s GR tend to corroborate the more unrealistic and over-embellished propaganda found in DA. The commonalities of the Glastonbury GR3 interpolations and their counterparts in DA, seems to have added to the credence and authenticity of both accounts even with the blatant contradictions. Ultimately, a disciple foundation in GR3 naturally leans toward the acceptance of Joseph lore in DA. It becomes less of a giant leap when Henry engages upon his second agenda. Unless one sees the DA as a book which evolved, (useful to Henry’s purpose at different times), one will never understand that the content was interpolated according to the changing motives.

The first two chapters in DA concerning Joseph was very much a part of the propaganda already included in DA when Henry Blois died. This is a fact denied by the modern scholastic community simply because it does not fit with their re-construction of events. There is no definitive evidence to suggest that the first two chapters of DA did not exist as part of the last additions written into DA before Henry’s death. Like a defective gene, the assumption that the mention of Joseph was a late addition by a consolidating author has been passed down through succeeding generations of scholars.

Henry Blois is well acquainted with the contents of the prophecy of Melkin which, even when misinterpreted, clearly suggested that on Ineswitrin Joseph is buried to be found someday in the future. If Henry had not had a copy, there would be no mystical island called Avalon in the First Variant. There would be no Graal in Chrétien’s work, and there would be no Joseph and a mysterious vessel in the Vaus d’Avaron in Robert de Boron’s work. Most of all, there would never have been the idea to plant a fake

---

If I am correct about Henry Blois as the instigator of the reference to Freculphus that Henry obtained this from the abbey library; we must assume that Freculphus had misinterpreted Gallatia for Gaul where Philip actually was located. Henry Blois must however have come across this Georgian book to make the connection between St Philip and Joseph. Lagorio seems to think the abbey looked to the Apocrypha as if like bees working in concert…. the monks over several generations contrived the DA interpolations to fit with the Romances. Lagorio’s perception is interesting: Joseph’s premier in the Grail romances occurred in Robert de Boron’s Joseph d’Arimathie, a late twelfth century work telling how Joseph and the Grail company travelled from Jerusalem westward with the ultimate destination in the Vaus d’Avaron, possibly a variation of Avalon. Do you think?
gravesite to be found in the future in Avalon with the location pointed out in DA.

However, like the ‘experts’ in the modern era, Henry Blois did not understand the instructional data of Melkin’s prophecy. But only the inept could not understand the unearthing of a cross at Montacute and not connect it to the clue left by Melkin concerning Joseph’s burial site mentioned by Father Good. Especially, regarding a point on the 104 mile line we are instructed to find in the directional data of the Melkin prophecy.

Therefore, it is hardly surprising that Henry Blois had already searched for Joseph at Montacute (knowing that it was himself who had changed Ineswitrin for Avalon on the prophecy), aware that Joseph’s remains were on Ineswitrin but uncertain of the island’s location. Henry could not interpret the obtuse Latin prophecy, but Henry understood the intent of the prophecy was to cryptically provide the islands location, by means of direction. Even Henry, unable to decipher the solution, would know that the bifurcated line mentioned would indicate that the prophecy would probably have a geometrical solution. Henry just thought he would appropriate the only island in ancient Dumnonia with a Joseph legend i.e. Looe island.

Carley, who has witnessed the solution to Melkin’s prophecy\textsuperscript{581} is unwilling to admit that all the pieces of his and Lagorio’s jigsaw assessment of the three genres under discussion in this volume do not fit together. Joseph lore in DA being dismissed as late interpolation has led to some serious scholastic contradictions in chronology.

Instead of finding the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea (as it was set out in the prophecy), Henry decided to concoct the biggest fraud in history by staging the bogus remains of his chivalric King Arthur in a tomb and placing with it an identifying Leaden cross. The location of the burial site was pointed out in DA and Henry knew the relics would eventually be searched for by posterity. Disinterment and the re-interment of famous people and saints was a common practice and the collection of random saints’ relics were known to have been sourced by Henry and taken to Glastonbury. The fame of Henry’s renowned chivalric King Arthur would live forever in the memory of the British Isles. However, none of these

\textsuperscript{581} According to Goldsworthy, \textit{And did those feet}.... a copy of the geometry was seen by Carley and ignored.
events disprove the existence of the prophecy of Melkin; they highlight its existence. Now, if our ‘experts’ would have us understand that these ‘set of circumstances’ just happened at Glastonbury ‘fortuitously’ by the coincidental actions of so many different monks over generations (a bit like throwing a jigsaw in the air and expecting all the pieces falling into place) they should not be posing as scholars.

Our current expert on Geoffrey of Monmouth, Julia Crick understands ‘Geoffrey’ invented the chivalric persona of Arthur but has no idea ‘Geoffrey’ is Henry Blois even after researches entitled ‘Script and Forgery in England’\textsuperscript{582}. She may however, like some perceptive commentators, realise that Avalon is a fabrication. If Avalon were really Glastonbury, why is it that William of Malmesbury does not mention it anywhere except in the interpolated section of DA? If Avalon was not synonymous with Glastonbury and had never been heard of by William of Malmesbury, and both ‘Chivalric Arthur’ and Avalon were fabrications; would not such an ‘expert’ be able to deduce the same man might be responsible for both inventions.... cognisant of the fact that ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arthur is fictionally placed in Autun, (a stone’s throw from a town called Avallon) in the region of Blois.... and all this transpired while Henry Blois was abbot of Glastonbury!!!

Our scholars would have us believe that Chrétien writes about Un Graal (which is based on the ‘vessel’ of the duo fassula in the prophecy of Melkin) and Robert de Boron writes about the Grail and Joseph of Arimathea and the sending it to the Vaus d’Avaron, completely independently of Glastonbury or Henry Blois’ influence.... while Avalon, by a fortuitous set of circumstances, suddenly becomes synonymous with Glastonbury at the find of one object (the leaden cross).

More miraculously, Avalon just happens to be accepted as Glastonbury by Gerald of Wales in 1193, even though he refers to records which indicate

\textsuperscript{582} Crick acts upon the appeal of A. G. van Hamel: \textit{What is wanted most at present is a minute study of all the Latin texts that are still buried in British and continental libraries.} Crick achieves this in \textit{Dissemination and Reception} but without knowing the author of HRB, she is in no way equipped to categorize the HRB’s evolution from \textit{Primary Historia}, through an altered First Variant aimed at Papal audience where changes were made ingratiating the text toward papal approval; and then followed by the later expanded Vulgate version. This is not to say that a \textit{Primary Historia} was a reduced first Variant. Episodes recorded in EAW from \textit{Primary Historia} may have been reducted in First Variant to be re-established again in Vulgate considering the mindset of Henry Blois when the origins of HRB was composed. Scholar’s like Griscom have tried to put into historical context HRB but only to support theories regarding the dating of texts through dedicatees. As we know this is a fruitless exercise.
where the body was located. As I will cover shortly, Gerald has read DA and in that book the name Avalon already exists. In the interim 20 year period between Henry Blois’s death and the unveiling of Arthur’s tomb, are we to believe there was no cognisance of Avalon’s synonymy with Glastonbury? Scholars would have us believe Henry de Sully (the abbot in 1191) decided to carry out a fraud at Glastonbury positing for the first time that Glastonbury’s previous name was Avalon. And hey presto in the same period Robert completely remote from Glastonbury has Joseph and Avalon and the Grail (derived from the duo fassula).

One thing all the experts leave well alone is the question of Glastonbury’s transformation into Avalon and who was behind it. It would be unbelievable for all and sundry to suddenly accept Glastonbury as Avalon just because the leaden cross implicates Glastonbury as such. Even in the twelfth century healthy scepticism existed and Henry de Sully would hardly get away with pulling a stunt, which, to all intents and purposes, just mimics an island mentioned twice in HRB.

Do you really think they just had a hole dug and pulled out bones and everyone was ok with the pantomime? Arthur’s grave had matured ten years at least and we will get to Gerald’s eyewitness testimony shortly which modern scholars have haughtily ignored because it does not fit with how they have instructed us that events transpired. Avalon’s conversion to Glastonbury could never happen without Henry’s groundwork; not forgetting Insula Pomorum is part of this groundwork toward transformation as early as 1155-7 in VM.

Previously, scholars have rationalised that Avalon transformed into Glastonbury at the time the leaden cross was unearthed and therefore the Charter of St Patrick followed subsequently. The postscript to the Patrick charter in DA (which antedated the disinterment) substantiated further the position that Avalon was the old name for Glastonbury. When the leaden cross was found, there was a ready acceptance of Avalon as the previous name for Glastonbury. None have suspected the instigator of the St Patrick charter, and the person who interpolated the location of Arthur’s grave site into DA is the same person who invented the name Avalon and the chivalric Arthur and who pre-ordained the location to Glastonbury before Arthur’s disinterment. The same person had the leaden cross fabricated. Henry de Sully unearthing the relics was just doing what Henry Blois knew would
eventually be done and what Henry Blois himself had done with saints relics in the past.

The reader may also remember Henry Blois was the instigator of the rumour regarding Dunstan whereby that rumour had been countered by Eadmer’s letter in which it was stated that Eadmer as a boy at Canterbury remembers Dunstan’s reinterment: *With it was found in inscription on a lead tablet which clearly stated that there lay the body of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury.* It was from this incontestable proof from antiquity that Henry got the idea for his Leaden cross to mimic a similar proof of Arthur in Avalon.

The abbot of Glastonbury, (aka Geoffrey of Monmouth) is the inventor of both Avalon and the persona of the Chivalric Arthur.... who fabricated the cross which bears testimony to both his inventions at a location at which he was abbot. Also preachers named by ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ also come to Avalon in what the scholars know to be a concocted charter in a book dedicated to Henry Blois. These are not fortuitous circumstances!! This is conscious design by the architect of the *Matter of Britain.*

For scholars like Lagorio, the answer to many of these random coincidences is to force all the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle to fit face side-down. That way, no-one can see the picture, it has no context! Adherents to Lagorio’s theory are happy to accept that Joseph lore appeared at Glastonbury by a *fortuitous convergence of factors*. Modern scholars have no understanding of the meaning behind Melkin’s prophecy and even less idea than those who lived in the fourteenth century (who at least understood it was a set of geometric instructions), which, when deciphered, led to a sepulchre.

Our ‘experts’ decree is clouded in ignorance and yet they pronounce the prophecy is a fake and even worse, they maintain the man who composed the cipher for the prophecy never lived, while insisting the prophecy is a construct of various sources. If all that were true, one must ask why bother to invent solutions like Baybars (in Arabic al-Malik al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars al-Bunduqdari), Sultan of Egypt and Syria. What are we looking for here an island in Dumnonia or something to baffle the senses?

The modern conclusion is that a person who did not exist could not leave an accurate set of instructions.... which when portrayed on a map lead us to an Island in Devon. Our scholars would have us believe that it must be coincidence that Joseph was a tin merchant and the Devonian Island
donated to Glastonbury in the 601 charter (which fits Diodorous’ description of Ictis) is not Ineswitrin. None of these experts consider the traditions of the Cornish regarding Joseph and how the panoply of early saint’s names, defines most towns and villages in Cornwall. These were from the earliest Christian followers in the first century. Should we not consider why there is such a large number of early Saints particularly in Cornwall.

Henry as we know carries out all his authorship with subtlety to avoid discovery. If Melkin’s prophecy or Melkin’s name had been included in DA with the original name of the island on the prophecy i.e. Ineswitrin, it would lead every investigator back to Henry Blois as Abbot of Glastonbury and how it was a dead Caradoc wrote the life of Gildas in which Ineswitrin is transformed into Glastonbury; and how this book was produced 10 years after Caradoc’s death and to which Malmesbury never referred in his unadulterated writings. This essentially is why there is a record of the prophecy under the name Insula Avallonis (in a no longer extant volume), which JG must have seen, and why the name of the Island was changed on the prophecy.

The same prophecy about Avalon could only be associated with ‘Geoffrey’ as no-one had heard of Avalon before he had it in the storyline as the mystical isle in HRB. But if Life of Gildas where Glastonbury is transformed into Ineswitrin and where Arthur is connected to Glastonbury and the scene is then portrayed on the Modena Archivolt were to then be connected to a Melkin prophecy (which had the original Ineswitrin name on it) then c.1140 Henry Blois was recognisable as the common denominator. But because the prophecy had a change of name and was in a tract written supposedly by Melkin (De Regis Arthuri mensa rotunda) and much later only JG divulges its contents, Henry Blois is today not even connected to the Prophecy or suspected as the promulgator of Joseph lore at Glastonbury.

The Melkin Prophecy is after all where Henry Blois got the inspiration for the actual island itself called Avalon in HRB.... named as we have covered, from the Burgundian town. Melkin and Joseph have been discounted as later Glastonbury inventions, because our scholar’s understanding of events is that DA was interpolated over time and institutionally at Glastonbury. Also their understanding is that DA’s interpolation took place at a time after Arthur’s disinterment; even though
the location of Arthur’s grave is specifically mentioned in DA by Gerald’s account.

On what basis is this huge presumption made? It is made purely on the spurious deduction that it was Henry de Sully who instigated the fraudulent unearthing. It is the forcing of pieces of a jigsaw with no apparent picture visible, nothing more. But, by adopting this viewpoint, it obviously obscures Henry Blois as a possible interpolator, even though these experts know the entire Grail edifice innately connected to Glastonbury was propagated by someone named Master Blehis. One would have to have actively learnt to ignore evidence from mentors such as Crick and Carley to not see what is apparent.

Not only have they ignored Gerald of Wales’s written testimony given twenty years after Henry Blois death as an eyewitness to the disinterment of Arthur (written only one or two years after the event), but they have shunned every coincidence which connects our three genres of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Glastonburyana, and Grail legend. It takes more effort to deny the fact that Henry Blois is the common denominator than to accept it.

Henry Blois’ portrayal of royal court extravagance in HRB is so close to the real life experiences of Henry Blois and of his uncle’s court, so how does a Welsh cleric from the Marches have such insight into affairs of state? How is it that Merlin foresees two new metropolitan sees and so many episodes of the Anarchy? How is it that much of the corroborative evidence is found in a book (DA) dedicated to the person who is obviously the perpetrator of this fraud? How is it that the person attested to have propagated Grail legend has a name like Monseigneur Blois, Master Blehis, Maistre Blohis, Blihos Bliheris or Blaise. Giraldus Cambrensis’ Bledhericus is the ‘famosus ille fabulator’ who had lived “shortly before our time”; and we have already caught Henry as ‘Hericus’ as the hedgehog at Winchester in the Merlin prophecies.

The four corner pieces of the puzzle; Arthur, Joseph of Arimathea, the Grail, and the mystical Island have all been turned upside down and the pieces fit together but the connecting pieces don’t make a picture which anyone can see. A blank picture is what our experts have presented to us. Carley’s denial of the solution to Melkin’s prophecy can only be termed ignorant.

However, to concede to those scholars unaware of the solution to Melkin’s prophecy, we can understand that their assumption that Melkin is
a fabrication is largely based upon the fact that there is no mention of Melkin in DA and that the prophecy had not been deciphered before 2010. But, as I have commented already, if a fourteenth century forger came up with directions by coincidence, which actually, (when understood as a cipher), pointed to an island firstly and then this island was found to be in Devon... this in itself would be alarming; and really would be a case of throwing pieces in the air and watching them neatly form on the map.

Commentators have not suspected that one mind is behind the developing myth even when Arthur and Joseph and Avalon are linked in the earliest continental romances and Giraldus bears testimony that the raconteur of renown lived ‘shortly before our time’. Henry Blois was patron to Gerald and we know Henry Blois goes to extraordinary lengths in detailed interpolation to secret the fact that he is the propagator of the Matter of Britain. It would not be surprising that both Henry II and Giraldus had both been primed as to Arthur’s whereabouts. One must not forget, in the minds of those living c.1190 it was William of Malmesbury, the reliable historian, who lets us know where Arthur is buried. Do you really think a thirteenth century interpolator after the fact would just let us know where Arthur was buried without aggrandising the whole affair in DA if that is how it transpired? The real point to make is in both references the present tense is used i.e. In DA Arthur and Guinevere are between the piramides and the same in the colophon of Perlesvaus Arthur and Guinevere are buried in Avalon before they are found there in the future.

Scholars dating estimation of Robert de Boron’s Joseph d’ Arimathie c.1160-80 is guesswork but at least this incorporates the period Gerald says Bledhericus who is the ‘famosus ille fabulator’ who lived "shortly before our time". The oldest manuscript of Joseph d’ Arimathie just by coincidence comes from Modena where we know Henry passed through.

If we can witness one mind behind most of the pertinent interpolations in DA and GR which connects Glastonbury lore to the romances and the Grail, why must it be assumed that Joseph was only inserted into DA after Arthur’s disinterment? As long as no-one suspected Henry Blois as the fraudulent author of the chivalric Arthur in HRB, this assumption has remained tenable. It no longer holds when it is understood that the advent of both Arthur and Joseph into DA are by the same man who was the original propagator of the romance literature and was the author of the
Historia. When this is accepted, the Joseph legend will be seen to have derived from Melkin and from a verifiable prophecy which in essence can be substantiated and historically proved once the tomb is uncovered. But with modern scholarship ill equipped to recognise the connections made in this study of the three genres of work, Ictis will be in Plymouth, Joseph will just be a legend and the most important artefact worldwide will remain under Burgh Isl...

So, if we were to sum up on the present state of scholarship of our three genres; we would have to say there is no current authority who understands the provenance of the Grail romances. Most scholars have died disputing and chasing the answer much like the elusive Grail quest itself. Carley, our expert on Glastonburyana, by his own admission can’t make any kind of sense from the prophecy of Melkin and is not qualified to dismiss its contents as a fabrication simply because he has chosen to ignore evidence. Since Carley regurgitates Logario’s views, we can expect no new revelation from him without crumbling the very edifice of erroneous pronouncements he and his mentor have made regarding Joseph of Arimathea.

When it comes to our expert on the History of the Kings of Britain by Geoffrey of Monmouth, Julia Crick is our expert. If she does not know who wrote the book, it hardly seems the correct starting point by informing others how it was disseminated. In fact Julia informs us that Geoffrey's literary output too has been seen as a bid for patronage. Henry Blois was probably the richest man in Britain, in no need of a patron and all her recycled ramblings of previous scholar’s assessments of the dedicatees are redundant because not one dedicatee was ever a patron of Geoffrey... simply because ‘Geoffrey’ is Henry Blois. Certainly, none of our current experts are ‘qualified’ to make assertions concerning the Island of Avalon as none knows of the provenance of its name; nor do they understand how it is in reality Burgh Island in Devon derived by decoding the Melkin prophecy and having understood that its original subject of the Island of Ineswitrin has been transposed so that JG’s rendition of the Melkin prophecy speaks of the Island of Avalon (a Geoffrey invention).

Once we (the non-experts, using only common sense) understand that the prophecy of Melkin was in Henry Blois possession, we can then
comprehend why Henry in his interpolations in William of Malmesbury’s work, comments too frequently on the construction of the Old church.

In effect this prepares his audience to more readily accept that the words *cratibus* and *oratori* from Melkin’s prophecy are references to the Old church at Glastonbury. As we have covered, the reference applies to the naturally formed slate cavity/cave where Joseph is buried and the other to a religious house which once existed where the current hotel is on Burgh Island. If one witnessed inside the tomb one would understand why Melkin refers to it obliquely as a crater. It is formed from the geological upheaval of slate deposits which creates a naturally arched cave in which, (at the present day), the ceiling has partially collapsed and the tunnel to the cave has been bricked up. If the reader accounts this as hubris on my part, it is not!!! The cave was entered by the Templars c.1340 and the shroud, now known as the Shroud of Turin was removed. In 1453 a Margaret de Charney supposedly the Templar’s granddaughter, deeded the shroud to the House of Savoy and in 1578 the shroud was transferred to Turin.

There is a well-known local legend that on Burgh Island there was a monastery at one time in antiquity and it is to this that the word ‘Oratori’ in the Melkin Prophecy relates. In whatever book Henry Blois reproduced the prophecy, 583 he wants his audience to understand that the words in the prophecy apply to the old church at Glastonbury as far as any intelligible material in the prophecy can be made to appear coincidental (hence the direct reference to the church covered in lead mentioned in Perlesvaus).

The wattle construction of the oratory is not mentioned elsewhere in William of Malmesbury’s work except in what we know to be Henry Blois interpolations of GR3 and DA. Therefore, we should look to the reasoning of why such a normally inconsequential detail is highlighted and a wooden church becomes necessarily wattle in construction. The obvious reason would be that our propagandist is steering his audience to accept the ‘oratory’ in the prophecy as the current wooden church. The only reason he would be doing this is because the prophecy exists.

The point is.... if Henry Blois is employing certain words in Malmesbury’s works, so that they seem to correlate to the ‘Old Church’ and we know the prophecy does not apply to anywhere else but Burgh Island....

583 It has to be Henry who reproduced the prophecy as it has his invented name of *Insula Avallonis* substituted for Ineswitrin.
we must conclude that the person wishing to convince us of this has a reason for doing so. It is a purposeful attempt to mirror with what is stipulated in the prophecy so as to conflate Glastonbury with the original island location in the prophecy.\textsuperscript{584}

It is quite foolish that scholars find it unremarkable and natural to mention what a building used to be made of on several occasions, especially when William himself (not the interpolations) says it is made of wood.\textsuperscript{585} So, if Henry is keen to seek a harmonisation of criteria in the prophecy with what features exist at Glastonbury and this harmonisation is found in William’s GR3; the Melkin prophecy is unlikely to be a fourteenth century concoction; especially, if the church had burnt down and these were subsequent interpolations. This would be the case, unless it is a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’ and a huge coincidence that the data in the prophecy just so happens to indicate an island in Devon which had a name in Brythonic which meant the ‘island of White tin’ (attested to by Diodorus as Ictis by its location and description) and as William of Malmesbury relates was donated to Glastonbury in 601AD.

It is Henry Blois who is transforming William’s work in GR3 to correlate with a word found in the prophecy concerning ‘Wattle’. \textit{Cratibus praeparatis}: ‘prepared wattle’ is not clear; but is more relevant to a previously prepared (pre-readied- \textit{paratis}) ‘cave’ or crater as witnessed in Melkin’s prophecy in which Joseph is buried an was at one time used to store tin ingots.

To be fair (and running contrary to my proposition), in both DA (chap 1&6) and in GR3 the term for wattle used by Henry Blois is \textit{virgea} rather than \textit{cratibus} but in essence gives exactly the same sense. In fact in DA, Henry Blois’ interpolation uses \textit{uirgis torquatis} saying the disciples ‘had been instructed, making the lower part of all its walls of twisted wattle, an unsightly construction no doubt...’\textsuperscript{586} The oratory at ‘Avalon’ (in reality made of wood with a lead covering at the time of writing DA) now has one redeeming feature with which it becomes synonymous (or becomes eligible

\textsuperscript{584} The exact same procedure was used when it was imperative that Ineswitrin appeared synonymous with Glastonbury in the \textit{Life of Gildas}.

\textsuperscript{585} William of Malmesbury. Saints Lives, VSD, vol I, 16. \textit{At Glastonbury, as I mentioned before, there is, next to the wooden church, a stone one, whose founder is said by an old and reliable tradition to be of King Ine.}

\textsuperscript{586} Early history of Glastonbury abbey. John Scott, chap 1.
to be conflated with) the oratori mentioned in the prophecy, which now finds relevance situated at Glastonbury.

‘William of Malmesbury’ supposedly has told us that the church used to be built of wattle, but it is with too much emphasis and too often to be genuine narrative from William. Henry Blois makes such a point of this (and that is why I am labouring the point), so that the prophecy about the Island known as Avalon agrees on as many parallel points as possible. Henry Blois then persuades us (and John of Glastonbury follows his lead) that there should be no doubt that the cratibus found in the prophecy can only apply to the Glastonbury oratori. Henry, pretending to be William, is overly defensive and too frequent in his attempts to convince us of the construction and antiquity of the church in both GR and DA The obsession with the material of construction ironically points out that Henry is making a case rather than being able to base his assertions in fact, which evidently establishes the reason behind the interpolations.

Author B’s Life of Dunstan only ‘suggests’ that St Patrick died at Glastonbury, but Author B does not quote from any apostolic legend. There was none previously before Henry’s abbacy at Glastonbury. The only definitive proof of dating in antiquity was the 601 charter. The 601 charter and the prophecy of Melkin were probably in ‘the chest of documents’ until William found them.

Henry establishes the veracity of his position concerning an apostolic foundation by averring in DA that: There are letters worthy of belief to be found at St Edmund’s to this effect: ‘The hands of other men did not make the church at Glastonbury but the very disciples of Christ, namely those sent by St Philip the apostle built it’. It is suspicious that we are not informed upon what authority these ‘letters’ or works are based, but the reference is probably to the unus historiographus Britonum which includes material based on author B, but it does not mention Philip or disciples. The same argument exactly about Freculphus and the Gauls and St Philip is used in DA as in GR3; the only difference is that in DA an apostolic foundation is posited as a certainty. In none of the saint’s lives written by William of Malmesbury is St Philip mentioned. One would think St Philip was worthy of mention in VSD II considering what William had found out since writing VSD I.... if there were any truth to the assertion that William made such a claim. The same principles Henry uses to construct HRB i.e. conflation, obfuscation and confusion. St Philip was an apostle in Samaria and
Palestine, (admittedly there is no evidence he did not come to Europe)…. but it seems fair to speculate that it is Freculphus who starts the rumour confusing the Galli or ‘Gauls’ with Galatians or Gallati.

We do not know if William of Malmesbury\textsuperscript{587} would have known of Freculphus’s continental work nor quoted it as an authority.\textsuperscript{588} The matter of William’s tantalising proposition is probably the most important subject matter concerning the church and not a topic for a serious historian to trifle over. To posit such an earth shattering proposition (only tentatively) does not hold with the normal self-imposed professional strictures William normally obeys.

This black hole in history from which Henry Blois weaves his web of fabrications is consciously admitted in that in HRB, he promises a translation of another fictitious book devoted to the exile of the British Clergy in Brittany after the ravages of the farcical African King Gormundus. One can only imagine that Henry Blois envisioned writing the proposed fictitious book devoted to the exile which would surely have completed the Glastonbury void in history. I can speculate that it might have gone as far as a confirmation of St Patrick with St Germanus in Brittany.

The reader should be aware that if Henry had been discovered as the author of these various tracts, especially with the advent of the Merlin Prophecies, he would have been ridiculed and cast out as a liar and manipulator. So, Henry had to be careful in composing another fake history which (without incorporating Winchester or Glastonbury into them) would serve no purpose except to corroborate the pseudo-history of HRB. But, if he had written the book on the exile of British clergy, he would have been exposed by now. Instead the VM was composed, in which steps were taken to convince us ‘Apple Island’ was the same place as Avalon.

Fortunately for us in the modern era, a new post 1158 agenda was born on Henry’s return from Clugny. Glastonbury was to be glorified to take on even Rome’s apostolic succession. Henry moved Glastonbury’s status as high as one might presume to aim in hereditary succession…. through the family of Jesus by his supposed Uncle. Henry knew Joseph’s burial site existed, but could not locate the Island…. otherwise what is he doing searching at Montacute. Why would he perpetuate the prophecy if he did

\textsuperscript{587} His father was Norman and his mother English and he spent his whole life in England.

\textsuperscript{588} According to G. Baist two copies of Freculphus’ chronicles composed c.830 were listed in the Glastonbury Library catalogue in 1247.
not believe it and propagate Grail stories at the court of Champagne about Joseph and the Grail based on the material in the Melkin prophecy.

Henry relates about a vessel containing Christ’s blood being taken to ‘Geoffrey’s’ Avalon, organised by Joseph of Arimathea and tells of the Vaus d’Avaron.... so it would be a madness not to understand that Henry based his association of Joseph with the Grail on anything else but the prophecy of Melkin. The prophecy is the only thing we know is genuine by the accuracy of its data. The only change is the substitution of the Burgundian name of Avalon which we know derives from ‘Geoffrey’.

It is doubtful that William of Malmesbury would ever have been convinced of an apostolic foundation. Unless he is sequentially working toward that argument I can see no reason why Freculphus should be called upon to back up what is essentially an unfounded proposition. The real truth lies in the fact that the first 34 chapters of DA are an interpolation and William of Malmesbury starts the original DA with the 601charter as the earliest evidence of Glastonbury’s antiquity. Hence, a disciplic provenance was not known by William. Surely, someone is compiling a case calling upon a parallel of Author B which exists at St Edmund’s, and also a proposition which cites the nearest tentative documented589 disciple’s name to come within range of Britain put forward by Freculphus. This is then combined with persuasive rhetoric such as ‘faithful tradition of succeeding centuries’ and most convincing of all, ‘that trustworthy record found in several sources’.

If William refused to include falsehoods in his work which confirm Dunstan’s relics are at Glastonbury, while under great pressure from the monks to do so; it is doubtful he would flaunt a proposition of such importance contrary to every principle; especially with the following caveat. But I would not be thought to deceive my reader’s expectations with romantic fancies and therefore; leaving these points of difference undecided, I will set to tell a story of solid truth. The caveat is meant to undo suspicion.... but again the seed is planted, the stepping stone is placed. This is how Henry Blois operates and contrives his illusion of pseudo-history. In DA, nearly every tentatively held position in GR3 becomes certain fact.

589 The Roman church, at a very early stage, expunged chapter 29 from Acts of the Apostles, which relates that St Paul came to Britain. Since Augustine’s arrival any trace of the British church’s heritage has been wiped clean by the tightly held Roman monopoly on the Christian religion.
The interpolator of GR3 is of the same mind as the interpolator of DA. VSD II was finished after the main body DA and mentions nothing of William’s supposed new discoveries, much of which would have been incidentally relevant in VSD II. If we can understand that VSD II is the real reflection of what William understood after having written DA; how is it that no apostolic foundation is mentioned in VSD II?

It is therefore a serious flaw on which to base *a priori* assumptions, adducing that we may understand William’s original words from commonalities and comparisons between sections found in GR3 and DA. GR3 version B was composed by Henry. It is from William’s DA research, that modern scholarship surmises William’s better understanding and the reason for his additions in GR3. If this were wholly true VSD II should include the supposed momentous discovery of new understanding of a disciple or apostolic foundation posited in DA. But William’s general measured statement in VSD II is: *It was an ancient place as I have said, going back well beyond his (Dunstan’s) time; but though it owes its first foundation to earlier benefactors, it is indebted to Dunstan for its new pre-eminence.*

VSD II was written after the original body of DA, so one must be suspicious. The above quote is hardly the commendation of a man employed to search out the ancient sanctity of Glastonbury who has already stated that the Disciples of Christ built the church in DA and posited such a similar position in GR3. Therefore, both of the latter must be interpolations.

Surely modern scholarship is not going to insist these are late interpolations now they understand the motive behind such a grandiose claim and by whom it was written. The interpolator inserting propaganda into William’s GR3 version B, which, (not by coincidence), concerns for the most part Glastonbury, (excepting William’s genuine updated material) is surely the same person who initially concocts the charter of St Patrick.

Don’t forget, Henry is inserting folios into the only monograph copy of William’s DA. Henry would test the bounds of credibility using the reputation of William of Malmesbury. By this bold assertion of concocted

---

590 In VSD book II, the prologue starts: *I have dealt with in another work, as well as God allowed me, with the antiquity of this most holy Monastery of Glastonbury. Yet the prologue of DA states: I have laboured to commit to eternal memory the life of the blessed Dunstan, abbot of Glastonbury and later archbishop of Canterbury, and have now completed with scrupulous regard for the truth two books about him which your sons and my masters and companions had asked for.* The discrepancy is explained by the prologue of DA being written after both VSD book ii and the main body of William’s unadulterated DA.

591 VSD II 10.3
propaganda and impersonation, it appears as if William of Malmesbury recorded the Patrick charter in DA (even if no charter was concocted or existed in gold, only in ‘copy’ form). In the St Patrick Charter the Lord’s brother James had sent the uncle of Jesus to found Glastonbury.\textsuperscript{592} St Philip of GR3 is now outranked. In GP William of Malmesbury expressed his view that the first founder of the monastery of Glastonbury was King Ina, acting under the advice of St Aldhelm. So to think a reliable historian could go from that position to Philip’s disciples or James (and making no mention of this new found knowledge in VSD II) is nonsensical. Grandsen\textsuperscript{593} says: \textit{They show that William still had a strong tendency to bias when dealing with a monastery which interested him. Now the object of his favour was Glastonbury abbey, not Malmesbury. The reason for his interest in Glastonbury is not clear.}

What we do know is that William of Malmesbury worked at glorifying the English saints, but had no regard for the Briton’s as is evident from his comments on the 601 charter. William is not about to invent the 601 charter and logically, if it was a Henry Blois invention, why would he make the last paragraph addition of the bogus etymological statement in Caradoc’s \textit{life of Gildas} to support the initial agenda…. and then go through the contortion of reversing this proposition later by converting Avalon into Glastonbury

There would be no point of inventing the 601 charter, which had the name Ineswitrin on it, if the charter did not exist already in the archives at Glastonbury; especially when no-one had ever heard of the place before William’s discovery of the charter. As I have covered previously, how could the island of Ineswitrin, with only five \textit{cassates}, be given to the ‘old church’ at Glastonbury if the old church is on the same Island termed Glastonbury?

If Arthur and Gildas met in the time of Melvas, how is that the Island has two names Ineswitrin and Avalon? Also, when one considers the contortions which Henry goes through to set up Avalon as Glastonbury as part of his second agenda; the fact that he was forced to convince us that Glastonbury was indeed the Island of Ineswitrin in the first place adds weight to the existence of the genuine 601 charter.

The 601 charter would have been the main body of evidential proof which, not only countered Osbern’s postulation that Dunstan was the first

\textsuperscript{592} If truth were known, Joseph of Arimathea is more likely to be the Father of Jesus and therefore James his son also.

\textsuperscript{593} Historical Writing in England I c.550- c.1307. p. 183 Prof. Antonia Grandsen
abbot, but also clearly showed by the date and William’s own observation that the church (by its appellation) was already referred to as ‘old’ at the time. The point being that Henry Blois was Abbot of Glastonbury and the charter was genuine proof that the old church pre-existed any Augustinian institution and the charter would have been scrutinized at Rome (hence the need for ‘Caradoc’s’ nimble but latterly added etymology).

It has been necessary to undergo the ramble above while we are discussing the GR. Without the foreknowledge of these events, much of scholarships assessment of events can still be maintained.... until the three genres are brought under the same umbrella and disparate dissociative analysis is substituted for an all inclusive synthesis of common sense.

After that long diversion which sets the relationship of the two sets of interpolations into William’s work, I return again to the text of the GR3 interpolations of version B chapter 19 continued:

*Nor is it unlikely; for if the apostle Philip preached to the Gauls, as Freculphus says in book 2, chapter 4, we can well believe that he also sowed the seed of his preaching across the sea. But I would not be thought to deceive my reader’s expectations with romantic fancies and therefore; leaving these points of difference undecided, I will set to tell a story of solid truth.*

It is Henry Blois who postulates Philip. Presenting himself in character as William with the pretence of probity eschewing mere speculation; the factual historian moves on to tell a more solid proof. The seed is planted and it acts as a stepping stone. What once was tentatively posited as speculation becomes concrete fact in DA. Henry Blois uses the same format in the construction of the HRB. An episode or a persona mentioned in one of the annals is expanded upon so that there is historical reference, but the sense and situation is changed with no concern for anachronism.

**Chapter 20 (version B of GR3)**

*The church of which I speak commonly called by the English Ealdchirche, that is old church, on account of its antiquity, or that first made of wattle, and from its very beginning it possessed a mysterious aura of sanctity, and although ‘rough was the fabric that inspired such awe’, the whole country felt the breath. Hence the floods of common folk streaming in by every road; the gatherings of rich*
men, their grandeur laid aside; the frequent visits of the saintly and the learned.

Much of this passage is reiterated in DA and is commonly understood by commentators as newly redacted material from having completed the DA rather than propaganda. Again the wattle features and even an *apologia* is provided for the rustic construction and a repeat of the veneration in which the old church was esteemed as found in author B’s account. Although it is obvious to say that William is concerned with the antiquity of the church (as he has been commissioned to write a book on the subject), it seems to me that it is more the agenda of the interpolator of GR who constantly reminds us of its antiquity as it is him who is vying for metropolitan status based upon the establishment of early Christianity in Southern England.

**Gildas, for instance, a historian not without style and insight, whom the British have to thank for such knowledge of them as exists among other peoples, spent (so our fathers tell us) many years at Glastonbury, attracted by the holiness of the place. This church then is the oldest of all that I know in England, and thence derives its name.**

As I stated in my introduction to this section on GR, we can only make educated guesses at what are William’s new interpretations concerning Glastonbury in GR3 and what is Henry’s propaganda that has been spliced in. I think William did believe the church was the oldest in Briton and did in fact include the 601 charter in GR3 and therefore knew the old church existed before King Ine as he had previously indicated in GP. Gildas does not mention Glastonbury in *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*, and Henry Blois is relying on his bogus *Life of Gildas* as the authority of a connection with Gildas. He is plainly caught in his manipulation of history assuring his audience that such traditions were held by ‘our fathers’. As I covered, positing Gildas at Glastonbury dates the abbey to a pre-Augustine era and primarily was employed to confute Osbern’s assertion.

Henry Blois is planting the seed again for expansion in DA. We know the only account where Gildas is ‘put’ at Glastonbury is through ‘Caradoc’s’ account and we know that it was written by Henry. It is doubtful that William ever saw the bogus Caradoc account; and certainly before Caradoc’s account, there was nothing to indicate Gildas set foot in Glastonbury. We can therefore understand that in William’s genuine work, he knew nothing of Gildas’ connection to Glastonbury. Gildas is initially
posed as having spent many years at Glastonbury in GR3. Subsequently in DA, Henry Blois has turned him into a Glastonbury saint. According to the dates in the *Annales Cambriae*, Gildas would have been a contemporary of King Arthur. However, Gildas’ work never mentions Arthur by name or his own stay at Glastonbury.

Gildas is only otherwise mentioned in GR1 in connection with his book where William discusses the state of the Britons: *it is written in the book of Gildas wisest of the Britons*...

As I posited earlier, there is a suspicion that Henry is the person responsible for insinuating that the Nennius volume was written by Gildas which, (except for hagiographical accounts, the *Annales Cambriae*, and by St Omer), mentions Arthur by name and accounts his twelve battles. Henry tries to convert his audience (when writing as ‘Geoffrey’ in HRB) to the acceptance of Gildas being the author of the work currently recognised as being written by Nennius.

Henry has concocted the *Life of Gildas* under the pseudonym of Caradoc; so it does not add up that William supposedly relies on the authority of a contemporaneous author (i.e. Caradoc’s work) and adduces that Gildas spent many years at Glastonbury. These are not William’s words, but the product of Henry’s propaganda which are being re-used as part of the papal presentation... as the Vatican copy of Nennius (probably donated by Henry) is supposedly authored by Gildas.

If Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* had been read in reality by William, (as this is the only work that connects Gildas to Glastonbury); why does William not make mention in GR of the Gildas and Melvas episode in connection with Arthur? One would think that the T or A versions of GR would mention Gildas at Glastonbury if *Life of Gildas* was not in truth a fabrication. Especially when William of Malmesbury says in his own words (because it is in the T version) that Arthur *is the hero of many wild tales among the Britons even in our own day, but assuredly deserves to be the subject of reliable history rather than the false and dreaming fable; for he was long the*

---

594 GR. 70.4

595 Lambert is the only chronicler to refer to Arthur as *Arthur dux Pictorum interioris Britannie regens regna, fortis viribus* Arthur, leader of the Picts, reigning over realms of the interior of Britain, resolute in strength... and refers to Arthur’s palace in the land of the picts c.1120 twenty years before Henry Blois’ *Primary Historia*
mainstay of his falling country',\(^{596}\) (this, however, could be just another correction).

Gildas brought antiquity to Glastonbury in Henry’s mind, especially by association, living at a time prior to Augustine’s arrival. Yet, because Henry is the author of the *Life of Gildas*.... through discrimination, he avoids implicating himself as the author by not mentioning the Guinevere kidnap episode in HRB even when he fleshes out the first Variant with so much extra content to become the Vulgate; (*Life of Gildas* being probably completed after the *Primary Historia*). Again, it is artful confusion in that Henry implies in HRB that the work of Nennius was written by Gildas even connecting the two names in HRB. Gildas does not mention his stay at Glastonbury in any of Gildas’ work; an oversight considering he is posited as writing his works there. The reader can appreciate what a vital role the *Life of Gildas* had in confusing modern scholars. It corroborates certain pertinent pieces of information, which, when assumed as a genuine work and not produced specifically for propaganda; the *Life of Gildas* inevitably becomes a stumbling block to the truth of what really transpired at Glastonbury.

Chapter 20 (version B of GR3) continues about the old church:

*In it are preserved the bodily remains of many saints, some of whom we shall touch on in due course, and there is no part of the sacred building without the ashes of holy men, so thickly piled with relics are the floor, tiled with polished stone, the sides of the altar, and the altar itself, above and below. One may also notice in the pavement on both sides, stones carefully placed in triangular and square patterns, and sealed with lead; and I am not irreligious if I believe that some secret holy thing lies beneath them.*

This could of course be William’s text but the inference in the final line is Grail-esque and is highly suspicious that William should propose such a tantalising mystery. Especially if we consider by the 1170’s a story of Joseph and the Grail was being broadcast in the courts of Europe along with Arthurian romance and there is mention of a holy thing.... which turns out to be supposedly located at Glastonbury. I still think the insistence on the sanctity is overstated as if the passage is written, bent on convincing his

\(^{596}\) GR, Thompson and Winterbottom, vol I P.27
readers (the papal authorities) rather than merely stating the case as William would have done. It seems to be highlighted too often, not as anecdotal narrative as William would write, but with propagandist repetition.

The age of the place and its multitude of Saints inspire such reverence for the shrine that men would scarcely dare keep vigil there by night, or void their overflowing rheum by day; one conscious of pollution by the visions of sleep would tremble in every limb. No one ever carried hawk or drove animal into the neighbouring graveyard, and yet went his way unscathed in person or possession. Persons obliged to undergo ordeal by fire or water who made their supplications here have, with one sole exception in living memory, been triumphantly vindicated. If anyone had sought to raise nearby a building that might overshadow the churches light, he laid it open to ruin. It is notorious that the men of that region have no more solemn or familiar oath than to swear by the old church, and shun nothing more, from fear of immediate penalty, then to be forsworn. Any weakness in the truth of what I say, I shall remedy with evidence, in chronological order, in my book on the antiquity of Glastonbury.

On three occasions in the Glastonbury additions of GR3 (version B) the writer shows insecurity about the veracity of what he has written. It is Henry himself as the author of the interpolations who directs us to his vastly interpolated DA giving the appearance of William substantiating his claims about Glastonbury in a more comprehensive volume. This is Henry Blois’ art. Nowhere else in GR is William of Malmesbury trying to convince his audience on such flimsy material citing vague tradition and un-named ancient sources. Normally, William’s material is matter of fact, but a tradition here is being empirically built surrounding the church without any definitive foundation and this is not William’s modus operandi. The Persons obliged to undergo ordeal by fire or water i.e. judgement…. one assumes is Thurstan.597 Also, we witness in HRB the ease with which Henry is able to conjure up a scene. He has certainly here endowed the church with a mystical sanctity, that apparently all people hold it in awe; in effect confirming its illustrious disciplic foundation.

597 DA chap 76
Chapter 21 (version B of GR3)

Meanwhile, I have made it clear that the resting place of so many saints richly deserves to be esteemed a little heaven on earth. How sacred was that place, even among the Princes of the land, so that there above all other they preferred, under the protection of the mother of God, to await the resurrection, there is much to show, which, for fear of being tedious, I omit.

Henry’s reticence in not mentioning names for fear of being tedious implies there is much more to divulge. Henry’s pretence of William’s probity and reticence where he withholds in GR is compensated for (in no small measure) as he embellishes in DA. One prince named Arthur, (it turns out) was awaiting the resurrection at Glastonbury. I know of no other prince which ‘preferred’ to be buried at Glastonbury.

In DA, it is made clear that Henry planted the body of Arthur between the piramides. In GR1 William does not know where Arthur is buried and miraculously in DA the location was stipulated. However, when GR3 interpolations were composed no grave was yet manufactured at Glastonbury. The above assertion about the preference of royalty could apply to Arthur and lends credibility to the reasoning of why Arthur would be taken to Avalon. We know that Henry’s conversion of Glastonbury into Avalon is part of his post-1158 agenda and therefore we can be reasonably certain the faked grave site was concocted c.1160.

My guess, given Giraldus’ testimony, is that Henry Blois told King Henry II on his deathbed where Arthur’s body was located as well as having stipulated its location in DA. This is why the instigation of the search is attached by Giraldus to the King’s name

Modern scholars have believed that the interpolation giving the location of Arthur’s grave in DA was inserted after having disinterred

598 Excepting the reference to the figure on the pyramid which was said to represent ‘a King in state’.
599 In Gerald of Wales De principis instructione we are told: It was above all King Henry II of England who most clearly informed the monks, as he himself had heard from an ancient Welsh bard, a singer of the past, that they would find the body at least sixteen feet beneath the earth, not in a tomb of stone, but in a hollow oak. Now, it is fairly obvious to all that no bard could know the burial site of the ‘chivalric’ Arthur…. as Avalon had been concocted by Henry Blois only recently. Only one person could know the whereabouts of the body. That was the person who fabricated the leaden cross and buried some bones in a tree trunk to make it look like a burial from the times of the ancient Britons (even though it was a Saxon custom to bury in hollowed out trees). Only Henry Blois could contrive such a deception and make Henry II believe it. Henry Blois appears to have lived in retirement at Winchester according to popular opinion and we know for the last year of his life he was nearly
Arthur at Glastonbury. This is based purely upon how those scholars have decided to piece together their theories. What they should have realised is that the interpolator would have given a record of the disinterment in DA rather than just the location. It is just not feasible that a Glastonbury acolyte supposedly inserting in DA where the body ‘was’... after the unveiling, would leave the account of Arthur’s disinterment to Gerald to write up.

With the advent of Arthurian Grail literature and Kings involved with the discovery of Arthur’s most ‘un-human’ bones, this would have been the biggest news event in Britain. Every little detail would have been vastly expanded upon. Gerald’s account is nothing to the hype that would have been written in DA if it was an interpolator who could express what he had seen and what was found.

If only modern scholars would see that the mundane detail innocuously referred to in DA about where Arthur’s manufactured grave is situated is written by the person who had constructed the site but was not present when it was dug up.

In essence the scholastic standpoint is based upon the presumption that Arthur’s tomb was unknown prior to the disinterment and the assumption that Henry de Sully was the instigator of the fraud and defined where the body would be found. To arrive at this theory one has to ignore Giraldus who may have written as early as 1192 and may well have been an eyewitness to the unearthing of Arthur. The accepted theory takes no account of William’s genuine description of the pyramids which is why Henry chose the location. Another speculation might be the very reason for Henry Blois searching for Joseph in such a spot prior to his muses telling him to fabricate a tomb. Henry may have utilised the same hole in which to plant evidence of Arthur. I should rather accept Giraldus’ account

blind. Before going blind, he disguised himself as a conteur at times in the courts on the continent c.1160-68 to propagate his Grail propaganda. It is Roger of Wendover however, who gives account of how and when Henry Blois might have convinced the King of a rumour he had heard of Arthur’s burial site while also foretelling other things which were to happen on account of King Henry’s murder of Thomas Becket: The same year, also, on the 7th of August, King Henry returned to England and visited Henry of Winchester, now on his death bed, who rebuked the King for the death of the glorious martyr Thomas and foretold many of the evils which would come upon him on account of it. The bishop died full of years the next day. It is my opinion that Gerald’s assertion that Henry II was somehow involved in the unearthing of Arthur is accurate. The unearthing may have occurred in 1190 rather than 1191 as stated by Ralph of Coggeshal as we shall cover shortly, but it should never be forgotten King Henry II knows of Arthur’s link to Glastonbury as he is mentioned in the charter shown previously.

600 See chapter on Giraldus.
than Adam of Damerham’s written after 1277, who even gets Henry Blois’ death wrong by 7 years, saying he died in 1177.

Henry Blois, writing as William in DA, inferred that Arthur was buried in a precise location between the pyramids. The DA manuscript was in Henry Blois’ possession until his death, so it was not public knowledge where Arthur’s gravesite was situated until after Henry’s death when his collection of books got released to Glastonbury monks. If my presumption is correct he probably told King Henry of the fact the day before he died. Therefore, it was not widely known. When the body was discovered, there would be no come back on Henry. After all, who would bury a body to be discovered after their death?.... except the person who invented the bogus chivalric persona of Arthur. He could be the only one who planted the bones in the position stated in DA.

This GR3 passage above is reiterated nearly word for word in DA in chapter 31. This is the reason why scholarship has assumed the addition is a later interpolation after the fact. This may well be the case in that GR3 and DA did agree when both were being used to support Henry’s case at Rome before 1149, but it does not take into account Henry moving on to his second agenda and his glorification of King Arthur into posterity. It is such a pretention to write I omit it from fear of being tedious; when he clearly does not in either GR3 or DA.

Henry secretes the supposed body sometime after 1158 and it is unearthed 1190-1. So the difference between the passages is where Henry lays bare his hand in DA and spells out where Arthur’s grave is located i.e. the addition in DA is only made when Henry had planted the body whereas before GR3 and DA mirrored each other.

In DA Henry uses this same passage, but instead of being coy about which prince or nobles he is referring to which are awaiting the resurrection, he names Arthur; about whom he had only intoned in GR3 as above. He employs the same words as if William has just added an inconsequential fact: There is much proof of how venerated the church of Glastonbury was even by the nobles of our country and how desirable of the burial, that there especially under the protection of the mother of God they might await the day of resurrection, but I omit it from fear of being tedious. I

601 Following the same sentence in DA, Henry makes one addition when he moves to his second agenda: I omit it from fear of being tedious. I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monk’s cemetery between two pyramids. Henry Blois then cleverly in DA splices back supposedly into William’s work.
pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monk’s cemetery between two pyramids and many other leaders of the Britons......\textsuperscript{602}

When Henry Blois died, the precise location of Arthur’s tomb was specified (as above) in DA as it is Henry Blois who plants his alter-ego’s resting place at Glastonbury and had already laid the groundwork of propaganda which converts Glastonbury into Avalon. This is done by the same man who fabricated the St Patrick’s charter and who also introduced Phagan and Deruvian as the founders of Glastonbury in the St Patrick charter, which, just happens to mention both Ineswitrin and Avalon in DA. If modern scholars deem it otherwise, based on a presumption, that is their business. But, the problem remains that until one of our experts recognises that Avalon was substituted for the name of Ineswitrin (where Joseph of Arimathea is really buried) on the Melkin prophecy and is not the same place as Glastonbury.... a society of amateurs like the ‘Devon Archaeological Society’ will never get the nod to unearth the greatest discovery of the last 2000 years.... and the world will still keep believing a lie which was perpetuated to extend the Roman Empire.

‘The Vatican’ is the Roman extension of its empire (the single richest entity on earth) and in the present era has sway over a third of the human population. Do we really believe Jesus as having said \textit{And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church}. This is quite simply a lie and so is the resurrection (as posited in the Gospels) and we have a body to prove it; over which, the image on the Turin shroud was formed. That body is still extant on Burgh Island. Why otherwise would the Roman church extinguish the Templar Knights in one day?.... because it was them who owned the shroud and potentially had the power to bring down the lie that the Vatican had perpetuated, by crushing any residue of the traditions of the Britons i.e. the true events which transpired in Britain after the crucifixion.

This next section however, found in GR3 may be wholly or partially or not at all written by William. It is found nearly word for word in DA. It is worth considering that if it is original in its entirety, it might (as I posited

\textsuperscript{602}(DA), The Early history of Glastonbury, John Scott. Chap 31
earlier) have had some bearing on why Henry chose the *piramides* as markers for the site of Arthur’s tomb.

One thing generally unknown I would gladly tell, could I discover the truth, and that is the meaning of those pyramids which stand on the edge of the monastic graveyard a few feet from the church. The taller, which is nearer the church, has five tiers, and is 28 feet high. It threatens to collapse from old age, but still displays some ancient features, which can be deciphered though they can no longer be fully understood. In the uppermost tier is the figure habited like a Bishop, in the second one like a King in state, and the inscription ‘Here are Sexi and Bliswerh’. In the third too are names, Wencrest Bantomp, and Winethegn. In the fourth, Bate, Wulfred and Eanfled. In the fifth, which is the lowest, is a figure, and this inscription: ‘Logwor Weaslieas and Bregden, Swelwes, Hiwingendes, Bearn. The other pyramid is 26 feet high, and has four tiers, on which are inscribed Centwine, Hedde Bishop, and Bregored, and Beorward. The meaning of these I am not so rash as to determine, but I suppose the stones are hollow, and contained within them the bones of those whose names are to be read on the outside. Certainly, it is maintained with perfect truth that Logwor is the man who once gave his name to Logworesburgh, the present Montacute; that Bregden is the origin of Brent Marsh; and that Bregored and Beorward were abbots of Glastonbury in the days of the Britons. To them, and to such others as we may meet with, I shall thenceforward gladly devote more space; for it will now be my endeavour to set out the succession of the Abbots, the gifts conferred on each for the use of the monastery, and the King from whom they came.

Firstly, in GR William does not devote more space or cover the succession of Abbots, so, it is a possibility he is referring to his endeavours in DA or this passage is copied from DA. The complexity of the issue concerning chronology is exemplified in that; if this is an interpolation.... how is it that William in GR3 version B is saying *I shall thenceforward gladly devote more space* when, if he is referring to DA, DA was completed before 1134 and supposedly... when the GR3 was written c.1140, it could not not be looking forward. The fact that the *piramides* are mentioned is probably a salient fact in their incorporation into GR3.
Not that it has much bearing on our investigation, but, the generally held view by modern scholarship is that the word *Piramide* was meant as a monumental cross\(^603\) seems in this case a little stretched. On account that William has singled them out, it seems that these two *piramides* are given specific attention because they differ somewhat from the normal description of a monument over a tomb.

I agree with Scott’s assessment that the description of the *piramides* are William’s own words and a genuine update or expansion into GR or Henry’s into DA. However, this again presents a big problem in chronology as *Bregored* is mentioned both as a name on the *piramide* and in the 601 charter. These two *piramides* seem to be West Saxon and might mean Henry Blois has inserted the name Bregored because it is on the 601 charter. This cannot definitively be proved to be the case, but it hardly matches chronologically if Centwine died c. 685 and Hedde who is the bishop of Winchester from 674-705 are interred in the same West Saxon monument.

In DA chapter 35, Beorwald is successor to Bregored whereas in chap 32 of DA it says Beorwald became abbot after Haemgils. I would suggest that on the 26 foot pyramid only Centwine, Hedde the bishop and Beorward were mentioned. I hold this view purely on the basis of date thinking the name Bregored is an addition. The reason Henry might have done this is because there is no previous mention of Bregored anywhere else at Glastonbury (or Worgrez for that matter) and these names were the witnesses on the document which was being produced as proof of antiquity i.e. the 601 charter. One could speculate, since Ralph of Coggeshall in his *Chronicon Anglicanum* c.1200 could not make out any names on the *piramides* that this is precisely what Henry was banking on by inserting Bregored.

Even though a *pyramis*\(^604\) may in some way be used similarly by Eadmer to describe Dunstan’s grave at Canterbury and William’s use of the word in GP to describe the tomb of Wulfstan at Worcester and of course Indract\(^605\) at Glastonbury; it does not represent an accurate embodiment of William’s depiction here. Some commentators think it refers to an obelisk shaped cap on a cross in the graveyard.

---

\(^{603}\) Thompson and Winterbottom, GR. Vol ii, commentary p.401

\(^{604}\) Eadmer

\(^{605}\) DA, chap 20
It is stated that the *piramides* are tiered. So, to posit that the bones of those named on the outside are somehow contained within the shaft of a tiered cross does not seem to tally with William’s description. To describe the structure as possibly hollow, and to contain the amount of bones of those named by William, would indicate a tiered pyramid, not a stone shaft with a pyramidal cap. The suggestion they are commemorative rather than sepulchral seems to differ from the postulation in the text. I do agree that a singular tomb marked in some way by what is termed a *piramide* in which St. Patrick was said to be placed near the altar\textsuperscript{606} has a commonality in meaning or design or function, but these *piramides*, it would seem, were large tiered exterior structures. They were also prominent enough or of significant importance to warrant the description and height enumerated of an unequivocal place which described where Arthur was buried. If you had said Arthur’s body is between the *piramides* you could not really mistake the location given their size and after all Henry’s effort in the production of finding blonde hair and gorilla bones and skull, you would not want the world to miss the last act. So, an indisputable and definitive spot was chosen.

The last sentence seems to confirm that William is referring to the DA which implies that material about Glastonbury in GR is being updated after William’s visit as above: *To them, and to such others as we may meet with, I shall thenceforward gladly devote more space; for it will now be my endeavour to set out the succession of the Abbots, the gifts conferred on each for the use of the monastery, and the King from whom they came.*

The only problem is, again, that GR3 is written after William’s unadulterated DA had been completed. Why if this were a genuine update is it looking forward to writing DA which has been accomplished already? William does not set out the ‘succession of abbots’ in GR1, 2 or 3 as we have mentioned. One explanation maybe that Henry is merely leading into the next chapter concerning St Patrick while appearing to make the narrative flow so that the GR3 interpolations as seen in version B are not glaringly obvious additions into the text.

As Watkin observed,\textsuperscript{607} some names were later used by the forger of St. Patrick’s charter to provide a semblance of Glastonbury continuity and

\textsuperscript{606} DA, chap 10

antiquity. What Watkin does not realise is that Weaslieas could well be Henry’s invention. I have concluded that the Patrick charter inserted into DA was used in a propaganda exercise to acquire metropolitan status after the death of William. So, it seems likely that specifically the names (including Weaslieas) supplied authenticity to the Patrick charter. The piramides ultimately provide a way of locating Arthur’s tomb in the future.... as it was Henry who added the location as part of his second agenda when he redacted the copy of DA he had already provided in Rome. Obviously at that previous time Arthur was not interred at Glastonbury, the Anarchy was in full swing and Henry’s major priority was to establish a metropolitan for himself to free himself from Theobald’s subordination.

Chapter 22 (version B of GR3)

First, I will say a few words about St Patrick, with whom light first dawns on our recorded history. At a time when the Saxons were molesting the peace of the British, and the Pelagians assailing their

---

608 What is astounding always is Lagorio’s frivolous accounting of how the Matter of Britain, Joseph lore and Glatonburyana in general just happens: Despite the ecclesiastically suspect nature of the Grail legends, the temptation of this body of literature, linking the eminently qualified Joseph with Arthur and Britain’s conversion, was evidently too great to resist. Accordingly, Joseph was acclaimed as Glastonbury’s apostolic founder by a series of interpolations in William’s de Antiquitate, made shortly before 1250. These revisions amplified the extant charter of St Patrick to make Joseph of Arimathea, as Philip’s dearest friend.... Lagorio would have us believe that, if the Charter of St Patrick was extant and there had already been a conversion of Glastonbury into Avalon by the discovery of Arthur, then someone at Glastonbury appropriates Robert de Boron’s Joseph and the magic vessel story (written 1160–70) which mentions the vales of Avalon in the west; and suddenly (according to her analysis) around 1250 a group of monks appropriate Joseph to Glastonbury from a continental Grail story. This really would be a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’.

609 It is a little known fact that when the Saxons invaded the Britons, the invaders called them the wealas - an Old English word meaning slave or foreigner. This is probably the root of the name found on the 28 foot pyramid related in Malmesbury’s unadulterated text and may be the source for Henry’s muses to connect this name on the ‘piramide’ Weaslieas to his Wellias from Wells.

The taller, which is nearer the church, has five tiers, and is 28 feet high. It threatens to collapse from old age, but still displays some ancient features, which can be deciphered though they can no longer be fully understood. In the uppermost tier is the figure habited like a Bishop, in the second one like a King in state, and the inscription ‘Here are Sexi and Bliswerh’. In the third too are names, Wencrest Bantomp, and Winethegn. In the fourth, Bate, Wulfred and Eanfled. In the fifth, which is the lowest, is a figure, and this inscription: ‘Logwor Weaslieas and Bregden, Swelwes, Hiwingendes, Bearn

610 Notice how Henry Blois in his impersonation of Wace as author of the Roman de Brut is no longer concerned with the Pelagian Heresy as he was when he composed the First Variant. The sole purpose was to highlight Briton’s fight to preserve the Christian values held by the Catholic Church to which he was appealing. He also
orthodoxy, St Germanus of Auxerre came to our aid on both fronts: the enemy he routed with the alleluia triumph song, the heretic he blasted with the apostolic thunders of the gospel. Returning thence to his own country, he called Patrick to be a member of its household, and some years later with the authority of the Pope Celestine dispatched him to evangelise the Irish. Hence the entries in the Chronicles:

‘AD 425 St Patrick is ordained by Pope Celestine for service in Ireland, and A.D. 433 Ireland converted to Christianity by the preaching of St Patrick, with many miracles’. After executing his mission with vigour at the end of his life he came back home, and landed in Cornwall voyaging on his altar, which is still held in great veneration by the Cornish for its holiness, and its value in the treatment of the sick. So, he came to Glastonbury, and having become a monk and Abbot there, after some years paid the debt of nature.

Any hesitation about this statement is dispelled by the vision of one of the monks, who after the Saints death, when the tradition was already uncertain whether he had been a monk and Abbot there, and the question was much discussed, had his faith established by the following oracle. In his sleep, he seemed to hear someone reading, at the end of an account of St Patrick’s many miracles, the following words: ‘so he was honoured with the Sacred Pallium of an Archbishop; but afterwards became a monk and Abbot here’. The reader added that, if he did not fully believe, he would show what he had said, written in letters of gold. So Patrick died in the 111th year of his age and the year of our Lord for 472, which was the 47th year after his sending into Ireland. He rests on the right side of the altar of the old church, in a stone pyramid, which the devotion of later times has overlaid with silver. Hence it is an ancient custom amongst the Irish to visit Glastonbury to kiss the relics of their patron saint.

There are three statements, which at a glance, put the claim for Patrick at Glastonbury on shaky ground: 1) Any hesitation about this

uses Pelagius c. 400 to show Christianity existed in Britain at that date. In Wace he merely mentions: St. Germanus came to Britain, sent by St. Romanus, the Apostle of Rome. With him came St. Louis of Troyes. These two fair bishops, Germanus of Auxerre and Louis of Troyes, crossed the sea to prepare the way of the Lord. Henry has moved on from trying to secure a metropolitan. This also is an indicator that when Henry published Roman de Brut…. it was probably c.1160
statement…. 2) the question was much discussed…. 3) if he did not fully believe, he would show what he had said.…

Let it be stated now so that there is no confusion; St Patrick never became abbot of Glastonbury and the sole purpose of mentioning that he was an archbishop, who became abbot, confers by implication that St Patrick ran his metropolitan from Glastonbury.

GR3 consists of genuine updates and material that acts as a propaganda bridge to positions held by Henry Blois which incorporate his two agendas. The fact that this polemically motivated passage is in version B of GR3 adds to the suspicion that the above chapter is polemically motivated like many of the other passages here discussed in version B of GR3. An advantage is clearly witnessed in professing to house famous saints. Most monasteries of the era receive alms from visiting pilgrims; the more famous the saint, the more pilgrims.

In my view, the practice of housing dubious relics at Glastonbury had started in Dunstan’s time. If the legend of Patrick was an assured fact (that he was abbot at Glastonbury), why is it here (fraudulently) in GR3…. and not in what remains of William’s life of Patrick? The fact he was an Archbishop and later to become abbot of Glastonbury is highly dubious…. yet we can understand why Henry Blois would have added it in his claim for metropolitan. Patrick’s presence at Glastonbury has its germ in author B’s Life of Dunstan where it is put forward that it was ‘thought’ St Patrick was buried at Glastonbury. Henry uses this tentative belief to promote to a more credible status that which is accomplished in the fabrication of the St Patrick Charter.

Some commentators have suggested that ‘nothing comes from nothing’ and therefore the rumour of St Patrick buried at Glastonbury is probably true, but I would suggest someone in the past has built upon a dubious association of another person called Patrick in the Meare and Glastonbury area. Certainly author B in the Life of St Dunstan distinguishes between an elder and younger Patrick and holds to the rumoured account of St. Patrick being buried at Glastonbury: Now Irish pilgrims, like men of other races, felt special affection for Glastonbury, not least out of their desire to honour St Patrick, who is said to have died there happily in the Lord.

---

611 Early lives of St Dunstan, Winterbottom and Lapidge p.19
Author B was an eye witness at Dunstan’s funeral and therefore may well be correct in his assertion or may well be employing the time honoured practice of pursuing alms by professing such a position. Some commentators have suggested it was Dunstan himself who started the rumour and we are not informed of Author B’s connection to Glastonbury.

William’s view on Patrick is seen from the small extracts in his life of St Patrick which Leland related along with John of Glastonbury (as it is no longer extant). William had read Author B’s Life of Dunstan and uses some of his material in his own life of Patrick. Neither mentions time in Brittany with St Germanus. Nennius does however state: Saint Patrick taught the gospel in foreign nations for the space of forty years. The only supposed account we have of William’s which avers such a position is in GR3 and DA, both interpolated by Henry Blois and which infer an archbishop became an abbot of Glastonbury.

I do not believe William himself would hold such a bold position as that found in DA or GR3 that Patrick became abbot of Glastonbury. The fact that the author (Henry) knows it is dubious and then concocts a ludicrous mythical supportive proof (which in itself is flimsy), to my mind, confirms that it is a Henry concoction.

No suspicion would fall on the Norman Henry Blois in the glorification of a Briton or an Anglo Saxon saint. The strange coincidence of Patrick’s supposed stay at Glastonbury is that it produces the events which supply the background of an even greater concoction in St. Patrick’s charter and also a fleeting connection to St Germanus. Author B does not suggest Patrick as abbot, but does say there are Irish pilgrims.

William made Glastonbury updates to his GR which in effect have determined where Henry’s interpolations are inserted into GR3. As Henry Blois is splicing onto what originally constituted new material from the original GR1, I would go no further than to suggest that St Patrick was introduced because Author B had established the possibility (senior or junior) and it is upon this that Henry Blois saw the opportunity to fabricate the St Patrick charter as being newly discovered by William in his researches (but after William’s death).

The genuine historical facts are included for effect: ‘AD 425 St Patrick is ordained by Pope Celestine for service in Ireland, and A.D. 433 Ireland
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converted to Christianity by the preaching of St Patrick, with many miracles'. It is Henry Blois who has attached the extraneous lore. In what remains of William’s life of Patrick related by Leland there seems to be no connection with Glastonbury (excepting that which Leland derived from DA). It is likely that Henry Blois might have created a third book devoted to the life of St Patrick in which the Glastonburyana may well have appeared. Whether it was written by Henry or William is a moot point as it is no longer extant if it truly did exist. Leland relates that at the end of the second book it says: Now I shall direct mind and pen to his welcome return to his homeland and his glorious passing to heaven. We can only speculate that the tome was going to be full of Patrick’s exploits at Glastonbury as there was no mention at all in the extant copies which Leland worked with.

Chapter 23 (version B of GR3)

According to a well-established tradition, this later attracted hither, two eminent natives of Ireland, St Indract and St Brigid. Brigid left behind her some personal relics, a necklace, a purse, and some weaving implements, which are still displayed as a memorial of her sanctity, and healed various diseases; but whether she returned home or entered into rest at Glastonbury, is uncertain. Indract, as we shall see in the course of our narrative was martyred near Glastonbury with seven companions, and later translated into the old church.

To my mind this could be one of the genuine additions made by William. When GR1 was finished he had not written these ‘lives’ and so it is feasible to posit that the Glastonbury interpolations in GR3 are built around the section where William has added genuine insertions. However when we hear the words ‘well established tradition’ we should be suspect.

Chapter 24 (version B of GR3)

Patrick was succeeded in the office of Abbot by Benignus, but for how many years is uncertain. Who he was and what his name in his native tongue, is neatly given in this epitaph at Meare:

Within this to the bones of Beonna lays,
Was Father here of the monks in ancient days.
Patrick of old to serve he had the honour,
So Erin’s sons aver and name Beonna.
The favour that he found, and still finds, in the sight of God, is clearly shown by the miracles worked during his life in old days, and since his recent translation into the larger church.

I would say the epitaph is real, but the inclusion here is not William’s. The epitaph may however indicate the uncertain discrepancy found in author B of a senior and junior Patrick. This opens up to the possibility that there was once an abbot named Patrick but it was not the St Patrick. We have seen concerning Eadmer’s letter which accuses Glastonbury monks of claiming Dunstan’s relics. This is all part of Henry’s business plan for financing his building spree. The fact that Benignus is ‘recently’ translated might indicate it is part of the same plan. However, again this may well be a genuine insertion but as we will cover in chapter 13 in DA, it seems highly dubious with the mention of Benignus.

Chapter 25 (version B of GR3)

The esteem for Glastonbury felt by the great St David, Archbishop of Menevia, is too well known to need any advertisement from me.

This statement alone is enough to rouse suspicion since none of William’s previous saint’s lives has mentioned him. However, as we know David was mentioned in HRB. The chapter is designed to substantiate the fact that there was already a church in St David’s era. The life of St David by Rhygyfarch ascribes the foundation of Glastonbury to St David, but the link with David will be discussed further in the chapter on DA.

The antiquity and holiness of the church was established through him by heavenly vision. With seven other bishops, whose metropolitan he was, he came to take part in the dedication; and when all things needful for the ceremony were made ready, on the night preceding (as was thought) the festival, he fell asleep. When he was sound asleep, he saw standing beside him the Lord Jesus, who gently asked the reason of his coming. He explained without hesitation; whereupon the Lord turned him from his purpose, saying that He had long since dedicated that church in honour of His mother, and it was wrong for such a sacrament to be repeated, and so profaned, by the hand of man. At the same moment, in a dream, the Lord pierced with his finger the palm of his hand, and said: ‘Behold a sign that what I have done already must not be repeated. Nevertheless, in as much as you were motivated by piety and not presumption, your penalty shall not last long. In the
morning at Mass, when you come to the “With Him and through Him and in Him”, you shall be fully restored to health and strength. The Bishop awoke in terror. He grew pale and then at the running sore of his hand, and later no less surely welcomed the truth of the prophecy. And, that his journey might not seem fruitless, he quickly built and dedicated another church.

My own feeling about this interpolation is that Henry is trying to negate that King Ine built the original church which William attests to in GR1\textsuperscript{613} where, it simply states that Ine built \textit{in a sequestered marsh, intending that the more confined the monks’ view on earth, the more eagerly they would hold to heavenly things}. However, in the GR3 version at this point we have ‘Ine’s additions to whose splendour will be found described in the little book I have composed on the ancient history of the house’.

What Henry Blois is in effect doing is extending the foundation further into antiquity from Ine’s building c.700 by saying King Ina only carried out an ‘addition’ to a building which in effect had been established by St David. Henry then refers us again to his little book which not surprisingly is the interpolated DA. The problem was that Malmesbury’s GR was already in the public domain so his interpolations could only be kept to a minimum, hence the referral to DA.

As we have already explained this agenda is in pursuit of metropolitan status and coincides with the position of an apostolic foundation. We will get to this shortly and see that this simple insertion in version B replaces 35C and 36C specifically…. so it does not contradict the St David stone building.

Concerning this famous and incomparable man, I find no certainty whether he died at Glastonbury, or ended his life in his own see. They say he lies with St Patrick, and the Welsh, by their habit of praying to him, and often in conversation, definitely confirm this, telling how Bishop Bernard more than once looked for his body, and in face of many protests could not find it. So much for St David.

Henry Blois imitates William and pretends probity in stating he finds no certainty concerning St David, but then makes sure the seed is planted in that St David lies near St Patrick; and St Patrick is fortuitously already established as buried at Glastonbury. Henry Blois even knows through

\textsuperscript{613} GR 1 i.35.3
conversations with his friend Bishop Bernard and his endeavour to find the grave, that there is no trace of St David’s burial place in Wales.

Chapter 26 (version B of GR3)

_Long after, in the year of our Lord 596, came Saint Augustine’s mission to Britain, sent by St Gregory; and it was one of his fellow campaigners, Paulinus Archbishop of York and later Bishop of Rochester, who according to the tradition of our fathers clothed the church, which had long been made of wattle as we have said, in a covering of wooden planking. His admirable skill contrived, while taking nothing from its sanctity, greatly to increase its beauty; and true it is that churches, when they are made more beautiful and solemn, can kindle even the dullest mind to prayer and bend to supplication the most obstinate._

The first thing to note is the ‘long after’... as this is the crux of the polemic against Canterbury and is the cornerstone of the request for metropolitan in that... why would a church be subordinate to Canterbury if it pre-existed St Augustine’s arrival. Again, I can only reiterate the attention to the construction of the church seems to be based in propaganda as an _apologia_ for the existence of a wooden church rather than a wattle church. It is obviously in wood at the time of Henry Blois’ abbacy as noted earlier. Considering we know this is an interpolation which in effect put forward the story of a contemporary missionary of Augustine’s i.e. Paulinus covering an already existing church in essence establishing a pre-Augustine church, we need to ask; what is the reason for convincing an audience of a wattle church being synonymous with the wooden church which is obviously standing in the abbey grounds? Too much is made of such a seemingly small detail and to what end? The only solution has to be that it is to comply with what is found in Melkin’s prophecy as the oratory of the (adorable) Virgin Mary built of Wattle and so made to seem to have relevance to the _orator_, the _virginem adorandum_ and the _cratibus_.

We should not forget that all these chapters we are investigating here are the B version of Glastonbury additions and are not in GR1. However, it is with the 601 charter that William in his original DA started his evidence toward elucidating the antiquity of Glastonbury.... so, we can assume it was a genuine update of William’s into GR3.
Chapter 27. (version B of GR3)

_In the year of our Lord 601, the fifth, that is after the arrival of St Augustine, the King of Dumnonia gave the old church land called Ineswitrin, in which it stands, (quae ibi sita est) comprising five hides in answer to the prayer of Abbot Worgrez. ‘I, Bishop Maworn, drew up this deed. I, Worgrez, Abbot of the same place set my hand thereto’._

The Chapter 27 inclusion of the 601 charter is for the most part a genuine insertion into GR3. The charter is the clearest evidence which Henry has that the old church pre-dated Augustine. It would be pointless averring the existence of a charter if it did not exist as a proof. By producing this document and the scanty first redaction of William’s DA along with GR3 with version B interpolations…. is the evidence upon which pope Lucius granted metropolitan status to Henry.

If Ineswitrin did not apply to Glastonbury, to which Island did it apply? One of the reasons for the final paragraph in _Life of Gildas_ giving the bogus etymology of Glastonbury was to make Ineswitrin appear to be synonymous with Glastonbury. We know this has to be an interpolation in DA and above as it was Henry who wrote the etymological farce in _Life of Gildas_. So it would only be him who avers (not William) that the Church stands in Ineswitrin (quae ibi sita est). It is quite ludicrous that an estate called Ineswitrin (which obviously refers to an island by the prefix Ines) is donated to an old church existing on the same island; which has never been referred to as Ineswitrin before Henry’s arrival.

Considering we know that Burgh Island is the Ineswitrin in Devon, a certain amount of word play is necessary to complete the illusion of translocation. By implying (as above) that the old church stood in Ineswitrin (quae ibi sita est) ‘in which it stands’, the translocation is made. It is plain the estate of Ineswitrin did not exist at Glastonbury. The ‘island of white tin’ was donated to the ‘Eald Church’ which existed on an island; so how come the ‘Ines’ can be donated to the ‘Eald church’ already existing on it.

It is cleverly implied that prior to the arrival of the Saxons, the British name for the Island at Glastonbury was Ineswitrin. Author B does not mention Ineswitrin and nor does any other document but the 601 Charter…. and as we have proposed the original prophecy of Melkin. Author B states: _Now, in Heorstan’s neighbourhood, there was an Island belonging to the crown; the old English name for which, was Glaestonia, (antiquito Anglorum
vocabulo Glaestonia vocitata). This in no way implies that the Island was named Ineswitrin or Avalon previously. The name of Ineswitrin is only corroborated in the fabricated charter of St Patrick which is a master piece in retro engineering of the Glastonbury legend and in the additional last paragraph of the Life of Gildas.... both authored by Henry Blois.

Chapter 28 (version B of GR3)

We cannot tell who this King was from the antiquity of the charter. That he was British is quite clear from his calling Glastonbury in his native tongue Ineswitrin, for that is known to have been its British name. Another point is worth notice; how ancient a foundation must be that even then was called old church. Among its Abbots with their barbarous British names, were, besides Worgrez, Ledemund, and Bregored. The dates of their reigns are obscure, but their names and dignities are on public record in the larger church, painted up near the altar. Happy the dwellers in that place, whom reverence for their ancient sanctuary of itself encourages to holiness of life; nor, I believe, can any perish from the way to heaven, of those who at their departing find so many patron from saints to recommend or to defend them.

We can see that someone is trying to persuade us that the charter applies to Glastonbury and so we are told it is ‘quite clear’ based upon the fiction that Ineswitrin in the native tongue of the Briton applied to Glastonbury. It is not ‘quite clear’, simply because it is not true.... and William would not advocate the point! Nor would he say it is ‘known’ to be Glastonbury’s name in ‘British’ as he had never come across the name until he found the charter.

Finberg is one of the few scholars that realises Ineswitrin is not synonymous with Glastonbury and that the grant applied to elsewhere.... although most of his other speculations on Ineswitrin are misguided. As we covered earlier, Grimmer has reservations also. In my opinion the insertion by Henry is as follows: That he was British is quite clear from his calling Glastonbury in his native tongue Ineswitrin, for that is known to have been its British name.

It has to be an interpolation created by Henry as this is what he himself wishes his papal audience to believe because it substantiates the 601
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charter. Henry understands that the church was British or Brittonic prior to its takeover by the West Saxon Kingdom. So, it is not William’s statement that the British name for Glastonbury was Ineswitrin. There was no prior evidence of this and William would not have been aware of Henry’s fabrication of Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas*. If it had been known by him in his previous researches it would have been recounted in a saints’ life somewhere or in GR1 or GP. The fact that the only evidence to that effect is supplied in the St Patrick charter and the DA and Caradoc’s life, (all fabricated by the same person) is testimony to it being an insertion by Henry Blois in GR3.

It is doubtful that William had any other understanding of Ineswitrin other than it was named on a very old charter as an estate donated to Glastonbury. I doubt ‘Ines’ or ‘Ynis’ even registered with William that in the Brythonic tongue referred to an island just as it does today i.e. Ynys Llanddwyn or Llanddwyyn Island being a small tidal island off the coast of Anglesey.

William would however have grasped the importance of what this charter would mean in evidence of antiquity which was the main thrust of his researches. The charter is of such a date that it evidences the church was already ‘old’ and hence William makes that observation and knows that it must be pre-west Saxon because of the Dumnonian King.

William would have had no doubt that the Glastonbury church stood long before Augustine’s arrival and William makes this plain in the prologue to VD I: *In fact, Glastonbury passed under the sway of the church long before St Patrick, who died in AD 472, while Dunstan saw the light of day in AD 925*. William gives credence to the rumour started by Dunstan or author B concerning the possibility of St Patrick at Glastonbury as that was the reason he was asked to do ‘another’ Dunstan biography. This same assertion is made here in the Glastonbury interpolations in chap 22 of GR3 and in DA in chap 10, but the point is that he understood this while writing VD I.

Finally, it seems fair to say that William did think of the Britons as barbarous and hence the last observations would appear to be William’s own words: *The dates of their reigns are obscure, but their names and dignities are on public record in the larger church, painted up near the altar. Happy the dwellers in that place, whom reverence for their ancient sanctuary of itself encourages to holiness of life; nor, I believe,*
can any perish from the way to heaven, of those who at their departing find so many patron from saints to recommend or to defend them.

We shall see in chapter 35 of DA that Henry Blois recognises a logical discrepancy, especially having been the writer of HRB, which upholds the view that there were no sub Kings in that era. How could Arthur then rule Britain if there is a King of Devon? So he cleverly inserts in DA: *It ought rather be believed that this King was an Englishman because in the time of the Britons there were no provincial Kings, as in the time of the English, but only absolute monarchs and also because, although that estate (Ineswitrin) and many others were granted to Glastonbury in the time of the Britons, as is plain from the preceding....*

Henry suddenly realises that having made Ineswitrin synonymous with Glastonbury it hardly obeys logic on two counts: 1) That a King of Devon would be donating land that is already on the island on which the church exists if it was one and the same island denoted by its prefix of ‘Ines’. 2) How can there be a provincial King if there is a national King. Henry Blois deals with this conundrum in two ways, by offering an explanation to the contradiction: *yet when the English drove out the Britons they, being pagans, seized the lands that had been granted to churches before finally restoring the stolen lands and many others at the time of their conversion to the faith.* In other words the grant now applies to when the Saxon’s came and took the land. By so contriving this invention, he manages to stay consistent that the original estate of Ineswtrin (which he had posited as being one and the same with Glastonbury), is just being re-established by the grant.... now the Saxons have converted to the faith. If Grimmer is right, how does a genuine charter have a date of 601 if the West Saxons arrived c.670 (according to Grimmer) and the rationalisation above is genuine? I think it was the second invasion of the Saxons in to the West Country c.590 that caused the real donation of Ineswitrin to Glastonbury.

Chapter 29 (version B of GR3)

*In the year of our Lord 670 Cenwealh, then in the 29th year of his reign, gave to Berhtwald Abbot of Glastonbury by the mediation of Archbishop Theodore, two hides at Meare. This Berhtwald against the wishes of the King and his diocesan, resigned from Glastonbury, and retired to rule the monastery at Reculver. So Berhtwald, as he was celebrated for holiness of life, of distinguished lineage (being brother’s*
son to Aethelred King of the Mercians), and most conveniently situated for Canterbury, succeeded on the death of Theodore to the archiepiscopal throne. I need say no more about the antiquity of the church of Glastonbury. Now let me return in due order to Cenwealh, who (was so generous) .......... main text of GR3 continues.

The whole section just above is William’s, except for where he states: I need say no more about the antiquity of the church of Glastonbury. This in effect splices the reader back into the original updated text of GR3 after all the Glastonbury version B interpolations which have suited Henry’s purpose in garnering evidential support in his case for metropolitan status. The text in GR continues normally until chapter 35 where William is on the subject of King Ine saying: ...his own high character can, to this day, be seen reflected; clear too from the noble monasteries built by him at Kingly cost, above all Glastonbury,

Here the text deviates and in William’s GR1 it continues on with the following: ...a house outstanding in our times too. He built it in a sequestered marsh, intending that the more confined the monks’ view on earth, the more eagerly they would hold to heavenly things.

However, in the GR3 (or specifically the B version) at this point, instead of the above we have: ...‘Ine’s additions to whose splendour will be found described in the little book I have composed on the ancient history of the house’. The C version which we will cover shortly is not entirely what William wrote as a later redaction i.e. it also has been interpolated,615 as it has had content added which is only relevant to the time of Savaric. However, William had redacted 35c and part of 36c which is King Ine’s charter without the later interpolation.

Henry Blois as we have seen above is responsible for the B version and substitutes William’s later redactions of 35c and 36c by replacing it with the small addition cited above about ‘Ine’s additions’. This was done so the B version does not contradict itself in the self-same volume i.e. GR3. The problem with William’s 35c and 36c version and the reason it had to be extracted from the B version is that version B was presented as evidence to the pope. If 35c and 36c were included, it would negate what Henry was trying to substantiate in St David having built the stone buildings instead of
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615 The interpolation is the latter part of the charter concerned with preventing a bishop coming to Glastonbury. We can speculate that our consolidating author is responsible for the whole or partial interpolation of chapter 36C.
King Ine. So, GR2 is more sincere than GR3 but part of 36C has been interpolated at a later date in the conflict with Savaric.

So, to make it clear, instead of what is to be related below i.e. 35C and 36C, Henry inserts just the small addition in the B version: ‘Ine’s additions to whose splendour will be found described in the little book I have composed on the ancient history of the house’. This replaces both 35C and 36C. In effect this does not contradict Henry’s assertion of a building by St David which he had made previously in chapter 25 of the B version.

So, now going to the c version of GR3:

Chapter 35C.

Glastonbury, to which he ordered to be translated the bodies of the blessed martyr Indract and his companions after removal from their place of martyrdom. Indract himself he placed in a stone pyramid on the left of the altar, where the care of the later generations has also laid St Hild and the others beneath the pavement, as chance or purpose decided. Ine also built from its foundations the Church of the holy Apostles, as an appendage of the old church of which I was speaking, and he enriched it with great possessions granting a charter in the following terms:

It is necessary to see clearly what Henry Blois has in effect achieved. In 36C, (which we are getting to), St David’s consecration of the church at Glastonbury is genuine fact and is mentioned in the unadulterated part of the Ine charter. It was added into GR2 after William’s researches along with the other redacted pieces we have already covered. However, the sense portrayed by William in 36C has been deliberately corrupted by Henry Blois to become the source for the concocted St David legend at Glastonbury. The reference to St David has been turned into a ridiculous myth where St David now build’s a church and the ‘unheard of miracles’ becomes a clear miraculous sign from God. This, as we shall see, is not what William wrote in the King Ine charter in 36C.

Henry, employing the Ine charter, has contrived the St. David building myth in DA and inserted into GR3 chapter 25.... around what was essentially a genuine King Ine charter, which Henry has excluded from GR3 B version on grounds of continuity. The St David fabrication of Henry’s is what now constitutes chapter 15 in DA. Henry’s aim in the second attempt in 1149 at achieving metropolitan status was toward convincing the pope by
establishing the Phagan and Deruvian myth through the St Patrick charter. Also, to avoid any doubt of antiquity, Henry infers that St David built the stone church as an appendage to the Old church.... rather than what William of Malmesbury actually believed and wrote i.e. that King Ine built it.

If David really had built the stone church, author B would have mentioned it rather than a vague reference to its antiquity. Given the charter evidence in 36C and chapters 40 and 42 of DA and the fact the Parker MS of the Anglo Saxon Chronicle (in a marginal entry) states that it was Ine who ‘built the minster at Glastonbury’, it seems fair to conclude he did. One assumes, only the Old church stood before that. St. David’s name stated as the builder is only contrived from the words in 36C which in no way implies construction but only consecration. However, we must take into account the tradition found in the eleventh century *life of St David* by Rhygyfarch who ascribes the foundation of Glastonbury to St David and which states that St David *founded twelve monasteries to the praise of God: first, arriving at Glastonbury, he built a church there...* If William had known of this, why would he state King Ine built the church?

Henry had redacted initially a copy of DA which certainly contained no mention of Joseph, but it was interpolated and ready for the pope with material which establishes the propaganda for Henry’s first agenda of acquiring metropolitan status. When Henry presents his case for metropolitan to the pope, GR3 and DA are employed as witnesses. Also the 601 charter is produced. These were presented in conjunction with HRB and *Life of Gildas*.

However, much later, because of the contradictions of who built what-when, Henry then attempts to clarify in DA in chapter 40. Henry in chapter 40 of DA is merely trying to coalesce the various contradictions from a first papal agenda which moved from an apostolic to a Phagan and Deruvian foundation and combine it with his post 1158 agenda which moved from either apostolic/disciplic to a Josephean foundation. Henry would not have posited a Joseph agenda to a pope when Rome had the monopoly on Peter.\(^{616}\)
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\(^{616}\) Saying this does not negate that Joseph came to Britain or is still buried on Burgh Island. It just adds to the fact that any previous knowledge of Joseph as in Cornish tradition has been expunged by Roman influence.... just as chapter 29 of Acts (which mentions St Paul’s visit to Britain) has been deleted from the New testament. Also the heinous interpolation was added which provided Rome with its self professed authority: *And I tell you*
It is entirely obvious that mention of Joseph is derived from the Melkin prophecy. Joseph would have outranked Rome’s own self-professed primacy through Peter; Joseph being a family member. The answer to the conundrum of when chapters 1 & 2 of DA were written is that the chapters including the Joseph lore were not in DA in 1144 or 1149 but were the last addition post 1158 and correlate with the advent of Henry’s Grail story promulgation. Both based on the prophecy of Melkin.

Post 1158 Henry Blois re-worked DA to incorporate Henry’s more modern agenda of a Joseph foundation and the establishment of Avalon at Glastonbury. This is how Henry left the copy of DA.... his last interpolations becoming chapter 1 & 2 of DA.

We will also see in DA that Henry Blois puts to good use Ine’s privilege which is omitted from GR3. But, in DA Henry employs his own qualifications and explanation giving a more extended version in chap 40. Here he offers an explanation for the seeming contradictory discrepancy of William’s understanding. *Ine also founded the greater church of the apostles Peter and Paul and because there were many churches there, I wish to insert here the facts about the location of the different churches at Glastonbury and their founders.*

Chapter 36C.

I have left the next quote from the C version un-highlighted so that the reader can see the King Ine charter is employed by a monk concerned with the Savaric dispute. Whether or not this is the same as Scott’s consolidating author of DA cannot be determined.

*In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, I, Ine, endowed of the Lord with the dignity of the King on the advice of Seaxburgh my Queen, and with the leave of Berhtwald Archbishop of Canterbury and all his suffragans, and at the request of Baldred and Aethelheard my sub Kings, and to the old church which is in a place called Glastonbury, which long ago our great high priest and supreme Pontiff consecrated by his own ministry and the ministry of Angels to himself and to Mary ever virgin, as he made manifest to St David by many unheard of miracles, from among those lands, contiguous and convenient, which I possess my inheritance from my father and hold for my*

*that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.* That sane men and women believe in the pope’s infallibility and position as the representative of Jesus is the most extraordinary lie ever perpetuated.
especial domain, do grant for further increase of the religious life and for the
use of the monks: in Brent ten hides, in Zoy ten hides, in Pilton twenty hides,
in Douling twenty hides, in Bleadney one hide, together with all those gifts
which my predecessors have given to the church aforesaid, to wit: Cenwealh, who by the mediation of Archbishop Theodore gave Meare, Beckery, Godney,
Marchey, and Nyland; Centwine, who had been wont to call Glastonbury the
mother of saints, and appointed that it should be free from all services both
eclesiastical and lay, granting it also this honourable privilege, that the
brethren of that place should enjoy the power of choosing and appointing
their own ruler in accordance with the rule of St. Benedict; Bishop Haedde
who gave Leigh (in Street), Caedwaalla approving and confirming it with his
own hand; albeit a pagan; Baldred, who gave six hides at Pennard;
Aethelheard, who gave sixty hides at Polden Hill, with approval and
confirmation from myself. To the devotion and the generous request of all
those persons I accede, and against the wiles of the men of ill-will and barking
dogs I set the sleeping bulwark of my Royal Charter, that as the church of our
Lord Jesus Christ and of Mary, ever virgin, is first in the Kingdom of Britain
and the source and fountainhead of all religion, so it may enjoy a privilege
and dignity above all others, and that she may never do humble service to any
man on earth, who rules over the angel choirs in heaven. Therefore with the
approval of Gregory the supreme Pontiff, who receives in the protective
embrace of the Roman church both (Glastonbury) as the mother of his Lord,
and me (unworthy as I am) with her; and with the consent of all the Kings of
Britain, the Archbishops, bishops, thegns and Abbots; I determine and confirm
that all the lands the territories and possessions of St Mary of Glastonbury
should remain quit and be for ever inviolate and free of all such royal
exactions and services as may be decreed from time to time, to which military
service and the building of bridges and fortresses, and from the decrees and
interference of all archbishops and bishops, even as is found to be confirmed
in the ancient charters of that same church and is known to have been
provided by my predecessors Cenwealh, Centwine, Caedwalla, and Baldred.
Whatever cases shall arise of homicide, sacrilege, poisoning, theft, rapine, in
the ordering of churches and appointing of their boundaries, in the ordination
of clerks, in the synodal assemblies and in judicial investigations of every
kind, let them without the pre-judgement of any man be determined as the
Abbot and convent may dispose.
To all the Kings of my Kingdom, the archbishops, bishops, thegns and Princes, I ordain as they value their honour and my love for them and to all servants mine as well as theirs I ordain as they value their bodily safety, and none of them presumed to enter the island of Lord Jesus Christ and of Mary ever virgin, to wit, Glastonbury, nor the possessions of the said church, for the purpose of impleading or making search or forcible removal or any other act that might be to the scandal of the servants of God in that place. This too I prohibited by the authority of Almighty God and of Mary ever virgin and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and of all saints, that in the mother church of Glastonbury or in its daughter churches of Zoy, Brent, Moorlich, Shapwick, Street, Butliegh, and Pilton, or in their chapels or in the islands, for any reason whatsoever any Bishop should presume to establish his episcopal see or celebrate solemn masses or consecrate altars or dedicate churches or conduct ordinations or make any dispositions whatsoever, unless he be invited by the Abbot or brethren of the aforesaid place. Should he come for this purpose at their invitation, let him not usurp for his own use any of the goods of the church or of the offerings made thereat, knowing that in two places lodgings have been set apart for him out of the possessions of the church, one in Pilton and one in the Vill called Polden Hill, that he may have a place of entertainment on his arrival or resting place on his departure. For it is not lawful for him, unless he be detained by stress or whether by bodily infirmity, or be invited by the Abbot or brethren, to pass the night there or to do so in the company of more than three clerks or four of the most. And let the said Bishop look well to this, that every year with those of his clerks who are of Wells, he acknowledge his mother the church of Glastonbury with a solemn litany on the Monday after Ascension day. But if being puffed up by pride he failed to do so or contravene what has been above ordained and confirmed, let him lose the lodgings above appointed for him. Let the Abbot and monks be free to receive the sacrament of the church from anyone of their choice who observes the canonical Easter, whether in the church of Glastonbury or in its dependent churches or in their chapels. Whosoever at any future time and for any occasion whatsoever, of whatever dignity, profession or rank, attempts to convert or brings to nought this record of my generous liberality, let him know that he will perish in everlasting confusion with the arch traitor Judas in the devouring flames of inexpressible torment.
This charter of donation was drawn up in the year of our Lord’s incarnation 725, the fourth indiction, in the presence of King Ine and of Berhtwald Archbishop of Canterbury’.

It seems that the author who has interpolated GR3 to create version C in Savaric’s time has interpolated with additions Ine’s charter derived from William’s unadulterated DA.

Version B of GR3 from chapter 38 onward through to the end of chapter 150 (which itself might be suspect) seems to be an unadulterated version of William’s genuine updated redaction. I shall include the additions here just for consistency to show that the B version is in fact William’s last redaction with Henry Blois’ interpolations interspersed. The main confusion to modern scholarship has been that these later ‘innocuous’ additions to version B, which are the product of William’s more recent learning, are accounted similarly with the Blois interpolations…. which, as we can see from most of the above form a basis for propaganda.

Chapter 38
Cuthred bestowed many benefits on Glastonbury, and gave them a charter in the following words:

Chapter 39
In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, I, Cuthred, King of the West Saxons, confirm all the gifts of previous King’s of Centwine, Baldred, Ceadwalla, Ine, Aethelheard, and of Aethelbald King of the Mercians, in towns and in villages, in farms and fields and greater estates, with which the ancient city of Glastonbury was endowed, and this benefaction of the Kings aforesaid, confirmed as it is with the subscription of my own hand and the sign of the cross, shall endure for ever approved and ratified, as I hereby decree, “while the revolving skies with ordered sway round earth and sea the starry ether wheels”. But if any man full of tyranny and insolence, attempts for any reason to break the witness of this might give and bring it all to naught, let him be separated by the winnowing fan of the last judgement from the company of the Saints, and being joined with the society of the rapacious, pay to all eternity the price of his violence and the presumption. But who is so with good intent is zealous to approve, support and confirm it, may his prayers be answered, and may he behold the glory of the most high for ever and ever together with the blessed hosts of the Angels and of all the saints. The text of
this deed and gift was published in the monastery aforesaid in the presence of
King Cuthred, and he with his own generous hand laid it upon the high altar
in the wooden church where the brethren do honour to the burial place of
abbot Haemgils, in the year of the incarnation 745.

Chapter 50.5

For, as I have described in my recent book on the antiquity of the
church of Glastonbury, the bones of the holy Bishop Aidan, of Abbot
Ceolfrith, and of the most holy virgin, St Hild, and of many others were at that
time translated to Glastonbury, and some bodies of other saints elsewhere.

Chapter 66

He lies in France at St Paul’s Cormery, a house built by Charlemagne on his
advice. That is why even today in that church food and drink of four monks
are distributed as daily alms of the soul of Alcuin.

Chapter 138 version B

(St Peters Church)... Which is now destroyed but which I know from my
own eyes was large and by the standard of ancient times, came first in the
monastery; St Mary's which the monks used prior to the church which now
stands was built later, in King Edgar’s days, under Abbot Aelfric. Of the
reputation Aethelstan enjoyed among the Gauls, both in the toils of wall and
in Christian piety, the letter which I subjoined gives some indication:

To Aethelstan, I have the honour of the most high and undivided Trinity
and with the most distinguished intercession of all saints Kings glorious and
munificent, I Radbod, prior of St Samson the Bishop, wish glory in this world
and in the next, internal blessedness.

May it please your most generous and exalted majesty, O most religious
and among all the early Kings of our own day most excellent and illustrious
King Aethelstan, I would have you know well most godly prince, that while
the stability of this our country still endured, your father Edward introduced
himself by letter to the community of brethren of St Samson the great
confessor and to Archbishop Levenanus my senior and cousin, and his clerks.
As a result down to this day we offer our untiring suffrages to Christ the King
for the salvation of his soul and for your salvation, and by day and night, as
we behold your great kindness to us, in our psalms and masses and prayers,
as though I and my 12 canons have been prostrate at your knee, we promise
to beseech God mercy for you. And now I send you relics which we know are
dearer and that all property on Earth, to wit, the bones of St Senator, St
Paternus and St Scubilio, master of the aforesaid St Paternus, who likewise
passed to live with Christ the same day and hour as St Paternus. The these
two Saints beyond question lay with St Paternus on his left and right in the
sepulchre, and their festivals are celebrated on 23 September, as is that of St
Paternus. And so, glorious King, pillar of holy Church, humbler of heathen
wickedness, mirror of your realm, exemplar of all goodness, scatterer of your
enemies, father of clerks, helper of the needy, lover of all Saints, suppliant of
the Angels, we who for our deserts and our transgressions live in exile and
captivity in France, pray and humbly beseech you that in your felicity, in your
generosity, in your great pity you should not forget us’. Such was the letter.

For the rest, the King in trusted the relics of St Paternus to Malmesbury,
and those of the other saints to Milton, a place where he had established a
monastery from its foundations. For at that time as I have said above, while
the piratical Northmen were infesting the whole seacoast as well as the city
which lie on the Loire, the bodies of saints translated from Brittany and that
part of Gaul now called Normandy and carried to safer places were, because
of the poverty of their bearers, easily available for sale to anyone, and
especially to Aethelstan, a well-known King with a great appetite for such
things.

Chapter 139.5

(submitting to a seven-year penance) (so the story goes) underwent
involuntary restraint at Lamport. Hence, when he saw that the neighbouring
church of Mulchelney was a very modest building, is said to have vowed more
than once, that if he were ever released, he would raise it with great
distinction. Whatever be the truth of this, one thing is certain, that, as I have
said in muniments of the church, King Aethelstan raised the church of
Muchelney to greater heights in honour of St Peter, helping those who dwelt
there with many rents. It is also to his credit that, if we may believe it, he
(took passionate vengeance on) the man who had him formed against his
brother.

Chapter 150 B version

Edgar of glorious memory, King of England, son of King Edmund, whose
attention was especially directed towards the worship of God, frequently
came to the monastery of Mary, holy mother of God at Glastonbury, and made every effort to exalt that place beyond all others in faith and importance; hence he made a gift of many splendid privileges with the common consent of the bishops, Abbots, and leading men of the province. The first is that no one except among the house should enjoy the name and office of Abbot there, and then only after undisputed election, according to the provisions of the rule, by the unqualified assent of the house. If it proves necessary for the Abbot or monk of some other place to be put in charge, Edgar decreed that no one should be chosen so one elected by the congregation of the monastery to rule over them, as fear of God dictates to them; but to prevent such an outcome, they are to take every trouble to discover whether someone, even the least of the congregation, can be found suitable for the office. He thought it proper, therefore, that the monks should forever retain the right to elect their Abbot, though he reserved to himself and his heirs the power to present the pastoral staff to the brothers chosen. He also laid down that whenever the Abbot and monks of the place decided that some of their own people should be marked out with holy orders, they should have them ordained in the name of St Mary, monk or clerk, as they thought suitable, by any canonically ordained Bishop, either in his see or in the monastery of St Mary at Glastonbury. He also agreed that, just as he did in his own property, so too the Abbot and convent should decide causes affecting the whole island, in all secular or church business, without anyone saying them nay. Nor would it be permitted to anyone to enter the island of his birth, whether he be Bishop or thegn or prince or another of whatever rank, in order to do anything that might be prejudicial to the servants of God there, just as his predecessors laid down and confirm the privilege, namely Centwine, Ine, Aethelheard, Cuthred, Alfred, Edward, Aethelstan, and Edmund.

When, therefore, as has been said, he had decided to confirm these privileges on the place in accordance with the general agreement of his bishops, Abbots, and nobles, he placed his own beautifully wrought ivory and gold staff on the altar of the holy mother of God, and by that gift handed the privileges over for possession for all time to the holy mother of God and her monks. Presently he had the staff cut in half in his presence, so that none among later Abbots could give it away or sell it, giving instructions that half of it should be kept in situ as a perpetual reminder of the said gift. But recalling the wanton fickleness to which men can succumb, and fearing that someone might one day try to remove these privileges or drive the monks out
he sent this charter, witness of his Kingly munificence, to the glorious Lord Pope John, successor to Octavian, praying that he strengthen them in writing with the papal authority. The Pope received the embassy kindly and confirmed what had been ordained with the unanimous agreement of the Roman Council, putting in writing the papal instruction and turning a dreadful vengeance of everlasting anathema against any future violator. The confirmation sent to Glastonbury by the Pope, King Edgar of fragrant memory placed on the altar of Mary the blessed mother of God as a lasting memorial, ordering that is carefully preserved from then on for the information of posterity. In case we should appear to be making all this up, we have found it agreeable to insert both these documents of all those who seek not to enter the fold of St Mary like shepherds through the door, but like thieves and robbers, to break into it by some other way.

Let all the faithful be aware that I, John, by the mercy of our pious maker, the unworthy Pope of the holy see of Rome, have been moved by the humble request made by Edgar, a glorious King of the English, and Dunstan Archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of the monastery of St Mary of Glastonbury, a house which they themselves had, through love of the King on high, enriched with many great possessions, increasing the monastic (population and instituting a stricter) observance there, and had shored up by the Royal command; I too will do the same, without delay. Assenting to their well-meant request, I received that place into the bosom of the Roman church and the protection of the blessing Apostles, and I affirm and confirm by privilege that until the end it remain in the monastic order under which it now flourishes, and that the monks choose their Shepherd from among their own number. But the ordination both of monks and clerks is to be at the discretion of the Abbot and convent. We also decree that no man whatever may enter the Island to hold court or to investigate or correct anything else there. If anyone plots to disobey, or to remove, retain, diminish, or rashly assault the possessions of the church, let him be subject to perpetual curse unless he regains his senses, on the authority of God, the Father, son, and holy spirit, and Mary, the holy mother of God, and the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints. But on all who do right by the place that the peace of our Lord Jesus Christ rest, amen, and let those conditions remain unshaken.

‘Done in the time of Aelfweard, Abbot of the monastery’
These things, therefore, the said King Edgar confirmed by his holy writ at London in the 12th year of his reign. And in the same year, 965 A.D. Pope John gave them his authority in a general synod at Rome, and ordered all the distinguished men who controlled the council to confirm them. Let, therefore, those who disregard such a curse realise under what hard sentence of excommunication they lie; and indeed Christ handed to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the power of binding and loosing, together with the keys of heaven. It is clear and patient to any one of the faithful that he who presides over the Roman church is the vicar of the apostle and the especial heir to his power. John of holy memory in his time presided in a praiseworthy manner over that church, just as even today he flourishes in glorious recollection; for he was advanced in that position by the choice of God and the whole people. If then, the decree of the apostle Peter is fixed, so consequently is that of Pope John. But no one can be so mad as to deny that the decree of Peter is fixed; so no sane man can argue otherwise John’s. These people then must allow to the blessed Peter and his successors the power given them by Christ and cease to flout the authority of such an interdict. Otherwise, if they disregarded it, they will, like the devil and his lackeys, fall perpetually under the curse. It is therefore beyond question that no outsider who has snatched the monastery for himself has failed to lose it disgracefully, and that this has befallen each of them not by any machination of the monks but by the judgement of God in enforcement of his holy authority. Let therefore no one who reads these words underrate there force; then no one draw attention to himself by even a mild show of anger. For if he is angry, he will be acknowledging that the words perhaps written for another apply to him too.

I have highlighted what seems to be suspicious polemic which indicates later interpolation after Henry’s death directed at the Bishop of Wells. We can only suspect on grounds that it is about Glastonbury and surely seems aimed at interference from Savaric. However, as we have covered before, while Henry was at Clugny and his power and influence had waned....there may have been interference from a bishop, but it is doubtful it came from Robert of Lewes.

Chapter 398.4

But this great victory was not achieved without bloodshed; for he lost many of his dearest friends, among them that distinguished man and valiant
knight Roger of Gloucester. Severely wounded in the head by a bolt from a crossbow at the siege of Falaise, he gave to the church of St Peter's Gloucester the manor called Coln St Andrew, and for this he sought the assent and concession of the King, who had come at once to see him, on which occasion, he besmirched with blood from his forehead the King's hand when he kissed it by way of the thanks. As further evidence of this action we have thought good to insert the confirmation and donation and the testimony of the King against Gilbert of Minières.

‘Henry, King of the English, to Samson Bishop of Worcester and Walter Sheriff of Gloucester and all his barons of Gloucestershire both French and English, greeting;

Be it known to you that I have given and conceded the manor of Coln to the church of St Peter's Gloucester for the common sustenance of the monks, as Roger of Gloucester gave and conceded it to them, to hold as securely as he did, for the souls of myself and my wife and those of my predecessors. Witnesses: Girmund Abbot of Winchcombe and Roger of Gloucester and Hugh Small.’

‘Henry King of the English, to his archbishops, bishops, Abbots, earls, barons, sheriffs, and all his faithful followers, both French and English throughout all England greeting.

Know that the monks of Gloucester and Gilbert of Minières came before me in my court, on a date set between them, to settle the dispute between them concerning the manor of Coln which Gilbert claimed as his against them and their abbot; and Adam de Port and William son of Odo testified before me that they were present when Roger of Gloucester gave that manor as alms to the church of St Peter and the monks serving God there, and when I confirmed that donation to them at Roger's request, and that Gilbert refused judgement for it.


In this chapter on GR, we can see that GR3 has a high percentage of interpolations on Glastonbury, some simply William’s later redactions
amongst which Henry Blois has inserted propagandist material in (version B). As long as we can understand who the interpolations serve, we can then better understand at what stage they were written. As we will see in DA, what is often tentative in GR3 is often posited as fact when Henry consolidated his final version of DA which establishes the bulk of Glastonbury lore. Who would ever have suspected the venerable Bishop of Winchester to have carried out such a fraud.

Finally, I will include here what William divulges of King Arthur in GR. Since Henry Blois is not concerned with anything else in his B version of GR, except those evidences which help his claim to metropolitan, it seems natural that he would not enlarge any further on Arthur than William’s original comments. The other updates of GR3 can be accounted to new information learnt by William while at Glastonbury. If his brief mention of Arthur had been expanded upon, suspicion of authorship of HRB and interpolation might then be found to have a commonality at Glastonbury.

With his decease of the Briton’s strength withered away and their hopes dwindled and ebbed; at this point, in fact, they would have collapsed completely, had not Vortigern’s successor Ambrosius, the sole surviving Roman, kept down the barbarian menace with the outstanding aid of warlike Arthur. This Arthur is the hero of many wild tales among the Britons even in our own day, but assuredly deserves to be the subject of reliable history rather than that of false and dreaming fable; for he was long the mainstay of his falling country, rousing to battle the broken spirit of his countrymen, and at length at the siege of Mount Badon, relying on the image of our Lord’s mother which he had fastened upon his arms, he attacked nine hundred of the enemy single handed, and routed them with incredible slaughter. 8.2

It was then that, in the province of Wales called Rhos, they discovered the grave of Gawain, who was Arthur’s nephew, being his sister’s son, and not unworthy of his uncle. He ruled in the part of Britain still called Galloway, and was a knight with a heroic reputation; but he was driven from his Kingdom by a brother and nephew of Hencest, of whom I have spoken in the first book, though he got some compensation for his exile from the great damage previously inflicted on them. And he deserved a share of his uncle’s glory, because they postponed for many years the fall of their ruined country. Arthur’s grave however, is nowhere to be found, whence come, the traditional old wives’ tales that he may yet return. In any case the tomb of the other
prince was found, as I have already said, in the King William's time on the seashore..... 287

If, as I suggest, the Melkin prophecy had stipulated Ineswitrin originally and Henry had employed the name in HRB instead of concocting the name Avalon, everyone would certainly have suspected that Galfridus Arthur was associated with Glastonbury, especially considering the recently emerged content of the *Life of Gildas*. Henry did not utilise the name Ineswitrin in HRB because he was reacting to the earlier agenda in ensuring the 601 charter was relevant to Glastonbury by concocting the etymology that Ineswitrin was Glastonbury.

It became simpler at the later date when Henry came up with the idea to fabricate the St Patrick's charter, to aver that both Avalon and Ineswitrin were the ancient names for Glastonbury. Because the 601 charter was being used as evidence in the case for metropolitan status for Western England, Henry did not use the name Ineswitrin in First Variant where Avalon first appears; and we know First Variant was composed using a template of *Primary Historia* for the 1144 appeal for metropolitan altered to suit an ecclesiastical audience. Therefore, it is not by accident that the etymological hodgepodge in the last paragraph of the *Life of Gildas* gets added to Henry’s already written *Life of Gildas* c.1139-40 and Avalon first appears in First Variant at the same time.... as the reader is now appraised that the two names are both common to the same prophecy of Melkin. It would not have taken long for someone to deduce the connection of authorship of HRB to Henry.

So, it is only later when his second agenda takes priority and the bishop of Asaph is dead that Joseph of Arimathea, (with whom the island of Ineswitrin had originally been connected in the Melkin prophecy), was then to be associated to Arthur’s *Insula Avallonis*. Henry’s muses invented stories which were proliferated into the ears of Chretien de Trotes and Henry’s verse was put into prose by Robert de Boron through the elusive Master Blihis and Blaise on the continent; through Henry’s visits to the court of Champagne.

We can see that it was the prophecy of Melkin that Henry’s muses or imagination utilise as a basis for the story of the Grail. The Grail came into being from the enigmatic code found in the Melkin prophecy. Henry used the essential icon of the *duo fassula*. He did not know of what the *duo fassula* consisted, but it seems likely he understood it as a vessel as this is
made plain by Robert de Boron and is a natural association to make since a literal translation infers blood and sweat.... liquids contained in vessels. Henry knew whatever the *duo fassula* was....it was intricately connected to Jesus. Henry Blois had the Melkin prophecy in his possession and the only way Robert could associate what Henry’s muses had obtained from the Prophecy i.e. The Grail and the Joseph lore and their attachment to Glastonbury and Henry’s Avalon or *Vaus d’Avaron*.... is through Henry Blois.

The *duo fassula* was linked with Joseph in the prophecy and the object was to be found also in the same sepulchre on an island. As we now understand, the name Ineswitrin was substituted. Henry Blois uses his substituted name of Avalon which is clear from Robert’s work recorded supposedly by ‘Blaise’ and what was written by Master Blihis in the ‘Grail book’; implying the Grail came to Avalon.... exactly as it is waiting to be found on the Island originally mentioned in the prophecy.

We should not forget that Melkin’s prophecy must have existed before Henry’s arrival at Glastonbury in some other work of Melkin’s with the original name of Ineswitrin as the subject of the prophecy, (if indeed it was not a separate folio found in the chest by William of Malmesbury). Since it made little sense....it is probably a good reason why it is not in DA or the Glastonbury cartulary. The Prophecy of Melkin with *Insula Avalonis* as subject must have pre-existed John of Glastonbury who was completely unaware of the accuracy of its instructions which indicate Burgh Island as the burial site of Joseph. John of Glastonbury could not randomly generate such accuracy by chance invention.

However, JG was aware that someone prior to him had associated certain features in the prophecy with the old church and the old church was in John’s day accepted to have existed in Avalon. It should be remembered John refers to Melkin as if his readers understand already of his existence. This would doubtless be due to Henry Blois having authored a book supposedly composed by Melkin titled *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda* in which JG found the *Insula Avalonis* version of the prophecy.

Henry Blois sees the advantage to be gained by improvising and foisting upon the world at large his second agenda post 1158. While writing VM at
Clugny, while lamenting the 19 years of his brother’s reign, he implicates Glastonbury as Avalon by calling it *Insula Pomorum*. This is a part of the conversion process of Avalon becoming a physical location at Glastonbury. Henry in VM has concocted associations with the last two stanzas of the Black Book text of *Afallennau* where the Apple tree will stay hidden until the two sons of prophecy come in the shape of Cynan and Cadwaladr which he then uses in the John of Cornwall’s prophecies and the Merlin prophecies in HRB. Yet we know it was not Merlin…. but someone interested in sedition in the final edition.

Henry Blois’ first agenda deals with the pursuit of metropolitan status pre-1155. The start of what I have termed the ‘second agenda’ commences in VM in pointing to the obvious association that the Island of Apples has with Somerset where the apples are plenty. This runs in conjunction with the further interpolations in DA concerning Joseph of Arimathea and the propagation of Grail literature through Master Blihis recounted by Robert de Boron and Chrétien de Troyes. It is at this period, post 1158, where the Grail edifice starts to take shape.

The *duo Fassula* as the Grail along with Joseph are integrated in romances with ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arthur and his Avalon. The Grail is linked to Arthur by Chrétien; and Robert de Boron also expands upon ‘Geoffrey’s’ Merlin and supposedly by ‘a fortuitous set of circumstances’….speaks of Joseph and the Grail and their connection to Avalon.

The whole continental interest is initiated by Henry impersonating Wace and spreading the myth of Arthur in the French vernacular through the *Roman de Brut*. The Wace material, as we have covered, had been started probably shortly after the metropolitan attempt of 1149 and its beginning was based on the First Variant version of HRB when Henry first started to compose *Roman de Brut*. It was then finished just after the Vulgate version when Henry had expanded several parts (the ecclesiastical bent having become redundant). The First Variant became more evolved and Vulgate was now disseminated after Henry returned to England from Clugny both

---

617 Vita Merlini. *Nineteen were the apple trees which once stood here with their fruit: they stand so no longer. Who, who has stolen them from me? Where have they gone so suddenly? Now I see them, now not.*

618 Henry Blois purposefully conflates Cynan Dindaethwy or Cynan ap Rhodri King of Gwynedd c. 798 – c. 816 in the prophecies with Conan Earl of Richmond c. 1138–1171, who Henry is trying to incite to rebellion against Henry II. Henry Blois employs the same process with Cadwaladrap Cadwallon King of Gwynedd c. 655 – 682 in the same instance trying to incite Cadwaladr ap Gruffydd c.1096 – 1172 to join forces with the Scots and Cornish and Conan to unseat Henry II from the throne by manipulating the prophecies of Merlin.
on the continent and in Britain. There is virtually no comment on HRB during the Anarchy and the Vulgate’s dissemination really started post 1155 and the wide spread interest across the continent and in Britain blossomed due to the versified HRB of Wace.

The various independent testimonies of Bleheris and Blaise etc. are just the incognito names for Monseigneur Blois. Henry employed a Jongleur in front of the Count of Poitou (the future Richard I) amongst others, as he spread his tales of Romanz to the amused court at Champagne.

Wace accuses the storytellers of embellishing their narratives until they appear as fable and Chrétien referred to Erec as ‘the hero of Tales which those who had their livelihood by relating such stories were wont to mangle and spoil in the presence of Kings’. Chrétien also says the ‘Perceval’ was the best tale ever told in a Royal court. It was Henry who could gain access to all. Given what we have covered so far, there seems little doubt that Henry Blois is directly responsible for propagating the ‘Matter of Britain’ in various different ways.

The point of greatest importance to note is that Henry Blois recognised and accepted that Joseph’s burial was in Britain along with the duo Fassula (whatever it was). Their existence in Britain was historical and both were to be found in the same sepulchre on an island. It was Henry himself as architect of the material which constitutes the Matter of Britain who masked it as fable: The minstrel has sung his ballad, the storyteller told over his tale so frequently; little by little he has decked and painted, till by reason of his embellishment the truth stands hid in the trappings of a tale. Thus to make a delectable tune to your ear, history goes masking as fable. Wace - (Henry Blois).

The fact that Faral\textsuperscript{619} has two bourdeurs ribauds boasting their knowledge of the Romances telling of such people as Kay and Perceval le Blois and Pertenoble le Gallois.... it is not surprising that we can accuse Henry of originating these names, especially when we consider his good friend Peter the Venerable, (who he entrusted with his moveable wealth when Henry fled England in 1155), could be the template for Pertenoble le Gallois. With a name like Perceval le Blois, as Henry’s Perceval (like himself).... Henry needs to find the Grail.

\textsuperscript{619} E. Faral, \textit{Mimes Francais du XIII Siècle} p.96
However, the *coup de grace* was not only the Joseph additions in DA, which correlated with his continental *Joseph of Arimathie* and other Grail material concerning Arthur and other hero knights: but it was the fact that in DA he had stated where Arthur was buried. Henry Blois knew that if he planted a body for Arthur and it was found, his alter ego would be more famous than any other King in history. For those at Glastonbury at the unearthing there was no doubt that the bones were from Arthur. They had probably been buried 20-30 years earlier than the time of discovery. It was Henry Blois’ certainty that one day after his death Arthur’s bones would be dis-interred. Arthur could not be found until Henry’s last redaction of his consolidated lore found in DA entered the public domain (after Henry’s death).... and that too was nearly thirty years after William of Malmesbury’s death. Just as Henry had done in HRB by employing the dead as witnesses he too would be dead when Arthur was disinterred.

What has confounded researchers is the presumption that any mention of Avalon or Arthur in DA has been definitively accounted by scholars as interpolation which occurred after the dis-interment.620 Obviously their reasoning behind such a misguided assumption is based upon the idea that pressures for financing the rebuild of the Abbey were to be relieved by the alms brought about by the discovery of the body. Scholarship is agreed that this is what inspired the fraudulent discovery by Henry de Sully of King Arthur’s remains in 1190-91. This theoretical standpoint is an *a priori* presumption and runs contrary to the eyewitness account of Giraldus.621 More profoundly, if the position of King Arthur’s grave really was a late addition into DA ....why is there no account of the disinterment, rather than the plain fact of where King Arthur was discovered. The statement is that King Arthur is still in the cemetery. One would have to be really set on obedience to a contrived theory to think that the interpolator after Henry de Sully has dug up Arthur would write: *I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids*..... and not mention any details of Glastonbury’s greatest event. But, what is evident is that once an expert has decreed a theory it will not be changed; thus the only real evidence of what transpired

---

620 Scott’s insistence on this *a priori* formulates his chronology:...because of the reference to Avalon, which we know was made only after the claim to possess Arthur’s bones. P.188

621 See chapter on Giraldus Cambrensis
supplied by an eyewitness at the disinterment, by necessity must be ignored because it blatantly contradicts the a priori assumptions of a contrived time line.

Moving on, archaeological evidence of Wattle buildings at Glastonbury in the distant past: campaigns of excavation between 1908 and 1979, have attempted to identify the various features described by both author B and William of Malmesbury. Unfortunately no comprehensive excavation report has ever been published.622

However, I am not implying that there never was a ‘Wattle’ church. It is the fact that the interpolations in GR which seem to be from Henry Blois corroborate the wattle mentioned in Melkin’s prophecy which makes me suspicious…. especially once we have understood that the prophecy and its directions never applied to Glastonbury. Therefore the ‘Wattle’ in the prophecy could not apply to the antiqua or vetusta ecclesia, but we are being persuaded to draw that conclusion. That means someone at an early stage must have knowledge of the Melkin prophecy and this is how JG arrives at his opinion. What is known as just a wooden church in Dunstan’s day has its construction highlighted too often for it to seem naturally remarked upon as we will see in progression. In GR3 chapter 26: Paulinus Archbishop of York and later Bishop of Rochester, who according to the tradition of our fathers clothed the church, which had long been made of wattle as we have said, in a covering of wooden planking.

Also in DA chapter 19: Paulinus, Bishop of Rochester and earlier Archbishop of York, had strengthened the structure of the church, previously made of Wattle, as we said, with a layer of boards and had covered it from the top down with lead.

We could posit that the author of the Perlesvaus or ‘Grail book’ had Glastonbury in mind, (the original book now lost), having been propagated by Master Blihis. I would like to think it may be the ‘Book’ which Henry is presenting in the Mosan plates as he is portrayed prostrated. The person writing about the Grail chapel has in mind the chapel at Glastonbury because in the Perlesvaus there is a: chapel nouvellemant faite, qui mout estoit bele e riche; si estoit covert de plon…. the DA features the same church with lead covering.
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622 The early lives of Dunstan, Winterbottom and Lapidge, p. 12
There is no mention of Wattle except in those places where we know Henry Blois has interpolated and this is my reason for suspicion that there might be an underlying ulterior motive. In GR3 and DA, too much attention is paid by the interpolator on the church’s construction which used to be wattle but is now wood. To my mind, the one reason which stands out is that *cratibus* in the prophecy is the link to Melkin’s prophecy through the word *virgea*. The reader might think this a mute-point, but in VSD1 when talking about the relics which had been transferred to Glastonbury ‘*from beyond the Humber, I shall be happy to relate when the moment arises in my book on the antiquity of the church*’⁶²³... a few lines later states: *at Glastonbury as I mentioned before there is next to the wooden church, a stone one whose founder is said by old reliable tradition to be King Ine.*

The point is that if VSD I and DA are written at the same time or the contents of DA just shortly after VSD I.... what could possibly cause the author to suddenly start taking an interest in the previous construction of the church, when he had referred to it as just a wooden church only months before. Why in GR3 and DA (which we know have both been interpolated by Henry) does this become a high-lighted issue; except to coincide with criteria found in the Prophecy of Melkin.

Why does our interpolator want his audience to know the current church (in wooden board or covered with lead) ‘used to be’ previously in wattle. What can only be normally considered an inconsequential fact is thus made into an issue like *the lady protesteth too much*. It begs the question as to why, if the old church is not of wattle at the time William published DA or GR3; why do we need to be informed of its former construction by an interpolator in two separate works of William of Malmesbury? I only mention this because it has a vital bearing on the considerations of the old church matching the description in Melkin’s prophecy when the Melkin prophecy in reality is obviously referring to a completely different location.

If I am correct about the reasoning, it would add credence to any who still have doubts that the prophecy existed in Henry’s time and leads to the conclusion that it was his inspiration for much of the Glastonbury Grail legend as will become plain in progression when we consider for the moment the establishment by Henry’s muses in HRB of Arthur’s mystical island and

⁶²³ VSD I,16.2
Arthur subsequently being found in Avalon in the future... at the very place Henry had been abbot.

Glastonbury is mimicking the Melkin prophecy not the prophecy’s composition being based upon facets of the old church and Robert de Boron’s Joseph as will become clear in progression. We can see the same gambit used at a later date by Glastonbury acolytes by implying the bifurcated line also references where the church once stood before the fire.

Herein lies the problem with modern scholars. Firstly if you deny Melkin’s geometrical solution you would never understand that it is intended for purpose i.e. to show on which Island Joseph’s tomb awaits to be discovered. If you deny Melkin’s prophecy existed in the time of Henry Blois one could never make the connections mentioned above between the people and places and literature. One would end up with a theory like Lagorio’s which is backward and inverse and then the problem arises that because nothing makes sense one has to make false assumptions to make a concocted theory fit together; and since none of it fits together the conclusion can only be at best vague.

The prophecy and the *duo fassula* and the introduction of Joseph existed at an earlier date than that proposed by Carley or Lagorio.\(^6\) In William’s day the old Church was not in wattle.... so why is the church’s previous construction highlighted, (who cares?) excepting that it fits the criteria of ‘cratibus’ in Melkin’s Prophecy. The prophecy is in an already extant document; and the fact that the 104 mile line is in reality that which Melkin wanted us to construct (so that it indicates Burgh Island), is witnessed by the search for Joseph at Montacute by Henry Blois and the consequent composition of *De Inventione*. It could only be Melkin who knew at this time that the contructed line the cipher reveals went through the marker point of

\(^6\) Lagorio, seems to think that somehow, the whole edifice (put together by Henry Blois’ inspiration and propaganda) was formulated in response to the chivalric claim of Charlemagne and was instigated by Henry II: ...by quelling those rebellious Celtic factions within his English realm, whose belief in future national leadership was fostered by Arthur’s promised return. Therefore, the institution of a British legend, praising the deeds of King Arthur and his round table, glorifying the heroic past of Great Britain, and establishing a national Monastic shrine would have been patently advantageous to the monarchy. It is a madness to think that Henry II was the driving force of promoting Arthur at Glastonbury. Are we really to believe that Henry II was in some way responsible for the conversion of Glastonbury into Avalon? Are we to suppose the production of the Charter of St Patrick just fortuitously happened in conjunction with Henry II’s facilitation of the discovery of Arthur… and the Avalon legend at Glastonbury? Our expert assures us that: Since Glastonbury had traditionally been equated with Avalon, Arthur could easily be included among the abbey’s early royal patrons….Depending on which argument she is defending; in one instance there is a tradition of Avalon before the unearthing and in the next it is the Leaden cross which establishes the tradition where there had not been one before.
the hill at Montacute which had been a clue to confirm the constructed line from Avebury terminated on the said island by passing through this point. What has transpired is that pre 1144 (when Looe Island was appropriated by Henry Blois), Henry has seen the evidence that ‘Joseph is carefully hidden’ at Montecute and his search has failed as we have already covered. But, Henry Blois knew by the 601 charter that Ineswirin had been donated to Glastonbury by the King of Dumnonia; so Ineswitrin must be in Devon or Cornwall and thus he thinks Joseph’s remains along with the enigmatic *duo fassula* is on Looe Island because Cornish tradition says he passed there. This is probably true among the places Jesus and Joseph are said to have visited by Cornish tradition are Penzance, Falmouth, St-Just-in-Roseland but, Looe was an island and Henry Blois was looking for Ineswitrin. Ineswitrin, the old Ictis, is further up the coast in Devon but Joseph would have coastal hopped on his trip to Burgh Island once having made landfall on the Cornish coast having passed Ushant.

Just to counter any argument that Joseph’s relation to Montacute related by Father Good could be a later discovery by those Templars who entered the tomb and had de-ciphered the prophecy; I should remind the reader of *De Inventione* being the product of Henry’s search at Montacute and his relation to Waltham. We know a copy of *De Inventione* exists at Glastonbury because Adam mixesthese events with Arthur’s disinterment. We know Henry was looking for Joseph’s sepuchre hence his appropriation of Looe island.

The only other three cogent pieces of Melkin’s prophecy which are applicable to the ‘old church’ are at best tentative. *Virginem adorandam* (the adorable virgin), does fit with St Mary’s church, but so could it fit with local directions on the island as we have covered. *Oratorii* which applies to a church could have been an ecclesiastical institution rumoured to have existed on Burgh Island in the distant past.... the footprint of which is now covered by the current Hotel. The ‘Island’ is probably the most clearly unequivocal part of the prophecy, but Avalon as we have seen is contrived as being applicable to Glastonbury and the name is unheard of in relation to an island in Britain before Henry’s HRB. The *duo fassula* becomes Henry’s *sang réal*, which in turn through oral translation or purposeful obfuscation became *san Graal* or Holy Grail. Helinand’s description of a large plate may just be a coincidental rendering of a word *Graal* in relation to a platter. However, we know Henry passed by Froidmont next to Meuse and so may
well have implanted news of the Grail at the abbey which Helinand added to his chronological history.

The directional data encoded in the prophecy was not understood until the modern era in 2010. It was not until after Henry Blois’ era that any relevance for the bifurcated line was sought by establishing the ‘Bronze Plaque’. But this action demonstrates that imitation and relation to the Church was sought based upon the Linea bifurcata as part of the prophecy.

Bogus directions on the plaque were meant to mimic the instructions and show relevance to words in the Melkin prophecy. We know from the directional data in the prophecy itself, that the Devonian King donating Ineswitrin is in fact donating Burgh Island and we have already established the name of Avallon is derived from the town in the region of Blois.
Chapter 26

De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesiae

Our authority on the DA is John Scott. He too assumes any mention of Arthur in DA is accounted as being written after Arthur’s disinterment. Most commentators assume the DA’s interpolations were inserted by several monks over a period c.1184-91 to around 1230-47 from which date the oldest extant copy of DA dates. As modern scholars have had no understanding of the scale of the fraud carried out by Henry Blois or the reasons for doing so, there has been a lack of direction in attempting to explain the connections between HRB’s King Arthur, Robert’s Joseph of Arimathea and of course the Grail; and their affiliation with ‘Geoffrey’s’ and Melkin’s Avalon at Glastonbury.

The DA plays an important role in substantiating parts of ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-history and vice versa where such people as Phagan and Deruvian are concerned and JG’s mention of HRB’s Arviragus to the twelve hides in
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625 John Scott. The Early history of Glastonbury. Boydell press
DA. As we have touched on already, there can be no understanding of the stages of transition through which the DA passed after having been completed by William of Malmesbury without understanding that at least two redactions were put together for Henry’s first agenda in a case for Metropolitan.

The post 1158 agenda which included the conversion of Glastonbury into Avalon and the introduction of Joseph as founder were added toward the end of Henry Blois’ life and probably were never read or seen in DA until after his death. What Scott refers to as a consolidating author is responsible for some later additions concerning the dispute with Wells.

William of Malmesbury wrote a book on the history of Glastonbury abbey which mainly exists unadulterated in the latter half of the present arrangement of DA from chapter 34 onwards. We can assume that the format of title heading followed by elucidation as is marked out nowadays by chapters is how William first arranged his History and Henry Blois imitated the format in his final redaction of DA. As I have stated, the original may well have been a monograph and singular copy and dedicated in the preface to Henry Blois. I shall use Scott’s translation to elucidate how the book of the DA formed and offer some speculations to early chronology.

What I believe has transpired is in 1144 Henry made several additions to DA building a credible case for a bogus apostolic foundation. This fraudulent propaganda exercise was initially built upon and expanded from a tentative comment originating with author B and developed by way of the GR3 version B interpolations. Even though metropolitan was granted to Henry Blois at the first request in 1144 there was not enough substance to the disciplic proposition when it came under scrutiny by a hostile pope in 1149. Even though the Eletherius envoys were most probably named in the first attempt (as their names were fortuitously corroborated in the First Variant and the book’s composition was directed to an ecclesiastical audience).... more compelling evidence was needed for the 1149 attempt.

Hence, the charter of St Patrick was produced which necessitated certain points in DA to be rationalised with the previous apostolic polemic and so we have such rationalisations as the ‘renovation’ of the Old church. The Charter of St Patrick was added into DA or most probably appended as a faked ancient document (posing as a copy of an original which avoids the question of papal seals). The fabrication was for the second attempt at
metropolitan probably put forward in evidence as having been found by William at Glastonbury.

References to King Arthur probably appeared in DA before 1158 but this is not important to Henry’s main thrust toward gaining Metropolitan. Since this ran along-side corroborative evidence in the First Variant there is an equal chance that the Arthur and Melvas story was included at that time originating from the *Life Of Gildas* which was definitely put forward as evidential support for the antiquity of Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ request for Metropolitan status.

It is certain that Joseph’s name was not part of DA lore when the DA was employed as a witness by Henry Blois in pursuit of metropolitan status. If Arthur’s name had appeared in the early rendition of DA it would have aligned HRB’s main character with *Life Of Gildas*. This might have brought suspicion on the ‘Bishop of fabrication’ since DA was dedicated to him alone. But who would know what Malmesbury had written if he was dead and there was only one copy of DA.

The basic content of the first 34 chapters of DA, researchers have deduced for the most part are interpolations, derived from various hands at later dates. In reality they are a consequence of Henry’s agendas. They are actually constituent parts of the edifice of the *Matter of Britain* which Henry Blois has left to posterity. If, as scholars seem to think, the DA was interpolated over time it would be rational that those interpolations would also be dispersed through the latter part of DA which has largely remained unadulterated. It is rather an indication that the first 34 chapters have been inserted as interpolated folio’s.

Primarily William felt it necessary to write DA as he was unwilling to concede to the monks own propaganda claim (started I believe by Henry Blois626) concerning Dunstan’s burial at Glastonbury. As Scott relates,627 William’s shortfall in compliance to write into history the rumours concerning Dunstan’s relics in VD is probably the catalyst for the commencement of the DA.

William seems to have become more than hagiographer employed by the monks and seems to be part of the fraternity while he carries out work on DA. In reference to Osbern’s accusation that Dunstan was the first

626 See chapter on Eadmer’s letter to the Monks at Glastonbury.
627 Early history of Glastonbury, p.4-5
abbot at Glastonbury, William sets out his own integrity and puts Osbern’s views to shame: *It is a misuse of learning and leisure to retail falsehoods about the doings of saints: it shows contempt for reputation and condemns one to infamy. I should be glad to be unaware that this fate has befallen a recent author of a life of Dunstan.*

In 1133-34, when Henry had received DA, few others had perused it until it was employed after William’s death at Rome as part of the case put forward for granting metropolitan to Henry. The consolidated (Henry version) of DA then arrived at Glastonbury after his own death with all Henry’s further input and rationalisations of certain contradictions evidenced in his changing agendas. Tatlock neatly hits the nail on the head, but he, like other commentators, has not suspected Henry’s personal interpolative input: *Indeed since William dedicated his work to Henry of Blois, nephew of Henry Ist and abbot there since 1126, it would be a plausible guess (no more) that the propagandist activities of both William and Caradoc were inspired in the abbacy of that able prelate.*

The text of DA begins with the Prologue:

*William of Malmesbury’s preface to his history of the church of Glastonbury.*

*To his Lord, Henry, Bishop of Winchester, who deserves to be cherished and honoured in the deep embrace of Christ, William as son of your church, sends whatever joy you might wish for. If there be any one thing which may sustain a man in this life and persuade him to endure tranquilly reverses and disturbances of the world, it is I think, above all, contemplation of the Holy Scriptures. Even the writings of the pagans can claim to be useful in so far as the brilliance of their language inspires the reader’s talents and refines his speech. But truly the harvest of those books inspired by heaven is far richer, for on one hand they pour sustenance of deceitful sweetness into the soul, and on the other hand they secured reward of eternal bliss. Moreover there are many, nay to my mind innumerable, truths in the Holy Scriptures, both precepts and examples, by which divine Grace instructs the minds of mortals*
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in right living. Precepts teach us how we ought to live, examples demonstrate how easy it is, with God's help, to carry out his commands. Yet nature has so fashioned the minds of some men that, although they know that both are necessary, they are incited more by hearing examples than exhortations. Similarly they respect the deeds of foreigners out of reverence for their sanctity but are seized by a keener joy if the life of any Saint who was their countryman is set forth, in which, as it were, they may perceive as in a mirror of living image of religion. For the affinity adds to the pleasure of the report and no one despairs of being able to do himself, through the grace of God, what he hears has been done by another from his part of the world.

Wherefore, I have employed my pen on that work, which I judged to be of no small value, in which I laboured to commit to eternal memory the life of the blessed St Dunstan, Abbot of Glastonbury and later Archbishop of Canterbury, and have now completed, with scrupulous regard for the truth, the two books about him for which the brethren at Glastonbury, your sons and my masters and companions, had asked. However, lest I seem to have lacked zeal in the performance of my duty, I will begin this book by going back to the origins of your church and will unfold its progress since the earliest beginnings. Nor ought this be considered very different from the original plan, since the honour of the church redounds to Dunstan and praise of him to the church. For, she fostered Dunstan at her maternal breast until manhood; and he added greatly to his mother's splendour. Therefore a small hope has begun to grow in my heart that this holy work may cause the dignity of the nurse to be highlighted by the example of her nursling. Some time ago I allowed those small books, the life of the blessed Patrick, and miracles of the venerable Benignus and the passion of the martyr Indract, which I had fashioned with like care, to be examined by the monks so that if anything unreasonable had been said it could be properly corrected. After assessing my writings at length and deliberating favourably they left me free of any blemish of blame because nothing in them gave offence to religious eyes or lacked graciousness. So venerable master and deservedly beloved father, I offer this little work whatever its worth, for your careful perusal. The motive for my action is clear: that your Excellency should know the number and identity of the men who founded and exalted the church which, under God and his saints, now relies chiefly on your protection. Now however, that you had imitated (I almost said surpassed) the deeds of those ancient heroes before you heard their names. As for detractors, if perchance anyone
should be so bold, I shall oppose them vigourously for in what way can earlier guardians be preferred to you? In extending the patrimony? But you both recover holdings earlier lost and by your able skills amass new ones. In constructing buildings? But an admiring guide will reveal more effectively than my words of praise the extent to which you surpass all your predecessors in this regard. In protecting the peace of the inhabitants? But you drive out all plunderers before the shield of your name, you banish clouds of dejection by the splendour of your countenance and you expose the chicanery of litigants by the good sense of your words. In the piety of your monks? But, as always, with God's beneficence religion so flourishes in your time that miserable envy is ashamed to fabricate any falsehood about it. The monks openly offer their love to your heart because you do not terrify them with a sneer but receive them joyfully when they come, treat them kindly and like a father, wish them well when they leave. These words which the poet used, not unjustly, of certain powerful men certainly do not apply to you: 'He compels all the inferior serpents to keep their distance and lords it over the empty desert'. In short, any eloquence falls short of your worth and your praise is valued more highly than anything else. Since this is so, accept I beg you, this tribute of my devotion and pledge of my zeal and do not deprive me of the fruit of my labour. So attend, if it please your heart, and give heed while I try to rescue from suspicion the antiquity of your church, arranged according to the succession of its prelates, in so far as I have been able to scrape them together from the heap of your muniments.

In the prologue of DA and from VSD it is clear the monks expected William to write their propaganda into history. They were not satisfied with William’s work in their commission of VSD because William was not going to re-iterate the rumour started by Henry Blois about Dunstan’s translation to Glastonbury. The monks after DA was complete have referred William to Henry Blois who is now at Winchester. When the prologue of DA is written, the two books of VSD are already complete. But, William has not pandered to the rumour of Dunstan’s relics at Glastonbury and incorporated it in VSD. This is the cause of his uneasiness witnessed above and the reasoning for writing DA. He has delivered an account of Dunstan’s life with scrupulous regard for the truth.

As above, William’s DA was dedicated in the preface to Henry as bishop of Winchester, who is not addressed as papal legate. If we allow the
dedication or prologue as being written totally by William (and there is no reason not to); it was probably written between 1133-4. The main body of William’s original work of *De antiquitates* was probably started c.1129 and finished c.1133.

We can learn a lot from the prologue about the relationship of Henry to William and the monks. William’s assessment of Henry’s talents in DA is free of the later suspicions he harboured of the Bishop’s guile.... portrayed by William in HN. As we have covered, William was older and respectful of young Henry Blois’ social standing and it is highly likely that William’s works and relationship to Henry Blois may well have been the catalyst for Henry starting the pseudo-history for Matilda, which eventually evolved into the *Primary Historia* and ultimately Vulgate HRB.

William would have been aware of the part played by Henry in the usurpation of the throne by his brother after this flattering prologue was written. Therefore laudatory comments on Henry’s successes in DA, regaining lost holdings and amassing new ones and the construction of buildings at Glastonbury (we should assume), refer to a time before Henry’s brother became King. At this time, Henry used his family connection with his uncle King Henry Ist to regain properties lost by previous Abbots mismanagement or greed.

The confirmation of a pre-Stephen era for the completion of DA is highlighted in the last paragraph of DA where Theobald is mentioned as a relative of Henry’s rather than King Stephen. William was bluntly obsequious in the dedicatory prologue, so DA must have been written before ill will or suspicion fell on Henry, especially since the preface itself was written sometime after the main text of DA.... when VSD II was already completed.

William’s mission and directive in writing the DA: ‘*while I try to rescue from suspicion the antiquity of your church*’ is also more relevant to Henry’s agenda at that time before Henry Ist died. As we have covered the ‘youth’ or young members at Glastonbury were the target of Eadmer’s letter. So, it is relevant that at this early stage that William refers to those who were already opposed to Henry: *As for detractors, if perchance anyone should be so bold, I shall oppose them vigourously for in what way can earlier guardians be preferred to you?*

What exactly transpired can be grasped from William’s words. William had laboured to commit to eternal memory the life of St Dunstan, and it is
‘now completed’ at the time of writing the prologue. The two books about Dunstan, for which the monks at Glastonbury had asked, we are told were completed with scrupulous regard for the truth.

This in fact was the problem. William did not give the monks back the story they had wanted him to tell à propos Dunstan’s relics translation to Glastonbury. Hence, we have William’s apology in that… should he have appeared to his hosts to have ‘lacked zeal in the performance of his duty’, he composed DA to make up for any shortfall which the monks felt he had lacked by not reiterating a bogus legend…. only recently started and for which there was no foundation.

But, then he says: *Nor ought this be considered very different from the original plan*...In other words, in William’s mind the initial plan to counter Osbern’s claim was to show that Dunstan was not the first Abbot; and he had done this (which amounted to the same thing in his mind) by showing the antiquity of the church at Glastonbury by writing DA. But, the wording is couched in such a way that we can understand that it was Henry who was the one annoyed at William’s adherence to the truth regarding Dunstan. Also the sequence of events shows that William stated VSD I and the monks could see that William was not playing ball so he was commissioned soley to provide a proof of antiquity by writing the body of DA and then continues to finish his original commission by finalising VSD in book II.

William seems to complain at this unfair treatment by saying that ‘some time ago’ (i.e. before Henry arrived and stirred things up) he had written small books, the life of Patrick, and miracles of Benignus and the passion of Indract, which he had ‘fashioned with like care’ (as that of Dunstan). The monks had examined them so that if anything unreasonable had been said it could be properly corrected; and after assessing his writings ‘deliberating favourably they left me free of any blemish of blame because nothing in them gave offence to religious eyes or lacked graciousness’.

It is clear that this is an admonishment against the unfair treatment he received when he had produced of the life of Dunstan VSD 1. The subtle complaint is slightly aimed at Henry Blois (peeviously), in that it infers before his arrival at Glastonbury the monks had not complained. The undercurrent of what is being said is that since Henry Blois had started the
rumour, William should be free of blemish. Also, because he wrote the truth, it should not give offence, just as it had not in the previous works. Why would William bring up the subject of detractors against Henry if there were none? Of course this was not Osbern as that incorrect accusation was an old insult but the detractor being referred to is Eadmer in his confutation to Henry’s rumour. Everyone would know who put this rumour about and for what reason but neither Eadmer or William could say as much as this would implicate the Grandson of William the Conqueror as a liar. No-one with Saxon blood coursing through their veins would be silly enough to do that.

The reference to detractors is definitely against Henry personally: *Now however, that you had imitated (I almost said surpassed) the deeds of those ancient heroes before you heard their names. As for detractors, if perchance anyone should be so bold, I shall oppose them.* The detractors are the Canterbury acolytes who have taken umbrage at Glastonbury’s presumption at such an untruthful and recently established claim regarding Dunstan’s relics. I think we may gather from William and from Eadmer’s words that Henry Blois had been bullish in his endeavour to revive the abbey’s prospects and may have tested credibility by inventing the story about Dunstan’s relics finding their way to Glastonbury.

After all, the most famous father of Glastonbury was Dunstan and for the enterprising Henry it would be difficult to capitalize on this asset in terms of alms without possessing the relics. Anyway, William, after all his efforts on the abbey’s behalf rummaging through dusty vellum scrolls *so far as I have been able to scrape them together from the heap of your muniments* is wanting to get paid. William, after writing DA over a period of 3-4 years while completing VSD II at the same time and living as one of the brotherhood at Glastonbury, now seeks a recompense in just wherewithal for his efforts: ‘*Since this is so, accept I beg you, this tribute of my devotion and pledge of my zeal and do not deprive me of the fruit of my labour*’.

Judging by the scarcity of MSS, my assumption is that DA was presented to Henry as the only copy and it is with him it remained. There are certain pointers in the texts of DA, VSD and GR1 which allow us to get a clearer picture of what was written by William and when. When GR1 was
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completed c.1126, GP was near completion and William firstly set about the ‘lives’ (mentioned above) and then moved on to compose VSD I after Henry arrived at Glastonbury. DA was foreseen as a necessary endeavour, because William was not going to compromise his integrity regarding the evidence of Dunstan’s burial at Glastonbury but William thinks the purpose of VSD in its ‘original plan’ was to counter Osbern’s old accusation which he thinks he was doing but then got persuaded to add the new rumour which he was not willing to do.

A general proof therefore of antiquity for the abbey was envisaged in the composition of DA. VSD I refers back to DA in the text and was written simultaneously with the compiling of DA. This was while William was housed in the abbey community. VSD II was completed after the textual body of DA (not the prologue) and also DA refers back to VSD I in its text. In VSD II, William says: *I have dealt in another work as well as God allowed me, with the antiquity of this most holy monastery of Glastonbury in which I profess my heavenly service. If anyone is desirous of reading about it he will find it elsewhere in my output.* This may not (as some have suggested) mean the references to Glastonbury in GR3. It rather specifically refers to DA. If one takes the ‘elsewhere’ as differentiating from ‘another work’ i.e. VD II, then it can only refer to DA (since we know version B of GR which has the Glastonbury additions is a later Henry Blois concoction).

However, the two books of VSD were written before the ‘prologue’ to DA as we have seen as above: *I have laboured to commit to eternal memory the life of the blessed Dunstan, abbot of Glastonbury and later archbishop of Canterbury, and have now completed with scrupulous regard for the truth two books about him which your sons and my masters and companions had asked for.*

Before we can understand how the DA was composed (minus the later interpolations after Henry’s death), we must accept that the DA ended up at Winchester with Henry as a single monographed presentation manuscript. If the manuscript was never seen at Glastonbury until after Henry’s death then chances are that anyone who perused it before going to Winchester was dead when it reappeared vastly altered. The only others in 1144-49 would have been Vatican officials advising the pope or maybe just the pope

---

631 We have covered in the chapter on GR that most of the updated material on Glastonbury in version B of GR3 are interpolations connected to Henry’s case for apostolic foundation.
while Henry made his case where the pope on both occasions died shortly after.

It is also necessary to understand that DA was spurred on by the monks at Glastonbury about the time Henry moved to Winchester. The fact that William saw his commission of DA coming from the monks (rather than Henry himself) is made clear in the last section of DA by referring to the monks as the collective ‘you’: On Henry Blois Abbot of Glastonbury.

After Seffrid was made Bishop of Chichester he was succeeded at Glastonbury in the year 1126 by Henry, brother of Theobald, count of Blois and nephew of the King Henry by his sister Adela, who was also made bishop of Winchester not much later. This man of illustrious birth is also distinguished in his knowledge of letters, kind and friendly in his address and noble in kindness of heart, a man whose origins and achievement have been advantage to you, as you know, and have brought you great favour in the eyes of men. It would neither weary me to say more of him nor weary you to hear more, but it would be advisable to spare his admirable modesty, for he has this characteristic, that he blushes to be praised although he does praiseworthy things.

From this closing paragraph which ended William’s original unadulterated DA, we learn that William was addressing the monks initially and wrote DA to satisfy them. After DA’s completion, the dedicatory prologue of DA was written targeting Henry as the receiver of William’s endeavour. The understanding that Henry Blois himself received the only presentation copy is the crux of how he was able to achieve the success of his literary edifice of the Matter of Britain without detection.

The only other witnesses to have viewed the interpolated redactions were the papal authorities between 1144 and 1149. Thereafter, DA had even more insertions added post 1158 and before Henry’s death, which are the content of chapters 1&2 and no doubt consolidation of the various agendas into one seemingly cohesive account. Parts of the foundation lore appears to contradict muddled consolidations made by Henry but are accepted; supposedly as accounts corrupted by the vagaries of time.

What should be noted is that what followed the prologue in the original is chapter 35 (the 601 charter), which in no way deviates from William’s said endeavour, as it starts with the physical evidence at the earliest point

---

632 John Scott’s chapter 83
in historical antiquity and thereby names the earliest said abbot of which he can find record confounding Osbern’s accusation at the start of his endeavour to prove Glastonbury’s antiquity.

I shall proceed to comment on the first 34 chapters of DA which have been interpolated by Henry Blois.

Chapter 1. About how the twelve disciples of St Philip and St James the apostles, first founded the church of Glastonbury.

'After the glory of the Lord’s resurrection, the triumph of His ascension and the mission of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, who fortified the disciples' hearts which still trembled with dread of temporal punishment, and giving them the knowledge of all languages, all who believed were together, including the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, as Luke the evangelist narrates; and the word of God was disseminated and the number of believers increased daily, and they were all of one heart and one soul. Because of this the priests of the Jews together with the Pharisees and scribes stirred up persecution against the Church, killing Stephen the first martyr and driving far away all the rest. So while the tempest of persecution raged, the believers were dispersed and went forth into various Kingdoms of the earth assigned to them by the Lord, offering the word of salvation to the Gentiles. St Philip, as Freculfus declares in the fourth chapter of his second book, came to the land of the Franks, where he converted by preaching and turned many to the faith and baptized them. Desiring that the word of Christ should be further spread, he sent twelve of his disciples to Britain to proclaim the word of life and preach the faith of Jesus Christ. Over them, it is said, he appointed, his dear friend, Joseph of Arimathea who had buried the Lord. They arrived in Britain in 63 AD, the fifteenth year after the Assumption of the Blessed Mary, and preached the faith of Christ with all confidence.

633 We can possibly assume that Henry Blois thinks the Crucifixion took place in 23 AD and aligns the date with the 40 years of captivity as suggested in the Gospel of Nicodemus. This seems most likely given the information JG supplies in his cronica which came from the gospel of Nicodemus wrapped up in other material which we covered earlier ….that must have come from a tract written by Henry probably under the name of Melkin. Or maybe he is aligning his date with other events known to him concerning James and Philip’s movements. Possibly, since it is mentioned twice: the 15th after the assumption of the glorious Virgin. However, the 63 AD is entirely spurious as Joseph would have arrived c. 35-37 AD to bring his son to be laid to rest in the disused but secreted ‘Ictis’ tin vault on Burgh Island. The only reason Joseph arrived here is from his connection to Ictis / Ineswitrin.
The pagan King hearing this new and unfamiliar preaching refused to absolutely agree with it and would not alter the teachings of their forefathers. Yet because they had come from far away and because the sobriety of their life demanded it of him, he gave them an island on the borders of his country, surrounded by woods and thickets and marshes, called by its inhabitants Yniswitrin. Later two other Kings in succession, though pagans, granted to each of them a portion of land. From these saints it is believed the Twelve Hides derive their name to the present day. After living in the wilderness a short time the saints were incited by a vision vouchsafed by the archangel Gabriel to build a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin in a place that was pointed out to them from heaven. They were not slow to obey this divine command and in the 31st year after the passion of the Lord, the 15th after the assumption of the glorious Virgin, they completed a Chapel as they had been instructed, making the lower part of all its walls of twisted wattle, a rude construction, but one adorned by God with many miracles.

Since it was the first in that territory, the Son of God honoured it by dedicating it to His Mother and the twelve saints offered faithful obedience to god and the blessed virgin in that place. They devoted themselves to vigils and fasting and prayers and were supplied with all necessities by the Virgin’s aid and by a vision of her. This transpired we learn both from the Charter of St Patrick and from the writings of the seniors. One of these, the historian of the Britons, as we have seen at St Edmund’s and again at St Augustine’s the Apostle of the English, begins as follows:

There is on the western border of Britain a certain royal island called by its ancient name Glastonia, spacious and undulating surrounded by slow rivers whose waters are well stocked with fish, fit to serve human needs and consecrated to sacred offices. Here the first neophytes of the Catholic law among the English found by God’s guidance an ancient church, built, as it is said, by no human skill, but prepared by God himself for the salvation of men, which afterwards the Maker of the heavens has proved by many miracles and sacred mysteries that He had consecrated it to Himself and to Mary the Holy Mother of God. There is more of this anon, but let us return to what we had begun.

After the lapse of many years, those saints who had been living as we described in that wilderness were led out of the prison of their flesh and the place itself, which had earlier been the habitation of saints became as a lair
for wild beasts, until it pleased the Blessed Virgin that her oratory should come again to the remembrance of the faithful.

Let me make entirely clear that this chapter was not written by William of Malmesbury or a later redactor other than Henry Blois. He uses an extract from author B as an authority and another author who supposedly wrote on the history of the Britons. He also calls as a witness of authority the St Patrick charter. It does not take much to work out what is going on. Except, where modern scholars rationalize to reverse engineer the puzzle with the assumption that... because the St Patrick charter mentions Avalon, it must have been written after the discovery of Arthur’s Grave.

Therefore, (so they believe), so too must this chapter have been constructed after that event. This chapter was written by Henry Blois, the man who had changed the name on Melkin’s prophecy to Avalon (so that Joseph would find a home) and also in this chapter is still bent on re-affirming that the Blessed Virgin’s Oratory was built of Wattle; all the words complying with the Melkin prophecy. Henry is also re-establishing that the apostolic foundation created as lore in his first attempt at metropolitan, now aligns with his later Phagan and Deruvian foundation from his concocted St Patrick’s charter.

The obfuscation is that the author of the ‘history of the Britons’ is Galfridus, but does not give an account of Glastonbury (as is implied above), but we know that the introduction of the preachers/proselytizers names into the First Variant acts as corroborative evidence of their names which appear in the St Patrick Charter.

The following section below continues on from the above in the M manuscript version of DA. The M manuscript is derived from the older T manuscript from which Scott has made his translation. Scott says that in the T manuscript it appears at the foot of the page in a late 13 century hand.

Now, the book of the deeds of King Arthur which relates to Joseph of Arimathea and which has in a ‘later part of the book’ about a search for the Holy Grail may just be the book written by Henry Blois to which Chrétien de Troyes refers. However, we have seen in HRB the very same ploy of a mysterious book involved, but we will discuss this book under the section on the Grail.

634 Alfred of Beverley and Henry of Huntingdon in his letter to Warin both refer to the early book as Historia Britonum ‘before it became the Vulgate Historia Regnum Britanniae.
What I intend to show shortly is that Robert de Boron (who relates a story concocted by Henry Blois) introduces Joseph and the Grail in the *Vaus d’Avaron* in the West and also in his *Perceval* and *Merlin* texts covers subjects which directly relate to Henry’s output in such a consolidatory nature that Robert cannot be accounted the inspiration for the trilogy but I will get to this later.

For the moment, given Henry Blois’ involvement, it is not out of the question that this section below might have been one of his own additions which was initially expunged because of its obvious dubious nature.... to be re-introduced from an older exemplar back into the T manuscript:

*(The book of the deeds of the famous King Arthur bears witness that the hignborn decurion Joseph of Arimathea, together with his son Joseph and very many others, came into greater Britain, now called England and ended his life there. Also recorded is the search of a certain famous knight, named Lancelot of the lake with the help of his comrades of the round table, after a certain hermit had set forth to Walwan the mystery of a particular fountain, the water from which continually changed its taste and colour, a miracle it is written, that would not cease until the coming of a great lion whose neck was feted with thick chains. Again in a later part of the book, about the search for a vessel that is called the holy Grail, almost the same thing is recorded where a white Knight explains to Galahad, son of Lancelot, the mystery of a certain miraculous shield which he entrusts to him to bear because no one else could carry it, even for a day except at great cost.)*

Much of the bracketed section above is reiterated in Chapter 20 of John of Glastonbury. We would be very short sighted if we thought a book of the deeds of King Arthur which bears witness to Joseph of Arimathea was not written by Henry Blois. Lord Frome’s copy of HRB even links Joseph with Arthur. But, the round table and Lancelot are found in Perlesvaus which

---

635 It should not be forgotten that Leland saw Melkin’s prophecy in a work supposedly written by Melkin. We should also consider, rather than upholding the scholastic view, that the ‘round table’ was a Wace invention and also remember Melkin is said to have written *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda*. It is from this work, I believe, John of Glastonbury procured not only the copy of the Melkin prophecy but also much other insight which scholars claim came from continental Grail literature. It should rather be recognised that the round table is a Blois invention (hence its appearance at Winchester), and the mention of the round table was in literature at Glastonbury put out as part of Henry’s authorial Arthurian edifice. Scholars need to recognise Arthur was connected to Glastonbury by Henry’s propaganda deposited in DA long before Arthur’s disinterment. *Carta Henrici Regis Secundi Filii Matildis Imperatricis De Libertatibus Concessis Ecclesie Glaston.* Volume 1, P 186. *The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury.* Dom Aelred Watkin…… Baldredo, Ina, inclito Arturo, Cuddredo et multis aliis regibus Christianis....
Nitze maintains was written at Glastonbury. Whether the above section was in DA as Henry left it at his death makes no difference. We know all the material originated through him anyway. JG must have had another source to have mirrored this material. You would have to be pretty silly not to get that *roman de Brut* which introduces the round table was not written by Wace but by Henry; especially the table turning up at Winchester.

Wace’s *roman de Brut* starts with First Variant and ends with Vulgate both authored by Henry Blois.636 The Round Table’s concept is derived from witnessing Stephen’s squabbling barons at court and extrapolated into a utopian ideal at King Arthur’s court in the versified Wace version of HRB. It is fairly obvious that Melkin’s prophecy existed because it too was found in the same source as JG’s work above. There is no one else who is going to author a book called *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda*, and accredit it to Melkin found at Glastonbury, except Henry Blois.

Now to all you scholars like Carley and Shoaf who are in denial about the existence of Melkin’s prophecy in the era of Henry Blois take note: The round table and Arthur were invented by Henry Blois, so the book above was written by him in which JG has sourced his information. So, since the Melkin prophecy is the template for firstly Henry’s mystical island of Avalon in HRB, secondly the Grail derived from the *duo fassula* into Grail legend and thirdly, Joseph lore transpiring at Glastonbury; you would have to be very sedentary to still hold as fact that Melkin’s prophecy was a fourteenth century composite regardless of the spectacular geometry that is displayed in locating Ineswitrin in Devon and even to deny the advent of

636 We can see that Hammer grapples with this problem: *This surely cannot be mere accident. The simplest way of accounting for this is to assume that the scribe of C had before him two manuscripts, one of which contained the vulgate text and the other the Variant Version and that in a moment of inadvertence he copied phrases occurring in both texts. Another possibility, however, must not be excluded: the scribe may have copied from a manuscript that already had the above arrangement.* Hammer like every other scholar cannot conceive of an evolving Historia and continues: *that the larger part of Book XI in C is a conflation of two recensions, the variant and the vulgate,* and goes on to say: *With the help of these two texts, which he used freely, he prepared a third, his own eclectic text.* Unless scholars realise the HRB’s evolution they will not grasp Wace’s Roman de Brut was authored by Henry through this same evolutionary process; and by extension, nor will they understand it was Henry Blois who introduced us to the Round Table but more importantly, (which is essential to the understanding of the solutions put forward in this book), they will never understand that Henry Blois was the author of ‘*De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda* ’ supposedly written by Melkin from which JG copied the Melkin prophecy which had had the island’s name of Ineswitrin substituted to Avalon.
Grail literature being dependant upon Henry as the architect given that Master Blihis as (Monseigneur Blois) is *Blihos-Bliheris, whom no man at Arthur's court knew* and neither do modern scholars recognise him either, even though H.Blois is the anagram of *Blihos* and *Bleheris* as we shall get to was reported to have told Richard I of the Grail; regardless of the other blatant tongue in cheek pseudonyms regarding Henry’s Grail output such as, Bliocadran, Bréri, Bledhericus Blaise etc; especially where Blihos Bleheris is Robert de Boron’s greatest teller of tales at court and where Blaise is given the honour of having recorded three of Robert’s *Histoires*.

Moving on, the first observation to make about the portion of Chapter 1 in DA not in any way disputed as part of the original T manuscript is that Henry Blois establishes the Glastonbury Church ‘*was the first in that territory*’ which is consistent with his case toward convincing us of the early establishment of Christianity in Western England.

To allow for the Phagan and Deruvian foundation which seemingly is more historically credible through Bede’s mention of Eleutherius and HRB’s establishment of the preacher’s names in connection with Eleutherius; Henry leaves us in no doubt that both of his foundation myths link chronologically from the first apostolic foundation to the second papal envoys.

The church had ‘*earlier been the habitation of saints*’ and ‘*after the lapse of many years*’ the oratory came again to the remembrance of the faithful. This is Henry rationalizing and aligning his own foundation legends. This is not a consolidating author trying to excuse the two independent contradictory legends which Henry had invented. Henry explains to us (melding his two myths in time) that Philip’s dear friend, Joseph of Arimathea who had buried the Lord, arrived in Britain in 63 AD and founded a church at Glastonbury. This in itself is stretching credibility given that Joseph was Jesus’ uncle or more likely his father and Freculphus association through Philip is mistaken; the whole concoction being actively brought to focus at Glastonbury which in reality has no connection to Joseph except having received the Island on which Joseph is presently buried as a donation in the year 601 AD.

Obviously, if Christianity did not exist in Britain it presents a problem for the second myth concerning King Lucius. So, in the interim time (conveniently pointed out to us) to the time of King Lucius’ cleansing in 166
AD, the church was rediscovered and renovated. Fortunately for posterity, this is corroborated in the (wholly fabricated) St Patrick charter, whereby Patrick tells us the brothers showed me writings of St Phagan and St Deruvian, wherein it was contained that twelve disciples of St Philip and St James had built that Old Church in honour of our Patroness!!!

In case there is any doubt of the existence of a previous church, we are induced to accept this façade again in the charter of St Patrick where Phagan and Deruvian carefully examining the place, they came across a figure of our Redeemer and other manifest signs by means of which they clearly knew that Christians had inhabited the spot earlier. Later they inferred from a heavenly oracle that the lord had especially chosen that place before all others in Britain to invoke the name of his glorious mother.

What the reader will understand as we get to how Robert de Boron’s Blaise so adequately informs us how it came about that this episode concerning Joseph in British history has been transmitted through History; we find the same process of combining a number of things into a single more effective or coherent whole as the same Architect is at work consolidating his propaganda in DA by way of the St Patrick’s charter and chapter 1&2 of DA.

Chapter 2. How St Phagan and St Deruvian converted the Britons to the faith, and came to the Isle of Avalon.

Annals of good authority record that Lucius the King of the Britons sent a plea to Pope Eleutherius the thirteenth in succession from St. Peter, to entreaty that he would illuminate the darkness of Britain with the light of Christian teaching. This King of great soul undertook a truly praiseworthy task in voluntarily seeking out faith of which he had scarcely heard, at the very time when most other Kings and peoples were persecuting it when it was revealed to them. To comprehend this matter further from another source Æthelberht, King of Kent many years after Lucius, can claim praise for a similar good deed because he did not reject the preachers sent to him from Rome or drive them away, but received them with generous hospitality and his speech and demeanor were added thereunto. For even though he refused

---

637 Pope Eleutherius was indeed the thirteenth pope 174-189 AD
to pledge hastily his acquiescence to their words, it seemed to him absurd to harm them since they had come from afar to instruct him of those things which they considered so important. Both of these men then, one of whom wisely invited Christianity and the other who willingly received it are worthy of full remembrance.

There came into Britain then, these two very holy men, the preachers Phagan and Deruvian, as the charter of St Patrick and the deeds of the Britons attest. They proclaimed the word of life and they cleansed the King and his people at the sacred font in A.D. 166. They then travelled through the realm of Britain preaching and baptizing until, penetrating like Moses the lawgiver into the heart of the wilderness, they came to the island of Avalon where, with God’s guidance, they found an old church built as is said by the hands of the disciples of Christ and prepared by God for the salvation of men, which afterwards the Maker of the heavens, showed by many miracles and sacred mysteries that He had consecrated it to Himself and to Mary the Holy Mother of God. This was 103 years after the coming of the disciples into Britain of St Philip. So when St Phagan and St Deruvian discovered that Oratory they were filled with joy and giving praise to god prolonged their stay and remained here nine years. Carefully examining the place, they came across a figure of our Redeemer and other manifest signs by means of which they clearly knew that Christians had inhabited the spot earlier. Later they inferred from a heavenly oracle that the lord had especially chosen that place before all others in Britain to invoke the name of his glorious mother.

They found in ancient writings the whole story, how when the Apostles were dispersed throughout the world, St Philip the Apostle came with a crowd of disciples to France and sent twelve of their number to preach in Britain. And these by the guidance of an angelic vision built that chapel which afterwards the Son of God dedicated in honour of His Mother; and to these twelve disciples, three Kings, though pagans, granted for their sustenance twelve portions of land.' Moreover they found their deeds written down.

Accordingly St Phagan and St Deruvian chose twelve of their companions and settled them on the island. They dwelt as anchorites in the very spots where the first twelve had dwelt. 'Yet often they assembled at the Old Church for the devout performance of divine worship. And just as three pagan Kings had granted the island with its appendages to the first twelve disciples of Christ in days gone by, so Phagan and Deruvian sought from K. Lucius that
the same should be confirmed to those their twelve companions and to others who should come after them in the future.

And in this way many others in succession, always keeping to the number twelve, dwelt in the island throughout all the years, until the coming of St Patrick the Apostle of the Irish. To this church also, which they had thus found, the holy neophytes added another oratory built of stone, which they dedicated to Christ and the holy Apostles Peter and Paul. By their work therefore was restored the Old Church of St Mary at Glastonbury as trustworthy history has continued to repeat throughout the succeeding ages. There is also that written evidence worthy of belief to be found at St Edmund's, to this effect: The church of Glastonbury did none other men's hands make, but the actual disciples of Christ built it; namely those sent, by the Apostle St Philip. Nor is this irreconcilable with truth as was set down before, because if the Apostle Philip preached to the Gauls, as Freculfus says in the fourth chapter of his second book, it can be believed that he cast the seeds of the Word across the sea as well.'

The last sentence is clearly arguing to convince us of tentative postulations. The first sentence should be enough to convince us of the author: Annals of good authority record that Lucius the King of the Britons sent a plea to Pope Eleutherius. In reality Pope Eleutherius never sent anybody to the King of the Britons. But, even though Bede misunderstands the Liber Pontificalis, there is only one history where Lucius: despatched his letters unto Pope Eleutherius beseeching that from him he might receive Christianity. So, Henry is most emphatically referring us to his own work of HRB rather than what we are led to believe is Bede’s where Phagan and Deruvian do not appear.

The title of chapter 2 alone should convince us that two of the vital pieces of Henry Blois’ literary edifice are spliced together before his death. The title leaves no doubt: How St Phagan and St Deruvian converted the Britons to the faith, and came to the Isle of Avalon. The chapter headings are in the T manuscript and it should be understood that it is Henry who has converted Glastonbury into Avalon. Henry Blois is the same person who introduced us to Phagan and Deruvian in First Variant HRB and introduced them into Glastonbury lore in the St Patrick charter and is obviously the same man who now connects them to Avalon as being synonymous with Glastonbury.
What I have termed Glastonburyana did not evolve haphazardly as modern scholarship has decreed, following a proliferation of continental Arthurian and Grail material, but it was laid out in DA by the man to whom the DA was dedicated, the man who wrote HRB, invented the mythical Island of Avalon; and instigated continental Grail stories as Monseigneur Blehis (or H. Blois) or Blihos-Bleheris.

The title of each chapter in DA follows the format which William had set out in his original; creating a title for each subject as he covered it. The title headings are not the work of a consolidator but defined in Henry Blois’ last consolidation of DA before he died. Scott seems to think there has been a clever consolidating editor who consolidates Glastonbury lore before 1247. Lagorio and Carley have assumed many monk’s evolved these myths in the era after Arthur’s tomb was unveiled; over a period of about 60 years to 1247 AD.... to a point in time where the T manuscript is dateable.

To be fair, if Henry Blois is not understood to be accountable for the authorship of HRB and there was no suspicion that he is connected to the invention of Caradoc’s Life of Gildas (or the invention of the Grail being derived from the prophecy of Melkin); one could see how our experts arrive at such a conclusion. One can also understand that to make the pieces of this puzzle fit, the Melkin prophecy had to follow the Grail (in their minds) and therefore since Chrétien ‘invented’ the Grail.... the persona of Melkin must be an invention also.

This is acceptable to a point but scholars are supposed to be diviners of the truth as it is understood in the era in which they live. These specialists in a particular branch of study are supposed to be our guardians of the bastions of truth, a stronghold of learning wherefrom descisions of great purport are exercised; the outcome of which affect us all regarding history religion and politics. I have never met an honest lawyer as their job is to twist the truth through semantics or alter reality; but even they can get disbarred. Our medieval scholars uphold a lie citing each other with hallowed honour while suckling others at the trough.

Anyhow, Henry Blois presses his polemical point based on HRB’s bogus historicity of King Lucius and Bede’s mistaken identification of Britain as the place where Eleutherius sent envoys to Lucius, so that we are reminded that Phagan and Deruvian pre-date any Augustinian conversion of the English. To comprehend this matter further from another source Æthelberht,
King of Kent many years after Lucius, can claim praise for a similar good deed because he did not reject the preachers....

The sole reason for mentioning Æthelberht c.590–616 AD was to undermine the primacy of Canterbury and to show Christianity existed prior to the Augustinian conversion of Æthelberht. Æthelberht married Bertha, the Christian daughter of Charibert, King of the Franks. Probably it was Bertha’s marriage which influenced the decision by Pope Gregory I to send Augustine as a missionary to Britain. Augustine landed on the Isle of Thanet in Kent in 597AD. Æthelberht was converted to Christianity, and he provided the new mission with land in Canterbury on which Canterbury Cathedral now stands. Herein is the very reason the scribe of all this quagmire of falsity has set out in chapters 1&2 a consolidation of the inventions he has composed in pursuit of metropolitan to be free of Canterbury’s primacy.

Henry uses his own work of the faked ancient charter of St Patrick and his own HRB (the deeds of the Britons) to substantiate his own synopsis of the consolidation of his first agenda and the arrival of Phagan and Deruvian: There came into Britain then, these two very holy men, the preachers Phagan and Deruvian, as the charter of St Patrick and the deeds of the Britons attest.

There is no previous mention of the name Ineswitrin other than that found on the 601 charter and which would have existed on the prophecy of Melkin. Any allusions to Ineswitrin in DA are founded on Henry’s concoction under Caradoc’s name, except for the 601 charter. The name of the island is aligned to Henry’s concocted St Patrick Charter supposedly written by St Patrick himself, where Patrick fictitiously has words put in his mouth about his arrival at Glastonbury: I came to the island of Ineswitrin.

In effect, Henry Blois has three corroborative pieces of evidence which indicate that Ineswitrin now applies to Glastonbury; the St Patrick Charter, Caradoc’s life of Gildas; and the 601 charter itself, found at Glastonbury. The illusion is more tenable if one ignores the fact that the grant of the Island of Ineswitrin had the Devonian King as signatory and logically must be somewhere in the old Dumnonia (in Devon).

Concerning Avalon, I have maintained that it was not part of Henry’s first agenda to persuade us that Avalon was indeed the same location as Glastonbury. The first agenda is clearly seen where Ineswitrin is used instead of Avalon in the St Patrick charter, and where the etymology of
Ineswitrin in *Life of Gildas* substantiates Henry’s claim that the name applies to Glastonbury. The reasoning behind Henry’s persuasive etymology, as I have explained previously, added credibility to the 601 charter, so that the donation of the estate applied to a known location i.e. an estate which was supposedly part of Glastonbury Island.

Yet, as Henry melds his later (post 1158) lore into DA, Avalon is mentioned in the second chapter as a consolidation because Henry knew he had achieved his transformation before his death even if we had to wait for the Leaden cross to confirm it for us. Also Avalon is in the postscript to the St Patrick charter in chapter 9 as if William of Malmesbury were the author, where St Patrick is posited as the first Abbot on the Island of Avalon... (in direct contradiction of Osbern’s assertion). But, in essence, as an indicator that the fraudulent St Patrick charter did exist as a document and was composed in a time before Henry’s post 1158 second agenda concerning Avalon takes shape, there is no mention of Avalon actually on the St Patrick charter.

It is not a random consolidating monk c.1230 who conveniently mentions Avalon here in chapter two in connection with the Patrick charter or in the postscript of the Patrick charter as seen in chapter 9. Most emphatically this is Henry Blois synthesizing his agendas in chapters 1&2. It should not be forgotten either that posing as ‘Geoffrey’, Henry is also bringing *Insula Avallonis* from HRB to synonymy with Glastonbury by implying it is *Insula Pomorum* in VM in this same era, locating Avalon geographically in the only county in England renowned for its production of Apples.

It is more sensible to accept my analysis when Avalon was understood as being synonymous with Glastonbury because the Perlesvaus refers to the church at Glastonbury and the colophon refers to Avalon in Perlesvaus also; and Robert de Boron referring to Avalon (all before 1190). We know through the analysis in this work that all that material has emanated from Henry’s muses while alive!! It must be a fact then Avalon surely was referred to in DA before Henry’s death as is evident in the mass of information we have waded through up to now and he could only be the inventor of Avalon.

If you choose to see it in reverse, then ‘Geoffrey’ must have been a real and genuine prophet seeing into the future locating his island where Arthur was taken in VM (which is obviously commensurate with Avalon through...
Burmaltus); which only turns out to be Glastonbury for Lagorio et al when the Leaden cross is discovered in 1190-91. Thereafter according to Lagorio, the monks beaver away interpolating Williams work. I wonder how ‘Geoffrey’ could know that supposedly Henry de Sully would ‘fortuitously’ confirm his assumption for him nearly forty years later. I wonder also how the continental Grail composers and continuators all got together and agreed amongst themselves that they would locate Avalon at Glastonbury also which turns out to be *Isle de Voirre*; especially when the ‘church covered in lead’ is mentioned in *Perlesvaus* before 1190, but even this is denied by Lagorio and Carley because of erroneous chronology. How else does the writer of *Perlesvaus* know Arthur and Guinevere are buried at Glastonbury just as Gerald knew also and bore witness. The only way for scholars to make their assumptions fit is to ignore Gerald and his first hand evidence.

If Glastonbury had an ‘old’ church in 601AD, then it must have stood prior to Augustine’s arrival. There was a Celtic church of the Britons not born of the Roman mission of Augustine evident more than anywhere else in Britain.... in Cornwall. However, what is interesting is that there was no extant explanation or documentation of Ineswitrin in the Glastonbury records and no-one knew c.1128-34 where Ineswitrin was when William came across the 601 charter and the Melkin prophecy in Glastonbury’s muniments.

The same status still applies in 1144 when Henry was requesting metropolitan for himself; hence the need for Henry to invent ‘Caradoc’s’ etymology to substantiate that the donation by the King of Dumnonia which was on an archaic document which mentions Ineswitrin clearly relates to a known location i.e. Glastonbury. As we know, William started his original DA with what is now chapter 35 which is a transcript of the 601 charter. Therefore we can see Henry’s mind at work paralleling the etymological farce he had created in the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas* in achieving the aim in establishing Ineswitrin as an estate on Glastonbury (island) and how such a situation transpired: *although that estate* (*Ineswitrin*) *and many others were granted to Glastonbury in the time of the Britons, as is plain from the preceding, yet when the English drove out the Britons they, being pagans, seized the lands that had been granted to churches before finally restoring the stolen lands.*
Henry Blois is certainly no slouch at corroborative synthesis as we have seen throughout this exposé.

It was not until after VM was written at Clugny, that the first flowering of Henry’s design concerning Avalon being situated at Glastonbury became apparent. In VM, as we covered, Henry’s first step toward the undoing of a first agenda (creating synonymy with Ineswitrin) to an understanding of Avalon at Glastonbury.... contrives *Insula Pomorum* to become equitable through a conflation with ‘avalla’. Hence, we can now recognise a reverse etymological farce taking shape as his Avalon of HRB becomes Glastonbury in the apple region of Somerset.... confirmed by it being the same Island to which Barinthus took Arthur.

Ultimately, what was disclosed on the ‘Leaden Cross’ which Henry fabricated for the grave of Arthur confirms Avalon at Glastonbury by the fact that it was found there after being informed that Arthur was buried there. So, those who were unclear as to where the *Insula Avallonis* of HRB existed; at the disinterment, it indisputably became the same Island of Glastonbury through Arthur having been taken to *Insula Pomorum* in VM and the Leaden Cross stating ‘Here lies Arthur in Avalon’

This did not happen as a consequence of Grail literature filtering back to Glastonbury, but was considered by ‘Geoffrey’ when Henry published the VM c.1155-58 as part of the conversion process. The contrivance conflated the mythical isle named in the Melkin prophecy to the name of the Burgundian town Avallon found in HRB. The inspiration for creating a bogus grave to be found in the future has its seed also in the Melkin prophecy. Due to Henry’s propaganda, Joseph’s real sepulchre on Burgh Island has been transposed into a fictitious grave at Glastonbury and through the Leaden cross King Arthur was confirmed to be buried on Avalon.

The St Patrick’s charter was part of the pre-1158 interpolations and therefore there was no Joseph material in DA before 1158 and St Patrick’s charter only mentioned Ineswitrin. There was no narrative in DA which connects Joseph to the Patrick charter, until there is the chronological link made with the apostolic foundation and Joseph’s foundation within DA in

---

638 We should not forget either that the inspiration for the leaden cross came from Eadmer’s testimony establishing Dunstan’s existence at Canterbury by the leaden tablet found in his grave.
Henry’s later consolidating chapters 1 & 2 and the additional postscript to the St Patrick Charter only completed after 1158.

Yet a clear evidence of Henry’s prior attempt to gain metropolitan is evident where he melds the bogus Apostolic myth with a later Joseph myth.... having been sent by Philip and James with the concocted legend of Phagan and Deruvian in the St Patrick Charter. This supposedly took place 103 years later when Phagan and Deruvian arrived.

Chapter 1 & 2 of DA act as a consolidation and synthesis of these two (or three) foundation legends which reflect Henry’s changing agendas; firstly apostolic in 1144, secondly Phagan and Deruvian in 1149, thirdly, (in terms of insertion into DA), Josephean post 1158).

Now, what surprises me most is that Medievalist researchers in the past might have given credence to any of the lore put forward in chapter 1 & 2 above, as there is not one word of William’s present in the text. It is a madness to think that William wrote any of this and yet it is those very same entrenched scholars who think I am mad. I agree this whole exposé is poorly delivered but I have had to garner evidence from differing perspectives to build an overview of what transpired in three different areas of study where invariably my views contradict commonly accepted a prioris as truths; which in isolation, may seem tenable but no longer hold true when put in context. Our three genres blantly have a common denominator in Henry Blois.

As we covered above, VSD was written contemporaneously with DA. So, how is it that there is no mention of Ineswitrin (excepting that mentioned in the 601 charter) in William’s other works which have not obviously been interpolated. Also there is no mention of the St. Patrick’s charter, Lucius, Phagan and Deruvian, St Joseph of Arimathea or any early establishment by apostle or disciple of the church (by James or St. Philip) or Arviragus’ twelve hides.

There is certainly no mention of Dunstan in the island of Avalon or Ineswitrin, but both author B and William refer to Glastonbury as the name for the island. William certainly did not know where Avalon was even if he had come across the name in HRB (which is impossible) and had only seen Ineswitrin as the name on the charter and in the Melkin prophecy. William would instantly have dismissed the Melkin prophecy having no
understanding of its composition or Latin and could only possibly have seen the *Primary historia* in which Avalon is not mentioned.

We should rather be more accurately guided to find William’s real position concerning the several items mentioned above by looking at William’s VSD I & II as they were written contemporaneously with DA. William’s position would not have shifted so drastically since writing GR1.... especially concerning the later Glastonbury interpolations we covered in version B of GR3.

We can conclude; the only way the Glastonburyana in GR and DA (with information covering Henry’s first agenda) could corroborate or tally is through one interpolator and the interpolator was alive at the time to make GR3 version B interpolations corroborate with DA interpolations but couldn’t predict by whom or when Arthur was going to be unveiled. The additions into DA not found in GR which include Joseph and Avalon are also Henry’s work but accord with a second and later agenda post 1158. But this does not deny the fact that there are definite later additions into DA and GR3 C version after Henry’s death.

Scott suggests regarding DA: it is possible that William’s manuscript was annotated at different times by various monks but at some time a substantial rearrangement of the work must have been undertaken to synthesize these additions into a coherent whole.639

This contrasts exactly my point about a single minded consolidator who actually understood the ‘coherent whole’ to make *The Matter of Britain* coalesce rather than depending on random fortuitous convergence of factors. There was no major rearrangement by various monks at different times and the synthesis was done by the single interested party who we now know invented the polemically motivated propaganda in the first place and understood the reasons for its contradictions. He smoothed them over perfectly and melded them into the ‘coherent whole’ as we saw in chapter 1&2 above. But this again does not deny the fact that interpolations occurred after Henry’s death, but does not necessitate a consolidating editor or redactor on the scale Scott believes.

In general, DA existed in the format and order we have it today at the time Henry Blois died. No consolidating editor is going to write chapters 1 & 2 except Henry Blois. If this was composed over time by different monks all

---

639 John Scott, The early history of Glastonbury. P.34
deriving their lore from continental Grail literature then ‘Geoffrey’ saw into the future.

The interpolated part of DA was composed by the man to whom the two agendas were an integral part of his life. The first pertained to the metropolitan the second to perpetuating his alter ego of Arthur at Glastonbury and bringing his continental Grail legend at his Nephew’s and Marie of France’s court..... to coincide with Joseph from the Insula Avallonis found in Melkin’s prophecy. The icon of the Grail was derived in the first place from the prophecy and expressed as an idea by Henry’s muses as a vessel containing Holy Blood but it was also the essence of the Melkin prophecy describing a sepulchre being found in the future on an island that Henry’s muses came upon the manufacturing of Arthur’s grave for posterity in Avalon.

The propaganda can be understood to parallel Henry’s metropolitan agenda, as long as it is comprehended that Henry is author of HRB and the Merlin prophecies, Life of Gildas, the first 34 (and part of 35) chapters of DA, and the source of Robert de Boron’s Joseph d’Arimathie.

Most importantly, with the acceptance of the fact that Henry Blois was the elusive Master Blehis, we take into account that the Perlesvaus written by a certain Master Blihis (Monseigneur Blois) concerning ‘Gawain who overcame Blihos-Bliheris, whom (incidentally) no man at Arthur’s court knew’. Monsiegeur Blois and the coincidence of similar sounding Bliobleheris, Bliocadran, Blihos-Bliheris, Bréri, Bledhericus does not happen by chance. Especially where Blihos Bleheris is Robert de Boron’s greatest teller of tales at court and where Blaise is given the honour of having recorded three of Robert’s Histoires. As I pointed out in the preface to this work without putting things in context in the era they transpired and connecting the three genres of Glastonburyana, Grail Literature, and Geoffrey’s Arthuriana, the dots will not connect and there will be no comprehensive picture formed of the Matter of Britain.

Is it beyond coincidence that the Master Blihis, who knew the Grail mystery, and gave solemn counselling about its revelation; the Blihos-Bliheris, who knew the Grail, and many other tales; the Bréri, who knew all the legendary tales concerning the princes of Britain; and the famous storyteller Bledhericus, of whom Gerald of Wales speaks, are separate personalities.... especially when Blihos is the anagram of H. Blois. The very
PhD which qualifies one as an expert is that which prevents one seeing the wood for the trees.

We should look at one more of Scott’s assumptions regarding DA which becomes an incorrect a priori once Henry Blois is understood to have authored HRB and much of the first 35 chapters of DA: Finally we can be sure that all references to King Arthur must have been written after the purported discovery of his remains buried between the two pyramids in 1190-1, as must those chapters that seek to identify Avalon with Glastonbury because such an identification only became necessary and meaningful, after, and as further evidence for, the claim that Arthur had been buried at Glastonbury.

This hugely incorrect assumption is obviously based upon theories put out by Lagorio and which Carley and Arthurian scholars regurgitate today.... making flawed many subsequent assertions based on this premise. Arthur’s tomb location between the piramides was definitively written into DA before 1171. No-one else knew where the bones were except the man who put them there and manufactured the bogus grave site with the leaden cross. It is the same person who told us that Arthur and Guinevere were buried at Glastonbury in the Perlesvaus colophon. It is only a fool who would believe that a Welsh bard informed Henry II of the location, because we are not stupid enough to think that the manufactured site was real.

Scott, however, does perceive a contradiction to the assumptions in the excerpt above: ...stimulated by the association with Arthur that had already been adumbrated by Caradoc; but once concocted Arthur’s links with Glastonbury became an important element in the local legends. Curiously, an account of the discovery of his remains is not to be found in DA, although other facets of the legend are incorporated....

The salient fact is that Scott’s observation points to the fact that there is little change to DA from how Henry left it. Obviously there would be no description of the events surrounding the disinterment. That there is no account of the unearthing adds weight to the position I have maintained in that; the consolidating author of DA after Henry’s death had a minor role and did not synthesise the most part of the material in the first 35 chapters as claimed by Scott. No account of the events surrounding the disinterment
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is given, but the location of where Henry planted the body is nonchalantly provided couched in the form of a casual ‘aside’, as if it were common knowledge.

Our consolidating author is only adding historical notes, not adding large interpolations which bolster the legend as that has already been accomplished by Henry Blois. Scott is one of the few scholars who does perceive that Avalon was not Glastonbury and is not duped by the propaganda which insinuates that the two are identical locations with differing names in time. He also (as above) knows that someone is responsible for the ‘synthesis’, but like all other commentators primed by Lagorio thinks the jigsaw puzzle miraculously fell into place on its own; and there is no suspicion upon our ‘Cicero’.

This has ramifications for scholar’s assumptions concerning the colophon in the Perlesvaus:

*L'auteur du Haut Livre du Graal affirme même que son texte est copié d'un manuscrit latin qui a été trouvé en l'Isle d’Avalon en une sainte meson de religion qui siét au chief des Mares Aventurex, la oli rois Artuz e la roïne gisent.*

The author of the Perlesvaus or the *High book of the Grail* claims his text is copied from a Latin manuscript which was found in the Isle of Avalon in a house of holy religion which stands at the height of moors of adventure where King Arthur and Queen Guinevere lie.

At a stretch we could make more sense of this by assuming that because Avalon is an Island the reference is to the ever-changing tides/water levels (*Mares Aventurex*) which surrounded the Somerset levels in Dunstan’s era as described by author B. (" from feminine of *adventurus*, future participle of *advenire* "to come to, reach, arrive at,"). A
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641 In Henry’s postulation that ‘Geoffrey’ had sourced his material from a mysterious book, we should be wary of the same ploy being used by Henry Blois a second time. It is a gambit by which Henry lends credence to the source of the Grail legend, seemingly having been derived from an ancient ‘Book of the Grail’. I do not deny the existence of a Grail book in that Chrétien says he has obtained one from Philip of Flanders (Henry’s cousin), but my conclusion is that it was written by Henry Blois. Certainly no book could have come from a realistic Avalon. The Intention is to connect the ‘*duo fassula*’ and Joseph named in the Prophecy of Melkin, also written in Latin and found at Glastonbury with the book of the Grail which supposedly came from a religious house where Arthur and Guinevere were buried. The idea is that we are to believe that the Grail book has its origins in the ecclesiastical system.
more likely translation: *in a house of holy religion which sits atop reaching tides*; an allusion to the flood planes around Glastonbury.

We know this has to be Glastonbury and there is only one person converting his fabled Avalon into a realistic location since 1155-7. The assumption made by scholarship regarding this text is that it post-dates the disinterment of Arthur because of the flaw in Carley and Logorio’s assessment of Glastonbury’s association with Joseph and Grail literature derived from the continent. This assumption precludes Henry Blois from being the interpolator even though he had stipulated in DA that Guinevere and Arthur were buried between the *piramides* at Glastonbury and makes the same statement in the colophon to Perlesvaus both before 1189-91

This is why it is vital to understand that the location of the grave was provided in DA before Henry’s death. The fact that both Guinevere and Arthur were both posited in DA as being buried at Glastonbury together, also tallies with Gerald’s account only one or two years after the event.

It thus becomes feasible that Master Blihis wrote the Perlesvaus and Henry Blois is one and the same who stated in the colophon of Perlesvaus where both Arthur (and his Guinevere) would be found and in DA.

As a result of Henry’s interpolations and his planned fraudulent interment of the Leaden cross and bones which supposedly pertained to Arthur, Arthur was able to be discovered; not as Scott’s understanding that it *only became necessary and meaningful, after* the unearthing that Arthur’s name was found in DA at Avalon.

This following passage, obviously written by Henry, is thought by all commentators to be a later interpolation post 1190-1: *I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids*.... The idea behind the interment was inspired by the Melkin Prophecy foretelling likewise of a body to be uncovered in the future, but the reality of the interment of Joseph of Arimathea on *Ineswitrin* will remain clouded in mystery until academia changes its position and a more capable younger generation comes out of the woods.

---

642 In his book ‘And Did Those Feet’ Goldsworthy had thought of King Arthur as an historical figure. Efforts were made by Goldsworthy to obtain permission from the hoteliers on Burgh Island to show them where he thought a tunnel entrance existed to the sepulchre, but the Devon Archaeological Society and the owners of the Island took advice from experts who advised that Arthur could not be on the island on account of ‘Geoffrey’ having invented his persona.
Annals of good authority record that Lucius the King of the Britons sent to Pope Eleutherius asking for Christian teachers.... which starts chapter 2 (as we know) is based on Bede’s mistake, but what few commentators have remarked upon is the creation of a King Lucius in HRB who is inserted into British history by Henry Blois purely to substantiate his myth regarding Phagan and Deruvian and how the introduction of two preachers into the First Variant help in establishing his case for metropolitan.

We can see at the end of chapter 2 there is nothing which can be attributed to William based upon positions held in GR1, VD or VP or GP. Scott gives a good idea of what he thinks William’s original text contains. I agree for the most part where Scott breaks down the first 36 chapters of DA.

Scott’s assessment\(^643\) of what can be accounted to William having written reduces 19 pages to just four and a half pages, but Scott still believes in genuineness of comparable material in the version B interpolations of GR3 and he admits more to Malmesbury’s pen than is necessary. Much of that was written by Henry also. However, there are references to the 1184 fire in DA which were obviously written after Henry’s death. This would convince any commentator that interpolations occurred after 1184.

Carley accuses John of Glastonbury of elaborating greatly the material in DA saying John ‘discovers’ many, and dubious sources to fill out William’s account. One can see how Carley arrives at this assumption. Most of the elaborations would be derived from other material put out by Henry i.e. a more complete Perlesvaus or ‘Book of the Grail’ (no longer extant), which, obviously complimented continental Grail literature since it too (in its initial stages) was authored by Henry.

John skilfully consolidates into lore in his Cronica Henry’s DA propaganda, along with other parts of Henry’s output no longer extant. However, the main features of the foundation legend that Henry had concocted i.e. the building of the church by the disciples of Christ\(^644\) and its consecration by them is referred to only 13 years after Henry Blois death in 1184 in a charter that Henry II attested between the 2\(^{nd}\) and 16\(^{th}\) of December just after the fire. It should be understood why there is no mention of Joseph as at this stage. There was no ‘tradition’ actually at the

\(^643\) John Scott. The early history of Glastonbury, Boydell press.

\(^644\)Mater Sanctorum dicta est, ab alius Tumulus Sanctorum, Quam ab ipsis discipulis Domini edificatum et ab ipso Domino dedicatum primo fuisse venerabilis habet antiquorum auctoritas. Great Cartulary of Glastonbury p.186
abbey, as the DA was still a seedling planted only 13 years ago when Henry’s copy of DA came to light. It is more likely the monks were conservative with the use of DA and chose to use GR3 version B to show dignitaries as Joseph might be a bit hard to swallow until time had passed. Hence the referral to the apostles in the charter without Joseph. My guess would be that If the King was not informed verbally then the monks might have shown him GR3 instead of DA.

Although the legend of Joseph did ‘evolve’ the seeds for this legend were planted by Henry Blois in his life time in DA but until Arthur had been discovered and Roberts work was all the rage Joseph matured with time. We must never lose sight of the fact that although Joseph is a concocted legend at Glastonbury it is based on the truth which was embedded in the Prophecy of Melkin which after we have covered Grail literature the reader will understand more clearly.

To make such an outrageous claim of housing the relics of Joseph with no long standing heritage would seem foolish for the Glastonbury propagandists, but no-one could counter the antiquity of the old church or how far back into antiquity it was founded and the Apostolic foundation had supposedly been recorded by William of Malmesbury a reliable historian in GR3.

Henry II financed the rebuilding of the abbey after the fire using (as Adam of Damerham relates) the stone from Henry Blois’ palace. Henry II was a concerned benefactor to Glastonbury until his death in 1189 but his son Richard Ist was more concerned with employing his coffers for war. One theory is that the funding for restoration dried up at King Henry’s death, hence the disinterment of Arthur by an ingenious Henry de Sully soon afterward.

Another theory might be that while King Henry was alive, with the proliferation of Henry Blois’ Arthuriana in the courts of insular Britain and on the continent, the time came to capitalize on the fame of Arthur or even see if the rumours were true. However, it is my belief that King Henry II was advised by Henry Blois where the body was located and was told that he had been informed by an ancient bard (obviously with Melkin in mind). Don’t forget, since the name change Joseph was now buried in Avalon.

Henry Blois may even have instructed King Henry to only reveal this on his own death bed or asked him to make sure Arthur is housed in the Church. Hence we have Giraldus’ connection to King Henry’s involvement
and the disinterment soon after King Henry’s death. This is of course speculation, but goes some way to explain the many extraneous chronological discrepancies which will be covered in the chapter on Gerald and his relationship with Henry II.

Though Carley believes John is ‘discovering’ material, much of it must have actually existed in John’s time and originated through Henry Blois. John is not a gross fabricator but draws from other works. The information existed at Glastonbury so JG mentions Arviragus in connection with the DA tradition.

It is obviously Henry who has implied in another work that it was Arviragus who gave the disciples for a dwelling an island to flesh out the foundation story and tie it into the twelve hides around Glastonbury: After this Saint Joseph and his son Josephes and their 10 companions travelled through Britain, where King Arviragus then reigned, in the 63rd year from the Lord’s incarnation, and they trustworthily preached the faith of Christ. But the barbarian King and his nation, when they heard doctrines so new and unusual, did not wish to exchange their ancestral traditions for better ways and refused consent to their preaching. Since however they had come from afar, and because of their evident modesty of life, Arviragus gave them for a dwelling an island at the edge of his Kingdom surrounded with forests, thickets and swamps, which was called by the inhabitants Ynswytyn, that is ‘the Glass island’. Of this a poet has said, ‘The twelvefold band of men entered Avalon: Joseph, flower of Arimathea, is their chief. Josephes, Joseph’s son, accompanies his father. The right to Glastonbury is held by these and the other ten.’ When the saints then, had lived in that desert for a short time, the Archangel Gabriel admonished them in a vision to build a church in honour of the holy Mother of God, the ever virgin Mary, in that place which heaven would show them. Obeying the divine admonitions, they finished a Chapel, the circuit of whose walls they completed with wattles, in the 31st year after the Lord’s passion, the fifteenth, as was noted, after the assumption of the glorious Virgin, and the same year in fact, in which they had come to St Philip the apostle in Gaul and had been sent by him to Britain.

As we know, Henry Blois, writing as ‘Geoffrey,’ enlarged upon some casual mention of a British King supplied by Juvenal. Henry Blois invents
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645 HRB IV, xvi ‘Some King shalt thou lead captive, or from the draught-tree of his British chariot, headlong shall fall Arviragus’.
a whole persona who is mentioned sixteen times in HRB. Henry Blois
donated the lives of the Caesars to Glastonbury and certainly knew
Arviragus played no part in the Roman annals. Arviragus is found in no
other writing. Henry employs Arviragus to give context in HRB to the
pseudo-history which highlights the bogus viewpoint of relationship
between the supposed illustrious Britons and how they were regarded in
high esteem by the Romans. Arviragus seeks refuge (coincidentally) at
Winchester, but Claudius follows him there with his army.

As the narrative in HRB goes, the Britons break the siege and attack the
Romans, but Claudius halts the attack and offers a treaty. Claudius proffers
a pact with Arviragus because of the standoff at Winchester and Claudius
gives his daughter Genuissa in marriage to Arviragus. Arviragus becomes
powerful which causes him to halt his tribute to Rome, forcing Claudius to
send Vespasian with an army to Britain. Vespasian marches to Exeter and
besieges the city. Arviragus meets him in battle there. Again, the fight is
stalemate and Queen Genuissa supposedly mediates peace. Vespasian
returns to Rome and Arviragus rules. Arviragus and his queen build the city
of Gloucester and therein, (after Arviragus’s death), is the Dukedom of
Gloucester formed. Arviragus is succeeded by his son Marius.... another
invention of ‘Geoffrey’s’. This episode supplies historical context bridging
together ‘Geoffrey’s’ concocted pseudo-history leading up to and setting up
an erroneous power relationship between Rome and the Britons before the
ensuing Arthurian legend.

If any major role had been played by Arviragus, a Roman chronicler
such as Tacitus (if the early date for Arviragus is believed) or later
chronicler would have remarked upon him. The British submission to Rome
is seemingly presented as an accord or free gesture of magnanimity on
behalf of ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arviragus.... which obviously runs contrary to realistic
history. ‘Geoffrey’s’ supposed entente is laying the foundation for his pre-
Saxon Britons where they are not perceived as conquered.

To carry this fake history chronologically by ‘Geoffrey’.... to appear as
historicity portraying a defiant Britain, no one personage (except
Ambrosius) can be attached to a historical event. So, Henry uses a persona
in the guise of Arviragus (mentioned historically but only anecdotally by

Originally in Juvenal, Satire IV, .126-127, a satirical poem by Juvenal, in which a giant turbot presented to the
Roman emperor Domitian (AD 81 – 96) is said to be an omen that "you will capture some King, or Arviragus
will fall from his British chariot-pole".
Juvenal) to lead in to his Arthuriana. As we have become accustomed by now, it is part of Henry’s conflationary ploy.

Arviragus whose real historical contribution is slight (if at all) is employed by Henry Blois to rewrite history in the form of an embellished and fabricated persona in exactly the same way the chivalric Arthur is invented. It would have been a Henry Blois device to bring his invention of Arviragus from HRB into Glastonbury lore in his ‘Grail book’ which is from where John of Glastonbury may have sourced his elaborations. Is it not (again) a raging coincidence that both Arviragus and Arthur are known to be Galfridian inventions and yet both feature in Glastonbury lore just like Phagan and Deruvian?

So, we cannot, as Carley supposes, hold John of Glastonbury as the inventor of such stories. Even though Henry has not interpolated the name of Arviragus in DA, it seems fair to assume HRB’s Arviragus is found connected to Glastonbury through Henry and his output.

It would seem a huge coincidence given that Arviragus is an invention of Henry’s that John found the source for Arviragus giving Joseph and his band a dwelling in Avalon, if it had not come from the man who invented the name Avalon, put Joseph squarely within its lore and invented the persona of Arviragus. John is merely the person who coalesces from different sources and one of these I am positing is a missing book which connected HRB’s Arviragus with Glastonbury lore and we should not look further than Master Blihis our Cicero who is responsible for all things concerning the Matière de Bretagne.

One of the things which has made the DA most impenetrable in determining who wrote what and for what purpose, is made much clearer, by understanding that Henry had an earlier and later agenda. The apostolic agenda through Philip which had been posited by Henry at his first presentation at Rome in 1144…. later becomes connected by clever consolidation to a foundation by Joseph.

However, leaving untouched much of William’s work evidenced in the latter half of DA, Henry interpolates the DA at the beginning. But problems arise in working out when items of his later agenda are so easily and seamlessly woven into the former. This to me is clear evidence of one person who understands why the contradictions exist trying to coalesce and synthesize into one chronological legend that which was disjointed because of the overlaying of earlier agendas.
Because we do not have evidence of the prophecy of Melkin before John of Glastonbury it in no way negates that the prophecy existed and was the basis for the mythical Island in HRB and the later Joseph legend at Glastonbury in DA. The Melkin prophecy was the inspiration for the Grail and was the inspiration for the storyline propagated through ‘Robert de Boron’.... but more importantly than all those, it was the template for the manufacture of Arthur’s gravesite. Henry Blois is responsible for all this by his possession of the document but his substitution of the name Ineswitrin on a bone fide ancient document is the only reason Joseph ever came into contact with Avallon. Until scholars get their heads around this Joseph remains on Burgh Island.

The assumption of early thirteenth century interpolation and consolidation of DA is largely based on two premises. The first is that Gerald does not mention Joseph but mentions Avalon. For this reason scholars have assumed Joseph lore followed insertions about Avalon which were thought to follow Arthur’s disinterment. Secondly, modern scholars have also assumed St Patrick’s charter was produced later than the disinterment because of its reference to Patrick being ‘first abbot of Avalon’. This presumption is entirely incorrect. The reference to Avalon in chapter 9 of DA in the postscript pertains to the monastery not the Church and would not have appeared on the faked St Patrick charter produced by Henry Blois (written in gold).... if indeed it was presented at Rome at all. In other words Henry has employed his own propaganda of the concocted St Patrick charter and included its contents with a postscript written by himself in DA. The suggestion is that the concocted document existed.

Avallon, (which is Henry’s Burgundian town eponym) and Joseph from the Melkin prophecy at Glastonbury, have Henry as common denominator. It was Henry who clearly posited Ineswitrin as the Isle of Glass through Caradoc, purely for the motive to establish the credibility of the 601 charter by which his case for antiquity was proved to papal authorities. The chance that Robert recounts an *Isle de Voirre* without any contact from Henry would involve an alarmingly fortuitous convergence of factors.... since Caradoc also intonates the ‘Glass’ association with Glastonbury prior to Robert de Boron.
There was absolutely no precedence in Glastonbury lore concerning Joseph prior to William of Malmesbury unearthing the prophecy; probably alongside, in the same place at the same time he uncovered the 601 charter. If we can accept Ineswitrin as the original name on the Prophecy of Melkin (and it is difficult not to given ‘White tin island’ being synonymous with Ictis and Joseph’s known trade); then the mystical island scenario on which Avalon is based and where Arthur is last seen, would make the connection to the prophecy too obvious to use without Henry’s authorship being discovered.

William had probably handed over the original Melkin prophecy to Henry Blois along with the 601 charter. That both pertained to Ineswitrin and were found at Glastonbury may well have been the catalyst for Henry’s storyline invention of Avalon which was not mentioned in the *Primary Historia* since this was newly discovered and Henry had been in Wales in 1136. This is only a year after Mamesbury presents his copy of DA to Henry and then in 1137 he in Normandy composing the *Arthuriad*.

Why the Melkin prophecy is not in DA is because of subtlety and traceability just as Glastonbury is not mentioned in HRB and Arviragus in DA. Henry’s authorial edifice is an illusion, just as Caradoc’s Iniswitrin is later substantiated in DA as being relevant as an earlier name for Glastonbury and is corroborated in the St Patrick charter. If more of Melkin’s work existed, it may well have been destroyed in the fire in 1184. But the work composed in his name about Arthur’s round table was surely from H. Blois.

It seems obvious, if we can accept the provenance of a Glastonbury *Perlesvaus*, that Henry Blois wrote the original of the Grail book/Sanctum Graal/Vulgate Estoire. He expected posterity to learn of the coincidence of the French Grail literature and its connection to Joseph, to be commensurate with Melkin’s ‘duo fassula’ on Avalon where Joseph was buried. One can only suppose that John of Glastonbury must have found the Melkin prophecy in a work along with other material (including the mention of Arviragus and his connection to the twelve hides) which must have been contrived by Henry.

If the fire of 1184 had not happened and several parts to the puzzle had not been destroyed, what should have naturally coincided earlier i.e. the understanding that the Grail and ‘duo fassula’ were commensurate.... had to wait until John of Glastonbury included the Blois version of the Melkin
prophecy in the *Cronica*..., which had substituted Avalon instead of Ineswitrin. The prophecy survived in the form where Henry Blois had substituted *Ineswitrin* by the Burgundian eponym Avallon. Herein is the answer to why the instructions within the prophecy are not a fabrication... and actually reveal Burgh Island. Avalon is not some ‘Celtic Otherworld’ as most modern commentators maintain and there was certainly no Island of Avalon before Henry Blois’ invention in the First Variant.

Arviragus is not in DA yet the boundaries of twelve hides are in chapter 72 & 73 of DA and form part of William’s original work. John of Glastonbury is a consolidator of other works concerning Glastonburyana and we know a large part of this propaganda derives from Henry Blois. It appears as if it is John who puts together the hides and Arviragus, but, I would suggest, given John of Glastonbury’s disposition not to invent fable, much of John’s information is derived from Henry’s lost work. What we can surmise then is that Henry, elsewhere, in other output, had connected William’s ‘twelve hides’ to a fictitious Arviragus from his own HRB.

Anyway, Gerald is only concerned with ‘Geoffrey’s’ Arthur as he appears in HRB, because his power centre was in Wales and stood as an icon for Welsh nationalism. So, the fact that Gerald does not mention Joseph (even having read the DA) is irrelevant and should not be assumed by scholars as *a priori* basis for a late appearance of Joseph. The deduction being that mention of Joseph in DA is a late invention following an inspiration from French Grail literature.

Again, if this were the case, how is it that Caradoc’s mention of *Isle de Voirre* (which can only apply to Glastonbury) pre-empts Robert de Boron’s *Isle de Voirre*.... when we know *Life of Gildas* was written c.1140. That would be the opposite of what Lagorio concludes; Glastonbury propaganda affecting continental literature.

Gerald of Wales neither mentions the St Patrick charter nor Ineswitrin, yet this is obviously Henry Blois’ invention which is also in DA. Gerald having read DA is not concerned with Glastonburyana but Arthuriana and Avalon. So, Lagorio’s assumptions about the ‘evolving’ of the legend concerning Joseph is flawed; as Joseph was assuredly written into DA before Henry Blois’ death.\textsuperscript{646}

\textsuperscript{646} Carley. The Chronicle of Glastonbury abbey. P li. *The first official recognition of Joseph at Glastonbury is not recorded until John wrote his Cronica in the early 1340’s; what status the legend enjoyed before then, and when it was actually incorporated in DA is not clear.*
Another reason scholars assume Joseph material derives from a later interpolator and was not in DA at the time of the unearthing of Arthur is because Adam of Damerham makes no mention of Joseph either. Adam starts, (as we have noted), where DA finishes i.e. with the abbacy of Henry Blois. For pages Adam leaves us in no doubt of the glorious reputation of Henry Blois held by monks at Glastonbury. Adam even mentions that Henry Blois had generously ordained that 30 Salmon should be eaten at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost ‘so that his own name might be remembered’. I only mention this to show Henry’s vanity in perpetuating his legacy into the future.

Adam is purely ‘following on’ and therefore is not repeating or reiterating anything found in DA. Adam wrote a hundred years after Henry died. Adam says Henry died in 1177 so his accuracy is not great. He also mentions that certain saints were unearthed from the site of the Old church after the fire i.e. St Patrick, Dunstan, Indract and Gildas. Probably the only genuine relics were those of Indract. But that aside, Joseph is not mentioned as he was not unearthed. The point about unearthing Joseph was that no-one could attempt a bogus find as one would have to replicate and produce what one imagined constituted the Grail or duo fassula.

Logically, it seems likely that if Henry had searched for Joseph at Montacute as well as Glastonbury, it may well be the cause of why Arthur is buried where he is. Henry thought the piramides might mark where Joseph was buried since Henry himself did not know where Ineswitrin was. Both the 601 charter and Prophecy were uncovered at Glastonbury. But if Henry did believe the prophecy of Melkin about a burial site for Joseph (since it was him who had provided the bogus etymology in Caradoc and changed the name on the prophecy), it clearly shows he had no idea where the remains of Joseph might be.

It seems probable that in Adam’s era there was suspicion as to how Joseph suddenly arrived to complement Glastonbury and provide it with apostolic ancestry. Anyway, Adam was relating as a continuator from William’s research, not reiterating the history already established in DA.

It is not clear because Carley refuses to believe Henry Blois could have interpolated DA or been responsible for Joseph lore at Glastonbury. This is largely based on the fact that Gerald does not mention Joseph’s name. Why should Gerald when commenting on Arthur’s disinterment? He does not mention St Patrick either!! So Carley has concluded the St Patrick charter is by a later interpolator also. Let me therefore make it clear. Joseph and the St Patrick charter were included in DA before Henry Blois’ death…. just as the Grail was taken to Avalon in Robert’s work c.1165-1175, long before Arthur was unearthed.
which was too recent to have formed what might be termed a ‘tradition’. Adam is covering what had happened since DA and therefore Lagorio and Carley’s assumptions, on the basis that both Gerald and Adam don’t mention Joseph and that Joseph material could not have been in DA at the time of Henry’s death or even at Arthur’s unveiling no longer stands as a scholastic decree.

Therefore, this leaves open the entire framework I am positing i.e. that Joseph material is based upon Melkin’s prophecy and the Melkin prophecy was the catalyst for the mysterious island in HRB and the Grail is based upon the duo fassula…. and the discovery of a body on Avalon in the future is based upon Joseph’s sepulcher being found as predicted by Melkin. Most important of all is that the Grail quest is a simulation of Henry’s personal search for the relics of Joseph and the enigmatic duo fassula. Let us hope common sense prevails..

However, before this can happen the experts need to understand the geometry leading to Ineswitrin and they should not discount it as anything other than an encoded document pinpointing the grave of Joseph on Burgh Island. Henry’s knowledge of the Melkin prophecy has in effect defined the Island of Avalon as the last place Arthur was seen. Ineswitrin has become fictionally interpreted in HRB as Avalon, named by Henry Blois. That we should be confident that there has been a substitution of name on the Melkin prophecy is fairly self-evident. 1) The data would not point to an Island in Devon coincidentally. 2) There would not be five cassates on the Island which are still evident today. 3) The island’s connection to Ictis and Joseph’s name to the tin trade are a coincidence too far to be anything other than fact. 4) The islands etymological name is evident in that it was ‘White tin Island’ or Ineswitrin. 5) Henry would never have gone to the trouble of the etymological addition to Caradoc’s life of Gildas if the 601 charter, which had the name of Ineswitrin inscribed on it, did not exist.

Because the 60 charter existed in reality, it referred to an island in Dumnonia evidenced by its donation from its King. It is Melkin’s prophecy, which by its geometrical directions, points out the Island in Devon. Hence, Melkin’s prophecy in reality is locating Ineswitrin as the island upon which Joseph’s relics are to be found and it is synonymous with that named in the 601 charter. Hence, it is not Insula Avallonis as stated on the prophecy.... as we know that this name also is the invented name plucked from a town in
Burgundy by Henry Blois the writer of HRB. Thus we can be sure the same person has substituted the name.

Any theory to the contrary which avers that both Melkin and his prophecy are a fake is a theory and in no way verifiable. As I have maintained from the beginning, my reason for writing this is not to put forward a theory but to show how it is that certain events have transpired which have resulted in the relics of Joseph and Jesus remaining on Burgh Island. It is easily verifiable.

Henry invented the chivalric Arthur. So Arthur’s grave could not exist on the invented Island of Avalon. But this does not follow for Joseph of Arimathea on Burgh Island. The stupidity is that... it is our experts who supposedly are better informed than ourselves who have decreed that a search is fruitless and no bodies are to be found on Burgh Island.

Julia Crick ‘knows’ Geoffrey’s chivalric Arthur is a twelfth century invention. Therefore, Arthur could not be buried on Avalon. She is not qualified to pronounce on Joseph being buried on Ineswitrin. Carley denies the existence of Melkin and has no idea of the meaning of Melkin’s prophecy. He dismisses the geometry which we have covered in this work. To him it has no relevance. How could it, because he was taught to accept by his mentor Lagorio that Glastonburyana (and Joseph) just happened as a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’ and because he has adduced there is no mention of the prophecy or of Melkin himself before John’s Cronica.

It is worth pointing out though, that there was a devastating fire which must have burnt some volumes and evidence which would have led us to an earlier interconnection between Glastonburyana and continental Grail literature... if it were still extant. Carley’s expert opinion is unbending largely because several of his works on Glastonburyana have posited conclusions which are based on false assumptions.

Chapter 3. How a certain monk of St Denis spoke of Glastonbury.

Let us digress a little in order to further establish the antiquity of this church. When a certain monk of Glastonbury named Godfrey, from whose letter we have taken both this chapter and the next, was staying at St Denis in the district of Paris in the time of Henry Blois, Abbot of Glastonbury,

---

647 The fact that Henry’s other greatest fiction of Arthur’s continental battle scene derives from the same area in the Blois region witnesses Henry’s source of inspiration is personal.
one of the older monks asked him “where do your people come from? Where do you live?” He replied, “I am a Norman monk, father from the monastery in Britain that is called Glastonbury”. “Is that ancient church of the perpetual Virgin and compassionate mother still standing” he asked. “It is”, the monk said. At this the elder who was gently stroking Godfrey’s head, remained wrapt in silence for a long time and at length spoke thus: “this church of the most glorious martyr Denis and that which you claim as yours share the same honour and privilege, the one in France, the other in Britain; they both arose at the same time and each was consecrated by the highest and greatest priest. Yet in one degree yours is superior for it is called a second Rome”. While he was hanging on that man’s words, the guest master separated them from each other, despite their reluctance, and they never saw each other again. But, no more of this.

It seems to me that this is a ploy by Henry Blois and this was written in DA before his death. To me it is doubtful that this was written by the writer of T. The reader must not forget two things. Firstly, we are dealing with the master of retro authorship. If my assumption that DA was in Henry’s possession until his death, he could well have written this for posterity. What is almost certain is that, if it was written by our consolidating author of T, the propaganda about Glastonbury as a second Rome originates from Henry Blois. A good reason for suspecting this is that his name is involved. The propaganda in essence places Glastonbury monastery above his good friend Abbot Suger’s ecclesiastical house by the respect shown by the monk of that establishment for Glastonbury. There may be a grain of truth to the account, but in essence it is an account of a conversation which at best can be accounted as hearsay.

But, this is not the first time Henry Blois uses seemingly inconsequential anecdotes which establish or add credibility to one of his propagandist positions. The propagandist position is that, like St Denis where all the French Kings were buried, so is Glastonbury where King Arthur is buried. This is how ‘lore’ is established. Even though the letter, which no doubt existed, (but was fabricated by Henry), portrays the essence of a dialogue between two priests…. the bogus letter to which the piece in DA refers, makes sure we understand that at a contemporary time (when Saint Denis,

648 It is not by accident that Henry Blois’ friend Bernard refers to Henry as a rival pope in his letter to pope Lucius II where he alludes to ‘vitis illa Wincestrie, immo ut vulgo canitur, vitis secunde Rome’
Bishop of Paris c.250 AD, established the abbey of St Denis), Glastonbury was standing as it is second to Rome.

What also raises my suspicions about Henry's involvement in reproducing this letter as relating to a monk of Glastonbury named Godfrey, is that he is staying at St Denis in the time of Henry Blois.... and so in effect back dates the perception we are meant to believe.... that if William of Malmesbury wrote this, it must have been a commonly held perception about the antiquity of Glastonbury especially in terms of primacy.... being accounted second unto Rome.

Henry's aim from the time he returned from Clugny in 1158 was to establish Glastonbury as the second greatest Christian ecclesiastical establishment after Rome; established by Jesus' uncle and King Arthur's Avalon.

Before the burgeoning Cistercians, Clugny had once held a similar honour in France. My suspicion is that the story is made up of inconsequential and intimate detail dressed up to seem matter of fact.... as a conversation portrayed in a letter. My worst suspicion is upon the final sentence in that it pretends upon William of Malmesbury's style; to be dismissive of tale and hearsay, but as always (again) the seed of propaganda is planted and irreversible.

Chapter 4. How a great number of people first began to live at Glastonbury.

Having described the foundation, dedication and later rediscovery of this oratory it remains for me to describe how this island came to be inhabited by a large number of people. We read in the 'deeds of the ancient Britons' that 12 brothers from the northern parts of Britain came into the West where they held several territories, namely Gwynedd, Dyfed, Gower, and Kidwelly, which their ancestor Cuneda had possessed. The names of the brothers are noted below: Ludnerth, Morgen, Catgu, Cathmor, Merguid, Morvined, Morehel, Morcant, Boten, Morgent, Mortineil, and Glasteing. It was this Glasteing who, following his sow through the Kingdom of the inland Angles from near the town called Escebtiorne up to Wells and from Wells along an inaccessible and watery track called Sugewege, that is 'the Sow's way', found her suckling her piglets under an apple tree near the church of which we have been speaking. From this it has been passed down to us that the apples from the tree are known as 'Ealde Cyrcenas epple', that is 'old church apples'.

Similarly the sow was called ‘Ealde Cyrce suge’. While all the other sows have 4 feet, this one had eight, *remarkable though that may sound*. As soon as Glasteing reached that island he saw that it abounded with many good things and so came to live on it with all his family and spent the rest of his life there. That place is said to have been first populated by his offspring and the households that succeeded him. These things have been taken *from the ancient books of the Britons*.

Scott highlights the point that: ‘the reference to Henry Blois in the past, establishes that this chapter and the previous was not William’s work since Henry did not die until 1171’. This is certainly not authored by a consolidating or last interpolating editor and the author of the letter above (from which this is derived: *from whose letter we have taken both this chapter and the next*) uses the same conflationsary format as witnessed elsewhere concerning not only himself but again with how Glastonbury got its name.

Henry feels he has licence to invent anything as we have seen before mainly in HRB where there are no end of myths but especially where Newburgh is relating a story of Henry Blois having found a greyhound in a rock and keeping it as a pet. Just as unlikely is a pig with 8 legs.

The sole person, whose aim it is to convince us that…. firstly, Ineswitrin is the old name for Glastonbury and latterly that *Insula Avallonis* is synonymous with Glastonbury, is Henry Blois. Here, I believe is how Henry connects his own French propaganda which posits an alternative *Isle de Voirre* and connects its namesake *Glas* through an episode found randomly in the *vita tertia* of St Patrick. I believe this is Henry’s etymological contortion through an apple eating pig owned by Glasteing…. so Glastonbury becomes identified as, *Insula Pomorum, Isle de Voirre,* and *Avalon,* all names fabricated by Henry Blois (except for *Ineswitrin* which should never have been associated with the location of Glastonbury).

We should also remember that Henry’s first agenda had to convert Ines Gutrin\(^{649}\) (as it pertained to Glastonbury) as if it were synonymous with the Ineswitrin on the 601 charter which he was using as an evidential part of

\(^{649}\) Aelred Watkin would have us believe regarding Iniswitrin, Inis Gutrin, Isle of Glass, Avalon, Avallo etc: *At first sight these epithets may seem disparate, but there is one factor that is common to them all, namely a reference in some form or another to a Celtic underworld or beyond world, a magical abode of healing and of peace*. Watkin is certainly right about the common factor but it has nothing to do with a Celtic underworld.
his case. This of course he had done neatly by impersonating Caradoc. Henry has employed the identification of Glasteining as a swineherd from Glas. The Vita tertia of St Patrick contains an episode where St Patrick encounters a large grave in which Glas is raised from the dead saying: Ego sum Glas filius Cais, qui fuit porcarius Lugir regis Hirote. The sole purpose for which Henry employs this pig story in DA is to connect the apple island of VM through an apple eating pig to Glastonbury. This is so that the island in VM where Arthur is taken by Barinthus is now no other than Glastonbury. It is not by coincidence that this is where miraculously, thanks to Henry Blois having planted a bogus grave and identified its spot (in DA), Arthur will be found. Henry's alter ego, the chivalric Arthur, will be the food of story tellers and Henry Blois' entire pseudo-history will become part of British history.

As we saw in chapter 3 of DA, the information in Godfrey's letter from whose letter we have taken both this chapter and the next, (meaning the above chapter 4) covers a number of passages, rebuilt to cause conflation from Nennius' Historia Brittonum and some other source (not in Nennius) which provided the court pedigrees of 'Hywel the Good' shown by A. Wade Evans: udnerth map Morgen, map catgur, map Catmor, map Merguid, map Moriutned, map Morhen, map Morcant, map Botan, map Morgen, map Mormayl, map Glast, unde sunt Glastenic qui venerunt que vocatur Loytcoyt.

Considering the content of this supposed letter (if one existed), I can only conclude contrary to Scott that this has Henry's stamp on it. It might well be written into DA by Henry himself as it exists, or the information supplied was in the form of a letter composed by Henry Blois which our consolidating author of DA has transferred into DA from what was a separate letter. Since this is written by the master of illusion and retro dating.... and William himself is supposed to be the composer of DA 'as a whole', I would suggest Henry Blois is referring to himself as if being referred to by William. It does not imply that Henry is dead as Scott assumes, but merely implies that Godfrey was writing this letter in the time

---

650 The final paragraph in which we are assured are the genuine words of Caradoc in the Life of Gildas, we get the etymological convolution which is employed solely to make the Ineswitrin on the 601 charter credibly appear to pertain to the location of Glastonbury: Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin (made of glass). But after the coming of the English and the expulsion of the Britons, that is, the Welsh, it received a fresh name, Glastigberi, according to the formation of the first name, that is English glass, Latin vitrum, and beria a city; then Glastinberia, that is, the City of Glass.
of Henry Blois. This goes some way to establishing my proposition that Henry made sure the final redaction of DA was not exposed to the public domain until after his death.... and DA was part of the 40 or so books donated to Glastonbury after his death.

It is unfortunate in GS at the point where we could discover exactly what the author knew about Wales that the pertinent folios are missing. As I have covered, my proposition is that ‘Geoffrey’ obtained his knowledge of Wales as Henry Blois who was there (clearly as an eye witness in GS) to the suppression of the Welsh rebellion in 1136. It is not by coincidence that the brothers from the north come into the West where they held several territories, namely Gwynedd, Dyfed, Gower, and Kidwelly. This is exactly where Henry had spent time. It is also clear from GS that Kidwelly castle belongs to himself. This we might assume is through having retaken it and repelled a siege from within as we discussed earlier. The fact that the book or books of the ancient Britons is referred to twice as the source for the eight legged pig is indicative of the inventor of this story.... the inspired author of so much other dubious lore found in HRB (also about the ancient Britons).

Chapter 5. On the various names of that island.

This island was at first called Ineswitrin by the Britons but at length was named by the English, who had brought the land under their yoke, Glastinbiry, either a translation into the language of its previous name, or after the Glasteing of whom we spoke above. It is also frequently called the island of Avalon, the name of which this is the origin. It was mentioned above that Glasteing found his sow under an apple tree near the church. Because he discovered on his arrival that apples were very rare in that region he named the island ‘Avallonie’ in his own language that is Apple Island, for ‘Avalla’ in British is the same as ‘Poma’ in Latin. Or it was named after a certain Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters because of the solitude of the spot.

When will scholarship not be duped by Henry’s maze of eponyms and etymological contortions for Glastonbury? This chapter follows from the previous in its onslaught of propaganda in equating VM’s Isula pomorum with this apple polemic. Scott, like most previous commentators regards both the previous chapters (which are obviously linked), a late interpolation: principally because of the reference to Avalon, which we know
was made only after the claim to possess Arthur’s bones. How Lagorio in her false assumption has so neatly hypnotised every subsequent scholar about the date when Avalon appeared at Glastonbury is astounding.

We should be observing that it is the same man who invents Avalon in the first place in the First Variant who attempts through VM to make Barinthus’ *Insula Pomorum* synonymous with Glastonbury and this was long before the discovery of Arthur’s bones in Avalon. Whoever maintains that Avalon was not associated with Glastonbury prior to the discovery of the Leaden cross is plainly ignoring the apple polemic of VM which could not have forseen an unearthing of Arthur in Avalon without a designer leading them through this etymological quagmire to that conclusion; which only transpired in reality because the designer led them to Arthur’s grave by stating where it was before it was found. The pre-planted Leaden cross merely confirms in 1189-91 the illusion set up in Arthur’s faked grave site sometime after 1158 and before 1171.... which was already predestined to be a final confirmation of Avalon by the author of HRB and VM and pointed out by the same writer in DA. The etymologial contortions we are studying now in DA, just duped those in that era to join the dots and accept what essentially our Cicero has left to posterity i.e. a fantastic fairytale.

One can see that on this flawed principal *a priori* to which Carley and Lagorio both adhere also, there can be no rational explanation as to how Giraldus’ testimony immediately accepts Avalon as Glastonbury.... if he had not previously had some understanding of it locationally speaking. Who is responsible for Arthur being found at Glastonbury, which is already established as Avalon? How could it possibly be Henry de Sully? Certainly Robert de Boron knows of an association of Joseph of Arimathea and the *Vaus d’Avaron* already c.1165-80. It is no coincidence a person named ‘Blaise’ records this.

If it were the leaden cross that establishes Avalon at Glastonbury first, then we must ignore Giraldus’ statements, otherwise why are they unearthing Arthur at Glastonbury? Gerald says: *Arthur was a distinguished patron, generous donor, and a splendid supporter of the renowned monastery of Glastonbury; they praise him greatly in their annals*.... Gerald had read DA and the substance concerning Arthur and Avalon was already in DA.

---

651 John Scott’s DA, P.188, note24
There is no way this reference can refer to ‘Caradoc’s’ one Arthur episode at Glastonbury. I will discuss Gerald in a later chapter, but briefly, Gerald is our best eyewitness. If we are not tethered to modern scholarship’s presumptions; the fact is that the burial site was determined by the given location between the *piramides* which Henry Blois had interpolated into DA as a seemingly inconsequential anecdote.

Adam writing c.1290 is far less likely to be accurate on a date for the unveiling 100 years after the disinterment. Gerald knew King Henry II personally and was an eyewitness to the opening of Arthur's manufactured gravesite. Henry II died in July 1189, so the disinterment may have happened in that year or just after his death in 1190 Gerald says:

*The abbot had the best evidence from the aforementioned King Henry, for the King had said many times, as he had heard from the historical tales of the Britons and from their poets, that Arthur was buried between two pyramids that were erected in the holy burial-ground.....Furthermore, in our times, while Henry II was ruling England, the tomb of the renowned Arthur was searched for meticulously in Glastonbury Abbey; this was done at the instruction of the King and under the supervision of the abbot of that place, Henry (de Sully).....Now when they had extracted this cross from the stone, the aforementioned Abbot Henry showed it to me; I examined it, and read the words.....It read: "Here lies entombed King Arthur, with Guenevere his second wife, on the Isle of Avalon".*

Quite simply, as DA states, Arthur is buried between the *piramides* with Guinevere. So, why should it be presumed Gerald is lying by saying that the king said ‘many times’ *that Arthur was buried between two pyramids*? In truth Lagorio and Carley have quite simply ignored a contemporary eyewitness and made a massive erroneous assumption i.e. DA’s description of where to find the body could only have been interpolated after the unearthing and anything mentioning Avalon in DA could only have been written after this event.

It is evident I am annoyed at this. I have nothing against Carley or Lagorio or Crick but the fact remains that pronouncing such a decree means that no-one will ever find who Geoffrey really was or the

---

652 This date is approximate for he records the burial of Eleanor, queen of Edward I, as taking place 27 December 1290. He says that after that event Abbot John was summoned by the King to the funeral of his mother, Eleanor of Provence, which was performed at Ambresbury on the festival of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, 8 September 1291.
provenance of the Grail legend. Quite simply it excludes Henry Blois from two of our genres under scrutiny. The only reason such a pronouncement was made was through ignorance. The ignoring of Gerald is simply not scholarship. But what these erroneous assumptions lead to is detrimental to knowledge as a whole because their subsequent assumption is that Melkin and his prophecy are also fake. Believing this is also ignorance because it is the essential document which solves the Matter of Britain. If scholars continue to hold this view then we would never realise from what source the Grail legends were inspired and the truth that is hidden in the trappings of a tale.

Why the interpolator giving the position where Arthur’s grave was found, neglects to recount anything further than the position (after the fact), seems he has no idea of what events took place. Logically, if Ralph of Coggeshall and the Margam chronicler ascribe the disinterment to chance, (because a monk had expressed a strong desire to be buried between the piramides and by fortune the grave digger came across Arthur’s bones), it can only point to two deductions.

Firstly, we know there was no grave to be found unless Henry de Sully staged the disinterment. (This is the generally held misguided consensus). But, Henry de Sully is not the author of HRB’s chivalric Arthur. If Henry de Sully had the opportunity to point out in an interpolation in DA where the body was located as posited by Gerald before the unearthing; do you think he would write such an innocuous statement. (this is impossible anyway given the date Henry de Sully joined the abbey). If he or one of the monks made the interpolation afterward he surely would have put the details in DA that Gerald discloses. Henry de Sully is the person who supervises the dig not the fraudster as Gerald plainly states.

So, secondly, we must deduce that Coggeshall and the Margam chronicler have heard an account of the unearthing of Arthur which someone has related to them which combats the current scepticism about a possible fraud.... by implying it was a chance and random discovery. This is the hearsay of the populace giving credence to the find.

I can only logically conclude that the grave site was manufactured there by Henry Blois. The location and specific depth etc. was revealed to the King by Henry Blois with the pretence Henry Blois had gleaned the information (or it had been passed into posterity) by an old Welsh Bard. The
idea/inspiration for this fiasco is obviously based on the Melkin prophecy where Joseph is to be found in the future. The confirmed certainty that it is Arthur’s grave and the location is Avalon is established by the Leaden cross which, (as discussed previously), is modelled (inspirationally) on Eadmer’s reference to the lead tablet ‘confirming’ Dunstan’s whereabouts at Canterbury.

Grandsen makes an error in her method of rationalizing all the discrepancies. She presumes ‘the monks of Glastonbury suppressed the part played by Henry II, because they considered the story sounded less contrived without it’. This again is based upon the supposition that all things Arthurian in DA are interpolated after the disinterment. But in fact the opposite lends credibility to the position that.... Henry Blois, who wrote things Arthurian in DA, could not know what role Henry II played in Arthur’s unearthing.

Hence, it is only Gerald who recounts Henry II involvement leading to the disinterment and provides an eyewitness account. There is no association with King Henry mentioned in DA which there would be if the location was inserted by a later interpolator after the disinterment.... plus all the other incidental detail provided by Gerald.

Grandsen sees Gerald as commissioned by the monks to carry out a propaganda campaign. She also thinks that Glastonbury monks distributed pamphlets to other religious houses. She also thinks that Gerald had simply stated that Glastonbury was the former Avalon and was somehow responsible for furthering the propaganda by giving independent etymologies for both Glastonbury and Avalon assuming they were not in DA already. Grandsen imagines some sort of joint venture, where Gerald’s version is in cahoots with the monks. Grandsen’s viewpoint assumes that Avalon becomes Glastonbury by a contemporary monk interpolating after the bogus find.... engineered by monk-craft and Henry de Sully.

Since we know Henry Blois is ‘Geoffrey’ and Avalon is based on the name of a Burgundian town and we know Robert de Boron’s stories come directly from Henry Blois as Blaise, (who also knew the Vaus d’Avaron was in the west); it is remarkable all these ‘convergent factors’ fortuitously fits together neatly for the supposed interpolating monk.

Are we then supposed to believe that Gerald who has spent much time with Henry II enters ‘supposedly’ into a propaganda pact with Glastonbury monks, who don’t use the propaganda about the King in their annals which
they had supposedly commissioned Gerald to concoct? Events did not transpire as Grandsen, Carley, Lagorio et al have portrayed.

Between 1171 to the period 1189-90, Henry Blois’ *Matter of Britain* material circulated on the continent and in insular Britain and Master Blehis had made it fairly plain in the Perlesvaus that Glastonbury was perhaps Avalon (by the description of the lead covered church). It was also plainly written in DA. When the King decided to act upon the words which we have proposed he heard at Henry Blois’ deathbed, and DA had existed in the public domain for twenty years, there came a point where the most talked about person in the medieval era was unearthed.

Arthur’s disinterment probably transpired at the very time of King Henry’s death. I point this out because Henry de Sully was appointed by Richard I in September 1189 immediately after King Henry’s death in July 1189 and may have been appointed to carry out King Henry’s instructions. Gerald is not lying so we should think because he was a friend of the King’s he aggrandizes this event transpiring ‘because of’ King Henry. So my guess is that within about 6-7 weeks of Henry II dying, Richard now carries out his father’s wishes to disinter Arthur.

Richard I was of course the younger maternal half-brother of Countess Marie of Champagne and Countess Alix of Blois. These were the two nieces by marriage to Henry Blois’ nephews. It is at their court where Henry propagated his Grail stories to Chrétien and possibly Robert.

King Louis’s wife Constance died and Louis married Adèle Henry Blois’ niece and the sister of the Count of Blois and Champagne. King Louis betrothed his two daughters, Marie and Alix to Theobald of Blois’ sons, Theobald and Henry. Their father was Henry Blois’ brother. It also important to point out that Henry’s brother (Theobald V of Champagne) presided over the wedding arrangements between Eleanor of Aquitaine and the King of France, Louis VII; and when he remarried Adèle the main recorded proponent of Grail literature was betrothed the Henry’s favourite nephew. We should not forget Marie of France, Eleanor of Aquitaine’s first child, was instrumental in Chrétien de Troyes obtaining the ‘book of the Grail’ written by Master Blehis, our Henry Blois. We know Marie and Alex were propagators of French romanz literature and Henry Blois was uncle to both of their Husband’s.

---

653 I will discuss this point concerning Eleanor in the Chapter on Gerald.
Now, I would suggest it was during his time in Burgundy that Henry hatched the plan to write Grail literature. It was in 1158 that Marie of France married the said ‘Henri the Liberal’, the troubadour, the favourite nephew of Bishop Henry Blois (since Eustace’s death). This Marie of France is the same as the person who wrote the Lais of Marie of France where also we hear of Avalon in her work but I will get to this in the chapter about her because again there is huge misunderstanding from modern scholars.

This connection must not be dismissed, as Henry returns back to England to take up his place at Winchester in that year. Having become less powerful and less able to manipulate and having seen his malicious prophecies concerning the Celts overrunning Henry II fail to become reality, Henry settles into a more reclusive mode to write and orally propagate propaganda concerning King Arthur, Joseph and Avalon.

If modern scholarship could rid itself of the a priori standpoint that all things Arthurian in DA are interpolated after Arthur’s disinterment, and Avalon was commensurate with Glastonbury transitionally before the leaden cross was exposed; we can then accept a Grail, Arthurian and Joseph legend emanating from Glastonbury through Henry Blois to his relations before the disinterment; not emanating from the court of Champagne and Troyes back to Glastonbury.

Once this is accepted we might then accept the Island name on the prophecy of Melkin was changed to Avalon and understand why this was done as a consequence of Henry’s second agenda i.e. the establishing of Avalon at Glastonbury and thus locating Joseph’s grave there also. Hence all the lore about the two cruets at Glastonbury!!

It is necessary that modern scholars accept the Prophecy of Melkin as part of the inspiration for the mythical island in HRB, and how ‘Geoffrey’s’ island is linked to Joseph.... because we now understand that Geoffrey of Monmouth is in fact a pen name for the Abbot of Glastonbury.

Pertinent to this tangled mess is the sepulchre of Joseph.... to be found with a mystical object stated in the Melkin prophecy.... and the commonality between Ineswitrin as Burgh Island, Joseph, Avalon and the Grail, which are all common to the prophecy of Melkin; aware that Avalon is the invention of HRB’s author.

Originally the bones of Joseph and the duo fassula were stated to be on Iniswitrin in the Melkin prophecy and are still on Ineswitrin in reality. Henry Blois who put Arthur at Avalon in HRB is the abbot of Glastonbury.
where Avalon was then recognised to be located. As we know, Henry Blois was a patron of Gerald and most probably predisposed an acceptance within Gerald concerning Arthuriana and Glastonburyana in relation to Avalon during conversation in Henry’s own lifetime (although Gerald never associated the Bishop with Geoffrey of Monmouth and is obviously dubious of ‘Geoffrey’s’ history). But Henry Blois may have even showed an updated DA to Gerald before he died.

After that long deviation we will get back to DA:

Chapter 6. With what great devotion various saints came thither.

The church of which we are speaking, frequently called by the English ‘the old church’ because of its antiquity, was that first made of wattle. Yet from the very beginning it possessed a mysterious fragrance of Divine sanctity, so that, despite its mean appearance, great reverence for it wafted through the whole country. Hence the streams of people flowing along all the roads that lead there; hence the assemblies of the wealthy divested of their pomp; hence the constant succession of men of religion and letters.

We should not forget that on the 601 charter the church was termed ‘old’ and this was on a document which obviously existed and was genuine, otherwise there would be little point in Henry making the etymological addition to the last paragraph of Caradoc’s bogus Life of Gildas or William’s unadulterated DA commencing with the charter.

The church’s mean appearance i.e. in wood; we now hear again was first made of Wattle which implies it was no longer and I believe never was. Author B states it is in wood c.960AD. So, before that date, we are led to believe in chapter 19 that Augustine’s fellow preacher Paulinus, Bishop of Rochester and earlier Archbishop of York, had strengthened the structure and covered it in wood c.600 AD. We must take account of why is it so important that the composition of the church is highlighted so frequently....especially, in consideration that William supposedly mentions often what it used to be made of 750 years previous to when William is supposedly writing these words. As I covered already, it is so that it mirrors with the cratibus in the prophecy of Melkin which makes the prophecy more likely to appear to pertain to Glastonbury when in reality it bears witness to relics on Burgh Island.

Now, all things considered, which we have discussed above concerning the synonymy between Glastonbury and Avalon that was seen to be in
evidence through VM’s *Insula Pomorum* at an early date of 1155-58; we must now be aware that the Melkin prophecy is being made relevant to Glastonbury also through *Insula Avallonis*. Hence the inordinate persuasions to have us believe that the old construction of the church was in Wattle so that another part of the Melkin prophecy complies with Glastonbury lore. But, it is the man who is inventing the lore who is also bent on us believing the prophecy applies to Glastonbury as he is the inventor of Avalon in HRB. Thus, certain parts of the prophecy’s wording i.e. *cratibus*, he would have us believe applies to the church in Avalon. My proposition that a parallel is being sought…. points to the existence of the prophecy of Melkin in Henry’s era and therefore is an indicator that the prophecy’s *duo fassula* is the template for the Grail itself and Arthur’s gravesite.

Chapter 7. On St Gildas.

As we have heard from our forefathers, Gildas neither an unlearned nor an inelegant historian, to whom the Britons are indebted for any fame they have amongst other peoples, past many years there, captivated by the holiness of the place. There too he died in 512AD and was buried before the altar in the old church.

Gildas does not even mention Glastonbury in his *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*. The only connection Gildas has to Glastonbury is that found in the concocted Life of Gildas, where Henry has impersonated Caradoc. The point of the interpolation in DA is to continue the proposition that Gildas was at Glastonbury from Henry’s 1144 agenda. Before the Amen at the end of Life of Gildas we can read about Gildas: he was buried in the middle of the pavement of St. Mary’s church; and his soul rested, rests, and will rest, in heavenly repose. Amen. This is proof positive that Henry Blois’ reason for composing Life of Gildas was to have Gildas buried at Glastonbury and to show in the Melvas incident there was an abbot at Glastonbury at that date. As I have explained previously the etymological hodge podge (after the Amen) was added later in 1144 to show the location of Ineswitrin on the 601
charter applied to an estate at Glastonbury. I suggest a gravesite was constructed for Gildas after Malmesbury had left Glastonbury.

Above in DA, it is stated Gildas died at Glastonbury in 512 AD. So, this has provided a further 100 years of antiquity from where William of Malmesbury started his oldest physical evidence provided by the 601 charter. The story of Guinevere’s kidnap, as we have covered, was initially introduced to date Glastonbury to counter Osbern’s accusation through association with a ‘datable’ Gildas and to highlight the activities of Arthur but also corroborate that the HRB Arthur is synonymous with Life of Gildas’ Arthur through Guinevere.

As we saw in GR3 (Henry’s interpolations), Gildas is mentioned as above, but now in DA and Life of Gildas he is actually buried at Glastonbury; both probably written after Malmesbury had died. Henry’s interpolations of William’s GR cover the saints at Glastonbury, but omit that Gildas was buried there. This is simply because Henry did not add this anecdote in DA when he went to Rome in the first instance, but it has been added subsequently…. when he recomposed DA and had obviously manufactured a memorial for Gildas in the abbey. It would hardly be fitting to produce a book on the Life of Gildas in which Gildas poses as an arbiter at Glastonbury in a kidnap episode which no-one has ever heard of before; and also posit that he was buried at Glastonbury when no previous mention of his name had been found there. This might stretch credibility too far for papal authorities not to suspect newly invented material. Gildas’ resting place is obviously manufactured at a later date and brought into Glastonbury lore in chapter 7 of DA.

Chapter 8. On St Patrick.

A little before this time, when the Angles with threatening the peace of the Britons and the Pelagians were assaulting their faith, St Germanus of Auxerre provided help against both, as we read elsewhere; for he scattered the former with an alleluia chant and blasted the latter with the thunder of the evangelists and apostles. Then, when he was considering a return to his own country, he received Patrick into his immediate company before sending him some years later, at the command of Pope Celestine, to preach to the Irish.
After he had diligently carried out the duty enjoined on him, Patrick returned to England in his old age, **rejecting his former dignity and popular acclaim.** He landed in Cornwall on his altar, which is still held in great veneration by the inhabitants, both on account of its sanctity and usefulness and on account of its deliverance of the sick. Then, coming to Glastonbury and finding 12 brothers living there as hermits, he gathered them together and, **assuming the office of Abbot**, taught them to live a communal life, *as he quite clearly declares* in the following document that he wrote at the time.

If I am correct in my analysis that the St Patrick charter was employed in the later attempt at metropolitan status in 1149 after an initial gambit of a disciplic/apostolic foundation; we can then understand that the present chapter and the following St Patrick charter are a later insertion/redaction to an already interpolated DA by Henry Blois which was simply apostolic and now to which the GR3 version B concurred as they were both presented as evidence in pursuit of metropolitan status. Thus we have the anomaly in chronology where Henry has to introduce St Patrick after he has spoken of Gildas with *A little before this time*.

Firstly, in the above, Henry refers us to HRB and then to his interpolation in GR3 relating to Patrick the archbishop preferring to stay at Glastonbury.⁶⁵⁴ All this we can understand is part of a persuasive polemic relating to the metropolitan. If a consolidating author was persuading us to believe in the St Patrick charter by stating that the Patrick charter was written at the time of St Patrick (as we are all supposed to believe), certain inconsistencies in logic appear. What is the point of the St Patrick charter if Patrick is the first abbot of Avalon and yet Arthur’s disinterment has already established Avalon as Glastonbury? Why was it necessary that this document happened to be at the tor rather than at the abbey? Well, the obvious reason is so that the copy (without the seals) was found at the abbey and so could be produced at Rome.

There is simply no way that any other person than Henry Blois wrote the St Patrick charter which rules out Scott’s theory of a consolidating author who comprehensively rearranges DA. No consolidating author c.1230 would be setting us up to receive the next chapter (9) which is the St Patrick charter itself, which obviously existed before he wrote and logically could

---

⁶⁵⁴ *rather than to dwell in Kings' palaces*
only be of use to Henry in his endeavour. There is simply nothing to be gained from a late invention as Scott believes.

I should just summarise what we have covered to make clear the construction of DA. Initially in 1144, at Rome, Henry had proposed an apostolic foundation and had included the Gildas myth at Glastonbury along with Caradoc’s *Life of Gildas* which he had written firstly to counter Obern’s accusation and then added the last paragraph to show that ineswitrin was synonymous with Glastonbury so that the 601 charter referred to a known location. Gildas was probably not a saint there nor buried there at this stage. In 1149 Henry had constructed the St Patrick charter as additional evidence to be presented with another of Malmesbury’s work i.e.GR3.

It is unlikely DA had the last paragraph attached where St Patrick is the first abbot of Avalon and this is more likely a later addition when Henry himself consolidates DA toward the end of his life c.1169. This late consolidation was to complement the Grail and Arthurian propaganda and material concerning Joseph propagated to the court of Champagne and Troy.

Henry then added chapter 1 & 2 of DA before his death which, in effect, consolidates his pre and post 1158 agendas. Where Scott deduces a late consolidator for DA, I prefer Henry’s separate agenda’s to explain the overlay of material in DA. Hence, where Scott believes chapter 8 is written by a late interpolator because it leads into the St Patrick charter of Chapter 9, I suggest that it merely reflects a follow on consolidation from Henry’s first agenda. The first agenda focused on dating the antiquity of Glastonbury by the historical persona of Gildas. Gildas in effect had been placed at Glastonbury by the bogus *Life of Gildas* and who (we are led to believe) had followed on from an unbroken Christian settlement at Glastonbury church of apostolic foundation. This continuous Glory of foundation had to be established as a complete chronological train of events in the St Patrick charter, so the pope who was granting the metropolitan would understand.

So, where Scott is suspicious of chapter eight’s beginning *A little before this time* because of chapter eight’s connection to the St Patrick charter; I suggest it is merely a reflection of the 1149 attempt at metropolitan and follows on in a consolidation from the earlier agenda which presented the Gildas material.
However, as I have suggested before, the St Patrick Charter may have been produced as a separate document and then incorporated into DA as it is here presented with chapter 8 as its introduction. Either way, it is still a product of Henry Blois easily understood by its corroborative Phagan and Deruvian in HRB. As to there being any substance to the legend of Patrick’s relics at Glastonbury, it is impossible to tell, but it seems unlikely given author B’s uncertainty as to the two Patrick’s.

Henry Blois may not be the first fraudster at Glastonbury which my uncle Ferdinand referred to as the officine de faux. If one had to take a position, it would be fair to conclude that someone called Patrick was buried at Glastonbury, but the charter was concocted by Henry based upon this previous rumoured uncertainty. Many of the traditions later attached to Saint Patrick actually concerned Palladius, who in ‘Prosper of Aquitaine’s’ Chronicle was said to have been sent by Pope Celestine I as the first bishop to Irish c.431. Prosper of Aquitaine’s associates Palladius’ appointment with the visits of Germanus of Auxerre to Britain to suppress the Pelagian heresy and it has been suggested that Palladius and his colleagues were sent to Ireland to ensure that exiled Pelagians did not establish themselves among the Irish Christians. This is where Henry gets his information for DA concerning St Germanus’ possible connection to Patrick. We should not forget that this similarity of conflationary material in the construction of a legend smacks of ‘Geoffrey’s’ similar methods in HRB.

In author B’s lifetime, who was the first to write a Life of Dunstan, there was a Patrick myth, so it may have substance: now Irish pilgrims, like men of other races, felt special affection for Glastonbury, not least out of their desire to honour the ‘elder’ St Patrick, who is said to have died there happily in the Lord.

In the GP, William of Malmesbury had expressed his view that the first founder of Glastonbury was King Ina, acting under the advice of St Aldhelm, written when William had visited Glastonbury before Henry’s arrival. A similar statement is found in GR1. The relics of Benignus and Indract were recognised as genuine, but William in GP was sceptical of St Patrick’s relics residing at Glastonbury and allows the possibility of Patrick’s return after his Irish mission just as Henry in his interpolation reiterates. In William’s VP according to Leland, supposedly Patrick ‘came to Glastonbury, and having become a monk and abbot there, after some years
yielded to nature’. He then follows on with the assertion: any hesitation about this statement is dispelled by a vision of one of the monks. This seems to me that Leland is sourcing what Henry had written about Patrick in DA not William’s life of St Patrick. If Henry can write a life of Gildas, he can also write a life of Patrick.

In William’s VD: Irishmen frequented the place in great numbers; men with a wide range of expertise, who had mastered the liberal arts fully. Wishing to give themselves over to philosophy more completely, they had abandoned their native soil, rejected all family ties and made their way to Glastonbury, led on by love of their preacher, Patrick, whose mortal remains are held to have lain buried there from time immemorial.

If William did believe that Patrick’s relics resided at Glastonbury it was probably down to pressure from the monks, but we cannot say if he recorded it based on previous author’s testimony or the monks’ firm belief or whether he believed it himself…. or that he even wrote the life of Patrick. Author B struggled to rationalise Patrick’s existence with a Patricius ‘senior’ and ‘Junioris’ and expected contention on the issue: but if my writings are refuted and scorned by the envious rejection of the jealous. There is just no way to tell if there is any truth that St Patrick was at Glastonbury before Henry Blois took up the mantle to establish it as fact…. based upon what seems to be a flimsy foundation.

Chapter 9. The charter of St Patrick.

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I Patrick, the humble servant of God, in the year of His Incarnation 430, was sent into Ireland by the most holy Pope Celestine, and by God’s grace converted the Irish to the way of truth; and, when I had established them in the Catholic faith, at length I returned to Britain, and, as I believe, by the guidance of God, who is the life and the way, I chanced upon the isle of Ynswytrin, (Insulam Ynsgytrin) wherein I found a place holy and ancient, chosen and sanctified by God in honour of Mary the pure Virgin, the Mother of God: and there I found certain brethren imbued with the rudiments of the Catholic faith, and of pious conversation, who were successors of the disciples of St Phagan and St Deruvian, whose names for the merit of their lives I verily believe are written in heaven: and because the righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance, since tenderly I loved those brethren, I have thought good to record their names in this my writing.
And they are these: Brumban, Hyregaan, Brenwal, Wencreth, Bamtonmeweng, Adelwalred, Lothor, Wellias, Breden, Swelwes, Hin Loernius, and another Hin. These men, being of noble birth and wishing to crown their nobleness with deeds of faith, had chosen to lead a hermit’s life; and when I found them meek and gentle, I chose to be in low estate with them, rather than to dwell in Kings’ palaces. And since we were all of one heart and one mind, we chose to dwell together, and eat and drink in common, and sleep in the same house.

And so they set me, though unwilling, at their head: for indeed ‘I was not worthy to unloose the latchet of their shoes’. And, when we were thus leading the monastic life according to the pattern of the approved fathers, the brothers showed me writings of St Phagan and St Deruvian, wherein it was contained that twelve disciples of St Philip and St James had built that Old Church in honour of our Patroness aforesaid, instructed thereto by the blessed archangel Gabriel.

And further, that the Lord from heaven had dedicated that same church in honour of His Mother: and that to those twelve, three pagan Kings had granted, for their sustenance, twelve portions of land. Moreover in more recent writings I found that St Phagan and St Deruvian had obtained from Pope Eleutherius, who had sent them, ten years of indulgence. And I, brother Patrick, in my time obtained twelve years from Pope Celestine of pious memory.

Now after some time had passed I took with me my brother Wellias and with great difficulty we climbed up through the dense wood to the summit of the mount, which stands forth in that island (Glastonbury Tor). And when we were come there we saw an ancient oratory, well-nigh ruined, yet fitting for Christian devotion and, as it appeared to me, chosen by God. And when we entered therein we were filled with so sweet an odour that we believed ourselves to be set in the beauty of Paradise. So then we went out and went in again, and searched the whole place diligently; and we found a volume in which were written Acts of Apostles along with Acts and Deeds of St Phagan.

---

655HRB IV, viii. The name of the King’s nephew was Hyreglas; who in HRB X,v. just happens to be Hireglas of Periron the nephew of Bedevere. ‘Periron’, I conclude, is the river Parrett near Glastonbury upon which Henry built a mill and he also had a White horse, hence we see in a Merlin prophecy:

An old man, moreover, snowy white, sitting upon a snow-white horse, shall turn side the river of Pereiron and with a white wand shall measure out a mill thereon in HRB VII, iii.
and St Deruvian. It was in great part destroyed, but at the end thereof, we found a writing which said that St Phagan and St Deruvian, by revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ had built that oratory in honour of St Michael the archangel,\(^{656}\) that he should have honour there from men, who at God's bidding was to introduce men to everlasting honour. And since that writing pleased us much, we sought to read it to the end. For that same writing said that the venerable Phagan and Deruvian abode there for nine years, and that they had also obtained indulgence of thirty years for all Christian folk who visit that place, with pious intent, for the honour of the blessed Michael. Having found therefore this great treasure of divine goodness, I and brother Wellias fasted three months, engaged in prayer and watching, and controlling the demons and beasts that in divers forms appeared. And on a certain night, when I had given myself to sleep, the Lord Jesus appeared to me in a vision, saying Patrick, my servant, know that I have chosen this place to the honour of My name, and that here men should honourably invoke the aid of My archangel Michael. And this shall be a sign to thee, and to thy brethren, that they also may believe: thy left arm shall wither, till thou hast told what thou hast seen to thy brethren which are in the cell below, and art come hither again. And so it came to pass. From that day we appointed that two brethren should be there continually, unless the pastors in the future should for just cause determine otherwise.

Now to Arnulf and Ogmar, Irish brethren who had come with me from Ireland, because at my request they were the first to make their humble dwelling at that oratory, I have entrusted this present writing, keeping another like unto it in a chest at St Mary's as a memorial for those who shall come after. And I Patrick, by counsel of my brethren, concede a hundred days of pardon to all who shall, with pious intent, cut down with axe and hatchet the wood on every side of the mount aforesaid, that there may be an easier approach for Christian men who shall make pious visit to the church of the Blessed perpetual Virgin and the aforesaid oratory.

\(^{656}\)It is worth noting for those sceptics who deny there is an alignment of Churches along the St Michael Line i.e. the line which starts at Avebury and runs to St Michael’s mount in Cornwall, which Melkin directs us to bifurcate; that both Glastonbury tor and St Michael’s Mount were both dedicated to Michael already at the time of the Norman invasion. Henry Blois here, as the inventor of the St Patrick charter, re-iterates this fact. This is the alignment (meridianum Anglum) to which Melkin expects us to bifurcate within the circle of Avebury (sperula) at an angle of 13 degrees; and extend a line for 104 miles south (through Montacute) to locate an Island.
Postscript:

That these things were truly so, we have proved by the testimony of a very ancient writing, as well as by the traditions of our elders. And so this saint aforesaid, who is the Apostle of the Irish and the first abbot in the Isle of Avalon, after he had duly instructed these brethren in rule and discipline, and had sufficiently enriched that place with lands and possessions by the gift of Kings and princes, when some years were past yielded to nature, and had his rightful burial, by the showing of an angel, and by the flashing from the spot of a great flame in sight of all who were there present, in the Old Church on the right hand of the altar.

J. Arimatage Robinson’s dating of the St Patrick charter to 1220 is unfounded and is based on the train of false a priori we have discussed already. There is simply no bone fide reason to believe this is a construct made in 1220 simply because Wellias’s name is employed. It must be understood that initially Henry Blois concerned himself with establishing the authenticity of the 601 charter by claiming Ineswitrin was in fact synonymous with Glastonbury. Only later, post 1158 when he manufactured the grave site for Arthur did he change his propagandist intent to make Glastonbury appear as synonymous with Avalon which name he had invented in HRB as Arthur’s last recorded location.

Supposedly, in Patrick’s own words in the St Patrick charter ‘I came to the island of Ineswitrin’, wholly implicates Henry Blois as author as it is he who convinces us of Glastonbury’s synonymy with this name in Life of Gildas. He is the one person who carries out the substitution of Ineswitrin

657 It is a little known fact that when the Saxons invaded the Britons the Invaders called them the wealas - an Old English word meaning slave or foreigner. This is probably the root of the name found on the 28 foot pyramid related in Malmesbury’s unadulterated text and may be the source for Henry’s muses to connect this name on the ‘piramide’ Weaslieas to his Wellias from Wells. The taller, which is nearer the church, has five tiers, and is 28 feet high. It threatens to collapse from old age, but still displays some ancient features, which can be deciphered though they can no longer be fully understood. In the uppermost tier is the figure habited like a Bishop, in the second one like a King in state, and the inscription ‘Here are Sexi and Bliswerh’. In the third too are names, Wencrest Bantomp, and Winethegn. In the fourth, Bate, Wulfred and Eanfled. In the fifth, which is the lowest, is a figure, and this inscription: ‘Logwor Weaslieas and Bregden, Swelwes, Hiwingendes, Bearn
for Avalon in the Melkin Prophecy\textsuperscript{658} (as we know the prophecy data applies
to Burgh Island). Henry Blois corroborates Ineswitrin’s association with
Glastonbury in the last paragraph of \textit{Life of Gildas} and here in the Saint
Patrick Charter for consistency; but also letting us know it is called Avalon
in the consolidating postscript in DA which would not have accompanied
the St Patrick charter when presented at Rome.

We should not consider that the part played by Phagan and Deruvian in
the St Patrick charter was thought about by some other than Henry Blois or
at a much later date as Robinson suggests.\textsuperscript{659} I, frankly, can see no reason
for its invention given its substance other than to strengthen the case at
Rome for Henry. The postscript was added to DA later in Henry’s final
consolidation post 1158.

Scott’s assessment of the date of the charter is based upon the misguided
deduction that the point of the reference in the charter to the keeping of
two copies is indicative of a date of composition after the fire.

More probably, it is the apologetic explanation for why it is found at
Glastonbury abbey among its muniments. Firstly, because the oratory on
the tor had been destroyed or fallen into disrepair. Secondly to excuse the
charter’s sudden appearance and the fact that a copy was being presented.
Henry in Rome probably maintained the Patrick charter would have been
found by William and thus its inclusion in DA. Maybe it was presented
separately.

I do not agree with Scott’s claim that the charter was written post 1184
and would have been fabricated to counter Osbern’s claim. Scott’s theory is
based upon the fact that the postscript says Patrick was the first abbot of
Avalon. Osbern’s claim that Dunstan was the first Abbot of Glastonbury was
made before 1090 so I very much doubt St Patrick’s charter solved that issue
which in effect Henry Blois had already solved by interpolating GR3 and
DA. William of Malmesbury’s DA (excluding St Patrick charter) deals
adequately with Osbern’s claim so why invent a charter post 1184.

The postscript to the St Patrick charter in DA was indeed written by
Henry Blois. The Charter may have existed (in gold letters) as a separate

\textsuperscript{658} At the time (post 1158), when the substitution of the name was carried out on the Melkin Prophecy, ineswitrin
had no importance in establishing the 601 charter as authentic.

\textsuperscript{659} Robinson’s assumption is largely based on the mention of Wellias, which, as we have covered, could be a
later interpolation, but could just as well be Henry providing the eponym for Wells nearby. Also, Robinson
thinks Avalon is established by the appearance at Glastonbury of the leaden cross like most other commentators.
document, fabricated for the perusal of papal authorities in 1149. It may have been added in DA in 1149.

The fact that Henry Blois’ second agenda was the creation of Avalon at Glastonbury indicates Henry’s inclusion of the charter written into DA post 1158 as part of his consolidation representing the bogus document (in gold lettering) word for word which had been used as a separate document earlier. Of course, the exposed Glastonbury Tor never had trees on it and it is just another gambit by Henry (as he does throughout HRB) to provide an incidental explanation, that since antiquity, the trees on the tor have been chopped on account of the ease of access for the pious. Also, it is a clever gambit on Henry’s behalf to invent the fact that the charter was found along with the deeds and Acts of the Apostles. There is simply no limit to the inventiveness of Henry’s muses.

The St Patrick charter, in effect (pre-Joseph lore) provides myth of the foundation story of the abbey and splices well with HRB’s mention of the preachers names. The brief references to Patrick by author B adds credence to the concocted charter. So, I would conclude that the St Patrick charter dates to 1149 and the mention of Wellias (which in effect establishes little for any interpolator concerned with Wells) is purely coincidental because (as we know from HRB), Henry is very keen on eponyms.

I cannot see how Patrick and Wellias as contemporaries, strengthens to any relevant degree the point of the entire interpolation of the charter, or Glastonbury’s case against the intrusion of the Bishop of Wells. It rather just highlights that Henry’s position is that Patrick must have been at Glastonbury as Wells is not so far away. The town nearby (Henry would have us believe) is obviously named after Wellias. Therefore, we are supposed to think that, because of the eponym, the St Patrick charter should be the more believed as genuine.

As I have already said, the postscript to chapter 9 is not part of the charter and would be part of Henry’s later consolidation when the conversion of Avalon to Glastonbury became the thrust of Henry’s second agenda post 1158. If Henry had not been the author of HRB, I too would say that the Patrick charter by its inclusion of Wellias seems to be an interpolation connected with the contention with Savaric, but again, we have the reasoning behind Caradoc’s etymology to consider if the charter was presented before the postscript was added to it in DA.
Henry may have provided evidence that the missionaries Phagan and Deruvian were also connected to the old minster at Winchester to which Rudborne also attests. Maybe Henry thinks if Glastonbury shows an early date of foundation by association with Phagan and Deruvian, it would follow that Winchester, which plays a prominent part in HRB, must also have been established by these first missionaries of Eleutherius. We do not know if Rudborne’s information is true and where Henry got their names from or they too went into Winchester lore from mention in HRB. The fact Phagan and Deruvian stayed in Glastonbury for nine years is just extraneous incidental detail meant to add flesh to the concoction.

Thus we have in HRB: *At last, when everything had been thus ordained new, the prelates returned to Rome and besought the most blessed Pope to confirm the ordinances they had made. And when the confirmation had been duly granted they returned into Britain with a passing great company of others, by the teaching of whom the nation of the British was in a brief space established in the Christian faith. Their names and acts are to be found recorded in the book that Gildas wrote as concerning the victory of Aurelius Ambrosius, the which he hath handled in a treatise so luminous as that in no-wise is there any need to write it new in a meaner style.*

Henry knows Phagan and Deruvian are not mentioned in Gildas’ work and we know Henry has read Gildas as it is a source in the composition of HRB. Henry, who is the advocator of Nennius’ work having been written by Gildas does mention Eleutherius, but not obviously Phagan and Deruvian.

Why Henry chose to use Patrick was evident through author B’s *senioris, junioris* testimony. The rationale was that the charter would be accepted as a charter of St Patrick, which had been located by William in his endeavours to elucidate Glastonbury’s antiquity. That St Patrick was the first abbot and St Benignus his pupil was the second is a Henry myth. Even

---
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661 In Nennius, it states that: *After the birth of Christ, one hundred and sixty seven years, King Lucius with all the chiefs of the British people received baptism in consequence of a legation sent by the Roman emperors and Pope (Evaristus) Eleutherius.* This is obviously lifted from Bede’s mistaken identity of Lucius. Now, If we remember Henry’s penchant for purposefully changing the spelling of names to give the air of inaccuracy over time (because the first year of Evaristus was A.D. 79), and couple this with my suspicion and wavering position of certain interpolations into Nennius….. one can only be very suspicious at the appearance of a Legate in 167 AD. A *Legatus* is a general officer of the ancient Roman army drawn from among the senatorial class. A Papal Legate is a messenger from the Holy See, which we know was not sending out legates in 167 AD. We are still no clearer on the subject of interpolation in Nennius given Henry’s obvious attempts in HRB to have us believe Nennius’ work was written by Gildas.
Ralph Higden questioned it in the fourteenth century supposing that there had been some confusion with a later Patrick. I would assume a tomb marked with the name Patrick existed and possibly is the reason why the myth existed about St Patrick’s burial at Glastonbury which author B relates.

The choice of content by Henry in the ‘St. Patrick’ charter\(^\text{662}\) is a means of propaganda and should come as no surprise given Henry’s aims in substantiating Glastonbury’s antiquity. What appears at first glance is a strange choice of focus (the St. Michael church) may indeed have deeper reasons. What may have happened is that the 601 charter which named Ineswitrin as the island being donated to the old church; it may have been called into question and as an effect caused the focus on the tor (as being separate from Glastonbury abbey’s Old Church).

The objection or suspicion may have been that in GR1 King Ine had founded Glastonbury. By the miraculous discovery of a charter which fortuitously had been duplicated and had been discovered by ‘William’.... it could now be argued that ‘William’ could hold the positions held in his GR3 (or at least that was the argument to be presented at Rome); even though William is made to seem ignorant of the preachers names (saying they had been lost in time) before the advent of the newer additions.

We need to understand the Vulgate HRB as being different from a First Variant.... and also to grasp the development of the *Primary Historia* into the First Variant, by assessing EAW’s evidence in the many variations of storyline in which it differs from Vulgate.

Henry of Huntingdon hearing for the first time the names of the two preachers who brought the word of God to Lucius would surely mention them by name as in HRB: *forasmuch as the blessed Pontiff, finding that his devotion was such, sent unto him two most religious doctors, Pagan and

\(^{662}\) The consensus of modern scholarship is that with the mention of Wellias as part of the narrative, the charter must be a product of the Savaric dispute. The death of Robert of Lewes as Bishop of Bath is the root cause of future conflict where a good relation had always previously been maintained between him and Henry Blois. Robert died in 1166 and Henry soon after in 1171. Conventionally, the Glastonbury monastery, like most others, was subject to the diocese. After the death of the bishop of Bath the contention appeared. Robert of Lewes was indebted to Henry Blois for his position and he worked with Henry for the benefit of Glastonbury. At the death of Henry Blois the interference started. For nearly fifty years Glastonbury had been run under the auspices of the Bishop of Winchester and it was rich pickings for Savaric.
Duvian, who, preaching unto him the Incarnation of the Word of God, did wash him in holy baptism and converted him unto Christ.663

If their names had been incorporated into the copy of Primary Historia found in 1139 they would be in EAW. We can see Henry Blois has conferred great status upon them in Vulgate HRB: The blessed doctors, therefore, when they had purged away the paganism of well-nigh the whole island....

This one fact above any other of the variations in storyline (considering Henry’s activities recorded by chroniclers) shows that Huntingdon has a different version from the Vulgate.664 The only reason scholars holds the view that Huntingdon’s summary is a summary of the Vulgate is because even though the differences in storyline are glaring, they have no way of reconciling the differences holding the a priori that the First Variant is by another author or it was composed after the Vulgate. Add to this their deductions being swayed by the dates of the dedicatees. In the end their logic is: why advocate a different volume if the dates of the dedicatees fit even witnessing the glaring differences in EAW.

We know Henry wrote Primary Historia initially as a composite of the pseudo-history of Britain destined originally for Matilda.... and the chivalric Arthuriana was an addition in 1137-38 after having been in Wales in 1136. Huntingdon found Primary Historia in January 1139. On 1st of March 1139 Henry is made Legate because he had complained to the pope because he had been the Archbishop of Canterbury in waiting. It is not by chance that Severus becomes a Legate in HRB, when before (unless Huntingdon was vastly mistaken), he was earlier an ‘Emperor’- Imperator in Huntingdon’s EAW before Henry’s appointment: When these tidings were brought unto Rome, the Senate sent as legate, Severus the senator and two legions. The prophecies were never a part of the Primary Historia. As I have already pointed out, many ‘experts’ believe the prophecies were a part of the 1139 manuscript, even though Huntingdon’s précis of the Primary Historia in EAW supposedly omits mention of the prophecies and ‘overlooks’ any allusion to the character of Merlin. So, we have to see now why Phagan and Deruvian are employed in First Variant not Primary Historia.

---
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664 Scholarship’s view is erroneous in its belief that First Variant followed Vulgate. It is also misguided in its view that Merlin and his prophecies were present in the copy found at Bec and it is an assumption that any mention of Merlin and his prophecies were purposefully omitted by Huntingdon in EAW; considering the two storylines to Stonehenge.
The *Primary Historia* is the first version not a variant. Even Crick\(^{665}\) comments that if the section on Vortigern, which in effect introduces the prophecies of Merlin by including the reasoning behind Geoffrey’s intermission i.e. by means of the dedicatory letter to Alexander…. ‘could be omitted without disrupting the flow of the narrative’.\(^{666}\) To concede such a glaring point and not recognise that Merlin and the prophecies are not mentioned by Huntingdon’s EAW is a rationalised position rather than a logical deduction. Crick, like Carley, forces the pieces together with her assumption that Vulgate HRB was found at Bec instead of a version she has not even contemplated (which I have called *Primary Historia*), which, by the briefest analysis of EAW, can be seen to differ widely from Vulgate; even by Huntingdon’s short précis.

Yet, in an unperturbed and seamless way, Huntingdon continues his narrative through the very point where the Merlin saga is inserted in HRB; and where Merlin’s prophecies are integrated with Vortigern\(^{667}\) and the passage which inspired Henry’s introduction of Merlin and the two Dragons. The irony is that Huntingdon is completely ignorant that his own patron Alexander is going to be the dedicatee of the Merlin insertion after 1148; after both Huntingdon and Bishop Alexander have died.

The last version of the Prophecies were partly intended to unseat Henry II by inciting rebellion and so it was expedient that ‘Geoffrey’ was created retrospectively to establish his ‘Welshness’ from Monmouth rather than the anonymous Galfridus Arthur.\(^{668}\) Henry of Huntingdon, unsuspecting that the *Primary Historia* is written by Henry Blois signs off on EAW even giving Galfridus Artur a commendation: *These are the matters I promised you in brief. If you would like them at length, you should ask Geoffrey Arthur’s great book, which I discovered at Le Bec. There you will find a careful and comprehensive treatment of the above. Farewell.*

\(^{665}\) Julia Crick, HRB, dissemination and reception in the later middle ages. P.17

\(^{666}\) Crick p.18 also comments that ‘many copies were in circulation during Geoffrey’s lifetime’. It is ironic that even if Geoffrey had lived in reality, virtually no copies circulated until after 1155. The completion of the Vulgate and introduction of the updated prophecies, where we witness the ‘sixth invading Ireland’ prophecy, transpired after 1155.

\(^{667}\) All of this is prompted and inspired from Nennius’s boy Ambrose and the two serpents as witnessed in chapter 42 of Nennius

\(^{668}\) Galfridus Arthur’s association with the Welsh is that Henry located Arthur’s utopian court at Caerleon and this is why Alfred of Beverley thinks he is a ‘Britannicus’. Also ‘Geoffrey’s’ association with Ralf in the charters came from Monmouth also. Only after these charters were tampered with, did ‘Geoffrey’ have his provenance from Monmouth written into the Vulgate.
So, getting back to DA; in the Patrick charter, Henry leaves out Lucius’ name, but, because of the mistake Bede makes (who is then followed by Nennius), Lucius is automatically accepted as the King who was posited by Henry Blois himself in HRB as the King of Britain at the time of Severus; as Severus was Roman Emperor from 193 to 211 (which is close enough for ‘Geoffrey’). It is remarkable that Henry wove a mistake by Bede into HRB and the person of Lucius became an integral part of his pseudo-history and is the cause of the arrival of the fictitious Phagan and Deruvian in the St Patrick charter.

The Eleutherius episode is entirely void of anything to do with British history as Bede had mistakenly understood Britanio for Britio. As I mentioned already, the King of Birtha was in fact a Lucius Aelius Megas Abgar. We might suggest that since Bede referred his book to papal authorities for approval, there may well have been some purposeful misguidance, which, ultimately pretends Roman proselytization of Britain where none existed prior to their propaganda... in referring a gullible Bede to the Liber Pontificalis.

The inspiration of Henry’s Avalon in HRB becoming synonymous with Glastonbury occurred when Henry’s second agenda formed in his mind after 1158. So, chapter 2 of DA entitled ‘How the saints Phagan and Deruvian converted the Britons to the faith and came to the island of Avalon’; we may understand as a consolidation of his previous propaganda to the new.

Lucius and Phagan and Deruvian again feature in Chapter 33 of DA under the title: On the Kings, abbots and other founders of the church of Glastonbury, arranged chronologically. This chapter in effect ties together the sequence of twelve disciples of St. Philip who came to Britain, followed by Phagan and Deruvian, and followed by their distant successor Patrick.

Henry Blois is an extremely clever interpolator, but the evidence shows through Huntingdon’s précis that HRB went through a transitional evolution. The same applies for DA as it is clear that Joseph lore was the last to be added and was added after Henry had promulgated Grail stories.

The scenario is all the more believable because the St. Patrick charter was seemingly uncovered in recent research by the well-known and conscientious historian named William of Malmesbury.

Perhaps, the first fraudulently interpolated apostolic evidence of foundation, where metropolitan was actually granted in 1144, was deemed too tentative by an unsympathetic pope on the second request for
metropolitan status. The Patrick charter itself provides the bogus account of how it was that a manuscript which Patrick himself purportedly discovered, related the events of the early foundation by Phagan and Deruvian which transpired at Glastonbury: *In addition I discovered in a more recent document that saints Phagan and Deruvian had petitioned Pope Eleutherius who had granted them an indulgence of ten years....*  

It seems likely, judging by the postscript to the St Patrick charter, that the charter was a faked ancient document presented separately from DA at Rome which Henry later added into the text of DA with the additional postscript: *That these things were truly so, we have proved by the testimony of a very ancient writing.....*

St David’s ring had been found miraculously by Henry Blois himself at Glastonbury. St. David (we are supposed to believe) who had been Archbishop of Caerleon, in the city of Menevia had his own abbey, founded by the blessed Patrick who had even foretold of St. David’s nativity as narrated in HRB: *At that time also died David, that most holy Archbishop of Caerleon, in the city of Menevia, within his own abbey, which he loved above all the other monasteries of his diocese, for that it was founded by the blessed Patrick who had foretold his nativity.*

We can understand that pope Lucius II granted a metropolitan to Henry on the basis of the interpolations in William of Malmesbury’s DA which was mainly centred upon the apostolic foundation, the GR 3 version B interpolations, along with Caradoc’s evidence which puts Gildas at Glastonbury and backed up the 601 charter. The First Variant version of HRB was obviously a great aid to presenting a pre-Augustinian Christian history at Winchester. At the second attempt, where the pope was less receptive, more guile was employed fabricating further evidence. Hence the

---

669 The question of Indulgences has been investigated by Dr. H. C. Lea in his work on Auricular Confession. The earliest grant which he can point to as indisputably genuine is that made by Urban II at the dedication of the church of St Nicholas at Angers in 1096 AD: it gave one month’s relaxation of enjoined penance for the anniversary. At the dedication of Cluny in 1132, Innocent II granted 40 days for the anniversary. There is a grant by the papal legate, Peter of Cluny, to Westminster in 1121: this gave relaxation of 40 days of *criminalia* and a third of enjoined penance for *minora* to those who visited the church on the festival of the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul. In Dr. Lea’s list we find that in 1163 Alexander III, in dedicating *S. Germain des Prés*, granted a year on the actual occasion and 20 days for the anniversary. Henry saw the advantage of indulgences, but his grants provided by St Phagan and St Deruvian make these other genuine dispensations fade into insignificance with ten years.
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St Patrick charter. Bede’s introduction of the mistaken Eleutherius story which was recycled in the *Primary Historia*, then has the preachers introduced and named in the First Variant.... and then probably a Charter of St Patrick (a copy in gold) was used in conjunction with DA.

Coincidentally, it should be remembered that pope Lucius II also dispatched a papal legate, Igmarus (or Hincmar), to England, charged to investigate the request of Bernard, Bishop of St David’s, (who was a friend of Henry’s), who also was petitioning to elevate his see to the rank of metropolitan. Henry had tried to help Bernard by foreseeing the Pall being returned when he constructed the prophecies as well as affirming credence to his position that the metropolitan had existed in Caerleon previously. Also Igmarus the legate took with him the Pallium to William, Archbishop of York who was Henry Blois’ and Stephen’s Nephew as I have covered. This may indeed be part of the reasoning behind HRB’s glorification of St. David’s on account that both Henry and Bernard were after the same thing.671

Henry’s additions into DA which contained his first agenda would have been started soon after William’s death in 1143 when he lost the legation; not forgetting Henry was the person who had paid William of Malmesbury and had the only copy of DA. As Scott concedes, the DA, when handed to Henry Blois, was minus most of the first 34-5 chapters.

Pope Innocent died on September 24th, 1143 along with Henry’s power as Legate. Archbishop Theobald having endured being subordinate to the bishop of Winchester in many respects while he called legatine councils at will, beat Henry to Rome and became the next legate to avoid the previous slight to his authority over the English church. Since Henry had lost the legation to Theobald through pope Celestine, he was dreaming up ways to overcome his predicament.

This set of twelfth century circumstances is one of the chance reasons that the DA and Glastonbury legends first evolved through Henry’s initial interpolations in DA. Henry had already written the *Primary Historia*; he was without influence with his brother and had been denied the legation.... as John of Hexham records about Celestine ‘a man of great age... had been educated amongst the inhabitants of Anjou, and designed to strengthen their

---

671 It must not be forgotten that at this stage the *Primary Historia* was written by Galfriedus Arthur initially, not Geoffreyc of Monmouth who was miraculously to become Bishop of Asaph, but only after he had been consigned to death by Henry Blois.
hands by the abasement of King Stephen; on which ground he was exited to a
dislike of Henry Bishop of Winchester.\textsuperscript{672}

Theobald of Bec’s legation was brief because pope Celestine died on
March 9\textsuperscript{th} 1144. Theobald then waited in Rome hoping to be reinstated after
such a short period. But instead Henry Blois was cordially received by the
next pope but was not re-assigned as legate. Considering the rapidity with
which popes were changing, Henry obtained his goal and was granted the
metropolitan for Winchester.

However, the formalities were not concluded and Lucius II died on
February 15\textsuperscript{th} 1148. The new pope was a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux, a
Cistercian who hated Henry Blois with a vengeance. Eugenius III who, as we
have covered, described Henry as ‘a man who could mislead two Kingdom’s
with his tongue’, now refused to grant the metropolitan status of
Winchester. This I believe is a fair account and explanation of how Henry’s
first agenda which is relevant to the two attempts reflects firstly the
apostolic fabricated interpolations in DA and secondly the Phagan and
Dervuvian foundation found in the Charter of St Patrick; both in direct
relationship to Henry’s attempt for metropolitan.

Chapter 10. On the death of St Patrick.

Patrick died at the age of 111 in 472 AD, which was the 47th year after he
had been sent to Ireland. If he was indeed born in 361 and was sent to Ireland
in 425, this took place when he was 64; and he converted the Irish to the faith
of Christ in 433. When he eventually returned to Britain he remained on the
island of Avalon for 39 years leading the best possible life. Then he rested at
the right hand side of the altar in the church for many years, 710 in fact until
the fire in that church, whereupon his body was placed in a stone piramide,
near the altar to the South and the diligence of the inmates of the house later
ensured that this was nobly covered in gold and silver out of reverence for the
saint.

Henry’s entire pseudo-history is based on conflation and blurred
anachronisms and Henry Blois, as witnessed in HRB, does not ‘do’ dates.
The person who wrote the brief insert of chapter 10 is Scott’s consolidating
author who is attempting to rationalise for his readers the chronology of St
Patrick with known history. Obviously from the previous postscript where

\textsuperscript{672} John of Hexam chap 22
Patrick is called the first Abbot of the island of Avalon, Scott’s consolidating author follows the acceptance of the conversion myth of Avalon into Glastonbury created by Henry.

He accounts the years until the movement of the relics on account of the fire sometime post 1184. The collection or invention of relics was a commercial necessity for religious houses. Taking into account Henry’s own interest in relic collection at Glastonbury, it seems obvious that he knew Arthur’s bones would be exhumed at some date to be given a more sanctified resting place within the church. Henry Blois went to the trouble of making a non-corrosive leaden cross which, when found, would establish the existence of his alter ego in Avalon. At the discovery of a body of Arthur with Guinevere, his pseudo-history would be accounted history. No other than Henry manufactured Arthur’s grave, given we have established that Henry is author of HRB and William of Malmesbury does not know where Arthur is buried when writing GR1. However, given author B’s uncertainty about whether the rumours were true about St Patrick’s relics lying at Glastonbury, it would be fair to assume, if any grave existed with the name Patrick on it, Henry Blois would have secured it as St Patrick’s relics.

We can assume there was no previous legend of St Patrick because Osbern would never have said Dunstan was the first Abbot if there was any definitive previous lore concerning Patrick at Glastonbury. This surely also would have been mentioned in Eadmer’s invective against the invention of false claims about the housing of relics.

Chapter 11. A vision of St Patrick

Long after the death of the blessed St Patrick, when the question often arose whether he had been a monk and Abbot there, all doubt was eliminated by the vision of a certain brother whose memory had grown shaky after the blessed man’s death so that he continually asked himself whether it had been so or not. It was confirmed by the following Oracle. When he had sunk into sleep and he seemed to hear someone who was reciting the saints miracles at these words: ‘therefore this man was distinguished with the holiness of the Metropolitan Pall; and later he became a monk and Abbot.’ He added too that he would show what he had said written down in letters of gold for anyone who did not completely believe it.
Scott\textsuperscript{673} indicates that chapter 11 of DA identifies Glastonbury with Avalon. His notion is based upon the postscript to the St Patrick charter without realizing that at one stage Henry Blois had concocted a charter, but at a later date he had added the charter itself and its postscript into DA. So, in effect it is part of the myth that makes Glastonbury synonymous with Avalon, but the postscript was added into DA following a copy of the charter and both were fabricated by Henry Blois at separate times.

In chapter 11, Henry Blois attempts to eliminate the suspicion that St Patrick might not have been associated with Glastonbury. In effect, the chapter establishes that ‘Archbishop’ Patrick became abbot of Glastonbury and by association \textit{distinguished with the holiness of the Metropolitan Pall} the monastery at Glastonbury. Certainly no consolidating author is interested in establishing any notion of a metropolitan pall being possessed by an abbot of Glastonbury except Henry Blois.

What is interesting though is Henry’s clever strategy of faking the St. Patrick charter. The 601 charter was ancient, the Devonian King’s \textit{flourit} barely legible, having been obliterated by time. Concerning the St Patrick charter, if one was to pretend another hundred and fifty years of antiquation on top of that…. it would be very difficult to forge a convincing document for consideration which did not appear to be a fake. This is the precise reason we have this explanation of how there was in existence a St Patrick’s charter composed in gold lettering which did not obviously corrode or become illegible over time. I would imagine the charter was fabricated by Henry and the gullible contemporary’s (and us in posterity) are led to believe this charter in gold letters miraculously conveyed St Patrick’s words through time and gave evidence of Phagan and Deruvian’s foundation myth \textit{for anyone who did not completely believe it}.

One should consider the cleverness of constructing such an elaborate mechanism, by which, Henry has thought out the possible way of convincing others how this new information had come to light. He used William as the discoverer of the gold lettered charter and who would doubt such a conscientious historian; especially, if the charter was in evidence.

Henry goes further back in history to establish erroneous lore because ‘supposedly’ Patrick is conveying the words of Phagan and Deruvian (which they had written in a book found in the chapel at the top of Glastonbury tor)

\textsuperscript{673} The early history of Glastonbury, p. 191 note 36
which takes the myth right back to the apostolic era in that they had ‘re-discovered’ an already existing church in 167 their supposed era. The convolution in establishing this myth in the twelfth century without previous lore bares witness to Henry’s inventive genius. These are not the efforts of Scott’s consolidating author, who, in effect, is confuting contrary arguments to the likely hood of St Patrick ‘returning’ to England... as he concerns himself with twisting the story to fit the known dates.

Thus, we hear of St Patrick’s unlikely 111 year age at death. The consolidating monk writes after the fire in 1184 and is solely interested in establishing Glastonbury’s claim of housing the St Patrick relics and their appearance (since author B’s period) in the new building.

Chapter 12. On St Indract and St Bridget.

Hence the custom developed among the Irish of visiting that place to kiss the relics of their patron. Whence the well-known story that St Indract and the blessed St Bridget, prominent citizens of that land, once frequented the place. They say that after St Bridget, who had come there in 488 AD, had tarried for some time on the island of Beckery, she returned home but left behind certain of her ornaments, namely a bag, a necklace, a small bell and weaving implements, which are still preserved there in memory of her. As our pen has recorded elsewhere, St Indract and his companions were martyred and buried there. Later he was translated by King Ine from his place of martyrdom into the church of Glastonbury.

In chapter 12 of DA, Henry includes the first sentence just to re-iterate author B’s words, which is probably the earliest propaganda recorded at Glastonbury: Now Irish pilgrims, like men of other races, felt special affection for Glastonbury, not least out of their desire to honour the ‘elder’ St Patrick, who is said to have died there happily in the Lord. As we have covered already, we can tell the entire proposition of Saint Patrick at Glastonbury is flimsy and we can see the discrepancy of a senior and junior Patrick as a device used to possibly explain things in author B’s era. Some have suggested Dunstan himself was the first propagator of the myth of St Patrick at Glastonbury and someone in author B’s era tries to rationalise the mistaken identity of a Patrick at Glastonbury. We have no reason to doubt the authenticity of St Indract at Glastonbury. Henry just surreptitiously
connects St Bridget and Indract as historically real to the myth of Patrick by association. It sounds highly dubious that a bag and necklace would have come down from the fifth to the twelfth century, so I would propose that these objects were more recent to associate St Bridget with the abbey.

Chapter 13. On St Benignus.

In 460 AD. St Benignus came to Glastonbury. He was a disciple of St Patrick and the third to succeed him in his Irish see, as their ‘acts’ attest. Admonished by an Angel, he forsook his homeland and the dignity of his episcopate in accordance with a vow and undertook a voluntary pilgrimage which led him under God's guidance, to Glastonbury where he found St Patrick. How much favour he found with God is revealed by many signs and miracles; witness the marks of his presence deal at Meare, the broad expanse of water granted at his prayers and the huge leafy tree that flourished from his withered staff. After endless struggles on the island he came to a blessed end and after many years had passed in 1091 AD he was translated to Glastonbury with honour.

We can see the only person interested in building a case for St Patrick at Glastonbury is Henry Blois because it is he who invented the charter. St Patrick at Glastonbury is doubtful in reality, yet there were rumours and St Patrick was ‘said’ to be buried there, but it all seems controversial and dubious. An account of St Patrick which attempts to bring him in to close association with Glastonbury would be made all the more credible if Saint Benignus of Armagh (d. 467, a known associate), was also brought into the concocted myth. St Benignus was the son of an Irish chieftain in Ireland. He was baptized into the Catholic faith by St. Patrick, and became his favourite disciple. Benignus is said to have contributed materials for the "Psalter of Cashel", and the "Book of Rights". He succeeded St. Patrick's nephew Sechnall as coadjutor and became the first rector of the Cathedral School of Armagh.

The probability that St Benignus ever set foot in Glastonbury is even less than that of St Patrick. However, there is another Patrick who was prominent in the area and Meare is only a couple of miles from Glastonbury. As we shall see in chapter 33 of DA shortly, Henry attempts to convince us of the notion of St Benignus’s proximity to the area because he

---
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has espied a grave inscription at Meare with an epitaph which associates a
certain Beonna with the other Patrick ‘Junioris’ and would have us believe
through this that Beonna is St Benignus. Henry is insistent that St Benignus
should become part of Glastonbury lore because of his known relationship
with St Patrick.

St Patrick is more easily established and thus the St Patrick charter. In
chapter 22, St Benignus’ name is mentioned in the numerous relics
deposited at Glastonbury. Henry also interpolates his name into the body of
William’s relatively untouched work in the latter half of DA. A curious
sentence is inserted as an aside at the beginning of chapter 66 which says in
reference to Aethelweard: Harthacnut gave him a reliquary, in which the
body of the blessed Benignus now rests. In an obvious interpolation in
chapter 67 in a list of abbots, Sigegar is randomly said to lie beneath St
Benignus.

In chapter 71 Patrick is named as the first abbot and St Benignus follows
as the second. These must be Henry additions to the British abbots because
initially William’s list will have started with Worgret who is on the 601
Charter. In chapter 72 there is a short interpolation again to confirm the
translation of St Benignus in Thurstan’s era. It is the shortest chapter of a
couple of lines which has been inserted into William’s original work while
on the topic of Thurstan.

This highlights the fact that Henry has inserted it into William’s original
because in Henry’s mind he makes Thurstan responsible for the bogus act
of translation from Meare and thus dates the event to 1091 AD during
Thurstan’s abbacy. The dexterity and thoroughness with which Henry
creates his illusion is clearly witnessed. I find it extraordinary that
researchers in the past have been duped into believing that St Benignus
ever came to Glastonbury.

A persona of secondary importance is incidentally provided with an
entire cover story to substantiate the persona of primary importance which
is St Patrick; a case study of a cover story needing background. St Patrick is
the supposed creator of the St Patrick charter which substantiates Henry’s
goal toward metropolitan status. The whole is a web of illusion and
substantiates the fact that GR version B is heavily interpolated by Henry
where we are told: Patrick was succeeded in the office of Abbot by Benignus,
and where he affects being ever cautious by only stating fact: but for how
many years is uncertain. Who he was and what his name in his native tongue, is neatly given in this epitaph at Meare:

*Within this to the bones of Beonna lays,*
*Was Father here of the monks in ancient days.*
*Patrick of old to serve he had the honour,*
*So Erin’s sons aver and name Beonna.*

In the DA version of this epitaph found at Meare (covered in chapter 33), it states Irish (Hybernigene) rather than Erin. It is not by coincidence that Leland did not find the *Life of Benignus*.... because it is stated in the interpolated section of GR3 as having been written with other saints lives.... because certainly William would never have written it.

We must accept that some interpolations in GR3 are interpolations by Henry Blois into William’s final redacted manuscript as previously discussed. Otherwise, there can be no other alternative but to recognise Saint Patrick at Glastonbury as Scott and Carley have both had to concede. The stupidity is that, if the St Patrick charter is an obvious fake, why do we lend any credibility to Patrick at Glastonbury; especially if author B’s testimony is only tentative anyway. What has duped our scholars is the thoroughness of both HRB and DA in clever conflation, correlation and corroboration.... the supporting evidence concerning St Benignus is a prime example which makes it all the more convincing.

If we can accept that Henry presented an early edition of an interpolated DA at Rome for his own purposes, we can then admit it was consolidated later by him. An unconcerned consolidating editor would more likely omit contradictory evidence rather than coalesce the whole. If we understand this, we can see that Henry at the later stage is in fact rewriting history for posterity rather than writing it for his previous contemporary agenda.

It transpired that Henry has added later anecdotal and incidental information which provides a credible background to tentative persona at Glastonbury which seemingly coincides or is corroborated by other bogus episodes. A regard for the truth was dispensed with when Henry Blois started the Dunstan rumour when he arrived at Glastonbury or composed the historical Brutus the Briton pseudo-history for Empress Matilda and Henry Ist.

Chapter 14. *On St Columba.*
In 504 AD St Columba came to Glastonbury. Some men say that this saint completed the course of his life there, but whether this is so or whether he returned to his own country I cannot determine.

Saint Columba who lived from 521–597 was an Irish abbot and missionary credited with spreading Christianity in Scotland. He founded the abbey on Iona and Henry attempts to claim him also in a half-hearted way using hearsay, probably because of the Irish provenance and author B’s reference to the Irish. Henry also employs the same affected probity that he uses throughout, to give the appearance that these are William’s words. Scott is completely duped saying that ‘this chapter ought to be accepted as William’s work because the uncertainty expressed about whether the saint died at Glastonbury is in William’s style, whereas an interpolator would not have introduced the possibility of doubt’. Henry is not only an interpolator but a serial liar and propagandist.

Chapter 15. On St David the Archbishop.

How highly St David, the great Archbishop of Menevia, esteemed that place, is too well known to need illustration by our account. He verified the antiquity and sanctity of the church through a divine Oracle, for he came thither with seven bishops, of whom he was the chief, in order to dedicate it. But after everything that the service customarily required had been prepared he was indulging himself in sleep on what he thought would be the night preceding the ceremony. He had submerged all his senses in slumber when he saw the Lord Jesus standing beside gently asking him why he had come. Upon his instantly disclosing the reason the Lord restrained him from his purpose by saying that he himself had long ago dedicated that church in honour of his mother and that it would not be seemly to profane the sacrament with human repetition. As he was speaking he seemed to pierce the Saint’s palm with this finger and added that he should take it as a sign that he ought not repeat what the Lord had done beforehand; but because he had been motivated by devotion, not impudence, his punishment would not be prolonged, so that, when he was about to say the words, ‘through him and with him and in him’ in the mass on the following morning, the full vigour of his health would be restored to him. The priest was shaken out of his sleep by these terrors and, just as at the time he grew pale at the ulcerous sore, so later he applauded the truth of the prophecy. But, so that he might not seem to have done nothing, he quickly built another church and dedicated it as his own work.
These words come in the Canon of the Mass after the Consecration and before the Lord’s Prayer. The corresponding passage in our Prayer Book is: ‘Not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom and with whom in the unity’ etc. The chapter is designed to substantiate the fact that there was already a church in St David’s era. The life of St David by Rhygyfarch ascribes the foundation of Glastonbury to St David. The only reason this chapter is included in DA by Henry Blois is to stipulate that St David merely tried to consecrate an existing church so that Rhygyfarch’s version did not contradict Henry’s bogus apostolic foundation…. or even that by Phagan and Deruvian. This counters the tradition found in the eleventh century Life of Saint David which states that St David founded twelve monasteries to the praise of God: first, arriving at Glastonbury, he built a church there; then he came to Bath, and there causing deadly water to become salutary with a blessing, he endowed it with perpetual heat, rendering it fit for people to bathe…

Scott’s assumption that William heard this from oral tradition as he was not familiar with Rhygyfarch is irrelevant as it is not William writing. To say that Henry Blois was ignorant of the part played by St David in history would be futile as the base storyline and interaction of Dubricius found in HRB is derived from Rhygyfarch’s Life of David. We can see how the primacy of the fictional Caerleon was subtly transposed onto St David’s so it did not contradict Rhygyfarch’s testimony: Here begins the genealogy of Saint David, archbishop of all Britannia by the grace and predestination of God.

Giraldus Cambrensis also wrote a Life of St. David, but it is little more than an extract of Rhygyfarch. In fact all the surviving manuscripts of The Life of Saint David may be traced to Rhygyvarch’s text as their ultimate source. So, Henry was on tricky ground having to find a rationalisation for what was Rhygyfarch’s account of the foundation of Glastonbury.

In any case, whether the bogus miracle story of Christ’s appearance to St. David was included as an apologia to counter balance Henry’s fabrication of an early foundation, by establishing a ‘consecration’ by Christ himself, rather than a foundation by St David, or whether it was primarily included to counter the assertion of Rhygyfarch; both establish the right of primacy to a church pre-existing any Augustinian foundation.
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The chapter contradicts the stone building of King Ine in GR1 (William’s genuine position for the stone building) and makes for an early foundation myth. Essentially, it harks to the apostolic foundation of Henry’s first attempt at metropolitan by implying that (through the disciples) Christ Himself was the inspiration for the founding of the ‘Old Church’.

In GR William notes that the place of St David’s burial is uncertain yet in chapter 16 Henry has inserted an account of how he came to be at Glastonbury. St David has little bearing on Henry’s early agenda and was probably necessarily included as part of Glastonburyana lore to counter Rhygyfarch’s suggestion that Glastonbury had been founded by St David.

Chapter 16. Of the relics of St David.
This worthy saint of God died in 546 AD. Moreover certain men assert that the relics of this saintly and incomparable man have been placed with those of the blessed St Patrick in the old church, a claim supported and confirmed as beyond doubt by the frequent prayers of the Welsh and many of their stories, in which they openly disclose that Bernard, Bishop of the Ross Valley, has more than once looked for the relics of the saint there, despite the opposition of many, but has not found them. We will append an account of how his relics were translated from the Ross Valley to Glastonbury. In the time of King Edgar a certain lady named Aelswitha acquired them through a kinsman of hers, who was Bishop of the Ross Valley at that time when all the districts had been so devastated and scarcely anyone was to be found there, except a few women, and these in scattered places. And she bought the relics to Glastonbury.

The ‘certain men’ who assert can be understood as the singular Henry Blois placing St David’s relics close to those of the bogus Patrick relics. This may be a later insertion in DA as Henry’s friend Bernard died in 1148 and there would probably be no claim at Glastonbury or reference to Bernard’s search for the grave of St David in Wales until after Henry’s friend Bernard was dead. If the St Patrick tomb had already been planted in the old church at the time author B wrote, author B would not have implied his burial there as ‘tentative’ based on hearsay. It is upon author B’s tentative testimony confusing two Patrick’s that Henry builds the entire fabrication of St Patrick at Glastonbury.

Henry is cognisant of the fact that his friend Bernard had tried to locate the relics of St David without success. ‘Rosina Vallis’ does not appear
elsewhere in William of Malmesbury as an alternative to Menevia. We can conclude that Henry visited the Ross valley in 1136 and affects a distance from Bernard (posing as William) by calling him bishop of the Ross valley. Henry Blois also cross references the *Vallis Rosina* found many times in Rhygyvarch's text, of the *Life of David*:

"The land," say they, "whereon you are, shall be yours forever." And Bwya gave that day to holy David the whole of *Vallis Rosina* for a perpetual possession.... To this he answered, "I grieve to have seen smoke rising from *Vallis Rosina*, which encircled the whole country....

Henry also supplies the bogus translation story by connecting it to Aelswitha in the time of King Edgar. This is written by the man who loves to establish a myth to the glorification of Glastonbury.

Chapter 17. *On the relics translated from Wales to Glastonbury.*

Certain religious men from Wales bear witness that, intending a journey to Rome in those days, they brought with them to Glastonbury many bodies of saints and relics which they left behind there when they set out on their journey. This translation occurred in 962 AD, the 420th year after the death of St David.

The myth of St David at Glastonbury is based upon St David's relics not existing elsewhere in Wales. This fact is made clear to Henry by his friendship with Bernard and should require us to be suspicious of any episode which mentions his name in connection with Glastonbury. Bernard, bishop of St David's died in 1148, so there may be some possibility that the bogus translation myth was employed in the 1149 request for metropolitan status at Rome, as it could hardly come to light during Bernard's lifetime if he were looking for relics in Wales.

Chapter 18. *On the sanctity and dignity of the church of Glastonbury.*

The church of Glastonbury, therefore, is the oldest of all those that I know in England and hence the epithet applied to it. In it are preserved the bodily remains of many Saints, besides Patrick and the others of whom I spoke above, and there is no part of the church that is without the ashes of the blessed. The stone paved floor, the sides of the altar, the very altar itself, above and within, are filled with the relics close packed. Deservedly indeed is the repository of so many saints said to be a heavenly shrine on Earth. How fortunate, good Lord, are those inhabitants who have been summoned to an
upright life by reverence for that place. I cannot believe that any of these can fail of heaven, for their deaths are accompanied by the recommendation and advocacy of such great patrons. There one can observe all over the floor stones, artfully interlaced in the forms of triangles or squares and sealed with lead; I do no harm to religion if I believe in some sacred mystery is contained beneath them. Its age and its multitude of saints have called forth such reverence for the place, that at night scarcely anyone presumes to keep watch there, nor during the day to spit there; let anyone aware of displaying such outcomes and quake with bodily fear. No one has brought a hunting bird within the neighbouring cemetery or lead a horse thither and left again without himself or his possessions being harmed. Within living memory everyone undergoing ordeal by iron or water who has offered a prayer there has, with one exception, rejoiced in his salvation. If anyone sought to place any building nearby which by its shade interfered with the light of the church that building became a ruin. It is quite clear that to the men of that province no oath was holier or more oft repeated than that ‘by the old church’, upon which they did anything rather than perjure themselves, out of fear of sudden retribution. The testimony of many absolutely truthful men throughout the ages upholds the truth, if it be doubtful, of the words we have set down.

The aim of this entire exercise is summed up in the first sentence in proving that William thought the church of Glastonbury was the oldest of all. William supposedly says: In it are preserved the bodily remains of many Saints, besides Patrick and the others of whom I spoke above. In William’s unadulterated Life of Patrick related by William, there is no mention of Patrick at Glastonbury to the end of book 2 which Leland has related. It is in the Life of Patrick where Henry Blois, writing as William, states on the final folio, there will be a third book.... which we can only imagine would have dealt with the fable of Patrick’s return.

In all likelihood the third book was never written just like the Estoire des Bretons said to have been written by Gaimar. It may have existed, but if it did, it would have been written by Henry Blois. This of course would lead into the fictitious time in later life when Archbishop Patrick settles as Abbot of Glastonbury. Leland relates that the works he came across were mutilated. Leland states that: ‘I found two at Glastonbury, where the monks say Patrick is buried, though this distich take, unless I am mistaken from the epigrams of Bede, tells a different story’. Leland then goes on to relate
information he had found about Patrick which he assumes was written by William, but had in fact been written in DA by Henry Blois.

John of Glastonbury’s view on Patrick is irrelevant also because his information is derived from HRB and DA. After stating that Constans was formerly a monk at Winchester (the reader knowing why this fable was introduced and by whom) John of Glastonbury goes on to recycle that St Germanus brought Patrick into his intimate circle. Prior to Henry Blois, the Patrick myth was just tentative at Glastonbury, so when we read the bodily remains of many Saints, besides Patrick.... we should realise these are the words of Henry Blois. The sentence which suggests if anyone sought to place any building nearby which by its shade interfered with the light of the church that building became a ruin could refer to the state of disrepair the buildings were in before the arrival of Henry Blois and to my mind suggests that this passage was written before the fire in 1184.

Chapter 19. On St Paulinus the Bishop.

To return to my theme, the birth of St Patrick in 361 AD preceded the arrival in Britain of the blessed Augustine by 236 years. The traditions of our fathers maintain that the latter’s comrade in preaching, Paulinus, Bishop of Rochester and earlier Archbishop of York, had strengthened the structure of the church, previously made of wattle as we said, with a layer of boards and had covered it from the top down with lead. It was managed with such skill by this celebrated man that the church lost none of its sanctity and its beauty was much increased. And certainly the more grandly constructed a church is, the more likely it is to entice the dullest minds to prayer and to bend the most stubborn to supplication.

Henry Blois states his theme here, in that, Patrick preceded St Augustine by 236 years and this is the thrust of his argument and the intent behind his propaganda. It is the point of interpolating DA with a St Patrick legend at Glastonbury. It is not in any way coincidental that, the time span by which St Patrick preceded Augustine is a stated 236 years. It clearly points to the fact that it is Canterbury’s primacy, which Henry is trying to show has no basis.

It is also made clear that Augustine’s contemporary Paulinus repaired the church and Paulinus’s name is most likely happened upon because Bede attributes the building of a stone church at Lincoln to him. In other words, Paulinus is randomly chosen to repair a pre-existing church as a known
builder (of that era when Augustine arrived) and one whose action provides a proof of antiquity (because the church needed repair). This same Paulinus in Rhygyvarch’s *Life of St David* is:

*One of the bishops, called Paulinus, rises, with whom the pontiff, Saint David, had formerly read, and says, “There is one, made bishop by the Patriarch, who has not yet appeared at our synod....*

In effect the chapter is evidential support for Henry’s aim which establishes that the church was old when Augustine and Paulinus came to Britain, which indeed was a fact, as noted in the postscript to the 601 charter, but it also establishes a rationalisation of why the church is no longer in wattle. All contemporaries could see it was wooden and it probably had a lead roof.\(^{676}\)

I cannot stress enough how this onslaught of polemic about the previous construction of the church only highlights that the church is wooden at the time Henry Blois wrote; and it is Henry Blois who wishes us to be apprised of the wattle construction.... as it is not an issue in GR1 or VSD II.

We should then accept and understand Henry has seen and is in possession of the prophecy of Melkin. How can we think otherwise; especially, when much of the inspirational iconography of the *Matière de Bretagne*, (which is Henry’s work) is derived from the prophecy.

The Melkin prophecy must have been in existence. Henry Blois, was the person who instigated Glastonbury to be Ineswitrin to compensate for a first agenda and then trans-locate Arthur’s fictitious Avalon to be located at Glastonbury; a reversed Ineswitrin to compensate for his second agenda after writing VM where he had decided to locate Avalon at Glastonbury c.1155-7. There is only one reason he persists in letting us know the previous construction was in wattle. It is to find relevance to match the criteria of *cratibus* found in the prophecy of Melkin. What in normality would seemingly be a point of such little consequence i.e. the previous constituent composition, construction material or method of build, is repeated far too often to be in any way anecdotal comment, but definitive polemic as they are in the interpolated sections of GR3 and DA. This is overstated!! What used to be the construction material which is ‘no longer
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\(^{676}\) In Henry Blois’ *Perlesvaus* (derived from Master Blehis), we hear ‘coincidentally’ of the *chapelle nouvlemant faite, qui mout estoit bele e riche; si estoit covert de plon*....
evident' as a 'wattle' oratorius. Author B bear witness the church is in wood; hence the introduction of Paulinus covering it with wood.

Chapter 20. On the translation of Indract and his comrades.
Some years later the bodies of the martyr Indract and his comrades were translated from their place of martyrdom and buried in that church by Ine, King of the West Saxons, who had received a divine vision. Indract's body was put in a stone pyramid to the left of the altar, the others were put under the floor in places either carefully chosen or dictated by chance.

These are probably William's words and follow the description of the church and its sanctity found in chapter 18. There seems to be no propaganda value for Henry.... so the chapter seems to be slotted in where he thinks appropriate in his new version of Glastonbury's chronological history.

Chapter 21. On the relics translated from Northumbria to Glastonbury.
Sometime later when the Danes were attacking Northumbria, Tyccea, an Abbot from those parts, migrating from the north to the West under the cover of peace, retired to Glastonbury where, in his capacity of Abbot, he assumed the role of the church in 754 AD. For many years the north of the country was exposed to the plunder of those pirates while the rest of England suffered no attacks. Naturally, Tyccea brought with him rich sureties from his homeland, namely the relics of Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, the bodies of the saints Ceolfrith, Benedict, Eosterwine, Hwaetterht and Selfrith, abbots of Wearmouth, Bede the presbyter, Hebba, Begu, and Boisil, together with the body of Hilda abbess of the monastery once known as Streoneshalh but now called Whitby. These relics were placed above the altar and added greatly to reverence for the place. Moreover when Tyccea himself bid farewell to life, he received a distinguished burial in the right-hand corner of the greater church near the entrance to the old one. This sepulchre is noted both for its size and for its artistic engraving.

These for the most part are William's words and follow the previous chapter, but Henry has seen fit to assign to Tyccea the translation of Northern saints which is anachronistic. In GP King Edward carried out the translations. Henry himself was a relic collector and may have been responsible for some relics. However, there is something suspicious about foisting the translations on Tyccea and the story may be contrived so as not
to chime with his bogus story of the translation of Dunstan due to the Danish incursion.

If we follow the same rule as above where an occasional name is added by Henry we can see Bede features. Bede who was an idol of William’s would have been mentioned elsewhere if William of Malmesbury had genuinely known of Bede’s resting place at Glastonbury. Henry has claimed Bede so as to make Glastonbury appear a seat of learning where all who were noted in history seem to have wished to be buried there, or been translated there. The notion that every famous person in British history is buried at Glastonbury is ludicrous. Joseph of Arimathea, St Patrick, St Bregninus, St David, Gildas, King Arthur, Bede.....nonsense!!! Notice the same ploy in the next chapter in the pretence: I will pass over the ones mentioned before, namely.... and then ‘again’ does the complete opposite by naming them. The seed is planted!

Chapter 22. On the various relics deposited at Glastonbury.

Since the island of Glastonbury is remarkable in containing the ashes of so many saints beside those mentioned above, it is a pleasure to record the names of a few out of the many whose bodily remains, we do not doubt, for the most part rest there. For to account in detail the relics of saints collected their by Kings and magnates would be to extend this volume immeasurably; besides, they are recorded in the gospel books. I will pass over the ones mentioned before, namely that twelve disciples of St Philip, Phagan and Deruvian and their many disciples, Patrick, Benignus, Indract and his comrades, Gildas the wise, St David of Menevia, and those whom the venerable Tyceea is said to have brought thither. Know that it is reliably said that resting there are St Paulinus, Archbishop of Northumbria, two Innocents translated thither from Bethlehem by pious King Edgar, St Dunstan, our magnificent father on account of whose translation from Canterbury to Glastonbury we subjoin, as well as the bishops of St Aidan and St Besilius, martyred at a tender age; also the relics of St Urban, Pope and martyr, the bones of the martyrs St Anastasius, St Cesarius, St Benignus and St Melanus the bishop. There also rest St Aelflaed the queen and St Aelswitha, the virgin whose flesh and bones are still whole, as those who have seen them attest, and whose hair shirt and holy robe have not rotted. There to are the bones of the Queen St Balthild and the virgin St Mamilla as well as the saints Ursula, Daria, Crisanta, Udilia, Mary, Martha, Lucy,
Luceus, Waleburga, Gertrude, and Cecilia. In addition to the saints just mentioned there are innumerable relics of saints, the gifts of Kings, Princes, bishops and other nobleman, some of whose names are recorded in the old books of the church. Many relics too, carried from the Kingdom of Northumbria at the time the Danes were waging war there. Others were brought from Wales, when it was being persecuted, to Glastonbury, as though to a storehouse of saints. And although we do not have complete knowledge of them, they themselves rejoice in their full knowledge and contemplation of God.

This passage naturally follows the previous. It has much that is originally William’s material. However, interspersed are names such as Mary and Martha (perhaps the innocents brought from Bethlehem) amongst a list William no doubt had compiled with the added reminder that Glastonbury history goes right back to the associates of Jesus: For to account in detail the relics of saints collected....... would be to extend this volume immeasurably; besides, they are recorded in the gospel books.

We should note again the cleverness with which Henry often affects a position to seem disinterested in imparting information and yet surreptitiously follows it with the information anyway which plants the seed of propaganda. We see this where he makes a pretence of omitting material about Arthur in DA.... yet goes right ahead and drops the bombshell of where he is buried. Again above: I will pass over the ones mentioned before, namely that 12 disciples of St Philip, Phagan and Deruvian and their many disciples, Patrick, Benignus, Indract and his comrades, Gildas the wise....

Indract is certainly relevant to Glastonbury. The rest are placed in association at Glastonbury entirely due to Henry’s agendas. This chapter would seem to be constructed pre-1158 because it incorporates all the renowned around whom Henry had created an ancient association with Glastonbury. Obviously, Joseph does not feature in Henry’s pre 1155 first agenda which deals with primacy and the case for metropolitan. Joseph, Avalon (at Glastonbury) and Arthur’s burial in Avalon are all part of the post 1158 agenda on his return to England.

Because this passage is peppered with Henry’s fabrications, it is worth noting that the passage about Dunstan’s translation having being included in this chapter along with the others (who are spuriously connected to Glastonbury), lends credence to the position that the Dunstan translation
myth was started by Henry Blois. As we concluded when investigating Eadmer’s letter; *St Dunstan, our magnificent father on account of whose translation from Canterbury to Glastonbury we subjoin;* we know is certainly not William’s position. We can therefore look upon this chapter as a consolidation of Henry’s fabrications interspersed with William’s original words.

Chapter 23. *On the translation of St Dunstan from Canterbury to Glastonbury.*

Since we have been talking about other saints, we will append an account of how St Dunstan was translated. In 1012 AD during the reign of the famous King Edmund, called Ironside in his native tongue, the Danes landed on the eastern shores of England and brought all of the territory of Kent under their control. There they deprived many of their proper rank, banished many from their homeland and subjected many to a very cruel death. In this way, by slaughter rapine and burning, they destroyed divine things as much as human ones all the way to the city of London, sparing neither rank nor age nor sex. As a result the venerable Archbishop Aelfheah, not to mention any others, was driven from his seat of high office, had his estates devastated and his possessions seized. Who could tell of the rest without weeping? *Alas the sorrow of it!* The wicked villains entered the metropolitan church of the English people, and attacked the religious servants of God. *It is horrible to tell of it.* And they drove all of them from the house of God and destroyed everything by fire.

It came to pass that at that time King Edmund came to Glastonbury. There he spent some time during which he related the complete story of that terrible captivity of Abbot Beorhtred and the brethren of the house, telling them that the church of Canterbury had been burnt and entirely bereft of inhabitants and religion. The Abbot and the whole congregation were saddened at hearing this, as if a sword had pierced the heart of each of them. Among other things, they began to recite the lofty virtues of their distinguished father Dunstan who had, throughout his life, wonderfully honoured Glastonbury by gifts of ample estates and magnificent liberties and, above all, by instituting there the regular life. Deciding to be silent about all except religious matters, they at once fervently entreat the King and beseech his help and advice, that they might transfer the relics of that glorious man to the religious place where, nourished once on the milk of religion, he had attained such
great virtues that he had been able to illuminate not only the flock at Glastonbury but all the provinces of England.

Hearing this, the King met their desire with pious goodwill and determined that what they asked of him should be speedily effected. There was no delay; with his wish now granted the Abbot enjoined the undertaking of this mission on four of his fellow monks, specifying that, with the help of some friends, they should hasten to Canterbury, and should transfer the bones of the most holy Dunstan to Glastonbury. His sons received their father's orders most dutifully and, when they had made all the preparations for the great journey and had been blessed, they flew forth to obey their orders enthusiastically, trusting in the mercy of God and, especially in the power of the saint himself. For these monks had formally clung to the blessed Dunstan while he was alive by performing services in his chapel and had also committed his body to its burial place after his soul had been translated to peaceful rest; they had then remained by the side of his successor St Aelfheah until his martyrdom. For it pleased both these archbishops to have as assistants individuals from the monastic community of Glastonbury, both on account of the unsurpassed love and affection in which they especially held their nursemaid and so that, spurred on by the examples of their immediate attendants, they would not deviate from the life which they had previously been accustomed to live with them in the monastery. The names of those brothers were Sebrithus, Ethelbrithus, Bursius, and Aeldwordus, surnamed Quadrans. When these brothers came to Canterbury they found the place bereft of all its inhabitants, just as they had heard from the King. They went at once to the tomb of that most holy man, which was easily recognised by them because they themselves had placed him in his sepulchre. When they opened it they found the bones of St Dunstan, more precious than gold or Topaz; for his flesh had been destroyed over the long period of time; and gathered them up with fitting reverence, and not without tears. They also recognised the ring that had been placed on the saint's finger when he had been committed to burial, the one that he was said to have made himself when he was a young man. When they had accomplished everything for which they had come they gave boundless thanks to the one who had made their journey prosperous and returned to Glastonbury, joyfully bringing back with them the most precious relics. With how much delight their return was received by everyone, especially the monks, can be more easily inferred by a sympathetic reader and it can be disclosed by this writer's skill. This translation was
effected in 1012 AD, the second year after the murder of the Archbishop St Aelfheah and the 24th year after St Dunstan's final sleep.

We have already covered that Eadmer’s letter was in response to the claim put out by rumour that Dunstan’s relics lay at Glastonbury. Much of the above goes way beyond being an *apologia*... but should be looked upon as a direct confutation by the man who started the rumour in his youth. This spiel is essentially what should have been in the VSD but William had not co-operated with Henry or the monks.

At the time of the dispute there was no written counterclaim. How could there be because it simply is not true. Henry’s polemic here in DA provides a background to a story which was invented by Henry himself when he first arrived in Glastonbury purely to increase alms at a Dunstan grave. At that time Eadmer opposed the rumour. Now c.1165-68 when all those that remembered it was Henry who started the rumour were dead and while the venerable bishop in late life is writing up his final consolidation of DA he decides to put to rest the issue now Dunstan has a site near the altar.

Note now, that the entire story is now on King Ironside’s word and the bogus escapade now becomes his idea. Eadmer gives a good enough account of why the proposition is ludicrous. Eadmer wrote his letter 1126-29 never mentioning King Ironside as part of the rumour he was rebutting. Henry most probably wrote this rebuttal in DA for no other reason than it was him who concocted the rumour in the first place, forty years ago and now (after his death) few will take up the issue as vehemently as Eadmer had done.

The above spiel would not have been included in DA for Henry’s attempt at metropolitan. It would bring the whole of DA under suspicion as William’s VSD did not mention the translation and all generally accepted Dunstan’s relics at Canterbury. A continuator (Scott’s consolidator) has followed Henry’s lead in constructing the following chapters 24 and 25 out of necessity after the fire in 1184.

The initial rumour may have been a fabrication which, Henry, in later life regretted, as Eadmer’s letter does pointedly accuse the ‘youth’ at Glastonbury and implicates Henry as a fabricator. He was the most renowned youth at Glastonbury at the time. Dunstan was the most renowned son of Glastonbury before Henry went to work fabricating lore
for every other famous saint he could possibly conceive might be equated with Glastonbury.

As we can guess, initially the rumour of the translation of Dunstan’s relics was instigated to revitalise the coffers of Glastonbury just after Henry Blois’ arrival. In propaganda terms, for Henry’s first agenda at Rome, there is no benefit for proposing Dunstan’s relics lay at Glastonbury (as it was untrue) and we know Eadmer’s letter dates much earlier than 1144. There is no benefit to counter Osbern’s accusation that Dunstan was the first abbot as this mainly had ramifications on the antiquity of Glastonbury and was the cause of William writing DA.

The only benefit which can be derived from such a fabrication of the translation rumour of Dunstan’s relics is the attraction of pilgrim’s to Glastonbury’s most famous son at that time. ASC under the year 994AD records the devastation of London by the Danes and the capture and martyrdom of Aelfheah in 1011. Chapter 23 of DA can be looked upon as a reassertion of the bogus claim made by Henry himself in his youth when there is no-one left to contest the issue. As we know, Henry has a copy of William’s most recent recension GR3 and as we have seen is interpolating into that also, but the chronology in that is not clear. Hence, we can excuse the minor anachronism in the supposed date of translation. Most physical depictions of Henry Blois today stem from a contemporary artwork of Henry with a bishop’s staff holding a ring. I would suggest that it was Dunstan’s ring; fabricated to show that he had been translated to Glastonbury and now Henry has the ring.

Chapter 24. How the relics of St Dunstan were hidden under the ground.

When this had been accomplished, the brethren refreshed by God’s bounteous kindness, began a series of discussions to consider how they could commit their treasure to a safer place of confinement, for they feared with some justification, that when the enemy’s fury had been appeased and the church of Canterbury restored to its original state, the Archbishop, who was pre-eminent in authority and power, would demand back the relics that had been taken from him, whereupon the happiness that the monks had felt at their acquisition, would be equalled by their misery at their subsequent loss. The conclusion of their deliberations was a decision that two of their senior brethren, who were more reliable in keeping secrets, should conceal the most holy bones in an undisclosed place and acquaint no one with the knowledge of
the secret as long as they lived. Only when faced with imminent death should they point out the place to one of the older and wiser brethren, who would similarly disclose it to someone at the moment of his death, just as had happened to him. In this way it would happen that as time passed and event followed event, the place would remain unknown to all except for one person who would know the truth, until it should please the most high that this light should not be hid under a bushel, but should be placed on a candlestick to give light to all in the house of God. Once the plan had been so conceived the two brothers chosen for the purpose put it into effect. For they did a painting on the inside of a small wooden receptacle, properly prepared for this end, and wrote on the right-hand side S, with an inscription, and on the left D, with an inscription wishing to signify by these letters the name of St Dunstan. They put his remains in the receptacle and concealed it in the larger church beneath a stone cut out for the purpose beside the holy water on the right-hand side of the monk’s entrance, a place of which all the others were quite ignorant. There he lay for 172 years, knowledge of this resting-place being entrusted to one man only at a time in the fashion prescribed.

Chapters 23, 24 and 25 obviously link together in that they cover the disinterment rumour at Canterbury and the translation to Glastonbury legend. Chapter 24 is the apologia for the relic’s subsequent reappearance. This took place conveniently in the year of the Great Fire (1072+172=1184). The implication given by the date is that the relics were ‘miraculously found’ in 1184 and an apologia was constructed to rationalise their fortuitous appearance at such a time when pilgrim funds were much needed to rebuild the abbey.

However, the event of the fire may have been chosen by an interpolator who wrote long after the fire to explain that it was because of that event why the relics were duly unearthed at that date.

There are two scenarios with which we might explain this happening. Given that Henry had buried Arthur and revealed the location of his burial site, he may well be accused of having concocted the painted vessel of St Dunstan. We should not forget that, like Arthur, the translation story was merely a concoction and we know Henry Blois goes to great lengths to substantiate his concoctions. In which case, we may look upon chapter 23 and with the exception of the last sentence of chapter 24, as having been written by Henry.
Chapter 25 is undoubtedly the same late interpolator continuing on from the previous sentence. The case for chapters 23 & 24 having been written by Henry, I base upon the author, who has a full understanding of how he had concocted the story in the first place even naming the dubious abbot responsible for the translation and also Henry’s wish to perpetuate and substantiate his own propaganda.

The other scenario is that a later interpolator has picked up the story and either created a hoax much like Henry de Sully was thought to have done…. or merely recounted the episode at a much later date…. as if it had transpired long ago and used the fire as the reason for the relics being re-discovered.

Chapter 25. How those relics were discovered.

Time passed and the saint still lay hidden underground until there was a certain monk there named John Canan, mature in years and most wise in mind, who was very well-informed about the ancient regulations of the monastery and into whose keeping knowledge of this secret had in turn been committed, according to the reliable testimony of the brothers. This monk had been assigned guardianship of a certain brother named John of Whatley who was youthful in years and in the monastic life, and whom the elder loved with exceeding fondness for his sunny nature. Urged by his fellows, the young monk used to exhort his master, despite constant rejection, entreating him urgently and sometimes flattering him, to point out to him the spot which contained so great a treasure. Finally the elder was softened by these repeated flattering requests and so one day, when the boy was questioning him in the usual way, he gave vent to these words: ‘my most beloved son, you cannot enter the church and sprinkle yourself with holy water without your clothes touching the stone under which that which you seek lies hidden. But do not press me any more about this; rather consider wisely and in silence what you have heard’. The youth certainly did not cover what he had heard with a curtain of oblivion, while the elder in due course yielded to fate.

After his death what he had said in secret was proclaimed from the rooftops and became common knowledge. Yet although all were perplexed by the ambiguity of his words they languished in complete inactivity and no one applied his hand to a test by which the knot of so great a doubt could have been untied. Sometime later the monastery of Glastonbury was assailed by fire which consumed not only the church and other buildings but its
ornaments and treasures; and what is more, the greater part of its relics. It is not our task to describe here the sorrows caused by the fire because it is not our intention to occupy ourselves with these matters. The monks, seeking some solace for their grief, gathered together those few things that the flames had spared especially the relics. Then, troubled about St Dunstan, they recalled what John Canan and after him John of Whatley had said about him, which we related above, and they discussed it among themselves. After a few days had passed two of the brethren, Richard of Taunton and Ralph Toc, who were bolder than the rest in this matter, went with like mind to the place indicated earlier by John. They investigated it thoroughly and discovered the stone of which they had heard. Turning it over they beheld beneath it a wooden receptacle strengthened on all sides by iron bands. Calling the prior and the whole congregation together, they opened it and found therein the most sacred bones of the blessed Dunstan, with his ring on the bone of one of his fingers. And to remove every shred of doubt they saw a painting of him on the inside and $S$, with an inscription, on the right side of the receptacle and $D$, with an inscription on the left, representing the name of St Dunstan who had been placed therein. John of Canan’s story was thereby confirmed and the monks cheered by the discovery of these most desirable relics after their earlier distress, took them up joyfully and placed them with fitting reverence and devotion in a shrine suitably covered with gold and silver where they joined the shoulder and arm of St Oswald, King and martyr. The church of Glastonbury may therefore rejoice that it is fortified by the presence of so great a patron, thanks to whose intercessions and merits God continues to perform his great works there, repeatedly restoring life to the dead and health of those with all kinds of illnesses and frequently bringing aid to the foolish in all their perils.

To remove every shred of doubt, seems to imply that a physical object was fabricated to substantiate the bogus relics. The detail of the rediscovery given by the later interpolator is in the tradition started by Henry at the officine de faux, but it is clumsy by comparison. Henry knew that his additions were to be thought of as that which the reliable William had written. This clumsy attempt ruins Henry’s consistency.

Chapter 26. On a venerable cross which once spoke.

In the church of Glastonbury there is a certain cross, worthy of their narration and covered in gold and silver, which once spoke or rather, the holy
spirit spoke through it, to a monk of that place named Aylsi, in this fashion. When the monks passed by the cross, and it was as though it was by an altar, he did not incline his head with due reverence as the disciple of the rule required of him, although eventually on a certain occasion he did so bow when passing it. At this the cross burst into speech, as if it had the appropriate organs saying: ‘it’s too late now Aylsi, now it’s too late Aylsi’. Shocked by the divine voice he fell immediately to the ground and died.

The reader may remember that in the account of De Inventione Sancte Cruces Nostre, in which we have seen has the hand of Henry Blois à propos de Waltham; it also has a cross which is miraculous in that the head bows to King Harold. The cross was a very powerful symbol and to the superstitious medieval pilgrim, a story of such power and wonderment would bring pilgrims. Henry Blois understood the power of the cross and will have used it to his advantage.

Chapter 27. On another cross from which the Crown fell.

There is also in that place another very ancient cross which once used to stand in the refectory. Of this it is said that when one day King Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan were sitting at the table in the refectory thoughts contrary to the divine will arose in the King’s heart, at which, marvellous to relate, and image of the Lord attached to the beam of the cross shook its whole body, so that the force of this motion caused its Crown to fall between the King and the Archbishop. The King’s confession made clear what this portended. For when asked by St Dunstan what he had been thinking or what he had been considering doing, the King acknowledged that at that very moment he had been considering transferring the monks to another place and bringing nuns thither. The King was on this account reverently rebuked by the Archbishop, who pointed out that it was contrary to the divine will, and so he withdrew the proposition as an error.

This may well be a polemically designed passage to resist some intention by the bishop of Bath or King Henry II, Richard or John to replace monks with nuns at Glastonbury abbey.

Chapter 28. On a wounded cross.

There is a third cross smaller than the others, yet more renowned among the people which, has of old been covered with gold and silver. By a divine
miracle a great volume of blood once flowed from this when it was struck by an arrow; how this came about I will not fail to recount elsewhere.

The small cross, which is renowned among the people, may well be the small cross supposedly found with the Holy cross which went to Waltham, which is said to have been left in the church at Montacute. Again, this might well be another bogus story concocted as a pilgrim attractor. How the arrow hit the cross is not explained elsewhere, which may indicate, in whatever concoction the story appeared, it was burnt in the fire.

Chapter 29. On a certain image of the blessed it Mary.

Also to be found there is an image of the blessed St Mary which was not touched, not even the veil that hung from its head, by the great fire that surrounded the altar and consumed the cloth and all the ornaments on it. Yet because of the fire’s heat blisters, like those on a living man, arose on its face and remained visible for a long time to all who looked, testifying to a divine miracle.

Obviously written after the fire and so could not be connected to William or Henry Blois. Because the lacquer had bubbled and the image of St Mary was saved from the fire, a miracle was made of it.

Chapter 30. On the altar of St David, commonly called ‘the Sapphire’.

We read in the life of St David, Archbishop of Menevia, that while he was administering in his office of Abbot, to many of the brethren in the monastery of the Ross Valley, that he himself had built, an angel appeared to him one night saying: ‘tomorrow morning you must gird yourself, put on your shoes, and set out for Jerusalem. But you will have companions on your journey, two men from your household well known for their uprightness, Teilo and Padran, who will meet you tomorrow at an agreed place which I will now show you’. Without delay the saint disposed of the useful articles from his small cell, received the benediction from his brethren and, setting out on his journey early in the morning, reached the agreed place where he found the brothers as promised. So they began their journey together, not surrounded proudly with escorts but rich in the unity of their souls, none of them the Lord, none of them a servant. As they approached foreign lands St David was enriched with the gift of tongues so that they would not need an interpreter among the strangers. At last they drew near to the desired place and on the night before their arrival an angel appeared to the patriarch of Jerusalem and said.’ Three
Catholic men are approaching from the far west whom you are to receive with joy and courteous hospitality, and consecrate as my bishops'. As a result of this divine vision the patriarch gladly carried out the orders concerning the approaching saints. After he had consecrated them he said to them: 'the power of the Jews prevails over Christians and by confuting us they drive out the faith. Appear before them therefore and preach to them constantly every day so that their vehemence will be checked and will abate when they come to know that the Christian faith has spread to the far West and that its praises are sung at the ends of the earth'. In obedience to his command they devote themselves to preaching and by its success convert the infidels and strengthen the weak. After completing all their tasks they arrange to return home. Thereupon the patriarch enriched the venerable father David with four gifts, namely a consecrated altar on which he used to offer the body of our Lord and which was valued for its innumerable miracles, a remarkable bell, a staff and the tunic of woven gold, all of which are vaunted for the brilliance of their glorious miracles'. 'But', said the patriarch, 'because these would be burdensome to you on your journey I will send them to you when you have arrived home'. 'The holy men bid farewell to the patriarch and at length reached their homeland where they awaited the fulfilment of his promise. Eventually they received their gifts brought to them by Angels, David in the monastery called Langemelech and Padam and Teilo in their own monasteries. Hence it is commonly said that those gifts came from heaven.

Since St David wished so precious a treasure to have a most worthy guardian after his death he presented that stone to the church of Glastonbury while he was still alive because he cherished that church with fond love on account of its venerable antiquity and especially on account of the relics of St Patrick and the other saints preserved there, as will most clearly be proven to anybody reading his deeds. Moreover that altar is still displayed in the church of Glastonbury in memory of the saint, preserved not by human diligence but by divine providence which, amid constant storms of change with Kings and Kingdoms rising and falling, the fierce hurricanes of war raging and almost everything else being destroyed, continued to check the greedy hands of those who would have stolen it. The cover in which the blessing David received that stone is still preserved and appropriately honoured in his episcopal see. After this famous stone, hidden in the past for fear of war, had lain concealed for a long time, its whereabouts known to no-one, Henry of blessed memory, the Bishop of Winchester and
Abbot of Glastonbury, located it in a doorway of the church of the blessed Mary and adorned it sumptuously with gold, silver and precious stones, as can be seen today.

It is highly unlikely, given the attributes I have uncovered regarding the fabrications of Henry Blois, that a sapphire belonging to St David was genuinely discovered by Henry. In my opinion this was written by Henry, who, as I have posited before, is guilty of including his name as if it were written retrospectively. The account above is closely allied to the storyline of Rhygyvarch’s Life of St David which also names Padam and Teilo. The point which is relevant is that Henry Blois (the arch ‘back dating’ specialist), could have referred to himself as he did earlier in the third person to avoid any suspicion of authorship.

The reason we should consider this possibility is two-fold; firstly, because of his relationship with Bernard bishop of St David’s. It would be simple to donate the skin covering spoken of in Rhygyvarch’s Life of St David which authenticates the bogus find and would be easy corroborative evidence to find at St David’s.... if the skin covering found its way there via Bernard. Secondly, Henry Blois is the only one respected enough to concoct such a find and not be suspected of a manufactured fraud.... and rich enough to have the altar adorned so that it became part of Glastonbury lore.\footnote{An anonymous manuscript in the British Museum verifies that an altarpiece containing a large sapphire was among the items confiscated by Henry VIII during the dissolution of the monasteries in the mid-16th century. It does not seem too silly to suggest that the gem referred to (which Henry Blois had tried to buy at Waltham for 100 marks) is the stone by which St David’s altar became famous. The gold-leaved wooden portion remains, but the sapphire is missing. It would have been easy enough to cover wood with gold leaf and the spurious find (by Henry himself) puts St David at Glastonbury…. which of course, Henry Blois as the interpolator, is trying to square with Rhygyvarch's Life of St David. Through Henry’s interpolation, Glastonbury now owns a consecrated altar upon which the patriarch of Jerusalem used to offer the body of our Lord. The implication is that the altar was constructed and after the miraculous find of a sapphire the two were put together which indicated to the gullible that St David had hidden the sapphire and thus we are allowed to believe this is Rhygyvarch's association of St David adding to the church. To complete the illusion, we are informed by Henry Blois that St David built the stone church but there was of course an already extant wattle church and therefore there is no contradiction to Rhygyvarch. Saint David was unrecognized as a saint until he was canonized by Pope Callixtus II in 1123, most probably through the influence of Bishop Bernard. As a friend of Henry Blois’, we find Bernard’s position regarding the metropolitan greatly aided through ‘Geoffrey’ and Henry Blois’ Merlin prophecies concerning St David’s.}

Don’t forget, it is highly likely the introduction of St David’s name in DA is to counter Rhygyvarch's Life of St David which asserts Glastonbury was founded by St David. We can assume by the other references to
Rhygyvarch’s *Life of St David* that Henry Blois has read it and employs certain passages to give a semblance of coinciding reality.

It seems a possibility to suggest that Bernard was given the purported cover which probably was just a random piece of skin manufactured to seem like the cover of the altar which he had found. Henry manufactures the bogus find to coincide with Rhygyvarch’s *Life of St David*:

> When all things are done, they undertake to return to their native land. Then it was that the Patriarch presented father David with four gifts, to wit, a consecrated altar, whereon he was wont to consecrate the Lord’s Body, which, potent in innumerable miracles, has never been seen by men from the death of its pontiff, but covered with skin lies hidden away.

Chapter 31. *On the nobles buried at Glastonbury.*

There is much proof of how venerated the church of Glastonbury was even by the nobles of our country and how desirable for burial, that there especially under the protection of the mother of God they might await the day of resurrection, but I omit it from fear of being tedious. I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids, and many other leaders of the Britons, as well as Centwine who lies in one of the pyramids. Also there are tombs of the Kings Edmond the Elder, in the tower to the right, Edmond the Younger, before the high altar, and Edgar, previously in a column before the entrance to the church, but now in a shrine which also boasts the remains of the martyr Vincent. If space be available posterity will not complain that I was told such things in vain. I pass over in silence to the tombs of the bishops Brihtwig and Brihtwold, which richly adorn the northern portico of St John the Baptist, and those of the bishops Lying and Sigfrid and the ealdorman Aelfheah, Athelstan, Aethelwine and Aethelnoth, each of whom granted £100 worth of land and many other goods to Glastonbury.

Every commentator seems to believe the mention of Arthur (or some even Avalon) did not appear in DA until after Arthur’s disinterment. The Glastonbury interpolations in GR3 already discussed are polemically aligned with those in DA. They were undoubtedly inserted as part of Henry’s case for metropolitan. Why is it that scholars are so easily duped by Henry Blois’ affectation of probity whilst pretending to be William; and by their naivety, dismiss any possibility of understanding why the body was found where it was.
Henry has no intention of ‘passing over’ Arthur, using the same scheme in GR3 chapter 21:

How sacred was that place, even among the Princes of the land, so that there above all other they preferred, under the protection of the mother of God, to await the resurrection, there is much to show, which, for fear of being tedious, I omit.

But, here in DA (after having planted the bodies in a manufactured grave), he actually stipulates the location where Arthur and his wife (Guinevere) are buried:

but I omit it from fear of being tedious. I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids, and many other leaders of the Britons.

One cannot just create tradition in an instant at Arthur’s unveiling. Henry Blois accomplishes it by foisting his words onto a reliable William of Malmesbury and others in a book about Glastonbury; not forgetting ‘Geoffrey’s’ efforts concerning the synchronicity of a non-descript, non-locational Avalon in HRB, which became an *Insula Pomorum* (c.1155-58).... easily identifiable with Glastonbury. Henry uses the same ploy in chapter 22 as we witnessed above with a whole host of names, which are clearly Henry’s concoctions,: I will pass over the ones mentioned before, namely that twelve disciples of St Philip, Phagan and Deruvian and their many disciples, Patrick, Benignus, Indract and his comrades, Gildas the wise, St David of Menevia.

If we know the chivalric Arthur is Henry’s concoction in HRB and he feigns to ‘pass over’ him and all the above mentioned (excepting Indract) in their association to Glastonbury; why is that scholars cannot see the affectation of a pretence in skirting over something which Henry is in fact establishing as propaganda to the reader? It is clear he pretends nonchalance when in fact they are the main characters in his propaganda. The latter half of chapter 31 seemingly splices back into William’s words.

Chapter 32. On the two pyramids.

If I could elicit the truth I would gladly explain the significance of those pyramids which are a mystery to almost everyone. They are located a few feet from the old church and border on the monk’s cemetery. The taller one, which is nearer to the church, has five stories and is 26 feet high. Although it is almost in ruins, due to its great age it still preserves some memorials of
antiquity which can be clearly read, even if not fully understood. For on the highest storey is an image fashioned in the likeness of a bishop and on the second an image displaying regal ostentation and the words Her, Sexi and Blisyer; on the third the names Wemcrest, Bantomp and Winethegn; on the fourth Hate, Wulfred and Eanfled; and on the fifth and lowest story an image and this writing Logwor, Weslicas and Bregden, Swelwes, Hwingendes, Bern. The other pyramid of 18 feet has four stories, on which may be read Hedde, Bregored and Beorruuard. I will not rashly certify what these mean but hesitantly suggest that within those hollow stones are contained the bones of those whose names can be read on the outside. It can certainly be maintained that Logwor is he after whom Lugersbury, now Montacute is named, that Bregden gave his name to Brent Knoll, now Brent Marsh, and that Beorhtwald was abbot after Heamgils. Concerning these and others who may come up, I will speak at greater length later. For now, I will proceed to set down the series of abbots, what was given to each for the use of the monastery and by which King.

We discussed the pyramids under the section on GR and the reason Henry has chosen this space between the pyramids is because they are different from any other grave markers in the Glastonbury cemetery.... and only feet away from the old wooden church. The pyramids which are a mystery to almost everyone are highlighted on purpose. It is ridiculous to pretend to be ignorant of their significance in a graveyard when names of people are on them. What Henry is really trying to do is to highlight the mystery of why the pyramids are there, because between them he has planted the body of the famous King Arthur and his wife. The description of the pyramids and the persons named for the most part seem to emanate from William’s original work.

Chapter 33. On the Kings, abbots and other founders of the church of Glastonbury, arranged chronologically.

It ought first be mentioned that three pagan Kings gave twelve portions of land to the twelve disciples of Saints Philip and James who came to Britain in 63 AD, whence the name ‘the twelve hides’ still persists. Then saints Phagan and Deruvian who came to Britain and illuminated it with the gift of faith, obtained from King Lucius, who was reborn in Christ through their efforts,
confirmation of the island of Avalon and its appurtenances for the twelve brethren established there and the others who should follow them. Their successor after many years was the blessed Patrick who, finding twelve brothers still there leading a sort of eremitic life, instructed them in the communal life and enriched them with many possessions, as we can well believe even if they are unknown to us. His successor was St Benignus. Who he was and what his name was in the native tongue is expressed not inelegantly by the verses which are written as an epitaph on his tomb at Meare:

The bones of father Beonna are disposed within this stone.
He was in ancient times the father of the monks here.
And formerly Patrick’s servant too, perhaps
So say the Irish who call him Beonna.

He was succeeded there by many abbots of the British nation, whose names and deeds, veiled in a cloud of oblivion, have been lost to memory over time. Yet their remains which still rest there reveal that the church was held in the highest veneration by the great men of the British. A painting commemorating events of the past, exhibits the names of three only of those abbots, namely Worgret, Ledemund and Bregored, about whom I will have more to say later.

Henry Blois is a master at his craft, intonating that the Island of Avalon was connected through the twelve hides and the disciples through his fictitiously expanded Lucius from HRB. We may speculate that this chapter was in the edition of DA presented in the 1149 presentation because there is no real consolidation of the lore before chapters 1&2 and those two were definitely the last to be added to DA. Lucius has no place in British history. Avalon is an invention of Henry Blois’ along with the foundation myth of disciples and Phagan and Deruvian. We are informed by Scott that this chapter is largely a fabrication of a later reviser because it refers to St Philip, Phagan and Deruvian. This is more accurately a chapter written by Henry Blois the creator of Avalon in HRB and the man who has subtly materialised his invention to exist at Glastonbury. We should never lose
sight of the part that the island of Ineswitrin in the original form of the prophecy of Melkin has played in this saga, which we have covered already.

St Philip, Phagan and Deruvian are all Henry Blois concoctions. We know St Benignus at Glastonbury is a Blois invention which lent corroborative evidence in establishing St Patrick definitively at Glastonbury, but I do not deny there may have been a Beonna at Meare associated with the other Patrick. It is even possible that there was a painting with the names of Worgret and Bregored on it. However, the mention in this chapter of Worgret and Bregored is probably because their names are on the 601 charter and help to verify that it is genuine to aid Henry’s case…. as we know, the rest of the chapter is comprised of Henry’s propaganda. He is leading toward a further mention of Worgret (about whom I will have more to say later), as he gets to the point where William originally started his DA with the 601 charter.

Chapter 34. On the illustrious Arthur.

We read in the deeds of the most illustrious King Arthur that at Caerleon one Christmas he distinguished with military honours a most vigorous youth named Ider, the son of King Nuth, and, in order to try him, led him to Frog Mountain, now called Brent Knoll, to do battle with three giants notorious for their wickedness who he had learnt were there. This young soldier had gone on ahead of Arthur and his companions without their knowing it and had boldly attacked the Giants whom he killed in a terrible slaughter. After he had done so, Arthur arrived and finding Ider weak from excessive exertion and helplessly lying in a trance where he had fallen, he and his companions began to lament that the youth was almost dead. So he returned home unutterably sad, leaving behind the body that he thought was lifeless, until he could send a conveyance there to bring it back. He considered himself responsible for the young man’s death because he had come to his aid too late and so when he returned to Glastonbury he established 80 monks there for his soul, generously granting them lands and territories for their sustenance as well as gold, silver, chalices and other ecclesiastical ornaments.

Scott remarks that this story, the source of which cannot be determined was obviously interpolated after the purported discovery of Arthur’s remains
This is not definitive. Who else but the composer of chivalric Arthur material and (the giant fighting Arthur) would insert this with Arthur returning to Glastonbury.

Scholars would have us believe that, at the discovery of the leaden cross, all and sundry (Glastonbury monks included) were instantly informed and converted to the fact that Glastonbury used to be called the island of Avalon and there had been no preconditioning of this wondrous translocation in the period between 1171-1189-91. How do we explain the supposedly independent Vaus d'Avaron of Robert de Boron c.1160-80, Chretien and Robert’s and Caradoc’s Isle de Voirre.... the Grail’s appearance through Chretien in the same era.... Perlesvaus’ reference to the church covered in lead, along with Joseph of Abarimacie and the Grail. Most importantly, King Arthur with Guinevere being buried mentioned in a book written at Avalon. We would have to necessarily ignore Giraldus’ testimony to uphold Scott’s view that all reference to Arthur postdates the exhumation.

Chapter 34 is quite simply an invented story which incorporates the local topography of Brent Knoll and provides an episode which infers another link to Glastonbury for King Arthur....which in turn implies Arthur in deed set up the monastery there. This is such a clever passage by Henry Blois in that it is entirely independent of HRB’s Arthuriana. It associates the same ‘Caerleon’ chivalric Arthur invented by Henry Blois with Glastonbury.

This could not be an association that could be made in HRB at that stage without obviating Henry’s authorship. This of course coincided with the Caradoc kidnap episode which also puts Arthur at Glastonbury. King Arthur ‘returning’ to Glastonbury implies that he came from there.... and therefore provides adequate proof by association of Henry’s other goal.... the conversion of Avalon into Glastonbury.

---

678 John Scott p.197.77

679 We cannot know if Henry purposefully changed the name Avaron or if it was a later scribal error, but it is a madness to think that Glastonbury converted itself into Avalon and invented Joseph following Robert de Boron. This would imply that Robert de Boron is supposedly responsible for the Grail at Glastonbury. This truly would be a convergent set of fortuitous factors if we are in denial about the Melkin prophecy’s duo fassula being the template for the Grail. We would then have to deny the similarity of a body being found on Avalon just as Arthur was; and the coincidence that Joseph will be found in the future on Ineswitrin. Only a scholar would account the prophecy a fake and ignore the fact that the geometric instructions locate Burgh Island. Until it is accepted that Henry named Avalon in place of Ineswitrin on the prophecy, and the name of Avalon and Arthur’s manufactured gravesite on the island (located at Glastonbury) are a complete invention.... scholars will be confounded in solving the puzzle of how La Matière de Bretagne evolved from genuine events just after the crucifixion.
As I have mentioned, the latter chapters of DA from chapter 35 onward are more or less how they existed when Henry received DA from William. There is one later interpolation in chapter 69, to which, Henry has added regarding Arthur. Chapter 69 is titled: *On the possessions of Glastonbury given by English Converts to the faith.*

What is vitally important to recognise in this next interpolation in chapter 69 of DA is that it occurs in the section of the book which for the most part remains unadulterated from William’s original composition. Scott sets in bracket’s the following interpolation on Arthur distinguishing it as an inserted interpolation found in a body of genuine text written by William. What this actually proves for us is the genuine words of William would have run: *Firstly, the King of Devon gave 5 hides of land known as Ineswitrin.* What this reveals is that the 601 charter actually existed, as one can determine (as Scott indicates) how William’s words were written originally. Secondly, from this sentence above, we can understand that William had no conception that Ineswitrin was synonymous with Glastonbury as the original words written by William commences the chapter titled: *On the possessions of Glastonbury given by the English converts to the faith.* Therefore, as I have maintained, the etymology that leads us to believe Ineswitrin is synonymous with Glastonbury which is found in the last paragraph of *life of Gildas* and in chapter 5 of DA titled: *on the various names of that Island* is all part of Henry’s propaganda concerning his first agenda.

As William starts by date chap 69 with the first donation to Glastonbury (which he does at chapter 35, the start of the original DA), a donation of an estate by the King of Devon in the five *cassates* known to be on Ineswitrin…. we have Henry’s interpolation concerning Arthur’s fictitious donation into the largely untouched part of DA:

*Arthur in the time of the Britons gave Brent Marsh and Poweldone with many other lands in the neighbourhood, for the soul of Ider, as has been*

---

680 Firstly, the argument does not hold because the date of the 601 charter predates the West Saxon take over of the abbey c.670. Secondly, even with Henry’s clever explanation of the change of name and re-donation…. it is impossible to donate an island to a church on which the church stands. Also it is purely logical that if Ineswitrin and five *cassates* represented the entire Island of Glastonbury (as we are led to believe by the spurious etymologies)…. why are only five *cassates* being donated if the charter really does apply to the whole Island of Witrin defined by the word Ines. The Island is obviously in Devon and is Burgh Island which has the five cottages on it.
mentioned above; these lands we re fallen upon and taken away by the English when they were pagans but later restored, with many others after their conversion to the faith.681

The latter half of the polemic as we saw under the section in GR is part of the vital rationalisation of Henry searching for a way to establish what otherwise is a conundrum. Why, if Ineswitrin was synonymous with Glastonbury would a King of Devon be donating it to itself? The rationalisation is that Ineswitrin was known as Glastonbury in the time of the Britons and was restored to Glastonbury subsequently having been taken from them by the Saxons; i.e. the Saxons then restored to the church what was initially theirs, when they supposedly converted to the faith.

Henry sees the flaw in this argument in GR and in DA in that.... if at this time one King ‘supposedly’ ruled England, what is a King of Devon doing donating an Island to the ‘old church’. He, therefore, tries his best to explain the contradiction in the next chapter. The obvious solution which we have maintained throughout is that Ineswitrin is Burgh Island in Devon and it was never synonymous with Glastonbury. We can see William’s unadulterated reference to land known as Ineswitrin implies he does not know where it is.

One final observation is that Henry invents a King Nuth and Ider who feature nowhere else and so clearly disarms any suspicious mind into thinking that the account of this King Arthur in DA, which is the same King Arthur as that in HRB (both connected to Caerleon), are supposedly derived from independent sources and therefore add to the credence of an historical chivalric Arthur.

To everyone’s credulity, through this propaganda in chapter 69, King Arthur ‘returned’ to Glastonbury.... so it would only be natural, if Arthur were buried on Avalon (obviated after the fact of his disinterment), that Glastonbury was always (in its previous guise as Avalon) associated with Arthur. The most pertinent fact is the title to chapter 69 On the possessions of Glastonbury given by the English converts to the faith, where land ‘known’ as Ineswitrin was a ‘possession’ of Glastonbury having originally been written by William.

Chapter 35 and its title originally commenced the DA before much of the 34 chapters of Henry Blois’ interpolations were added. We can see below

681 Interpolation into chapter 69 of DA.
Chapter 35. *On the estate of Ineswitrin, given to Glastonbury at the time the English were converted to the faith.*

In 601 AD the King of Devon (Domnonie) granted 5 cassates on the estate called Ineswitrin to the old church on the petition Abbot Worgret. ‘I, Bishop Maworn, drew up this deed. I, Worgret, Abbot of the same place set my hand thereto’. The age of the document prevents us knowing who that King was, yet it can be presumed that he was British because he referred to Glastonbury in his native tongue Ineswitrin, which as we know was the British name. But Abbot Worgret, whose name smacks of British barbarism, was succeeded by Ledemund, and he by Bregored. The dates of their reigns are obscure, but their names and ranks can clearly be seen in a painting to be found near the altar in the larger church. Aeorhtwald succeeded Bregored.

(It ought rather be believed that this King was an Englishman because in the time of the Britons there were no provincial Kings, as in the time of the English, but only absolute monarchs and also because, although that estate (*Ineswitrin*) and many others were granted to Glastonbury in the time of the Britons, as is plain from the preceding, yet when the English drove out the Britons they, being pagans, seized the lands that had been granted to churches before finally restoring the stolen lands and many others at the time of their conversion to the faith.)

In the bracketed passage, as Thompson\(^683\) rightly points out, it is written by the same scribe as T, but Scott thinks it a later addition. However, innocently Thompson observes that ‘The writer was presumably thinking of such figures as Arthur and Vortigern’. This is precisely what our interpolative author is making sure we and papal authorities understand. Not for any reason that it might corroborate HRB, but simply squaring

---

\(^682\) Logically, if William had been employed to show the antiquity of the Abbey, he is going to start with the most ancient piece of evidence…. which not only was dated, but also showed a church referred to at Glastonbury as already old at that date.

\(^683\) GR vol ii p.403
Henry’s insistence that Ineswitrin applies to Glastonbury to strengthen the case for antiquity in pursuit of metropolitan status and in corroboration of the 601 charter. The charter was being produced in front of the pope along with DA and GR3 to show that lands previously owned by Glastonbury i.e. Ineswitrin had been seized in Saxon times and reinstated back to Glastonbury. Not for any purpose in gaining lands, but purely to show that this specific charter was proof that Glastonbury existed before the Augustine mission in that…. it already had an existing church, which, as we are directed to understand conveniently in ‘William’s words’ from GR3: Another point is worth notice; how ancient a foundation must be that even then was called old church.

We can understand more clearly why Henry went to such lengths to interpolate William’s work. If he was ever going to free himself of subordination from Archbishop Theobald in the period after he lost the legation, he would have to be a metropolitan bishop. This also clarifies the contradictions between two separate agendas in DA. One aimed at a metropolitan which includes a disciplic foundation, later confirmed by the St Patrick charter. The 601 charter in effect is what convinced pope Lucius II to grant metropolitan status in the first place.

Henry’s friend Bernard at St David’s had been trying most of his life as bishop to gain the same thing based upon what was maintained in Rhygyfarch’s Life of David and this is why Henry tries to help out by predicting a metropolitan in the early Merlin prophecies. Henry employs William of Malmesbury’s works to create a bogus history, but it is not entirely fallacious as Glastonbury’s ‘old church’ did exist before Augustine’s arrival. We know this from the genuine charter when Burgh Island was donated to Glastonbury in 601AD. Yet Henry Blois is using Glastonbury’s antiquity (and bogus material in HRB about Winchester) to gain metropolitan status for the whole of western England. As we saw previously, when John of Salisbury writes on Henry’s trip to Rome in 1149: After being publicly received back into favour, he began to intrigue with Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia, Gregory of St Angelo and other friends (as they afterward confessed) to secure a pallium for himself and become archbishop of western England. How Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia and Gregory of St

---

684 On September 23, 1149 Eugenius III consecrated Guido de Summa Bishop of Ostia. He died in 1151. It is more likely that the DA was shown at Rome between these dates with the St Patrick charter (copy). Even though the 601 charter was genuine, like the St Patrick charter, it was given a rationalizing postscript in DA.
Angelo compromised Henry we shall not know. What their ‘intrigue’ consisted of and what their role was in helping Henry would shed light on much surrounding Henry’s manipulative intentions.

The 601 charter could be assumed a fraud until conveniently the Life of Gildas persuades us to misconstrue the 5 cassates of Ineswitrin as part of the same island as Glastonbury. The only other mention of the island of Ineswitrin was in a prophecy about the discovery of Joseph of Arimathea’s body and William would have thought this a ludicrous invention as there was nothing in any charter or previous legend (excepting those of the Cornish) concerning Joseph. Why would there be? There was no legend of Joseph at Glastonbury.

The monastic house to which Ineswitrin was given in 601AD was not a West Saxon house and the island of (Ines) Witrin’s connection and location became lost in time when the church at Glastonbury was taken over. The only residue of the truth was maintained in a weak legend of the Cornish which still bore witness to Joseph’s presence in Britain. The work of Melkin or certainly his prophecy was paid no attention by William. Henry obviously could not include it in DA as it would be evident by the commonalities found in it that it was the template for the mythical isle of Avalon in his HRB, the emergent Grail stories and the reappearance of a famous body in the future.

Henry had not conceived of Joseph as the founder of Glastonbury or included such propaganda in DA when it was first presented to the pope. The Primary Historia had no mention of Avalon when it was first composed. But, Henry had deemed Avalon for the place where Arthur was last seen in the First Variant and we know by its more high tone and biblical nature…First Variant was part of Henry’s evidence for the 1144 case which convinced the pope to grant Metropolitan to Henry.

Why scholars believe a supposed scribe c.1247 decided to include Joseph in DA when Arthur is already a huge attraction at Glastonbury is never clearly defined; especially when Robert and the author of Perlesvaus had made Joseph’s connection with Avalon 70 years previously.

The simple answer is that no late scribe coalesced and formulated the consolidating lore concerning Joseph at Glastonbury. Quite simply the only reason the name of Joseph ever was associated with Glastonbury is because Henry Blois possessed the Melkin prophecy. There is just no way any modern scholar will get his head around this simple fact because
everything else that Crick, Carley et al have taught and believed all of their professional careers concerning our three genres.... crumbles; every thesis about Joseph and the Grail they have put forward becomes void. It is not that their endeavours have been in vain for without the circumspect groundwork of all previous aficionados’ of the three genres discussed here, no comprehensive conclusion could ever be discovered. My pique is that when confronted with the alternate view of how things transpired regarding our thre genres under investigation they will not accept it because it would void their previous works on the subject.

Henry Blois’ Joseph in DA becomes insignificant by comparison to Arthur after his disinterment and this is the reason for his seeming late appearance in Glastonbury lore. This emphatically though does not deny the fact that the continental Joseph of Arimathea story existed on the continent long before the disinterment of Arthur because Blaise was the source and Blaise was alive only until 1171. Also, as we saw a reluctance to brandish Joseph lore so blatantly having acquired him so recently.... until time had honoured the myth written into DA by the collision of continental Grail literature and Henry’s other works confirmed the legend which obviously still existed in JG’s era

Scholar’s rationalisations about Joseph’s inclusion into DA are incorrect. As I have explained, Adam would not mention Joseph specifically as a continuator of DA (no grave had been found like that of Arthur) and Gerald’s interest is only in Arthur. Gerald is not interested in some obvious concoction...inventing a saint to attract pilgrims with no previous tradition. Gerald is a chronicler of his times not a historian. Joseph’s association with Glastonbury is in DA c.1192 when Gerald wrote concerning Arthur’s discovery, but it is not clear to what extent the Perlesvaus had affected Gastonburyana or if continental Joseph d’Arimathie legends had combined with extant lore at Glastonbury so that there was a conscious understanding of Joseph and Grail lore being accepted.

‘Chrétien’ has already told of the Grail and ‘Robert’ of Joseph, but more importantly, there is already a book written by Henry Blois at Glastonbury which connects Joseph and Arthur to that place.685

685 William A Nitze, Glastonbury and the Holy Grail p.248. “The interesting passages bearing upon this subject have been conclusively discussed by Professor Baist and M. Lot. On more than one occasion the former scholar has expressed the opinion that in the twelfth century Glastonbury witnessed the production of an ecclesiastical Arthur story which was based on the Perceval of Crestien, and which brought the latter romance into relation
Henry in the end is responsible for chapter one and two of DA, but essentially, if he had included the prophecy of Melkin in DA it would have been too obvious that he was the instigator of the *Matter of Britain*.

For Henry’s build of the empirical literary structure of the *Matter of Britain* he had started with HRB which propelled Arthur through the monastic and ecclesiastical system in Latin and then onto the continental stage (through Wace) and Arthur’s burial place he had already included in DA. He had written the pre-cursor to Perlesvaus which of course mentioned Joseph and Grail lore and then proliferated this through his nephew’s and their wives and is definitively the originator of Robert’s trilogy.

If Henry wanted to remain the anonymous ghost writer, posing as Master Blithis while introducing Joseph…. he had to be careful. It is Henry who had interpolated the very book which is dedicated to him by William which also mentions Joseph and in which he converts Glastonbury into Avalon; it would hardly be a clever act to include the prophecy in DA. The Melkin Prophecy would in effect link his name to both those tracts in their connection to Glastonbury/Avalon and possibly implicate him in authorship of HRB where Avalon is first mentioned. But, even worse, it would link him to Chrétien and Marie of France and most importantly the Grail and Master Blithis. This is the main reason the prophecy of Melkin is not included in DA.

But, thankfully, Henry Blois did not change the contents of the Melkin prophecy one jot because the instructional data in the Prophecy is how we know the cryptic puzzle was designed to lead us to Burgh island. Henry changed the name of the Island from Ineswitrin to Avalon based upon his personal association with Avalon in Burgundy…. just as he had staged Arthur’s battle in the same region. What is certain is that he had no idea of...
the Islands location or who *Abbadare* was. But, because the Melkin prophecy pertained to Joseph’s sepulchre, Henry changed the name of the island to Avalon so that the prophecy would be thought to coincide with what was written in DA about an early apostolic foundation.

To include the Melkin prophecy in DA would be to advertise the inspiration for the *Sang Real* and the mythical island and betray himself to the world even after his death. Henry could hardly leave the original prophecy with Ineswitrin crossed out and Avalon inserted. Therefore we could only learn of its existence by copy in another work written by Henry Blois i.e. the one JG witnessed. Hence, the prophecy was merely copied into a work of Melkin’s or the book said to be authored by Melkin with Arthurian round table title which Henry must have written; to be found later with the name of the island changed, just as it came to pass in JG’s *cronica*.

From then on, Joseph also was buried in Avalon in the minds of all and sundry. Henry had the satisfaction in knowing that once Arthur was going to be discovered and the cross was found, Avalon would be established forever at Glastonbury. The DA would confirm the legend and Joseph of Arimathea would establish Glastonbury as a second Rome. Cicero spoke the truth but Henry Blois was his polar opposite.

The DA remained with Henry Blois as an only copy for his life. In it were transferred interpolations which at two separate periods became relevant to his aims. It is these contradictory standpoints; the apostolic foundation and the Phagan and Deruvian foundation which has steered commentators to conclude different interpolators.

The first two chapters including Joseph material was added last which synthesises all Henry’s differing agendas. Scott envisages some astute reviser before the scribe of our present copy which he terms T or Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.5.33 (724). The manuscript is attributed to Adam of Damerham which continues the history of the monastery down to c.1230, but in the same neat hand is a catalogue of the contents of the abbey’s library and the same scribe has dated the catalogue to 1247. It is from this information that we can determine the MS date. This is in fact the earliest extant manuscript of DA. There are certain interpolations which seem to pertain to the dispute with Wells and others which refer to the abbacy of Henry Blois, some of which have been added since his death in 1171. There are also references to the fire which destroyed the abbey in
1184 which cannot be any part of what William wrote or what Henry left as his own final redaction of DA.

One other factor which may have a bearing on Joseph’s name remaining less well connected to Glastonbury until the fourteenth century is because of material lost in the fire in 1184. Whatever Master Blihis had left behind from which our present Perlesvaus and High History of the Grail are derived must have survived second hand. There must have been other material which connects for instance Henry’s Arviragus from HRB to material which John of Glastonbury is using which is also lost... and from which Melkin’s prophecy appears. These inevitably must have been part of Henry’s edifice which comprises the Matter of Britain. It is plain that whoever wrote Perlesvaus was already apprised of the story of Chrétien’s Perceval and Robert’s Joseph d’Arimathie and seems to know a lot about Glastonbury. With a name like Master Blehis and Arthur’s connection to Glastonbury and the certainty of Henry having written HRB and the Merlin prophecies, one would have to be blind not to see the dots and connect them.

In his final days at Winchester between 1165 and 1170 Henry writes the elusive Book of the Grail which may have gone up with the fire, disappeared on the continent, or Henry had used its fictional existence much like he had done with Walter’s book in HRB. In other words it establishes a fictitious source for all Henry’s concoctions. Glastonbury is not connected to HRB, Joseph is connected to Glastonbury in DA and Perlesvaus but DA connects the same ‘Caerleon’ Arthur from HRB with Glastonbury where HRB avoids mention of Glastonbury. However, Glastonbury is connected to Arthur, Joseph and the Grail on the continent through Robert and Chretien’s Isle de Voirre, which had its origin in Caradoc’s/Henry’s etymological farce.686

A complex propaganda invention was carried out by Henry Blois and Joseph material circulated before Henry’s death as he was the instigator of it and it was he who connected it to Glastonbury. The Joseph material only surfaced to interact with his muses because he was in possession of the Melkin prophecy and it will take years before it is accepted as fact and for the present set of scholars to unlearn the backwardly contrived theses that

686 Caradoc, Life of Gildas:Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin (made of glass).
the likes of Lagorio put forward. This very complex subject matter because it has been divided by scholastic discipline has lain unconnected. If one cannot accept Melkin’s prophecy is a real encrypted document one will never find a solution to the *Matter of Britain*.

It is a bit contrived to assume that a British king Arthur in HRB and Joseph by Cornish legend.... both in Britain, are propagated in France and are the cause of the legends which took fruition in Britain; especially at Glastonbury when the abbot of Glastonbury has the anagram of H.Blois in Blihos Bleheris along with all the other BL variations of those attested to be responsible for Grail legend and those propagating the *histories* are at Henry Blois’ nephews’ court.

Glastonburyana merely coincided with the foreign template of Grail lore because it was the abbot of Glastonbury who spread the propaganda on the continent. When Wace made Arthuriana accessible and Henry saw the interest he then went on to his second agenda and through a different format to spread Joseph lore on the continent which ultimately collided with the same lore by the same author which had been percolating at Glastonbury.

If modern scholars really had a cohesive theory and their view was the true order of how events fortuitously transpired; and that there was no substance in reality to Melkin’s puzzle or the legend of Joseph; it would automatically make Kim Yale’s deconstruction of the prophecy a complete geometric coincidence just as I am sure all the BL names said to be sources of the Grail stories are considered coincidence.

As we know.... there is not a single piece of the geometric criteria found to be redundant in the Melkin prophecy, yet scholars prefer to exclude the numerical values and declare it a fake. Ultimately, it would mean a fourteenth century fabricator (as posited by Carley) jumbles up some figures and meaningless icons (supposed to relate to Joseph’s burial at Glastonbury) which coincidentally lead us (geometrically and by instruction to bifurcate a line) to a Devonian Island; which coincidentally, was donated to Glastonbury in 601. Our Joseph of Arimathea happened to be a tin merchant in Cornish legend in the old Dumnonia and a King donates an Island to Glastonbury. This Island then happens to be described by Diodorus as having a tidal causeway and happens to be an island renowned for ‘provending’ tin (two miles from where the cache of ingots/Astragali were found). It would also mean (if we assume the prophecy did not exist)
that Father Good took a stab in the dark and happened to posit Montacute as a place where Joseph was buried.... rather than Montacute having been supplied by Melkin as a place on the line to which he had indicated in the prophecy should be constructed to locate the Island.

A remarkable stab in the dark (for our fourteenth century fabricator) since it is not until the modern era the prophecy was decrypted. We should not think of Montacute in any other way than a marker on the line which the prophecy intended us to find, which, again by coincidence is mentioned pertaining to Joseph’s burial.

Now, if we add these random coincidences together with an Island which has a name in ancient ‘British’ which could (by my reckoning) have been derived from ‘White Tin island’ (Ineswitrin) and then connect the 601 charter to Glastonbury, (in which its British name is used and then coincidentally fits Diodorus’ description of Ictis having a tidal causeway); it becomes glaringly obvious that the Island of Ineswitrin is not at Glastonbury. I see now that since 2010 when nothing existed on the web about Melkin; there is now a Wikipedia page for the prophecy of Melkin which has appeared recently citing Carley’s views. This postulates the same intransigent nonsense about Melkin’s Prophecy; and surely written by a scholar. The legend may have been partly based on an older narrative of how the discovery of the alleged grave of King Arthur at Glastonbury, in c. 1191, had been foretold by an ancient Welsh bard, mentioned by Gerald of Wales around 1193.

This was obviously written by those believing what Carley has proposed. But if the prophecy is a fake, why try to defend an indefensible position. Why all the fuss about something that could be just dismissed if it really was a fake!!! Why has Carley written reams of rubbish on the topic of Melkin’s prophecy if it can be considered a fake. All that has been written by him establishes absolutely nothing except a conclusion which is blatantly wrong.

Carley will not back track on his position that Joseph must be a late invention. He has chosen to ignore all the evidence put forward here that associates Henry Blois to Geoffrey of Monmouth.

Crick knows the chivalric Arthur to be an invention; she knows Arthur could not exist on any island as he is a fabricated persona from the mind of ‘Geoffrey’. She does not know who transferred the Burgundian name of a town to become a mystical Island in a book about which she professes to be
an expert. She believes the book was written by Geoffrey of Monmouth; fully concedes its historicity is a fabrication and yet never questions the identity of ‘Geoffrey’. She never appears to enquire upon his validity i.e. the three stages of Geoffrey’s appearance as Gaufridus Artur, Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Bishop of Asaph and how it is we only have one recorded instance of a physical presence in front of theobald. Therefore, she is not in a position to advise on the existence of Joseph of Arimathea’s sepulchre on Ineswitrin. If our experts are inept, to whom do we turn.

Without cross referencing the authorship of HRB with that of Glastonburyana and Grail literature, Crick\(^\text{687}\) nor Carley nor anyone else is in a position to pronounce upon whether Joseph of Arimathea is buried on Burgh Island without understanding the facts first.

The beauty of writing this tome is the certainty that the established experts will deny the substance of Melkin’s prophecy and my findings. Even they as ‘experts’ cannot prevent what God has ordained at its appointed time to be uncovered. As Melkin’s prophecy predicts the whole world will come to gawk.

While I am on the subject of DA there are a few more pertinent points to cover which may help elucidate what actually transpired at Glastonbury after Henry died. We have no certainty who our consolidating author of DA was or if there was more than one after Henry until the scribe of T gives us the present oldest manuscript. One interpolator may have been Robert of Winchester who was prior at Glastonbury under Henry while Henry Blois was bishop; who then became abbot of Glastonbury after Henry’s death. Robert of Winchester was concerned with infringements from Wells before the Savaric usurpation.

Two churches, at Pilton and South Brent, the patronage of which was disputed between Wells Cathedral and Glastonbury Abbey fell under the

\(^{687}\) Crick writes a paper on ‘the Marshalling of Antiquity: Glastonbury’s Historical dossier’. This high sounding revelation starts with: \textit{the use to which history was put by the monks of Glastonbury...nurturing a cult of venerability which was spurious in the extreme. Why they felt impelled to do this, what they thought they were doing, and how they tackled their task are questions which underlie the following paper.} The only thing spurious regarding Geoffrey of Monmouth or Crick’s knowledge of events at Glastonbury is her expertise. Crick attaches some sort of connection between Arthur being unearthed in 1191 with the state of the abbey at Henry Blois’s arrival. It is a certain fact that Henry Blois had not even thought of making \textit{Insula Avallonis} commensurate with Glastonbury in 1126: \textit{The ultimate explanation for the historical and hagiographical creations of William of Malmesbury and Caradog of Llancarfan probably lies in reduced circumstances in which Henry of Blois found the monastery in the 1120’s when he came to be its abbot.}
jurisdiction of Wells while Robert was abbot and was the start of friction through Henry de Sully’s abbacy between 1189 -1193, when Savaric FitzGeldewin took over as Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury.  

However, there are charters found in GR3 version B and C of DA which must be early concoctions concerned with the infringements of the bishop of Bath and Wells. These charters provide polemical support for dismissing any attempt on behalf of a bishop to set foot inside Glastonbury. It is possible to speculate that these charters may represent an earlier attempt to appropriate Glastonbury from Henry Blois while Henry was at Clugny in exile, but there seem to be no records referencing this while Henry was alive. One must conclude that these are additions to charters directly related to the Savaric affair.

In regard to the later passages after Henry’s death concerning Dunstan, we can observe that the boldness of the assertions in DA concerning Dunstan are much in keeping with the confident un-historically correct assertions made about Patrick, St Benginus, Arthur and Joseph. Henry was the High born well connected and person of immaculate pedigee with enough confidence to dismiss conventionally held beliefs about Dunstan at Canterbury and with the gall and historical knowledge to propose the concocted account that Dunstan was translated to Glastonbury when Canterbury was set ablaze by the Danes.

So, it is possible to speculate that a later interpolator just after the fire in 1184 uses the premise instigated by Henry for a definitive find by planting a tomb and finding an identifiable and unequivocal Dunstan. The only

---

688 Adam of Damerham relates that Richard I was captured by the Duke of Austria who gave his captive to the Emperor of Germany. Now, Savaric was a cousin of the Emperor and because of the King’s importunity was suffered to grant him the Bishopric of Bath as well as the abbey of Glastonbury for his release from his chains. Henry de Sully was summoned to Durrenstein and informed of the transition to Savaric and Henry de Sully was elevated to the Bishopric of Worcester instead. Savaric met with his cousin the Emperor Henry VI in an attempt to secure Richard’s release. Savaric had obtained from Richard I letters allowing Savaric to be elected to the next available bishopric. After Savaric’s consecration, he traded the city of Bath to the king in return for the monastery of Glastonbury and the monks there objected; hence all the additions found in GR3 as we saw earlier.

689 Adam of Damerham says at the same time other saints were dug up such as the bones of St Patrick, St Indract and Adam repeats Henry’s interpolation and confirmation of the story about Dunstan’s translation. This is also another proof that it was Henry who had started the rumour and wrote the account in DA for which Eadmer at the time said there was no written evidence. Naturally, William does not mention the translation of Dunstan because he knows it is a fabrication. So, we can deduce soon after the fire Dunstan’s coffin was fabricated and our consolidator of DA adds his account after the fire.
reason to labour this point is that Lagorio followed by Crick and Carley all seem to think that the complex manoeuvrings which brought about the unearthing of Arthur, the apostolic, and Joseph foundation and the creation of Avalon at Glastonbury… just happened to transpire through the combined efforts of various interpolators.

Again, Grandsen’s theory that through desperation after the fire, Avalon, Joseph, Arthur, became an integrated body of Glastonbury lore by the simple interpolation of DA which took its cue from continental romance literature. R.S Loomis, after questioning why Avalon came to be identified with Glastonbury, tells us it is not the scheming of an Angevin King or the cupidity of Glastonbury Monks but it all rests on the mistaken logic of a Breton minstrel.690

I fully admit there may well be flaws and mistakes in this thesis, but until scholars admit that the accepted theory is less tenable than mine…. Henry’s authorship of HRB will be denied; Glastonburyana will be accredited as having taken shape by a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’ and the real Master Blehis will not be associated with the Glastonbury Perlesvaus or the emergence of Grail literature. More importantly than all, the body of Jesus and Joseph of Arimathea will remain fifty feet underground on Burgh Island.691

It is remarkable that the appearance of a continental Grail in our ‘experts’ view, becomes the template for the ‘Glastonbury’ duo fassula found in the prophecy of Melkin and not vice versa. Would it make sense that Glastonbury waits two hundred years to invent a prophecy? Why invent an ‘ecclesiastically more acceptable Grail’ which is now (duo) doubled? It is not clear to what purpose the Grail could possibly be made double if it were a late invention. Those experts who posit such a theory can find no rationale for Glastonbury’s doubling of a single Grail, simply because it never happened. Robert’s chalice of the last supper or magic vessel and Chrétien’s singular Graal are the product of Henry Blois’ propaganda on the continent derived from imagining what the duo fassula might be; but even Henry understood it was intricately connected to Jesus and wove into his stories tales of a single ‘vessel’. Let it not be misunderstood that both the Glastonbury ‘two Jugs’ and the continental

690 Arthurian Literature in the middle ages R.S Loomis p.67
691 See Image 5
singular Grail were inspired by the *duo fassula* and its relevance to Jesus.... which, Melkin’s prophecy makes plain exists in Joseph of Arimathea’s sepulchre and is still in it today.

The *duo fassula* is the (elephant in the room) subtext in the Melkin prophecy, within which, Melkin hides the real reason for designing his cryptic geometric puzzle. Henry Blois’ in his inventions which constitute Grail literature misunderstood the ‘doubled’ *fasciola* which in reality pertains to the Turin shroud and thought *duo fassula* pertained to two vessels but spoke about *un Graal* as a ‘vessel’ containing what he thought was Jesus’ blood (*sang real*) as he could not link two vessels to Jesus. *Sang real* or ‘Holy Blood’ as Henry understood the *duo fassula* through speech corruption when read out at the court of Champagne became San Greal or Holy Grail which Chretien relates as *Un Graal* still a mystifying object but Robert is much clearer on the subject.

Scholarly opinion naively believes that two hundred years before the advent of a fabricated prophecy, ‘William of Malmesbury had pointed out repeatedly that Wattle was the material of construction of the church at Glastonbury and stated the fact with such frequency in all innocence and with no intent. Why would William of Malmesbury think it necessary to relate to his readers that the church ‘used to be made’ of Wattle? More pertinent is why Henry Blois did so.

Why are such pains taken to erect a bronze plaque which in effect provides the only basis for any understanding of a bemusing (yet supposedly recently invented and randomly mentioned) *linea bifurcata*? Why was it necessary to mark where the Old Church had existed by specifically mentioning a *linea bifurcate* if there was no previous lore concerning it? It is because it is specified in the Melkin prophecy and the *officine de faux* is trying to find commonalities with the prophecy just as Henry had done earlier with the Wattle while impersonating William. Not even Henry Blois had managed to conceive and design some extraneous lore which would incorporate the use of the *linea bifurcate* which would help substantiate the existence of Joseph at Glastonbury but instead employed the prophecy through his muses to concoct the iconic object of the Holy Grail and had Joseph as the founder of Glastonbury. Without the Melkin prophecy to hand Henry surely would not have picked Joseph as founder, but his muses found different ways of interacting with the prophecy: 1) a quest to find the Grail as Henry himself had done, 2) also the
mystery of what it was, acted out in the form of a procession which no doubt was formed in Henry's mind from the processional rites at Mass at Clugny 3) the mystical isle on which Joseph lay became the template for Avalon in HRB and then Avalon’s existence at Glastonbury, 4) The discovery of a body unearthed in the future which is the essence of the Melkin prophecy becoming a template for the manufacture of Arthu’s grave, 5) Britain’s blessing at the unearthing of Joseph’s sepulchre on Burgh Island is stated clearly at the end of the Melkin prophecy; but is also likewise to the recovery and the renewal of the blighted lands which depended on finding the Grail i.e. the wasteland. 6) the Grail itself as an icon derived from the duo fassula, 6) of course Joseph himself being the founder of Glastonbury.

In the fourteenth century when John of Glastonbury wrote, all the monks believed the fabricated history which Henry Blois had conjured up about Glastonbury, and further continuators had built upon the foundations of Master Blihis. Henry based his entire edifice of Arthur’s Avalon, Joseph and the Grail on the prophecy of Melkin; ‘not’ vice versa. The linea bifurcata was just another piece of Melkin’s puzzle that monk craft employed so that the linea bifurcata appeared to be marking where the Old Church had stood (the Grail chapel) after the fire. This was supposedly because of its association with Joseph.

It would be a remarkable coincidence that what Henry Blois did not embellish from the prophecy i.e. the linea bifurcata; and was instead invented as a means of marking the ‘Old Church’ relative to Joseph’s supposed sepulchre.... in reality actually geometrically locates Ineswitrin in Devon. Yet we, as common sense observers, can witness this in the geometry. So, not only does the scholastic view have a theory which explains Glastonbury’s Joseph lore as a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’ but we also have a beyond probable coincidence of geometry which just so happens to employ every numerical criteria and icon provided by Melkin.692

Now, the layman does not require any specific qualification to understand to which location the geometry applies. Converse to the scholastic viewpoint that the geometry is meaningless Mumbo Jumbo and the prophecy has relevance to Muslims and Syria (or whatever other tripe is

---

692Carley’s fatuous explanation of the numerical data is at least an attempt to find relevance: Buried there is Abbadare powerful in saphat, who sleeps there with 104,000 among whom was Joseph from across the sea who lies in Linea bifurcata against the south corner of the wattle church built by the thirteen inhabitants of the place.
peddled); for what logical reason would the supposed inventor introduce such meaningless icons such as a *linea bifurcata*, the numerical values which no interpolator seems to find further use for, or the mystifying *sperula*... if indeed the prophecy was intended to convince us of a sepulchre of Joseph in the abbey grounds.

What have these random words and numbers to do with Baybars, Muslims or Syria... or are we to assume the numerical values have Middle Eastern relevance also to an English Meridian? It is an effrontery to common sense that Carley feels he has free licence to pontificate such nonsense. It is a sad fact that Carley’s pontifications are unchallenged by acquiescent deference.

What relevance would the *linea bifurcata* have to a concocted prophecy? If the prophecy had been concocted, one would think that the monks would have made it simpler to understand and pertain more acutely to the goals of their propaganda. Melkin’s prophecy is the foundation for the *Matter of Britain* not the ‘Matter of Syria’ and it is an encrypted geometrical puzzle. As I have already covered, there was certainly no misunderstanding (even in the fourteenth century) that the ‘bifurcated line’ was understood as directional, yet now Carley et al. muddy the waters even further with their learned opinions reinforcing an erroneous view by supplying a Wikipedia page with false information.

The DA was probably presented to Henry at Winchester just before his brother became King. Once Stephen was enthroned, Henry’s pseudo-history (which was being composed) was put on hold, as affairs of state took up his time. Any plan of a book destined for Matilda was obviously forgotten as Henry had helped his brother to usurp her crown. The Anarchy as such had not started, but Henry found himself in Wales suppressing the Welsh working closely on his brother’s behalf while his brother dealt with the Scots in the north. There would of course be no account of Wales in GS (right at the beginning) unless Henry had been there (but alas, from what we would have known of his eyewitness account... the folios are missing). He advised his brother (after attempting to quell the rebellion in the south) to let the Welsh fight amongst themselves as is implied in GS. It was not

693 Yet the material concerning the many Queens of Briton was still left rather than recomposing or changing the chronology and story line of the original Pseudo-History as the back bone of what became the *Primary Historia*. 
until mid 1138 that Henry Blois finished the first rendition of the *Primary Historia*, which in essence was the initial pseudo-history added to the new but as yet unexpanded chivalric Arthuriad.

There were probably only two copies of the *Primary Historia* until it was reworked into the First Variant post William of Malmesbury’s death in 1143, to be employed in the 1144 request for metropolitan status. The exemplar of the First Variant (which was owned by Henry) was updated with Prophetic material which dated from 1155. However, there were no dedications to Alexander or mention of Walter in it.

The final Vulgate version post-dates 1155 which has the ‘sixth’ in Ireland prophecy. The arrogant colophon, which is really directed to ‘whomever it may concern’ (but made to look as if it were pointed to three historians), is the final addition to the Vulgate HRB as pressure came upon the work to show that the seditious prophecies were extant even while William of Malmesbury and Caradoc were alive (the presumption is that Caradoc takes up the mantle from Geoffrey). Huntingdon also appealed to, died in 1157, so it was safe to ‘appear’ at that stage to be appealing to him also as a contemporary historian.

This is the genius of the Merlin interpolation into Orderic as this in effect predates the prophecies to Henry Ist time. Henry/ ‘Geoffrey’ was under immense pressure on his return from Clugny. If anyone had suspected that the Merlin prophecies were written by him he may have been put to death for treason by Henry II because there was no love lost between the two in 1158. Hence the colophon naming historians and especially Orderic’s interpolation which emphatically between both insertions ‘seem’ to back date the prophecies.

So, any accusation of sedition as people saw the upgraded King numbering emerge, and the Celts were encouraged to rebel in the era of Henry II in the updated prophecies…. could not be accountable to Henry Blois. What probably sparked this crisis in hiding his authorship was the advent of Ganieda’s prophecies in VM which were so obviously from the period in the Anarchy and thus ‘Geoffrey’s’ work came under scrutiny from people recognising the subtle change in the prophecies.

Henry made it seem as if the whole HRB was written earlier by addressing William of Malmesbury as if he were still alive. It was post 1155 when the majority of copies started to be produced and proliferated on the continent and in insular Britain being understood as an early work.
obviated by the dedicatees. The original *Primary Historia* is no longer extant and the few extant First Variant versions were eventually replaced by the more complete Vulgate editions. As there were probably only two copies of *Primary Historia* produced it is not difficult to accept that no copy has survived into the present era except what we can garner from its contents preserved in EAW. We also know that between 1147 and 1151 there were only two references to Galfridus’ work, both of them insular and both relying on the evolving First Variant and there were not many copies of this edition made either.

Since the DA reflects two parts to Henry’s first agendas, both stemming from attempts to obtain metropolitan (the apostolic foundation followed by the Phagan and Deruvian foundation), it is safe to suggest that neither the earlier or later agenda was deployed before William’s death. If we can accept that both the early and later foundation myths are the consequence of separate attempts at metropolitan, because Henry had been dismissed as Legate, this indicates that Henry had interpolated DA at an earlier stage (in 1144) and employed it as a genuine work of William’s words.

The second attempt at Metropolitan status probably was accompanied by the St Patrick charter written with gold lettering on Vellum which was later written into DA. Paragraphs like the postscript to the charter rendered in chapter 9 where ‘Avalon’ is mentioned would not have existed in DA at the papal presentation, but is part of a later consolidation of DA by Henry post 1155 when Avalon polemic was introduced. Chapter 22, where basic Phagan and Deruvian lore is introduced may well have been part of the 1144 attempt based upon the HRB’s reference to Eleutherius, but if an apostolic foundation were posited first then it would be unlikely. Latterly, the Phagan and Deruvian lore expanded upon by their inclusion in the St Patrick Charter.

One pertinent point in this whole affair of the *Matter of Britain* post Henry’s death is that Henry’s invention of a chivalric Arthur and the outcome of Arthur’s renown in the subsequent disinterment at Glastonbury; outshone Henry’s introduction of Joseph and the Grail. Therefore, the Joseph tradition fomented at a slower rate becoming legend by the time John of Glastonbury undertakes to consolidate and recycle the various sources. The essential difference between the HRB Arthuriana and the material about Joseph of Arimathea is that the truth behind the story of
Joseph and the Grail, (although fabricated by Henry in *romanz*) is based in reality. The HRB is a tale along historical lines.

That Henry suspected Ineswitrin existed in reality is highlighted by the fact that his hand is somehow connected to the search at Montacute and the coincidental procurement of Looe Island. Henry knew Joseph’s sepulchre existed but after he had exhausted his search at Montacute he started to look for an Ynis in Dumnonia. Looe island would be the obvious bet with the extant Joseph legend. Cornwall was a wasteland before the invasion and afterward even worse. What does Henry want Looe island for?

The Montacute search for Joseph spawned the fictitious story in *De Inventione*. As we have mentioned, Montacute was the only other place mentioned in connection with Joseph’s burial and since it is a precise marker on the line which Melkin led posterity to construct, the information could only have come from Melkin (or someone who knew the solution to the puzzle); which means the prophecy and the reference to Montacute existed in the time of Henry Blois.

Henry’s search for Ineswitrin almost certainly prompted his acquisition of Looe Island. Henry went to Devon in search of an Island based upon the fact that the 601 charter implied the island existed in Dumnonia. Henry knew Devon as he was left by his brother in charge at Exeter after the siege. Henry, who we know was in Plympton as an eyewitness to a dawn raid on the castle there in 1136 was also very close to Ineswitrin at some stage either then or later. If we refer back to Henry Blois’ concoction in both JC and HRB; that is, if I am correct about Salcombe (Salgoem) and ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Saltus Geomagog* (which like Salcombe is near Totnes as stated), where the Giant is thrown over a cliff by Corineus, being one and the same place…. we may suspect that Henry had ridden up on ‘Bolberry Down’ where he imagined the battle episode with the giant up on the cliffs took place. This cliff top to the west overlooks the Ineswitrin of old, the present day Burgh Island.

William of Malmesbury proposes in DA, with the help of documents at the abbey, to show the line of succession of abbots from antiquity; and, after he has recorded the names and dates of some nineteen English abbots before the year 940, he says: *I fancy it will now be clear how far that writer*

---

694 Both the 601 charter and the Prophecy of Melkin both named Ineswitrin.
was from the truth who wildly stated that the blessed Dunstan was the first abbot of Glastonbury'.

It is plain that William was certain that Osbern’s accusation that Dunstan was first Abbot of Glastonbury was wrong. In VD 1 William states against Osbern: *it is a misuse of learning and leisure to retail falsehoods about the doings of Saints; it shows contempt for reputation, and condemns one to infamy.* William disliked Osbern after earlier praising him and disagreed with what he had written and even refuses to refer to him by name. This change of opinion could only come about by certainty i.e. the genuineness of the 601 charter.

Henry’s problem was that if a donation had been made to the ‘Old Church’ on the Island of Glastonbury; to which island does the charter apply in reality? Henry found it necessary to contrive that the five cassates donated were local to Glastonbury to avoid any contention or discrepancy as to whether the charter was going to be received as genuine or not. You can’t have a charter for an unknown location when you are proposing it is proof of antiquity.

GR1 has no mention of Ineswitrin as this was written before espying the charter and the island is not mentioned in any other genuine work or saints life prior to William finding the 601 charter. *We cannot conclude that the charter itself is an invention because it dates to four years after Augustine’s arrival.* If it were a fabrication it would surely have ante-dated 597AD. I have shown above it fits in to where William originally referred to it in DA.

One can only surmise the original manuscript of the Melkin prophecy which pertained to the island of Ineswitrin (where Joseph is buried) was found at the same time, as it relates to the Island in the 601 charter.... even though the island’s actual location was lost to memory when the Dumnonians might have emigrated to Brittany. When the West Saxons took over Glastonbury and Ine built the stone church the charter had no relevance. The most certain fact that Henry could know is that Ineswitrin was in Devon or Cornwall, the old Dumnonia. Yet some other piece of information existed about Joseph’s burial site which spurred him to search at Montacute.

In the two books on the life of Dunstan written contemporaneously with DA, there is no mention of Ineswitrin. In the Life of Patrick, written before DA, there is no mention of Ineswitrin. Yet, we know the person who concocted the St Patrick charter is one and the same who impersonated
Caradoc who gave us the entangled etymology which puts Ineswitrin at Glastonbury. However, it is plain in the chronological sequence that William’s DA originally commenced at 601AD with the Ineswitrin charter which constituted the best (genuine) proof of the antiquity for the abbey. The 601 charter was then added to William of Malmesbury’s GR3 which constitutes chapter 27 & 28. In GR, most of the previous preamble which starts at chapter 19 in GR3: *Now, as we have reached the reign of Cenwealh, and the proper place to mention the monastery of Glastonbury, let me then from its birth tell thereof, the rise and progress of that house, so far as I can gather it from the formless mass of the documents…..* is positioned where it is in GR by William’s genuine inclusion of the 601 charter in his most recent updates to GR after DA had been written and William had left Glastonbury.

The accusation of some sceptics to the genuineness of the 601 charter will be that William did not refer to Ineswitrin in VD II, (written at the same time as DA), but the simple truth is that William recounted a copy of the charter purely to show the date when Ineswitrin was donated. William would never have thought that Ineswitrin was the previous name of Glastonbury because quite simply, it was not. Therefore it was not mentioned in VSD II.

The truth of this statement is indicated in the way the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas* is added to the main body showing the intention of carrying out the fraudulent etymological trans-location. The final paragraph would only have been added to the bogus work supposedly written by Caradoc, after William’s death in 1143 as William had never contemplated in either GR3 or DA that Ineswitrin was in any way synonymous with Glastonbury. The only reason some might think William did think of Ineswitrin as Glastonbury is because of all the propaganda put out by Henry Blois under the name of William of Malmesbury and the belief that Caradoc had actually written the etymological spin in the last paragraph of *Life of Gildas*.

William, out of favour with the monks, not having delivered what the monks expected, went to Henry at Winchester c.1134. Henry gladly

---

695 William might have met Caradoc but he was probably not at Glastonbury and had died c. 1129. (See chapter 22 on Caradoc). It is most probable that the *Life of Gildas* was written after Stephen came to the throne and before 1140 which, as we discussed, is determined by the date of construction of the cathedral at Modena which has the kidnap episode engraved upon it.

696 The original plan to which William refers in the prologue of DA is to counter Osbern’s accusation which, (without lying about Dunstan’s relics in VD 1&2) he accomplishes by the various proofs in his unadulterated DA, especially by commencing DA with the 601 Charter.
accepted the DA and paid William. Henry Blois now had the only copy of DA into which was added the various stages of Henry’s agendas which reflect the legends upon which modern Glastonburyana still bathes itself in myth. By the time the monks at Glastonbury received the DA upon Henry Blois’ death, 30 years had transpired since William’s death. Since William’s sojourn at Glastonbury, most of the elder monks who could have remembered William’s visit were passed on. This is, in effect, how the names of Ineswitrin and Avalon were foisted imperceptibly upon Glastonbury.

Only 13 years after Henry’s death there was a fire and many who could contradict the sudden appearance of material were in disarray. By the time Henri de Soilly unearthed the much famed King Arthur which Romanz, and the DA, and a Glastonbury Perlesvaus had rumoured to be connected to Avalon.... Glastonbury’s standing as Avalon was corroborated for those who were ignorant of the facts beforehand. Henry’s bogus history of Arthur had been accepted by all, based on the success of his HRB.... and it being accepted as a credible account of history since the Leaden cross had now identified Arthur’s relics in Avalon.

Through King Henry II’s influence, as Gerald suggests, Arthur was unearthed at Glastonbury (see appendix 34). We should not forget either, that Eleanor of Aquitaine and her daughters were most probably primed in Arthuriana in a direct link through Henry Blois. Eleanor may indeed have something to do with influencing Arthur’s unearthing after King Henry II death through her son Richard. King Henry II died in July 1189 and in September 1189 Richard I of England appointed Henry de Sully Abbot of Glastonbury.

There was no long standing legend of Joseph except the mention of him in DA and whatever was understood about his connection to Britain.... through Perlesvaus, Joseph d’ Arimathie, the Melkin prophecy and Joseph’s connection to Avalon (possibly posited in Henry’s/Melkin’s De Regis Arthurii rotunda).... was made more easily acceptable as the disparate works collided and corroborated each other.

Arthur, the Grail and its heroes searching for the Grail’s elusive presence are connected with Joseph of Arimathea and can only sensibly be understood as their separate stories having been spliced together by Henry Blois originally entwining motifs from Melkin’s prophecy to his work on
Arthur, before Chretien and ‘Robert’ expanded upon the connection through Master Bihis and Blaise.

Chrétien de Troyes in his unfinished romanz Perceval, le Conte du Graal mentions the Grail before any other raconteur but Joseph does not feature in the story. Chrétien de Troyes claimed to be working from a source given to him by Philip count of Flanders a close ally of Henry the Young King c.1170, Richard Ist brother. Henry Blois’s mother Adela was the daughter of William the Conqueror and Matilda of Flanders. Henry and Philip were related and Henry may have given him one variant of a Grail story i.e. Perceval, le Conte du Graal c.1160.

The only reason I mention this here is that, at this stage Henry had not decided openly to state Joseph’s name because he was developing the lore of Joseph in Avalon and Joseph’s connection to Glastonbury. Henry himself wrote the text that Robert then writes into prose for which Robert is now renowned.

. Marie of France was an older maternal half-sister to the future Richard I of England who was the Count of Poitiers (1169–1196) son of Eleanor of Aquitaine (Marie’s mother) and Henry II of England. Wauchier who is Chrétien de Troyes continuator of Percival le conte du Graal refers to what he thinks is the original author by name and calls him ‘Bleheris’ the first time. On the second occasion he states specifically that this Bleheris was of Welsh birth and origin, ‘né et engenuïs en Galles’. Now it would not take a genius to work out who this sounds like; especially with a name like Bleheris and ‘Geoffrey’ pretending to come from Wales.

In plain speak, (unless you are a Grail scholar) Wauchier is saying that Chrétien de Troyes’ poem was originated by Henry Blois. Wauchier says this in connection with a tale being told to a certain, Compte de Poitiers, whose favourite story it was, saying ‘he loved it above all others’, which would infer that it was not the only tale the said ‘Bleheris’ had recounted to the Count. I would hazard a guess and say that the compte originally heard a Jongleur reading out Henry Blois’ versified Percival recorded in prose by Robert.

So we have a young Richard who is presently le compte de Poitier/pitou c.1170-80 listening to Wauchier who is ‘continuating’ one of Bleheris’s histories which had been told first to Chrétien de Troyes obviously before 1170 (Henry Blois d.1171). Since we know Chrétien de Troyes was at Marie Countess of Champagne’s court c.1165 until he joined Philip I court, we are
well within Henry Blois’ life time for Henry to be the first promulgator of Grail stories at Marie’s court.

In a clear situation we have evidence of Henry’s niece at her court with Chrétien de Troyes hearing *Percival le conte du Graal* from Bleheris. The fact that Marie is half sister to Richard hearing Grail literature at Marie’s court (and the count had heard the same story before as it was his favourite); you would need to be in active denial to say Henry did not propagate his Grail literature through the court of Champagne and Marie of France (the writer of the *Lais*) is not Marie of Champagne but I will get to that shortly.

Marie is steeped in Henry Blois’ Arthuriana. Her court after 1164 is one of his main conduits for spreading *histoires* of Henry Blois’ alter-ego Arthur and the Grail through patronising Chrétien de Troyes. She is married to Henry Blois’ elder brother’s son. Walter Map was there also and certainly Robert de Boron’s work was contemporaneous as this is written by Blaise and Blaise is Henry Blois

Grail scholars of the past need to re-assess their time lines for the advent of Grail literature as so much credence has been given to the scholastic decree that has existed which dictated that Grail literature which includes Joseph was late; originating in France and trickling back to Glastonbury while busy monks all made it fit together in DA before 1247.

Scholars should understand one certainty; you can’t have a Grail or un *Graal* without having a Melkin prophecy as the template for it. So, we should not rely on a date c.1190 for the origins of Robert de Boron’s material because Scholars have decreed Joseph Grail literature comes later; after Arthur’s disinterment and the supposed advent of Avalon. This view is no longer tenable on two counts:

1) If you have the Grail which we know is derived as an icon from Melkin’s prophecy; Joseph is as equally possible because he is an icon of Melkin’s prophecy too. Both are contemporaneous in the same document that has inspired Henry Blois’ literary Grail edifice.

2) Robert de Borons work is a direct derivative of Henry’s work if it is not Henry’s directly. So Robert’s work in origin has to have been authored in Henry Blois’ lifetime. Of course if you are a modern scholar this could not be accepted because the premise that Melkin’s prophecy is a fake is based in ignorance. If you ignore the facts above which clearly show Henry Blois as
Bleheris at Marie’s court (in his lifetime) then there will be no solution to the Matter of Britain.

I do know that once you have looked at something one way and built ones own empirically derived theory one can’t wipe the slate of one’s mind. So until Melkin’s prophecy is accepted as real.... I see no quick advancement in medieval scholarship regarding our three areas of study

About the same time that ‘Robert’ states openly Joseph’s connection to the Grail. Robert de Boron has a full understanding of Merlin, Arthur and Joseph lore and the Grail’s connection to Avalon; too many points in Robert’s Trilogy are brought together that it could only be Henry Blois as the originator of this material. So, where the scholastic world is proposing that Monks are fitting the pieces together back at Glastonbury after 1189-91, Henry Blois the architect of this whole Grail edifice is putting it together in what is now accountable as Robert’s own work c.1165-1170 ......25 years before scholars have been able to allow in a backwardly contrived theory.

Chrétien de Troyes has Joseph in the guise of ‘Le Roi pêcheur’ or the fisher king in this early unfinished rendition of Perceval, le Conte du Graal. I think Joseph’s attachment to Glastonbury was forseen as a problem by Henry so Le Roi pêcheur’ was introduced as he was not so connected while Henry is alive but the fisher king was always Joseph in Henry’s mind.

It could be the case that at this stage Henry has Joseph in mind as the ‘King of the apostles’ strangely outranking the Peter upon whom the edifice of the pope is built. The first apostles were fishers as Jesus had sent them out into the world to be fishers of men. (Mt 4, 19; Mk 1,17). Again I only mention this here to open the possibility that Henry did believe that Joseph had arrived in Britain as an apostle and termed him King of the fishers of Men or ‘Le Roi pêcheur’ at an earlier stage.

The fact that King Arthur’s round table is in Perceval, le Conte du Graal at this early date should make those scholars who might be reluctant to connect the Winchester table to Henry Blois through Wace, at least try to make the connection that Master Blehis is Henry Blois. His relationship to Chrétien de Troyes is through Marie of France. It was the same Bleheris who, according to Wauchier, (Chrétien de Troyes continuator of le Conte du Graal) had ‘told tales concerning Gawain and Arthur’s court’ and the same Wauchier who said concerning the mysteries of the Grail that ‘if Maistre Blihis lie not none may tell the secrets’. Certainly no-one could except Henry
Blois who formulated his idea of the Grail on the *duo fassula* and even he as the inventor of Grail legend had no idea what it was.

Gawain\textsuperscript{697} also features in *le Conte du Graal*. This same Master Blihis, ‘who knew the Grail mystery’, and gave solemn counselling about its revelation in *The high History of the Grail* is said to be the same person who wrote the ‘book of the Grail’ from which Chrétien de Troyes is sourcing his material given him by Philip Ist. This would be the same Blihos-Bliheris\textsuperscript{698}, ‘who knew the Grail, and many other tales’; the Bréri, ‘who knew all the legendary tales concerning the princes of Britain’; and the famous storyteller Blehericus. In fact it was our knight (and Henry was a bishop knight), Blihos Bliheris, who, made prisoner by Gawain, reveals to Arthur and his court the identity of the Fisher King, and the Grail, and is so good a storyteller that none can weary of listening to his tales.

Now if Arthur’s round table turns up where the Bishop of Winchester resides; is it too much of a stretch to assume Henry Blois commissioned it considering we have not come across too many credible theories to date. It just so happens that around the round table there is a knight called Caradoc, the same Caradoc named on the Modena Archivolt in 1140 that Henry Blois commissioned; and this same Caradoc features in his own romance called the *life of Caradoc* included in the first continuation of Chrétien de Troyes’s *Perceval, le Conte du Graal* c.1170-80.

I do not wish to labour the point that Henry is directly involved with the proliferation of Grail literature but one point here should be made concerning the undoubted connectedness of Geoffrey’s work, Chrétien’s work, the Modena archivolt commissioned by Henry and the Life of Cadoc.

We know that Henry Blois has authored his *Life of Gildas* c.1139 based on the template set out in the life of Cadoc. The Modena Archivolt engravings were fabricated c.1140. ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Primary Historia* is dated to 1138-9. So, if we just take two people as an example i.e. Cai and Bedwyr we can see their provenance to Henry Blois’s muses. Cai and Bedwyr and their relation to

\textsuperscript{697} Jessie Weston insists: The Celtic origin of both Gawain and Perceval is beyond doubt; and the latter is not merely a Celt, but is definitely Welsh; he is always ‘li Gallois.’ Yes, but so was Geoffrey definitely Welsh !!

\textsuperscript{698} Jessie Weston also suggests that: the double form, Blihos–Bliheris, would have been adopted by the author himself, to indicate the identity of the two, Blihis, and Bleheris. It is worthy of note that, when dealing directly with the Grail, he assumes the title of Master, which would seem to indicate that here he claimed to speak with special authority. He certainly did, but he also put his name for everyone to see as an anagram H. Blois ….is Bleheris, screaming out from the page.
Warlord Arthur predates all Henry Blois’ authorship; i.e. anything Henry has included them in by way of his muses.

So, Henry reads the life of Cadoc and witnesses their relation to Arthur: *three vigorous champions, Arthur with his two knights, to wit, Cai and Bedwyr, were sitting on the top of the aforesaid hill playing with dice.*

Henry then composes the *Life of Gildas* where obviously he does not include Cai and Bedwyr because it would be too evident that he has based his concoction of *Life of Gildas* by mirroring the Life of Cadoc; but he achieves his agenda in writing *Life of Gildas* as we have discussed already. Cai and Bedwyr are in ‘Geoffrey’s’ work. They also feature on the Modena Archivolt where *Burmaltus* is confederate with Arthur and synonymous with *Bedwir; Che* is obviously Cai in the engraving, and Sir Kay is synonymous with Cai in Chrétien de Troyes’s *Perceval, le Conte du Graal*. We have a clear picture of connection from supposedly disparate sources and we know the source is Henry Blois.

Henry’s source for Arthur originated from his reading of the Life of Cadoc and other material he had come across while researching his pseudo historia before the advent of *Primary Historia*. The main source to Henry Blois’ muses for all his Grail literature was the prophecy of Melkin, but he started to mix Arthur material from HRB with Joseph material derived from the prophecy of Melkin and thus the Grail legends anachronistic joining of Joseph’s Grail with Arthur’s Knights’ and they were all around a table which turns up in reality where Henry was Bishop… just like Arthur’s body turned up where Henry was Abbot.

Henry Blois just needed to understand where the Island on which Joseph was buried was located so that he could discover what was inside the tomb; as he knew by his own invention of the Grail in the form he presented it, there is some unknown association of the Grail to Jesus i.e. the ‘*duo fassula*’ in the Melkin prophecy was something to do with Jesus and his blood.

If there was no body of Christ or tomb to be found anywhere; did Henry consider that maybe Joseph had brought Jesus here to Britain after the crucifixion, even if he could not decipher the obtuse Latin in the Melkin prophecy. Again, the only reason I posit this is because the Fisher king’s castle in Chrétien de Troyes’s *Perceval, le Conte du Graal* was called
'Corbenic', which comes from *coir benoit*, or in today’s French ‘corps béni’ which is representing the body of Christ as the ‘blessed body’. It is not a step too far considering Robert’s *vaus d’avaron* is so obviously the vales of Avalon; that we could even think that *per-ce-val* is a tongue in cheek.

Anyway, with an already extant Glastonbury Perlesvaus and with the advent of Henry’s Grail literature in France, it did not take the monks at Glastonbury (before and just after the fire) very long to deduce that their Melkin prophecy (that’s if you do not believe that JG invented it) and the *Vaus d’Avaron* of Robert de Boron’s Grail literature, both gave account of Joseph, who by Henry Blois’ hand now had his sepulchre at Avalon.

But, also in DA Joseph’s name was present in the first two chapters and Glastonbury was already known as Avalon to those in the monastery and this knowledge had percolated out since Henry had died. Robert de Boron’s mystical ‘vessel’ went to the *Vaus d’Avaron* because Henry is linked to those scripts directly which we will get to shortly.

What Lagorio sees as ‘a fortuitous convergence of factors’ was blatantly by design. With the advent of Henry’s Grail material, it would not take very long for someone to figure out that the *duo fassula* (from the Melkin prophecy) was the template for the Grail; especially since it was associated with Joseph…. and all of this emanated from Glastonbury/Avalon and through Henry spreading his roman material on the continent through Master Blehis.

It is no wonder Henry did not include the prophecy in DA. Instead of the conventional theory about the advent of Joseph at Glastonbury deriving from the continent in the thirteenth century, it must be accepted that Joseph’s name was in DA at Henry’s death. But, given that it was Henry Blois who attached the spurious name of his invented Avalon to a genuine geometrical guide to a tomb, it could only be Henry Blois who included and coalesced the Joseph lore in the first two chapters of DA.

The Grail material was planted in continental soil until Grail material met with its insular forebear which were the germs of Glastonburyana in DA, *De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda*, and the Glastonbury Perlesvaus, in the years following Henry’s death.

William of Malmesbury’s *Enquiry into the Antiquity of the Church of Glastonbury* is a work which many commentators have accused him of putting together carelessly. He is often accused of a piece of work which
flatters the vanity of the Glastonbury monks because of some of the beneficial lore posited in both GR3 and DA. The accusation is that William had for a time taken up his abode in their house and therefore compromised himself by recording puerile history while he ate their bread. This is unfair, because he maintained his integrity as an historian. This can be understood from the prologue of DA.

The denunciation of William is furthered by the discovery of a tenth-century list of the English abbots of Glastonbury, which cannot be reconciled with William’s list in the DA. In chapter 71 we should understand that the first two named abbots St Patrick and St Benignus are Henry inventions and certainly do not cover the period until William names Worgret, the abbot named on the 601 AD charter.

Eadmer who also wrote a *Life of Dunstan*, based mostly on author B’s work. Eadmer had accused Glastonbury of having no written evidence of Dunstan’s interment and William had not provided it in his VSD, but a suitable story of translation in the time of the Danish invasion was produced in DA. It is not the work of William; otherwise the translation would have been in William’s VSD 1 & II. This shows William kept his integrity and the DA account is partially by Henry followed by a further interpolator.

The First Variant HRB (modelled on the *Primary Historia*) was written at Winchester and hence *Pagan and Duvian’s* first appearance in HRB as named individuals: Unto Coill as born one single son whose name was Lucius, who, upon the death of his father, had succeeded to the crown of the Kingdom, and did so closely imitate to his father in all good works that he was held by all to be another Coill. Natheless, being minded that his ending should surpass his beginning, he despatched his letters unto Pope Eleutherius beseeching that from him he might receive Christianity. For the miracles that were wrought by the young recruits of Christ’s army in divers lands had lifted all clouds from his mind, and panting with love of the true faith, his pious petition was allowed to take effect, forasmuch as the blessed Pontiff, finding that his devotion was such, sent unto him two most religious doctors, *Pagan and Duvian*, who, preaching unto him the Incarnation of the Word of God, did wash him in holy baptism and converted him unto Christ.699

699 HRB, IV. xix
The first mention of Lucius and his letter to Eleutherius is in the *Catalogus Felicianus*, a version of the *Liber Pontificalis* created in the 6th century. The *Liber Pontificalis*, says that Lucius as King sent a letter to Pope Eleutherius to be made a Christian. The story became widespread after it was repeated in the 8th century by Bede and is found in ASC, but Collingwood and Myers belief is correct in saying that the myth is derived from a misreading of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

They state that this belief rests on an error in the *Liber Pontificalis* confusing the name of Britain and *Britium* in Mesopotamia. The main point to consider, mistake or not is that ‘Geoffrey’ believed Bede and thus went onto name Eleutherius’s envoys as Phagan and Deruvian. This is vital to the understanding of how ‘Geoffrey’ capitalized on Bede’s mistake and ultimately is responsible for the connection of Phagan and Deruvian to Eleutherius which at no time existed in reality. The King Lucius as presented in HRB is entirely fictitious.

Nennius also has the same episode, also derived from Bede: *After the birth of Christ, one hundred and sixty-seven years, King Lucius, with all the chiefs of the British people, received baptism, in consequence of a legation sent by the Roman emperors and pope Evaristus.* A marginal note in the Arundel MS. adds, "He is wrong, because the first year of Evaristus was A.D. 79, whereas the first year of Eleutherius, whom he ought to have named, was A.D. 161."

Bede’s mistake was not purposeful, yet chroniclers followed the mistake until Henry designs a myth around it for his own ends. Commentators seeing so many loose ends have had to accept the occurrence as credible history. This position has been augmented and made easier to maintain by the obvious presence of an early insular Celtic church. It is for this reason we should believe Joseph of Arimathea’s relics lie in Dumnonia.

Rudborne, while writing his *Historia Major* on the Old Minster at Winchester, compiled from the old annals would doubtfully suggest Phagan and Deruvian’s names in connection with the consecration of the old Minster, had he not seen their names there in connection with its foundation. Henry had originally included their names in HRB so that it might be later discovered that they were the founders of Winchester and thus it would be an added boon to his request to make Winchester a metropolitan (especially if the St Patrick charter was proffered as evidence in 1149 on which their names were seen) and their names were also found
in First Variant. Don’t forget at this stage no-one knew anything about the author of *Primary Historia* or First Variant.... no trail of ‘Geoffrey’s’ existence had been laid.

It should not be forgotten the interpolations of DA as Henry left it and more importantly, the construction of the First Variant (in which Phagan and Deruvian were added) was written at Winchester. We hear in DA that: *at the bidding of Eleutherius, therefore, two very holy men, the preachers Phagan and Deruvian’s came to Britain, as the Charter of St. Patrick and the Deeds of the Britons* attest. Proclaiming the word of life, they cleansed the King and his people at the sacred font in 166 AD. They then travelled through the realm of Britain preaching and baptising until, penetrating like Moses the lawgiver into the very heart of the wilderness, they came to the island of Avalon where, with God’s guidance, they found an old church built by the hands of the Disciples of Christ....

It is not by coincidence that both the authorities appealed to i.e. *the Charter of St Patrick* and *The Deeds of the Britons* (HRB) were both authored by Henry. In the last line of VM, Henry actually refers to his HRB as *Gesta Britonum* rather than the History of the kings of Britain. The DA then continues....So when Saints Phagan and Deruvian discovered that Oratory... the point of this is to establish that in Phagan and Deruvian’s era an ‘Oratori’ existed. In any reference prior to DA or St Patrick’s charter, any allusion to the ecclesiastical house at Glastonbury was a church or old Church and we can see the reasoning behind DA’s use of the word interchangeably with ‘old Church’ is to coincide with the *Oratori* of Melkin’s prophecy.... and this is possibly why the oratory on the ‘tor’ is implied.

In the same section entitled: *How the Saints Phagan and Deruvian converted the Britons to the faith and came to the island of Avalon*, the DA continues: they loved that place before all others and, in memory of the first twelve, chose twelve of their own companions whom with the consent of King Lucius, they established on that Island. These twelve stayed there in separate dwellings, like anchorites, in the very places which the first twelve had originally inhabited. Yet they used to gather together frequently in the old church in order to celebrate divine worship more devoutly. Just as the three pagan Kings had formally granted the island with its appurtenances to the

---

700 In the VM, we find the same reference by ‘Geoffrey’ to his own HRB: *Therefore, ye Britons, give a wreath to Geoffrey of Monmouth. He is indeed yours for once he sang of your battles and those of your chiefs, and he wrote a book called “The Deeds of the Britons”*
first twelve disciples of Christ, so Phagan and Deruvian obtained confirmation of the same from King Lucius this for their twelve companions and the others who should follow them in the future. Thus many successors always in twelves, dwelt on that island throughout the course of many years until the arrival of St Patrick, the apostle of the Irish. To the church that they found there these holy neophytes added another oratory made of stone, which they dedicated to Christ and the holy Apostles Peter and Paul.

So it was by the work of these men that the old church of St Mary at Glastonbury was restored, as trustworthy history has continued to repeat throughout the succeeding ages. There are also letters worthy of belief to be found at St Edmunds to this effect: ‘the hands of other men did not make the church at Glastonbury, but the very disciples of Christ, namely those sent by St Philip the apostle built it’. Nor is this inconsistent with the truth, as was set down before, because if the apostle Philip preached to the Gauls, as Freculph says in chapter four of his second book, it can be believed that he also cast the seeds of the Word across the ocean.

Whether or not such letters existed is not in question as William makes the point in VSD 1\textsuperscript{701} about a pre-existence to Dunstan’s abbacy countering Osbern’s position in saying: \textit{But how great the store Edmund set by Glastonbury from that day on is too well-known to require my narration to publish it abroad.}

As we have covered it was stated by author B: \textit{the first neophytes of Catholic law discovered an ancient church, built by no human skill as though prepared by heaven for the salvation of mankind.}

So, William’s reference to a well-known tradition in VSD 1 regarding Edmund and Glastonbury are now in DA, letters existing at St Edmund’s whereby proof is to be found that what was probably some reference to author B’s wording is now twisted from \textit{built by no human skill to…… the very disciples of Christ, namely those sent by St Philip the apostle built it’}. We can now see how Henry distorts the facts from seeming references made by William, from tentative to positively polemically motivated statements.

This is an object example of how Henry devises his craft. Supposedly, if William had reasoned in GR3 that if the apostle Philip preached to the Gauls, as Freculph says, it can be believed that he also cast the seeds of the Word across the channel. This does not mention Joseph but the ninth

\textsuperscript{701} Life of Dunstan I, 15.5, William of Malmesbury’s Saints Lives, Winterbottom and Thompson.
century bishop of Lisieux had also written that St Philip sent a mission from Gaul to England ‘to bring thither the good news of the world of life and to preach the incarnation of Jesus Christ’.

This too is based on Freculphus’ history. But, it is Dunstan’s biographer author B who recorded his belief that the earliest church at Glastonbury had not been built by men but had been fashioned in heaven. As is evident from above; the church which had not been built by men is now built by the very disciples of Christ and there is only one disciple which Henry has in mind when he adds the single word ‘restaurata’ and makes Phagan and Deruvian the restorers, (not the builders), of the Old Church as this implies Joseph as founder which connects back to his first disciplic agenda in 1144 where Joseph is obviously not named.

Henry’s agenda had shifted from an earlier proof of antiquity through the disciples posited by his interpolations in William’s GR3 and DA to the later charter of St Patrick which involved Phagan and Deruvian through William’s reference to Eleutherius. The two earlier polemics are consolidated in chapters 1 & 2 of DA to highlight Joseph’s foundation which is part of Henry’s post 1158 second agenda. The outcome is that the church is established by the actual disciples of Christ through ‘William’s’ words and it is no longer a matter of opinion but fact.... that in 167AD a church existed as witnessed in DA.

Another consideration is the cult of St Mary at Glastonbury. Both ‘Geoffrey’ and Nennius before him claimed that Arthur had gone into battle with an image of the Virgin on his shield, ‘which forced him to think perpetually of her’. Melkin’s adorandam virginem is I believe the main cause for this sudden arising of the Marian cult in the time of Henry Blois. It is not without coincidence that in the third chapter of DA it is claimed that during Blois’ time as abbot, one of his monks visited the abbey of St Denis in the Ile-de-France where he was reportedly asked if Glastonbury’s ‘ancient church of the perpetual Virgin and compassionate mother’ was still standing; to which the monk replied ‘it is’. This is another piece of Henry’s guile, as he is the instigator of this passage and clearly shows that he knew the impact that the DA would have after his death.

I suggest, it is the Melkin allusion of Virginem adorandam which fixes the St Mary cult at Glastonbury and it was just fortuitous that Nennius had such an applicable anecdote which could coalesce both Arthurian and Joseph legends to the Old Church. It was probably Henry who
commissioned a statue of the Virgin for the Old Church as an image of ‘Our Lady’ is first mentioned during his abbacy when Henry provided funds to keep a candle ‘perpetually burning’ before the image.

It was Henry who fostered devotion to the Virgin by presenting his abbey with a number of St Mary relics i.e. ‘some of blessed Mary’s milk and some of her hair and part of her sepulchre’. Also fragments of the very garments of that same blessed Mother of God. It was Henry who instigated the monks to observe all the principal festivals of St Mary and as we have covered, left funds for the upkeep of an 8lb candle to burn in St Mary’s Church on all the principal feasts. The stone church in Henry’s day was dedicated to Peter and Paul but someone is attempting to have us believe that in the Phagan and Deruvian era, the wooden Church which the neophytes ‘restored’ was dedicated to St Mary: To the church that they found there these holy neophytes added another oratory made of stone, which they dedicated to Christ and the holy Apostles Peter and Paul. So it was by the

702Just to show the convolutions which modern scholars have undergone adhering to certain misguided a prioris and how it seems that they are blind to the input of Henry Blois at Glastonbury and his influence on the Matter of Britain…. I will provide one extract from Watkin which should amuse the reader in its associations: We can then conceive of a story, apparently known at Glastonbury and probably lying behind the late twelfth-century de Boron’s Joseph d’Arimathie and its amplification in the Estoire del Saint Graal which brought the Grail-bearer to Glastonbury. But the medieval Glastonbury writers merely use this story to bring Joseph himself to Glastonbury; they never asserted that he brought the Grail. That is one line of approach, we may now suggest another. One of the vexed questions of hagiology is the story of the growth of the cult of St Mary Magdalen. There is first the process by which the martyrs Maria and Martha become identified with the sisters of Bethany and the confusion between Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalen, Martha and Lazarus in Provence and in Burgundy. At the moment it is impossible to say at what date Joseph of Arimathea is added to this group of Emigrants from the Holy Land. But the fact remains the cult of Lazarus has been traced back to the tenth century at Autun and, more recently still has been shown that Avalon was before Autun in the cult of Lazarus. But equally at Glastonbury we find evidence of an early cult of Lazarus. His festival occurs in a cotemporary addition to the tenth century Leofric missal and in a twelfth century Glastonbury collectarium. This festival is unknown in any other English calendars of these dates. Is it possible that here we come somewhere near to a clue to the introduction of the cult of Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury, is it possible that legends connecting him with Avalon in Burgundy were transferred by a natural confusion to the isle of Avalon? At the moment this can be no more than a query, for no reference to an early cult of St Joseph at Avalon has yet been found. But it is interesting in this connexion to note that the Estoire del Saint Graal was written in Burgundy, that St Mary Magdalen is mentioned in an Eleventh century Glastonbury kalendar at Cambridge that the Hermitage mentioned in the Glastonbury version of Perlesvaus was dedicated to her ……..Arthurian Literature XV edited by James P. Carley, Felicity Riddy. P.88
work of these men that the old church of St Mary at Glastonbury was restored.....

Strangely enough, the authors of the Somerset Historical Essays comment on Phagan and Deruvian and highlight their suspicions. They, however, do not contemplate that by the time the DA came to Glastonbury after Henry’s interpolations, William’s book was altered permanently with no original to compare against. It is certainly not as they suggest (along with Stubbs) that a comparison might be made with GR to find a sense of William’s original. As we know, the GR text also received interpolations concerning Glastonburyana, but we are told: The frequent repetitions in the text will at once suggest that it has passed through several stages of correction: and, in particular, the names of St Phagan and St Deruvian meet us so unnecessarily often, that we shall even begin to wonder whether they had any place at all in the original manuscript.703

We know the cult of St Mary had a large following in France, but, Henry Blois, rarely in his propaganda includes a detail which has no consequence. The church was genuinely known as the ‘Old Church’, as stated on the 601 charter. We know Henry Blois has written the piece about the ‘restoration’ of the church so that his first ‘disciplic’ foundation and the Phagan and Deruvian foundation don’t contradict each other. The question is why is Henry keen to make this association that the dedication was to St Mary, excepting the obvious connection with the virgīnem adorandum in the Melkin prophecy and to coincide with Nennius’ allusion to Arthur’s shield, which would make Arthur’s association with Glastonbury seem all the more feasible.

King Ine was probably the first royal benefactor of the Kings of Wessex who built the stone church. This is where the recorded evidence begins with William in GR3: The charter of this donation was written in the year of our Lord’s incarnation 725, the fourteenth of the indiction, in the presence of the King Ina, and of Berthwald, archbishop of Canterbury." What splendour he (Ina) added to the monastery, may be collected from the short treatise which I have written about its antiquities.

Herein is the 601 charter’s importance in the proof of antiquity. Of course Henry Blois’ Life of Gildas provides us with supposedly earlier accounts of the existence of a monastery at Glastonbury but we know

---

703 Somerset Historical Essays By J. Armitage Robinson
Caradoc’s account and the St Patrick charter are a Blois concoction written after William’s DA. These are the tracts with which Henry hopes to establish an archaic provenance. The gullible are made to think that William was aware of accounts beyond the 601 charter. The illusion is that William seemingly approved of their content by including the whole of St Patrick’s charter in DA and also appearing to reference the etymology from Life of Gildas concerning Ineswitrin.

With the semblance that William had nonchalantly mentioned Gildas’ stay at Glastonbury, one is obviously more inclined to believe in the truth of the kidnap of Guinevere and the part Gildas played with the abbot in a peaceable solution. The fact that there is a King Melvas at Glastonbury and a Maheloas, a great baron, lord of the Isle of Voirre in Chrétien’s ‘Erec’, where Henry has influenced Chrétien de Troyes, is not coincidence. Now, Eric and Enid was written as Chrétien’s first romance c.1165 while Henry is alive. You don’t have to have too much imagination to see that lord of the Isle of Voirre could only be Glastonbury. Now chances are this little booklet written c.1139 to complement Henry’s first agenda, finds its way to Chrétien is pretty slim. But once you include Henry Blois in the equation then you are certain how Chrétien got his information either in writing or more probably verbally through Master Blihis.

We hear for the first time in Caradoc’s Life of Gildas of the Isle of Glass etymology which of course both DA and John of Glastonbury expand upon. Master Blehis is the source for Chrétien de Troyes, but we will be covering soon the relationships and influence of Marie of France and her sister Alix and their mother Eleanor in relation to Chrétien and Henry Blois.

Because of the various tracts written under pseudonyms which tangentially corroborate each other, no scholar has found his way through the maze to find Henry Blois as the common author. This task has been made harder by the seeming contradictions of position in DA which we have discussed which pertains to Henry’s agendas at separate times. Because of these contradictions, it seems as if a late consolidator has tried to rectify the discrepancies especially as some of the interpolations in DA appear to reference Henry in the past. This is why Scott advocates a consolidating interpolator which he assumes is responsible for interpolations which were actually carried out by Henry Blois himself.

The task has also been made more difficult because researchers have been unable to bring the three genres of ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB, Glastonburyana,
and Grail literature under one investigation and have tended to focus on only two genres and comment on their common material. The reason for this is that until one accepts the retro dating of Vulgate HRB (the interpolation into Orderic making the Merlin prophecies appear to have existed in Henry I’s time and the advent of the *Primary Historia* at Bec in 1139)…. it is difficult to match the three genres chronologically, as Grail literature is always thought to have surfaced c.1180, even though we are told it had an earlier provenance from men with similar phonetically sounding names to Henry.

The difficulty unravelling what can only have come about by an initial designer has been exacerbated by the fraud of Henry’s backdating of HRB through the dedicatees and his composition of the colophon mentioning the historians. This has caused Arthurian material within HRB, to be thought of in terms of a different corpus, emanating by an entirely separate tradition of independent authorship, connected only by a distant Brythonic root. The main hindrance which has prevented scholars finding the truth is the mistaken presumption that any Arthuriana in DA was written after 1191 and the assumption that the perpetrator of the disinterment fraud is Henry de Sully.

Joseph material has never been taken in any way seriously as having any basis in history. Scholars have thought of it in no other way but a thirteenth century invention purely because of Joseph’s localised tradition at Glastonbury having been wrongly accounted as having stemmed from continental literature. When Arthurian Glastonburyana in Avalon burst onto the stage after Arthur was dug up in 1189-91, Joseph was essentially ignored.

Arthur’s fame after the unearthing consigned a mere saint to obscurity in the popular culture of both plebeian and court society. Gerald was not concerned with a second rate Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury which virtually no-one else but the few monks at Glastonbury had heard the rumours. Gerald’s interest lay in a Welsh Arthur from Caerleon who was buried in Avalon and it would be a tough illusion to convince the population that Henry de Sully had found Arthur at Avalon if there were no previous corroborative evidence. This is the brilliance of Henry Blois’ design.
As is evident from the DA text above, someone is trying to square the various accounts of how it is that the twelve hides exist and never paid Geld. The twelve hides of Glastonbury probably had its origin in privileges granted to the abbots of Glastonbury in a succession of charters by Anglo-Saxon Kings of Wessex. A grant from Centwine (676–85) of six hides at Glastingai and a similar grant from Baldred, may together have made up the twelve hides which was the assessment of Glastonbury in 1066, and which already represented a privileged estate. It is Henry’s clever manipulation which brings this mundane assessment corroborated in Doomsday into ancient lore by its attachment to Arviragus, masked in the confusion of history by the ridiculous notion: _Thus many successors always in twelves, dwelt on that island throughout the course of many years until the arrival of St Patrick._

The Abbey of Glastonbury had a peculiar jurisdiction in the area around Glastonbury known as the Liberty of Twelve Hides. Here the King’s courts had no authority and there is an example of a case begun before the King's Court at Westminster and handed on to the Abbot's court on account of the Liberty of the Twelve Hides. Glastonbury was possibly the wealthiest monastic institution at the time of the Norman invasion. Someone is attempting to have us believe the twelve hides stem back to Arviragus and Glastonbury’s sanctity has been in place since Joseph arrived. But, we should not forget (apart from a satirical poem by Juvenal) who first brings Arviragus to notice in British history.... he played no significant part in British history except that which is wholly fabricated by ‘Geoffrey’.

Now, it becomes very difficult to maintain that Melkin was a fourteenth century invention once we understand that it was the Melkin prophecy which sparked Henry’s muses to develop some of the many facets of the _Matter of Britain_. This, in no way makes the basis for the formation of the prophecy in the first place untrue. Scholars have assumed the opposite of that which transpired. The Melkin prophecy with its body to be found in the future, its Grail like _duo fassula_ and its island location, and its encrypted search which parallels the Grail quest are not the constituent parts which were fabricated by a thirteenth century composer of the prophecy.... but a template for the _Matter of Britain_ employed by Henry’s muses from a genuine encrypted document.

Author B of the _Life of St Dunstan_ writing c.1000 makes it plain that neither Ineswitrin nor Avalon were previous names of Glastonbury when
referring to Dunstan’s Father: *Now in Heorstan’s neighbourhood there was an island belonging to the Crown, the old English name for which was Glastonbury.* The modern consensus is that Glastonbury only became Avalon when Arthur was found there, (the Leaden cross confirming the location), but not one commentator has supplied an adequate reason why Glastonbury’s Henry de Sully should claim to unearth Arthur (at Glastonbury) unless of course it was understood beforehand that it was Avalon…. and where to look in the graveyard near the old church between the *piramides*. The fraud would be too ‘incredible’ without a precursor which primed everyone to accept such a sudden revelation that Glastonbury used to be named Avalon. Gerald recounts the conditions whereby the excavations were undertaken which I will cover in detail in a following chapter. There is only one person who could give the directions which were in DA and he is both the inventor of Avalon and Arthur and *Insulam Pomorum*.

The name Avalon is seemingly given so as to appear as an accepted fact in the postscript of St Patrick’s charter and chapters 1&2 of DA. Yet the information regarding where Arthur is buried is seemingly so inconsequential (matter of fact) it is nearly, but not quite, worthy of ‘omitting’.

It would take a very opportune Henry de Sully to insist he had unearthed Arthur at Glastonbury without for instance Caradoc’s convenient episode linking Arthur to Glastonbury and without there being any previous cognition of Avalon as the former name of Glastonbury. It would be of equal chance that if Henry de Sully was the person who had the Leaden cross engraved he might have put ‘Here is Arthur on *Insulam Pomorum*’, the only problem with that is that Joseph had sent the Grail to the *Vaus d’Avaron* 15 years before the fabrication of the cross…. so I guess our scholars are happy that the monks at Glastonbury supposedly beavering away making things match with emanating continental literature didn’t have that problem to solve. It is also evident that if the situation of Arthur’s gravesite were written into DA by a late interpolator, there would be other circumstances recorded surrounding the disinterment in DA.

William was employed to collate all the evidence of Glastonbury’s antiquity in a book. It was at this time Henry realised, not only did Glastonbury have an untraceable history but so did insular Britain prior to Gildas, excepting the Roman annals. It was at this time, as the initial
prologue of Vulgate HRB infers, that Henry Blois had the idea to outshine the plodding yet honest history of the half Saxon from Malmesbury:

*Many a time in turning over in my own mind the many themes which might be subject-matter of a book, my thoughts would fall upon the plan of writing a history of the Kings of Britain.*

It is therefore, mightily fortuitous, that after considering the subject matter and then falling upon a plan to write a History of the Kings of Britain, that, lo and behold, ‘Geoffrey’s’ good friend Walter has a book, which only needs translating and by chance, the same subject matter that Henry/Geoffrey had decided to write about, was fully covered therein. How is that for convenience? And to boot, the author’s name is Arthur just like the protagonist.

One wonders if Crick our expert on Geoffrey of Monmouth sees how ludicrous such a proposition is. It seems fair to suggest Henry did not alter the form of his already started original work destined for Matilda which had so many queens in insular history that in no way matched history; so, one must conclude had a design behind their inclusion in the pseudo history along with the aggrandising of Gloucester the Ducal seat of King Henry I bastard son. The pseudo history composed before the advent of the *Primary Historia* may have had an unexpanded account of Arthur in the original, but the whole section of unexpanded in First Variant and expanded chivalric Arthuriana in Caerleon found in Vulgate was based upon Henry's time in Wales in 1136. Seeing the architecture and defending Kidwelly were probably sources for his muses; and his muses were stimulated further while in Normandy in 1137.

Anyway toward 1144 it was Henry who had stated in HRB that following the work of *Pagan and Duvian* the Pope set bishops where there had been flamens, and archbishops where there were archflamens. The seats of the archflamens were in the three noblest cities, in London, York and in Caerleon and this transpired supposedly long before Augustine’s Canterbury. The point being that the region which included Glastonbury (Leogria) in that era was not subject to Canterbury: *Unto the Metropolitan of London Loegria and Cornwall were subject.* By the end of the thirteenth century the Monks at Abingdon had concocted a similar foundation myth

---

[^704]: HRB IV, xix
based upon ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB (and Glastonbury’s) where Fagn and Divian on the same mission to Lucius had founded their abbey also. They even invented a legendary Irish monk Abbennus, the eponym of Mount Abbenus (much like Geoffrey love of eponyms) where their monastery now stands.

I would suggest that the most powerful prelate in the land at William’s death requested William’s later redactions of GR from the monks at Malmesbury and interpolated the Glastonburyana into GR3. We should be aware of Stubbs observation concerning the renown of William at Malmesbury: With the exception indeed of the incidental references made by successive chroniclers, who borrowed from his history, there is nothing to be learned of him from extrinsic sources till the time of Leland, who indignantly observes, that even at Malmesbury, in his own monastery, they had nearly lost all remembrance of their brightest ornament.

Therefore, given the evidence above, it cannot be assumed that GR3 which contains insertions which run word for word with passages in the DA to have been written by William. Once we establish this and the reasoning behind the GR3 (B version) interpolations and Henry Blois’ ability to carry out interpolations....we should not accept the view that every addition in GR3 was made by William himself between the years 1135 and 1140. This view has been held for some time and used to suggest comparative accuracy in DA.

There is justification for not including the Prophecy of Melkin in DA. If one better understands how Henry Blois has maintained anonymity as the ‘ghost writer’ of many tracts, we can see that the Melkin prophecy in essence is central to two of our three main genres and would tie them together implicating himself as author when Arthur from the third genre and Joseph became entwined at Avalon. So, obeying his rule, he attaches certain icons to each other, appearing to be from entirely independent authors and leaves them separate for posterity to find.

As we have covered, Henry Blois, during his exile, killed off Geoffrey of Monmouth in the same year he wrote VM. It is in VM we can see he has formed a plan concerning the conversion of Glastonbury into Avalon.\(^{705}\) Only later, on his return to England does he make more amendments to the DA with Joseph material.... once his first (metropolitan) agenda becomes obsolete/redundant. Joseph was originally associated by the Melkin

\(^{705}\) Or even New Jerusalem at a later date as noted earlier in the additions to VM, quoted in John’s *Cronica*. 
prophecy with Ineswitrin and the *duo fassula* and Joseph was also connected with a magical vessel and Avalon by Robert. Arthur’s circle (i.e. the chivalric knights) is associated with the Grail by Chrétien. Arthur and Joseph are associated by the Grail and both connected to Glastonbury. It is a master-class in illusion, brought about by fraudulent authorship by the man who accounts authorship of more worth than any other facet of value normally placed on mammon.... and this by a man who accounts himself above Cicero who was arguably the greatest writer of all time in the ancient world.

Henry Blois is inventor of some of the best known fictitious personages in the history of Britain, Leir, Arviragus, Lucius, Phagan and Deruvian.... not to mention Merlin, but his chivalric Arthur was based upon a Celtic warlord as witnessed in the life of St Cadoc and the warlords friends were Kai and Beduerus.

Contrary to the consensus held by modern scholars, Joseph in Britain is not an invention and nor is the precision of the data found in the prophecy of Melkin inaccurate. Nor can the Melkin prophecy be accounted as a coincidently accurate fraud; and therefore the assumption that Melkin never existed is misguided. Nor can the legends of the Cornish be ignored or the ancient Greek writers such as Pytheas and Timaeus who recycled hiswork and Latin writers such as Strabo or Diodorus which tell of Ictis. The most famous place in Britain is Avalon and the fact that it exists in myth at Glastonbury is not by chance, but by design and human intervention. As the reader now understands, it has been achieved by the substitution of the name Ineswitrin, the Briton name for White tin Island on the prophecy of Melkin. The Melkin island of Isewitrin being synonymous with Pytheas’ Ictis.

Lagorio believes Joseph is an invented legend at Glastonbury, but does concede: *According to one Celtic tradition, possibly preserved and transmitted orally, Joseph’s family held mining interests in south western Britain, thereby permitting him to combine business with evangelism. In slight substantiation of this belief, nothing historically certain is known of Joseph’s actions following the resurrection.*

If one insists the legend of Joseph reached maturity in the late fifteenth century and ignores what is evidently at the start in the oldest manuscript

706 Valerie. Lagorio. The evolving legend of St Joseph of Glastonbury.
of DA unequivocally dated to 1247.... there can be little chance of recognising any truth behind the legend. Lagorio has dismissed Melkin and taught others to do the same. In reference to assessing Joseph’s ‘heterogeneous’ career, as she brings to an end her exposé, Lagorio hopes that the reader might also concur ‘in the Acta Sanctorum’s sagacious, if ironic comment’: Therefore he who wishes to await Arthur’s return to England may also await the fulfilment of that which Melkin promised of Joseph.

She simply has not understood that Arthur’s return was the Zeitgeist hope of the peasantry in the early twelfth century which Henry Blois eventually addressed by planting a bogus grave between the piramides and cannot be likened to the geometrical encryption constructed by Melkin to point out the whereabouts of Joseph’s sepulchre. It has been the cloned nature of people who profess to be scholars which have prevented the discovery of Joseph on Burgh Island.
Chapter 27

Gerald of Wales (1146-1223) on the discovery of King Arthur's tomb.

For Giraldus, Arthur was the national hero of the Welsh. As ‘Geoffrey’ understood, the Welsh were the residue of the Britons. The Celtic lands i.e. Dumnonia, Wales and Scotland were not integrated into Norman hegemony. However, King Arthur was a symbol of Welsh/Briton resistance to Saxon oppression, and according to ‘Geoffrey’s’ tradition, Arthur (conflated with Ambrosius) had fought against invading Germanic tribes on behalf of the Romano-Celtic ancestors of the Welsh. The hope of the Bretons first mentioned in EAW (or GR depending upon interpretation) reflects a view that Arthur was somehow going to return to establish the former glory of the Celtic cultures or Britons. This viewpoint was encouraged by Merlin’s prophecies initially until Henry wished to revenge his loss of power by unseating Henry II. Then the same prophecies were squashed against the Normans.

One view held by some scholars is that the alleged discovery of Arthur's tomb was a propaganda stunt designed so that the English/Norman overlords could use it against the Welsh, proving to them definitively that their saviour was permanently deceased and would never return to liberate them. The fabrication of a grave hardly seems a strategic rationale for quelling the rebellion of the Welsh against their Norman masters. Firstly,
Henry II had made an accord with the Welsh and it would hardly be a cause for the Welsh to submit once they found Arthur was in fact dead. It would be irrational that an entire nation would lay down arms at the discovery of Arthur’s grave.

Gerald’s testimony has been ignored because it does not fit with modern scholars’s assessment of why and how Arthur’s body was unearthed. Gerald was a prolific writer throughout his career. He is best known for his historical and ethnographic works such as Topographia Hibernica (The Topography of Ireland), Expugnatio Hibernica (The Conquest of Ireland), and Descriptio Cambriae (The Description of Wales). It is two of his lesser-known works which concern us here in which are contained his accounts of the discovery of King Arthur's tomb: the Liber de Principis Instructione (On the Instruction of Princes) c.1193 and the Speculum Ecclesiae (Mirror of the Church) c.1216.

Gerald became a royal clerk and chaplain to King Henry II in 1184, first acting as mediator between the crown and the Welsh Prince Rhys ap Gruffydd. Later he was chosen to accompany one of the King’s sons, John, in 1185 on John’s first expedition to Ireland. This started his literary career, in that, Topographia Hibernica is an account of his journey to Ireland. Gerald was selected to accompany the Archbishop of Canterbury, Baldwin of Forde, on a tour of Wales in 1188, the object being a recruitment campaign for the Third Crusade. His account of that journey, the Itinerarium Cambriae (1191) was followed by the Descriptio Cambriae in 1193-94. As a royal clerk, Gerald observed significant political events at first hand. It was in this period c.1192-3 that De principis instructione was probably written. One expert, Charles Wood⁷⁰⁷ says that De principis instructione was thought to be written in or even before 1193 and says the story of Arthur’s and Guinevere’s discovery was undoubtedly conveyed to him by monks who had participated in the original fraud.

Again, the standard theory is that Henry de Sully is the perpetrator of the fraud and is thought to have staged the event by supplying the bogus Leaden cross and the relics. Gerald’s testimony in the De principis instructione, I think, should be understood as Gerald having been present as an eyewitness⁷⁰⁸ and the details concerning King Henry’s involvement as

---

⁷⁰⁷ Guinevere at Glastonbury. Charles Wood
⁷⁰⁸ Now when they had extracted this cross from the stone, the aforementioned Abbot Henry showed it to me...
genuinely derived from first-hand knowledge. Gerald’s report of events surrounding Arthur’s disinterment is the closest in date to the discovery of the tomb. There is just no foundation whatsoever for modern scholars to simply ignore Gerald’s account. This view is not based on any other work, it is simply because what Gerald explicitly relates does not rhyme with their concocted theory. The most important point is that Gerald bears testimony to the fact that in the Glastonbury annals i.e. DA, Arthur’s resting place was already known.\textsuperscript{709} One can certainly say that Gerald has certainly swallowed a large part of Henry Blois’ interpolations in DA and the corroborating pseudo-history found in HRB.\textsuperscript{710}

Modern scholars’ view assumes that the time lapse (1184-1191) after the fire to Arthur’s body’s discovery was dictated (predicated) by financial reasons. The modern view is that as soon as King Henry was dead, the funds dried up for the rebuild of the burnt church. The presumption is that Henry de Sully was the instigator of the fraud and therefore the fabricator of the Leaden cross. Received wisdom holds (with an erroneous \textit{a priori} in place) that any mention of Arthur in DA was not interpolated until after his disinterment.\textsuperscript{711} If one were to eliminate this misguided standpoint, one would have to accept the possibility that Henry Blois could be responsible for much of the \textit{Matter of Britain} material. This is scholars’ blind spot and haughty presumption which has squewed every theory on King Arthur’s presence at Glastonbury. Scholars have chosen to ignore Gerald’s testimony and the discovery’s connection to Henry II.

Most importantly, Arthurian commentators have omitted to question why it would be that an interpolator of DA (after the disinterment) has taken in hand to record where the body was found and not a single other

\textsuperscript{709} Indeed, there had been some evidence from the records that the body might be found there....

\textsuperscript{710} Gerald Writes: After Albanus and Amphibalus, they were esteemed the chief protomartyrs of Britannia Major. In ancient times there were three fine churches in this city: one dedicated to Julius the martyr, graced with a choir of nuns; another to Aaron, his associate, and ennobled with an order of canons; and the third distinguished as the metropolitan of Wales. Amphibalus, the instructor of Albanus in the true faith, was born in this place. This city is well situated on the river Usk, navigable to the sea, and adorned with woods and meadows. The Roman ambassadors here received their audience at the court of the great King Arthur; and here also, the archbishop Dubricius ceded his honours to David of Menevia, the metropolitan see being translated from this place to Menevia, according to the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius; “Menevia pallio urbis Legionum induetur.”Menevia shall be invested with the pall of the city of Legions.”

\textsuperscript{711} There is no description of the disinterment in DA which would only be natural after the dig, if indeed Arthurian references were a later addition. The presumption is that the description of who is in the grave is derived after the unearthing. The scholastic community has made a ‘grave’ error.
detail about the unearthing. Luckily for us, Gerald has done so and even recorded how they knew where to look so that the manufactured grave could be be unveiled.

It is not a coincidence that the man who introduces us to Guinevere in HRB is the same man who invents the episode of her kidnap at Glastonbury by impersonating Caradoc and establishing the first connection of Arthur to Glastonbury.... and then pays to have the same episode engraved on the Modena Archivolt and eventually Guinevere is lying next to Arthur in Glastonbury just as he had foreseen in DA and the Perlesvaus colophon. The fact that they were uncovered in Avalon, the same place that ‘Geoffrey had alluded to as Insulam Pomorum 35 years earlier; is a remarkable coincidence without Henry Blois’ design and foresight telling the monks where to dig.

Surely it is not beyond comprehension that Henry names Guinevere as being alongside Arthur in DA when he specifies where the grave is located. Otherwise, Gerald’s account of the lock of hair is entirely fabricated and he is in cahoots with the interpolator of DA. Are we supposed to believe the interpolator of DA after the disinterment leaves it all to Gerald to give an account of Arthur’s disinterment without telling us what happened himself? Of course not!!!

Modern scholars need to understand that Arthur’s grave was planted by Henry Blois the instigator of the name Avalon, and that the grave was nonchalantly alluded to in DA. Several other pertinent pieces of the jig saw puzzle (nowadays seemingly upheld by scholastic decree), covered by this investigation would then no longer hold true. Several a prioris crumble, exposing the scholastic view as a rationalization or erroneous reconstruction of events rather than accepting certain truths which consequently fit together.

It is difficult for Watkin when he struggles with his own rationalized chronology in dealing with Gerald’s ready acceptance of Avalon:

What prompted the search? According to Gerald it was the stories of the Welsh bards which reached Henry II, who in turn urged the search. Gerald also speaks of visions and the writing on the pyramids. Ralph adds the story of the monk. It is certainly likely that the identification of Avalon with Glastonbury had by then already been made; it is possible the identification reached the ears of Henry II and that the King suggested the search. Watkin of course believes that the grave was manufactured by
Henry de Sully. Because of Raleigh Radford’s assessment that the cemetery was heightened by several feet at the time of St Dunstan, the fact the grave was found so deep probably gives the best rationalization of how the grave came to exist in the way it was found. Watkin suggests that the stone (seven feet down) in Gerald’s report was the stone of an earlier grave covered over. This is true in that Henry, when looking for Joseph of Arimathea, came across the lid and then decided on a course of action which involved fabricating a lead cross, supplying specifically chosen bones and hair and affixing the cross to the underside of the lid of the grave of the previous occupant.

Henry must have put the bones he had brought to replicate Arthur and Guinevere’s relics in a wooden hollowed trunk and left it in the original grave and replaced the slab with the Leaden cross fixed on the underside. Watkin’s speculation is that the grave was real (which is half true), but Henry de Sully adds the finishing touch: *the cross, though fraudulent, may have replaced a grave – cross less precise in wording, for to establish that the grave was certainly that of Arthur the written identification of Glastonbury with Avalon had to be made*. So, are we to believe Watkin’s explanation involves believing ‘Geoffrey’s’ historicity concerning Arthur having been taken to Avalon; and that if Avalon really was the ancient name of Glastonbury, we would find him between the pyramids in the cemetery…. even though we know Malmesbury does not mention Avalon except where Henry Blois has interpolated his work. Yes, even as Watkin states, it is a big ‘if’.

I have utilised John William Sutton’s translation in the extracts from Gerald’s two works.

**The Discovery of the Tomb of King Arthur from Liber de Principis Instructione [On the Instruction of Princes] c. 1193**

*The memory of Arthur, the celebrated King of the Britons, should not be concealed. In his age, he was a distinguished patron, generous donor, and a splendid supporter of the renowned monastery of Glastonbury they praise him greatly in their annals.* Indeed, more than all other churches of his

---

712 Gerald’s view of Arthur as a generous donor to Glastonbury comes directly from Henry’s interpolations in DA and from ‘Caradoc’s’ *Life of Gildas.*
realm he prized the Glastonbury church of Holy Mary, mother of God, and sponsored it with greater devotion by far than he did for the rest. When that man went forth for war, depicted on the inside part of his shield was the image of the Blessed Virgin, so that he would always have her before his eyes in battle, and whenever he found himself in a dangerous encounter he was accustomed to kiss her feet with the greatest devotion. Although legends had fabricated something fantastical about his demise (that he had not suffered death, and was conveyed, as if by a spirit, to a distant place), his body was discovered at Glastonbury, in our own times, hidden very deep in the earth in an oak-hollow, between two stone pyramids that were erected long ago in that holy place. The tomb was sealed up with astonishing tokens, like some sort of miracle. The body was then conveyed into the church with honor, and properly committed to a marble tomb.

A lead cross was placed under the stone, not above as is usual in our times, but instead fastened to the underside. I have seen this cross, and have traced the engraved letters — not visible and facing outward, but rather turned inwardly toward the stone. It read: "Here lies entombed King Arthur, with Guenevere his second wife, on the Isle of Avalon."

Many remarkable things come to mind regarding this. For instance, he had two wives, of whom the last was buried with him. Her bones were discovered with her husband’s, though separated in such a way that two-thirds of the sepulcher, namely the part nearer the top, was believed to contain the bones of the husband, and then one-third, toward the bottom, separately contained the bones of his wife — wherein was also discovered a yellow lock of feminine hair, entirely intact and pristine in color, which a certain monk eagerly seized in hand and lifted out; immediately the whole thing crumbled to dust.

Indeed, there had been some evidence from the records that the body might be found there, and some from the lettering carved on the pyramids (although that was mostly obliterated by excessive antiquity), and
also some that came from the visions and revelations made by good men and the devout.

But the clearest evidence came when King Henry II of England explained the whole matter to the monks (as he had heard it from an aged British poet): how they would find the body deep down, namely more than 16 feet into the earth, and not in a stone tomb but in an oak-hollow. The body had been placed so deep, and was so well concealed, that it could not be found by the Saxons who conquered the island after the King's death — those whom he had battled with so much exertion while he was alive, and whom he had nearly annihilated. And so because of this the lettering on the cross — the confirmation of the truth — had been inscribed on the reverse side, turned toward the stone, so that it would conceal the tomb at that time and yet at some moment or occasion could ultimately divulge what it contained.

What is now called Glastonbury was, in antiquity, called the Isle of Avalon; it is like an island because it is entirely hemmed in by swamps. In British it is called Inis Avalon, that is, insula pomifera [Latin: "The Island of Apples"]. This is because the apple, which is called aval in the British tongue, was once abundant in that place. Morgan\textsuperscript{716}, a noble matron, mistress and patroness of those regions, and also King Arthur's kinswoman by blood, brought Arthur to the island now called Glastonbury for the healing of his wounds after the Battle of Camlann. Moreover, the island had once been called in British Inis Gutrin, that is, insula vitrea [Latin: "The Island of Glass"]; from this name, the invading Saxons afterwards called this place Glastingeburi, for glas in their language means vitrum [Latin: "glass"], and buri stands for castrum [Latin: "castle"] or civitas [Latin: "city"].

It should be noted also that the bones of Arthur's body which they discovered were so large that the poet's verse seems to ring true: "Bones excavated from tombs are reckoned enormous". Indeed, his shin-bone, which the abbot showed to us, was placed near the shin of the tallest man of the region; then it was fixed to the ground against the man's foot, and it extended

\textsuperscript{716}In a battle fought near Kidwelly Castle, Gwenllian's (who I believe inspired ‘Geoffrey’s’ name of Guinevere) army was routed, she was captured in battle and beheaded by the Normans. In the battle her son Morgan was also slain and another son, Maelgwyn captured and executed. It is this same Kidwelly at which I believe Henry might have been present and claims in GS (Lidleia) belongs to himself.
substantially more than three inches above his knee. And the skull was broad and huge, as if he were a monster or prodigy, to the extent that the space between the eyebrows and the eye-sockets amply encompassed the breadth of one's palm. Moreover, ten or more wounds were visible on that skull, all of which had healed into scars except one, greater than the rest, which had made a large cleft — this seems to have been the lethal one.

When Gerald says they praise him greatly in their annals, the only annals which put Arthur at Glastonbury are the DA, Life of Gildas and possibly a lost Perlesvaus or Melkin’s ‘De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda’, all written by Henry Blois. William in GR1 states he does not know where Arthur is buried. However, when Henry Blois’s GR3 interpolations were composed where he nearly ‘omits’ to tell us of Arthur’s grave.... no gravesite was yet manufactured at Glastonbury. Someone in the interim between 1143 and 1193 has been busy. The clearest evidence of where Arthur was and how deep he was seems to stem from someone who was present at Arthur’s manufactured interment and who knew Guinevere’s remains would be there. Henry Blois was a master of propaganda and may well have passed the information to Henry II or Eleanor in various different ways.

Gerald is emphatic: But the clearest evidence came when King Henry II of England explained the whole matter to the monks. This is not a confused statement, but Gerald unequivocally suggests it was King Henry II who told the monks how deep the grave was. We just need to realize that if Gerald is not lying (and why would he be), then obviously.... whoever put the bones in the ground is the same person who knew the information supplied to the King. One guess at who that might be is the inventor of the Arthur persona in HRB who puts him wounded at Avalon just where he had put him 35 years earlier in VM.

Until conclusive evidence is put under the noses of scholars and experts there can be no disinterment of the sepulchre of Joseph and display what it holds. Unfortunately we live in a backward world where those supposed to instruct need instruction; and until they understand and they can declare to the world that what seemed obvious to the rest of us is in fact true, we have to wait for them to change their opinion. As I have stated before, it is not

---

717 This is an eye witness account of the events and obviously Henry Blois had planted the shin bone of an animal. To remark on the space between the eyebrows one would imagine that Henry was using the skull of a large primate unseen in Britain before by the spectators of the event.

718 Again, Gerald is describing a skull which has been prepared by Henry to match events described in HRB
until academia recognizes the truth that it can be accepted as the truth. Thus, my continued and repetitive ode against the ‘experts’. I will of course be pilloried for expounding a truth which is not yet established as I have been already. I write not as one reverse engineering\(^{719}\) a theoretical standpoint, but stating a fact that Joseph’s remains are 50ft under the slate deposit on Burgh Island.

Since Gerald is convinced that King Henry instigated the dig, we can either assume that it was some dying wish, or it was instigated by those closest to him after his death or that Adam of Damerham (d. after 1291) or Ralph of Coggeshall (d. after 1227) got the date wrong which is more likely than Gerald being mistaken. But this leaves the contention of Henry de Sully’s election by Richard I and the two month span between Henry II death and Henry De Sully’s election. Eleanor steeped in Arturiana my well be the catalyst and the reason for the King’s name associated with the dig.

Gerald is certain of Henry II involvement and states: *In our own lifetime, while Henry II was ruling England*. Let us just say that Henry de Sully was the abbot as Gerald would not make that mistake. So he arrived early before Henry II died and was installed properly by Richard. Whatever way you look at this, there will always be a certain amount of conjecture. Gerald is adamant of the King’s involvement and we should not dismiss the rest of his witness and defer to accounts and dates arrived at much later.

Gerald says in no uncertain terms however, a year or two after the discovery that Avalon was the ancient name for Glastonbury, and that the location of the grave was pointed out before the disinterment. Since the ‘chivalric’ Arthur never existed in history (except in Henry Blois mind) and yet ‘his bones’ had been fraudulently placed 16 feet down between two pyramids and that location was already known; even the most sedentary of minds could assess that Henry Blois (c.1158-71) is culpable of burying an animal bone,\(^{720}\) Gorilla skull and lock of blonde hair in a hollow oak tree trunk at least 20-25 years previously.

\(^{719}\) The analogy would be that of the world finding a space craft on earth and mankind’s attempt to re-engineer or understand the mechanics and physics of how it arrived on earth. The fact that mankind could not make it fly again through their lack of knowledge does not preclude it from once having flown from space. But, there will be those who think it a fraud because they have not seen the craft fly with their own eyes. Others with more understanding will accept that it must have come from space and recognise that until it flies again there will always be doubt.

\(^{720}\) Henry Blois’ collection of exotic animals he inherited from Henry I’s hunting lodge at Woodstock.
Gerald’s description of the lead cross placed under the stone, not above as is usual in our times, but instead fastened to the underside.... again, is more than anecdotal comment. I have seen this cross, and have traced the engraved letters — not visible and facing outward, but rather turned inwardly toward the stone. The whole piece would tend to indicate that Gerald was present as the slab above the hollowed oak was removed as Gerald is interested by the method of burial. I would say that all the other forms of what was written on the cross are untrue and Camden’s tracing is based on a false cross rendition of what was written.

It would hardly seem pertinent to expound upon the events concerning the monk and the lock of Guinevere’s hair, if the grave site had no connection with her. It seems pointless regurgitating speculations concerning the cross and what it had written upon it, but rather state that if a lock of hair was present (which by the account seems certain), the contention would be that; why would Arthur be buried with an unfaithful wife the reason for his downfall? It would suggest that Guinevere has been expunged from future accounts rather than Gerald (the eyewitness) had invented her name as being present on the cross. In any case Guinevere being present cross-references what Henry wrote in DA and the Perlesvaus colophon. If Henry had not written in DA where they both would be found then they would not have been found anyway (unless one takes the scholar’s view) and because we know Henry did write in DA; all the more reason to believe Gerald!

He repeats the same engraving on the cross in both accounts "Here lies entombed King Arthur, on the Isle of Avalon, with Guinevere his second wife". To my mind I would say Henry Blois is the one rationalising that Guinevere

---

721 In my view all later reports have expunged Guinevere so as to respect Arthur’s reputation and virility from having been cuckolded. Guinevere’s lock existed as Gerald maintains and whoever planted the bones and manufactured the grave had the non corrosive cross fabricated. The same person who manufactured the grave knows he has included her name on the cross and added the lock of hair into the grave so he is hardly going to state otherwise that Guinevere is not in the Grave. So we must look to the testimony in DA which was put there by Henry Blois. If Henry de Sully is responsible for the bogus grave; to what end does he include a lock of hair and include her name on the cross? It is more proved that her name (invented by Henry in HRB) was on the cross as all later renditions have expunged her name. Camden’s later representation of the cross must be a subsequent fake created to expunge Guinevere from lore. If Guinevere is in the same grave it can only be the Chivalric Arthur of HRB and no other Arthur so maybe this is Henry’s logic for including her.

722 All the following renditions obey the Glastonbury hymn sheet over 40-50 years after Gerald’s eyewitness account: Ralph of Coggeshall has the inscription as ‘Hic iacet ineditus Rex Arturius in Insula Avalonis sepultus’. Adam of Damerham gives us: Hic iacet sepultus ineditus rex Arturius in insula Avalonia. John Leland However, renders it, Hic iacet sepultus Inclytus rex Arturius in insulis Avalonia.
should be a second wife. One reason may be because he wanted to make sure that when the grave was discovered two bodies gave double the evidence that this was Arthur as stated on the Leaden cross. I think we are on safer ground considering that Henry had a reason for making her a second wife. Gerald made a copy of the wording on the leaden cross; so, to get it wrong twice seems less likely than future monk’s distancing Arthur from his wife for her adultery in some puritanical pious washing of Arthur’s legacy.

To disbelieve Gerald’s testimony, we have to consider why it was that all the other extraneous detail concerning the hair, the plait, the monk jumping in the pit etc. was invented.\textsuperscript{723} The monks tried to rationalize how it was that Arthur was buried with a wife who had in fact been the reason for his downfall by defecting into the arms of Mordred in HRB. (Yet how is it in anyway rationalized by a second wife if Arthur died and is in the grave). I think for some good reason Henry Blois put her there. Infinitely more reasons than a Henry de Sully who has not read the DA account (according to scholars) stating that she is buried there with him then Henry de Sully inventing lore about a second wife!!

If her name was ignored by later chroniclers from what was actually written on the cross, Guinevere was certainly present for Edward I and Eleanor of Castille’s visit in 1278. Wood’s theory of Guinevere at Glastonbury relies on ignoring most of Gerald’s testimony about the previous cognition of the whereabouts of Arthur’s grave and presumes that Henry de Sully was the instigator of the fraud. Wood supplies good reasoning and speculations as to why Henry de Sully might be implicated, but his theory ignores the existence of an already constructed translocation of Avalon\textsuperscript{724} into Glastonbury which we know is Henry Blois’ invention.

We are sure of this firstly, because Henry is ‘Geoffrey’ the inventor of \textit{Insula Avallonis} in HRB and \textit{Insula Pomorum} in VM; and secondly because of Gerald’s assertion that Arthur’s burial location was known previously.

\textsuperscript{723} This would not have been invented because of the status afforded to Guinevere’s hair in Chrétien’s Lancelot the Knight and the Cart; rather Chrétien wrote that because Henry had implanted the hair and made a point about it.

\textsuperscript{724} The cross really would be an over-ingenuous forgery and the discovery would seem highly dubious and beyond the bounds of credibility if indeed Avalon had not already been accepted as synonymous with Glastonbury, established through the propaganda found in DA. How can one name on one leaden cross convince everybody…. without all the supporting evidence from an extant Glastonbury Perlesvaus and DA and other possible works written by Henry Blois which may have been referenced before they were burnt in the fire.
Lastly, because we know that Robert de Boron’s *Joseph d’Arimathie* c.1160-70 (who has obtained his story from Henry Blois as Blaise) has connected the ‘vessel’ through Joseph of Arimathea to Avalon/Avaron in the west; and then... it just so happens that Avalon turns out to be Glastonbury as posited in DA before Arthur was disinterred with his wife.\(^725\)

We must also understand that the bones that Henry Blois will have deposited in the grave were unusually large and the probability is that he wrote a prophecy or poem (which has not survived into posterity) to the effect which foresaw the unearthing of the bones: *It should be noted also that the bones of Arthur’s body which they discovered were so large that the poet’s verse seems to ring true: “Bones excavated from tombs are reckoned enormous”*. As we know Henry is not averse to writing prophecy and only he could know that the bones were oversized.

---

**The Discovery of the Tomb of King Arthur from *Speculum Ecclesiae* [Mirror of the Church].**

*Cap. VIII.* Regarding the monk who, at the discovery of the tomb of Arthur, pulled out a lock of women's hair with his hand, and quite shamelessly accelerated its ruin.

*In our own lifetime, while Henry II was ruling England, diligent efforts were made in Glastonbury Abbey to locate what must have once been the tomb of Arthur. This was done at the instruction of the King and under the supervision of the abbot of that place, Henry, who was later transferred to Worcester Cathedral. With much difficulty the tomb was excavated in the holy burial-ground which had been dedicated by Saint Dunstan. The tomb was found between two tall, emblazoned pyramids, erected long ago in memory of Arthur.*\(^726\) *Though his body and bones had been reduced to dust, they were lifted up from below into the air, and to a more seemly place of burial.*

---

\(^725\) Do not forget that there is nothing in DA that relates to the events surrounding the exhumation and if Arthur’s location had been interpolated after the dig, surely events surrounding the dig would have been interpolated also rather than a later interpolator feigning to omit mention of where the grave was located and who was in it.

\(^726\) Gerald’s thought is that these *piramides* were put there to mark Arthur’s grave and implies, as we saw earlier, that there might have been some sort of engraving which indicated this. If some engraving concerning Arthur existed we can only surmise that this also was carried out by Henry possibly obliterating some earlier Saxon engravings.
In the same grave there was found a tress of woman's hair, blonde and lovely to look at, plaited and coiled with consummate skill, and belonging, no doubt, to Arthur's wife, who was buried there with her husband. [Standing among the crowd is a monk who sees the lock of hair.] So that he could seize the lock before all others, he hurled himself headlong into the lowest depths of the cavity. Then the aforementioned monk, that insolent spectator, no less impudent than imprudent, descended into the depths — the depths symbolize the infernal realm, which none of us can escape. Thus the monk thought to pull it out with his hand, to take hold of the lock of hair before all others — evidence of his shameless mind, for women's hair entangles the weak-willed, while strong souls avoid it. Hair, of course, is said to be incorruptible, for it has no flesh in it, nor any moisture mixed with it. Nevertheless, as he held it in his hand, having raised it up in order to inspect it (many watched intently and in amazement), it crumbled into the thinnest dust; miraculously it disintegrated, as if reduced to granules. [There are a few words in the manuscript missing here.] For it demonstrated that all things are transitory, and all worldly beauty is for our vain eyes to gaze upon, for performing illicit sensual acts, or for our moments that are susceptible to vanity — indeed, as the philosopher said, "the splendor of beauty is swift, passing, changeable, and more fleeting than the flowers of spring."

Cap. IX.
Regarding the bones lying intact in the tomb of King Arthur, discovered at Glastonbury in our times, and about the many things relating to these remarkable circumstances. Furthermore, tales are regularly reported and fabricated about King Arthur and his uncertain end, with the British peoples even now contending foolishly
that he is still alive. True and accurate information has been sought out, so the legends have finally been extinguished; the truth about this matter should be revealed plainly, so here I have endeavoured to add something to the indisputable facts that have been disclosed.

After the Battle of Camlann . . . [A number of words are missing in the manuscript.] And so, after Arthur had been mortally wounded there, his body was taken to the Isle of Avalon, which is now called Glastonbury, by a noble matron and kinswoman named Morgan; afterwards the remains were buried, according to her direction, in the holy burial-ground. After this, the Britons and their poets have been concocting legends that a certain fantastic goddess, also called Morgan, carried off the body of Arthur to the Isle of Avalon for the healing of his wounds. When his wounds have healed, the strong and powerful King will return to rule the Britons (or so the Britons suppose), as he did before. Thus they still await him, just as the Jews, deceived by even greater stupidity, misfortune, and faithlessness, likewise await their Messiah.

It is significant . . . [Two sentences or so are damaged in the manuscript] Truly it is called Avalon, either from the British word aval, which means pomum because apples and apple trees abound in that place; or, from the name Vallo, once the ruler of that territory. Likewise, long ago the place was usually called in British Inis Gutrin, that is, insula vitrea[Latin: "The Island of Glass"], evidently on account of the river, most like glass in color, that flows around the marshes. Because of this, it was later called Glastonia in the language of the Saxons who seized this land, since glas in English or in Saxon means vitrum[Latin: "glass"]. It is clear from this, therefore, why it was called an island, why it was called Avalon, and why it was called Glastonia; it is also clear how the fantastic goddess Morgan was contrived by poets.

It is also notable that . . . [Several words are missing, obscuring the meaning of the first part of the sentence.] from the letters inscribed on it, yet nearly all, however, was destroyed by antiquity. The abbot had the best

728 Gerald is giving us the answer to the contemporary question as to who buried Arthur and the rationalisation seems to have come up with Morgan from the VM.
evidence from the aforementioned King Henry, for the King had said many times, as he had heard from the historical tales of the Britons and from their poets, that Arthur was buried between two pyramids that were erected in the holy burial-ground.\textsuperscript{729} These were very deep, on account of the Saxons (whom he had subdued often and expelled from the Island of Britain, and whom his evil nephew Mordred had later called back against him), who endeavoured to occupy the whole island again after his death; so their fear was that Saxons might despoil him in death through the wickedness of their vengeful spirit.

A broad stone was unearthed during the excavating at the tomb, about seven feet . . . [A couple of words are missing] a lead cross was fastened — not to the outer part of the stone, but rather to the underside (no doubt as a result of their fears about the Saxons). It had these words inscribed on it: "Here lies entombed King Arthur, on the Isle of Avalon, with Guenevere his second wife."\textsuperscript{730} Now when they had extracted this cross from the stone, the aforementioned Abbot Henry showed it to me; I examined it, and read the words.\textsuperscript{731} The cross was fastened to the underside of the stone, and, moreover, the engraved part of the cross was turned toward the stone, so that it would be better concealed. Remarkable indeed was the industry and exquisite prudence of the men of that era, who, by all their exertions, wished to hide forever the body of so great a man, their lord, and the patron of that region, from the danger of sudden disturbance. Moreover, they took care that — at some time in the future when their tribulations had ceased — the evidence of the letters inscribed on the cross could be made public.

Cap. X.

\textsuperscript{729} As we have previously covered, Gerald was very closely connected to Henry II, so to imply that the King had spoken on many occasions of the location of Arthur’s burial would lead us to believe that he had been informed of the depth and location by the person who had planted it and had knowledge of its whereabouts.

\textsuperscript{730} Gerald is not uncertain about what he saw on the cross twenty five years after the unearthing. The insistence of modern scholars that the version which excludes Guinevere is the correct version is largely based on the assumption that what is written in DA about Guinevere being present in the grave is a late interpolation after the disinterment. There is nothing to eliminate Camden’s representation of the cross as fraudulent either.

\textsuperscript{731} In other words, modern scholars presenting their own corrupted version of events, dismissing his version, by implication call Gerald a liar.
The renowned King Arthur was a patron of Glastonbury Abbey. [Enough words are missing that the rest of this chapter heading is indecipherable.]

[The beginning of the sentence is lost.] . . . had proposed, thus Arthur’s body was discovered not in a marble tomb, not cut from rock or Parian stone, as was fitting for so distinguished a King, but rather in wood, in oak that was hollowed out for this purpose, and 16 feet or more deep in the earth; this was certainly on account of haste rather than proper ceremony for the burial of so great a prince, driven as they were by a time of urgent distress. **When the body was discovered according to the directions indicated by King Henry**, the aforementioned abbot had an extraordinary marble tomb made for the remains, as was fitting for an excellent patron of that place, for indeed, he had prized that church more than all the rest in his Kingdom, and had enriched it with large and numerous lands. And for that reason it was not undeserved, but just and by the judgment of God, who rewards all good deeds not only in heaven, but also on earth and in this life. [The end of the manuscript is very defective.] . . and the authentic body of Arthur . . . to be buried properly . . .

There are logical contradictions concerning the bones and the ‘dust of bones’, but it was a bogus grave site probably of mixed bones from an earlier grave. Henry the consummate saint collector had probably seen Saxon graves made from tree trunks. From the description it seems that Henry had used an old tomb lid and buried it seven foot down as the locator of the grave. Under this he attached a fabricated cross with said inscription faced the engraving against the stone so it would not get soiled or filled with mud and laid the gorilla skull and shin bone alongside some old previous bones with a lock of hair.

Against all the uncertainties surrounding exactly what was written on the cross, at least Arthur’s name indicating the grave was his and more

---

732 The reason scholars are so insistent upon denying that Henry II had any bearing on the event concerning the disinterment is because it fits much more neatly with their view that the unearthing and the bogus relics and cross were all staged by Henry de Sully. Since Gerald himself does not give a date for the disinterment it is more likely that the grave was dug up on the information supplied by the King who had been informed through the machinations of Henry Blois and it was Henry de Sully who carried out the act just after the King had died or not???.

733 Words like this show that there was suspicion and therefore all the more reason to find Gerald’s account genuine as the grave site had remained undisturbed for probably thirty years since Henry planted it and would seem all the more ‘authentic’.
dubiously (by providence of where the find took place) that Glastonbury was named Avalon. This is not in contention in the varying accounts. From this moment onwards for all and sundry it was made plain Glastonbury must have been known as Avalon in Arthur’s day and part of Henry Blois’ *Matter of Britain* was established as history. The cross was attached to the underside of the old tomb lid and underneath that there was the appearance of a seemingly Briton tomb at 16 feet deep. Henry had probably dug it this deep searching for Joseph assuming the pyramids were a sign (from the east) of something under them. These were small step pyramids not like any other in the cemetery.

The depth could only have been indicated to King Henry by Henry Blois (as only he knew the depth) and the King had most probably been informed of the rationalized reasoning behind the depth of the grave i.e. because of the fear of Saxon interference. This however, might have been Gerald’s or the monk’s rationalized observation. But, Gerald’s mention of Guinevere is because Henry Blois has planted the lock of hair; not because Gerald is making up an anecdotal account to coincide with Grail literature.

One of modern scholars’ biggest mistakes is to assume that the Perlesvaus (even though in the elucidation it originates from *Maistre Blihis* Master Blihos or H. Blois) was written by some other than Henry Blois. This is especially more neglectful in consideration that the author is acquainted with Glastonbury. Scholars’ blind spot is largely based on the dating of the Perlesvaus because its mention of Arthur’s and Guinevere’s burial place in Avalon to them could not be written before 1189.

I hope the reader appreciates the person who planted the grave and who located it between the *piramides* to be found in the future; and indicated the location in DA is the same as the person relating to Arthur’s burial in Perlesvaus.\(^734\) Now, as this relates to Gerald’s referring Guinevere and her name being on the cross, it is probably not from Perlesvaus\(^735\) but from DA which it is obvious he has read. Witnessing the lock of hair Gerald would instantly associate it with Guinevere by what was written in DA and by what was written on the cross.

---

\(^734\) Perlesvaus: *But or ever the King departed he made the head be brought into the isle of Avalon, to a chapel of Our Lady that was there.*

\(^735\) Perlesvaus: *But the queen bade at her death that his (Arthur’s) body should be set beside her own when he shall end.*
Scholastic logic assumes that mention of Guinevere is derived from Romance literature. This contrived viewpoint is now nullified, as both Perlesvaus and the interpolations in DA are written by the same person prior to her bogus relics disinterment.

We should not believe Gerald is concocting the entire account about the monk grasping the lock of hair. Scholars have tended to believe the version of words on the epitaph of the cross which omit Guinevere fraudulently made to expunge Guinevere. Basically, by omitting the only eyewitness account as having no reliability to the transpiration of events; scholars have been able to complete the puzzle face down without anyone aware of the picture how events really transpired. To what end? We should also not forget the chronology of Giraldus Cambrensis’ Bledhericus who asserts the ‘famosus ille fabulator’ who had lived "shortly before our time" i.e. 18 years before the unearthing and Gerald’s eye witness account. It is fairly obvious this is our Master Blihis and Gerald not only has been unknowingly primed by Henry in Arthurian lore but is writing just after his death.

Gerald has read DA, but he has no incentive to concur with it by mentioning Joseph or any other fabricated lore found within it (which is the common argument put forward by scholars as a proof Joseph was not an early inclusion found in DA). There is no reason for Gerald writing diligent efforts were made in Glastonbury Abbey to locate what must have once been the tomb of Arthur. This was done at the instruction of the King- unless it was true. We simply do not know the amount of ground between the two piramides and what efforts were made.

It would seem to indicate by the words: In our own lifetime, while Henry II was ruling England that Gerald links the events to King Henry.

Gerald wrote: The tomb was found between two tall, emblazoned pyramids, erected long ago in memory of Arthur, because he believed the pyramids were erected as a marker. Aelred Watkin remarks: the question remains; why dig in that spot.736

In Ralph of Coggeshall’s Chronicon Anglicanum, a history of England covering the years 1187 to 1224, Ralph avers that the monks were digging because of the desire of another monk to be buried in that particular spot in the cemetery. This could of course be Ralph’s own rationalisation having not heard of the events which brought about the disinterment. More likely

---

736 Aelred Watkin. The Glastonbury legends. Here at least is one commentator questioning logically.
though, it was the response which Glastonbury gave when suspicion was cast on their escapade in an attempt to make the event seem more random and less contrived. Henry de Sully was probably just as shocked as everybody else that the rumours turned out to be true and a grave of King Arthur was found.

Adam of Damerham’s account, writing after 1277, is relatively inconsequential compared to Giraldus’ and states that Henry de Sully had been urged to move Arthur’s body to a better resting place. So this also might be a catalyst for the disinterment in organising the building project and altar of the new build. Arthur’s presence at the alar may just be a consequence of the disinterment, thereafter finding a more sanctified location.

By William of Malmesbury’s account the piramides were marked with Saxon names (excepting possibly the interpolated Bregored). Henry needed an unequivocal marker for the grave. In the future the edifice of the two piramides would mark the spot inbetween for the confirmation of his pseudo-history built around his own alter-ego Arthur. Arthur would live forever in history by the very man who wrote the colourful account of British history. The chivalric Arthur needed to be substantiated from hearsay and myth into reality. The cleverness of Henry’s plan was the fabrication of a tomb and devising a plan for the discovery of the body after he was dead, along with the facts that he had covered ‘Geoffrey’ and Master Blihis from being exposed in his lifetime. This was achieved by the indoctrination of King Henry and the whole concept was inspired by the prophecy of Melkin. It may be also that Henry Blois had also altered some markings on the pyramid.

The discovery of the tomb conveniently fulfils Arthurian lore in HRB and VM. The whole edifice initiated by Henry Blois, on the ruse that through ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ who had obtained archaic information (the contents of HRB) from Walter’s book, now became historically evidenced and then became a confirmed certainty for Gerald once the tomb of Arthur was opened up: *True and accurate information has been sought out, so the legends have finally been extinguished*...

The real question is who, (considering all we have covered previously), could be responsible for implicating Avalon as Glastonbury except Henry

---

737 Bregored was pre- West Saxon as in the 601 charter.
Blois. Aelred Watkin realizes that the leaden cross alone would not, by itself, be enough to carry off a fraud by Henry de Sully. Watkin says: *It is certainly likely that the identification of Avalon with Glastonbury had by then already been made; it is possible that this identification reached the ears of Henry II and that the King suggested the search.* Henry Blois in DA and verbally in some way instilled this intrigue into King Henry and we may speculate that on Henry Blois’ deathbed Henry Blois passed the location on to King Henry.\(^7\) We should not forget either the Glastonbury Perlesvaus also pointed to the existence of Avalon at Glastonbury and the grave of Arthur and Guinevere before the disinterment. It must have been before the unearthing of Arthur’s grave because Henry Blois is responsible for the original Perlesvaus story.

When we consider the similarities we have with the discovery of the Holy Cross at Montacute and Henry’s involvement with that propaganda stunt as Dean of Waltham while he was searching for Joseph of Arimathea at Montacute hill…. it seems nearly all the evidence points to Henry Blois as to the reason Arthur was found where he was.

By the time we get to 1420AD we can see in the *Biblioteca Apostolica* a finalised squared up version of what was initially started by Henry Blois. The illusion is complete, yet the whole edifice of Glastonbury myth still relies on Melkin.

Abbot John Chinnock was succeeded by Lord Nicholas Frome who was elected abbot of Glastonbury in 1420-1456 in the reign of King Henry V. The

\(^7\) Carley. The chronicle of Glastonbury abbey. Carley suggests the unearthing of Arthur was probably Henry II idea and enquires: *Why Henry would have suggested Glastonbury as the scene of Arthur’s discovery is more difficult to determine.* P. xl. Perhaps if there was not such a rigid insistence that anything Arthurian in DA could not have been interpolated until after the excavation, he might find his answer. The fact that the abbot of Glastonbury was the author of HRB is the determining factor. At least this would not suggest that King Henry is the instigator of the leaden cross and thus a promoter of the understanding that Avalon was synonymous with Glastonbury. To rationalise Carley’s last proposition, he must therefore explain how Avalon became Avalon because his contemporary modern scholars are of the opinion that Avalon only became known as Avalon after the discovery of Arthur. He therefore suggests randomly in relation to his proposition about Henry II: *It is possible that he had in fact heard legends about Glastonbury’s being Avalon from Breton conteurs.* This of course neatly dovetails with his supposition that: *At some point in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century Joseph of Arimathea became associated with the court of King Arthur through the introduction of his name in the old French Grail Romances.* If Lagorio had not got it wrong and taught Carley to believe an incorrect *a priori* concerning a provenance from French Grail Romances in regard to Avalon; and if Crick had done what she professes to be an expert at, in elucidating who Geoffrey of Monmouth really was, Carley would understand the relation between Arthur and Joseph of Arimathea and at last we could move on to understand that Master Blehis is Henry Blois…. the primordial instigator of French Grail Romances. Presumably Loomis and Carley are in cahoots in believing Avalon is invented by a Breton *conteur*, but this theory has little relevance and is basically predicated upon what Marie of France says of the provenance of her material.
King ordered abbot Frome to inform him in writing about the excavation in
the cemetery of Glastonbury Abbey which had taken place in 1419 while he
was absent in Normandy and Henry V wished to be appraised of what
transpired and why the dig took place. Below we witness the response of
Lord Nicholas Frome answering the order from King Henry V to inform him
of the excavation:

Most illustrious and dreaded lord, according to the antiquity of your
monastery at Glastonbury, which was first called Yniswitrin and afterwards
the Vale of Avalon, the apostle St Philip, who was preaching in France, sent 12
of his apostles into Britain, and he appointed his dearest friend Joseph of
Arimathea to lead them. They came into Britain in A.D. 63 the 15th year after
the assumption of the Blessed Mary, and courageously began to preach the
Christian faith. A King named Arviragus reigned in Britain at that time, who
did not wish to change the traditions of his forefathers for better ways, and
rejected their preaching. Nevertheless because they had come from afar, he
gave them as a habitation an island called by the natives Inyswitrin. Later to
other Kings, although pagans themselves, granted to each of them a portion
of land, in this way the 12 hides are named for them up to present times.

Also most Serene Prince, in the aforesaid year Joseph of Arimathea built
with his disciples a chapel containing a statue of St Mary in the place where
the old church of Glastonbury is now situated, making the walls of twisted
wattle. Whence from ancient times it has been called the wattle Church.
Indeed all those buried there from of old, have with them twigs in their tombs,
namely one according to the length of the body, the other in a cross direction
under the feet, just as it is most clearly apparent to the Observer.

Also most excellent Lord, as for the death and burial of St Joseph, the
‘Antiquities of Glastonbury’ informs us concerning the prophecy of Melkin
who was before Merlin. The Isle of Avalon, eager for the burial of pagans, at
the burial of them all will be decorated beyond others in the world with the
soothsaying spheres of prophecy, and in the future will be adorned with those
who praise the most high. Abbadare, powerful in Saphat, the most noble of
pagans, took his sleep there with 104,000. Among them Joseph ‘De Marmore’,
named from Arimathea, took perpetual sleep and lies in ‘linea bifurcata’, next
to the southern corner of the oratory with prepared wattle, above the
powerful and venerable virgin, the aforesaid twelve sperulated ones,
inhabiting the place.
Also most dreaded lord, concerning St Phagan and St Deruvian, who were sent by Pope Eleutherius to baptise King, and how they came to Glastonbury. St Patrick the apostle of Ireland and first Abbot of Glastonbury wrote thus in his charter: I Patrick a humble servant of God, sent by the most holy Pope Celestine to Ireland in A.D. 425, converted the Irish by the grace of God to the way of truth. And when I had made them firm in the Catholic faith, I returned at last to Britain and as I believe with God leading me, who is the life and the way. I happened upon the island of Inyswitrin. There I found a holy and ancient place, chosen and sanctified by God in honour of the undefiled Virgin Mary, the mother of God, and there I encountered some brothers, instructed in the rudiments of the Catholic faith and pious in their lives, who has succeeded the disciples of St Phagan and St Deruvian, whose names I truly believe to be written in heaven for the merits of their lives. As they were noble of birth and wish to crown their nobility with works of faith, they decided to lead the hermetic life. Since I found them to be humble and tranquil, I preferred to be cast out with them, then to live in the court of King’s. And because we were all of one heart and one soul, we elected to live together sharing our food and drink and sleeping in the same house. And although I was unwilling, for I was not worthy to one loose to buckles of their shoes, they set me at their head. After we had been leading the monastic life in this way according to the rule of the approved fathers, the aforesaid brothers showed me the writings of St Phagan and St Deruvian, which asserted that 12 disciples of St Philip and St James had built the old church in honour of our aforesaid advocate the Virgin.

Also most illustrious prince, concerning the remains discovered at Glastonbury in the seventh year of your most gracious rule and power. In the south side of the cemetery of the old church were discovered three ancient coffins in the Earth, at a depth of about 14 feet. The coffin which lay in the northern part contains the bones of a decayed and perished man, the bones arranged according to the manner of death. Near the bones of the head there was an abundance in grains of green and sweet scented herbs with their seeds. In the coffin which lay in the middle there were contained the bones of 12 corpses, which was so ingeniously and so finally arranged within the casket, that after their extraction, indeed nobody there knew how to arrange them again in the aforesaid casket. In the third coffin which lay to the south there were bones of a decayed and perished individual lying in the manner of nature and away from the middle of the aforesaid corpse, towards the head a
great abundance of fluid which appeared as fresh blood to those present in that place, both by its colour and substance. All these coffins were found outside the chapel. Within the chapel however, under the southern corner of the altar another coffin was found with the bones of a decayed man. This coffin was adorned most excellently beyond the others, with linen cloth inside all over. And because it excelled all the others in delicacy of scent and eminence of place, it was enclosed in another large coffin until clear run notice of it will be able to be had in the future. Also most feared prince, in the fourth book, 10th chapter of De Regis Britonum where he speaks about King Arviragus, Geoffrey says the last: ‘Joseph of Arimathea came at that time into the island of Avalon or Glastonbury with his 11 disciples’. Concerning this a certain scribe writes in praise of their coming: The twelfold band of men enters Avalon, Joseph flower of Arimathea, is their chief. Josephes, Joseph's son, accompanies his father. The right to Glastonbury is held by these and 10 others.

It just seems extraordinary that ‘Geoffrey’ is seen to have introduced the story of Joseph of Arimathea’s arrival into HRB. No doubt Carley et al. will say that must be coincidence or later interpolation. Adam of Damerham specifically states that Henry Blois gave that book to Glastonbury. If only the modern era could get its hands upon Lord Nicholas Frome’s copy (or Henry Blois’ last redaction) of HRB. It is not as if Frome is uncertain about which chapter, or to which book, or to which author he is referencing.

Again, concerning this unearthing incident referred to by King Henry V, we have yet further scholastic speculations from Carley which only muddy the waters. Carley offers evidence of the interest demonstrated by monks of Glastonbury in finding Joseph of Arimathea’s burial site. Then he speculates that only King Henry V death in 1422 prevented the revelation of this astonishing ‘discovery’. It needs to be stated that Joseph of Arimathea was never buried at Glastonbury and any myth which avers such a position is as a direct consequence of the actions, oral transmission and written words of Henry Blois.

However it is plain to see by the account above, that since Henry Blois’ death, the officine de faux had been busy. It is not by accident that lore had

---

739 Culture and the King. Martin Schictman, James Carley.
been created around a great abundance of fluid which appeared as fresh blood found in a coffin and another covered in white linen that excelled all others. It would not take much to assume this was attributed to Joseph.

So, while on the subject of Gerald’s work, it might be helpful to go through the evidence piece by piece in detail as we did with DA and GR so that what Gerald is actually saying is not ignored. Modern scholar’s scepticism is largely based on two factors: the epitaph on the cross they choose to believe omits Guinevere and does not match Gerald’s rendition and King Henry was dead when Henry de Sully was elected to Glastonbury.

The Discovery of the Tomb of King Arthur from Liber de Principis Instructione (On the Instruction of Princes) c. 1192-3

1) The memory of Arthur, the celebrated King of the Britons, should not be concealed. This first sentence establishes that Gerald is a promoter of Arthur. Richard Barber like every other historian does not understand the existence of Henry Blois’ propaganda at Glastonbury and says of Gerald: The passage is introduced by a celebration of Arthur as patron of Glastonbury, which is not borne out by any material that can be safely dated to before the discovery. He also does not believe Gerald is an eyewitness: If Gerald had actually watched the excavation in progress, he would surely have said as much. Gerald gives an account of how it happened with detail which is contradictory to all others after him which indicates to me his version of what is written on the cross is more believable. He even mentions the crowd at the scene. Every subsequent account to Gerald is singing from the same hymn sheet excluding/omitting the presence of Guinevere in the grave. We should not be ignoring the fact that Gerald says, not only was she in the Grave, but her name was written on the cross.

If her remains were not in the grave, how did King Edward later witness her relics. Funnily enough Barber concludes: Finding this did not correspond with current ideas as to Arthur’s death they hastily revised their original account and a new version was presented to visitors within a few years of the original excavation. The real events transpired exactly as Gerald explains. Henry Blois had planted two sets of bones (and a plait of female hair) and

---

740 Richard Barber. Was Mordred buried at Glastonbury?
that is what was found. That some bones were dust only confirms the use of a previous grave. Only shortly afterward did Glastonbury change the story for the protection of Arthur’s honour by excluding Guinevere. Henry Blois had buried both to establish his completely fictitious tale of Guinevere and Arthur and this concurs with what was written in Perlesvaus and DA prior to the unearthing. Henry Blois’ intention was to establish Avalon and corroborate his concoctions in HRB. It may be Henry Blois’ own apologia in presenting Guinevere as the second wife. There is no confusion in Giraldus’s mind uxore secunda meant second wife. What we can conclude therefore from this is that the cross which Camden replicates is a forgery after the disinterment, where the monks agreed to exclude Guinevere. Herein may lie the answer to so many versions until a new cross is fabricated which concurs with the Glastonbury hymn sheet. How we can be sure of this is by the presence of Guinevere at Edward I and Eleanor of Castille’s visit in 1278 i.e. the bodies of both were transferred into the new building and then a new epitaph was written.

Now, regarding modern scholar’s dismissal of Gerald and his account in which Guinevere’s name is said to have existed on the cross, we should take into account the fact that Guinevere was in evidence in 1278. If we look at Adam’s account, he also mirrors what Gerald has said and does not deny Guinevere is present. Yet Adam holds with the more recent wording on the cross which has the shortened epitaph; which, in effect, had tried to get over Gerald’s insistence that the cross had stated uxore secunda and that Arthur had been buried with a defiled wife. Adam of Damerham (more than sixty years after the fact) writes: The diggers had almost lost hope, so

741 HRB X, xiii. Mordred, unto whom he had committed the charge of Britain, had tyrannously and traitorously set the crown of the kingdom upon his own head, and had linked him in unhallowed union with Guenevere the Queen despite her former marriage. Charles Wood is led astray by not understanding that all Grail material on the continent was initiated by Henry Blois: unfortunately for the monks and their plans, however, even though Chrétien’s tale of compelling adultery appears to have been written in the early to mid 1170s, nothing suggests that knowledge of it had spread very quickly or, more to the point, that it had taken hold in England by 1191. Wood ignores Giraldus, yet seems to think the monks decided to include Guinevere in their find but in fact the opposite was true because of Guinevere’s adultery. They had initially tried to expunge her from the records but had no option to accept she was real as she was in the coffin and translated with Arthur into the new church and not able to be expunged. The proof is that in 1278 she was present again. As the Glastonbury propaganda mill had turned in an effort to eradicate her from Glastonbury lore there was still the early record of Gerald which he reconfirmed unequivocally later on. It is for this reason we find the second exhumation to clarify the discrepancy once and for all. It is because of this second exhumation and the presence of Guinevere we can understand that once the tomb was sealed it remained untouched even though the myth had evolved outside the tomb. When it was opened the second time while Adam was there, we find that Gerald’s record is in fact true.
deep had they dug, when they found a wooden coffin of enormous size, with a lid. They raised it and opened it and found the Kings bones. They were of incredible size, the shin bone alone reached from the ground to the thigh of a tall man. They found also a leaden cross with the inscription on one side: Here lies the great King Arthur, buried in the Isle of Avalon.

Then they opened the tomb of the Queen who was buried with Arthur and found a lovely lock of golden hair, elaborately plaited, but as they touched it, it fell to dust. And so the abbot and the monks took up their relics and carried them with joy into the great Church, and laid them in a nobly worked double mausoleum, the king to the West at the head of the tomb and the queen at his feet to the East. And there they lie in splendour to this day with the following epitaph on their tomb: Here lies King Arthur, the flower of chivalry, famous for all time for his noble deeds. Here also lies his queen, whose virtues merited a heavenly crown.

We can see then by Adam of Damerham’s account that he has no problem with Guinevere being present; her name is omitted from the cross just as it is in Ralph’s and the anonymous Margam chronicler’s account. Since Gerald repeats the same about Guinevere being Arthur’s second wife in the later Speculum Ecclesiae and we now understand that it was Henry Blois who had the initial cross fabricated, I see no reason to disbelieve Gerald. The later rendition of the cross was to expunge the adulterer Guinevere.

2) In his age, he was a distinguished patron, generous donor, and a splendid supporter of the renowned monastery of Glastonbury. This is either based on the allusions in Caradoc’s life of Gildas where it is said that ‘the two Kings gave to the abbot a gift of many domains’. Logically, if Henry Blois wrote HRB and Life of Gildas and invented Avalon and propagated it as synonymous with Glastonbury; it is hardly surprising that Gerald is implying an already established association before the disinterment. Especially, this is true because Henry had already written Perlesvaus. The Perlesvaus as we have mentioned before is excluded as having been written prior to the unearthing, purely because scholars have contrived to piece together the puzzle of events at Glastonbury and have deemed it impossible that Guinevere could be mentioned in the colophon. They have therefore decreed Perlesvaus is of a date following the exhumation of Arthur. Yet Gerald is saying Guinevere is in the grave with Arthur not only because he
has witnessed her exhumation but also it is stated that she is there in DA prior to the dig.... and the Perlesvaus colophon had also pointed they were buried in Avalon.

3) they praise him greatly in their annals. These annals must exist at the time of Gerald writing. We know one is DA, another, Perlesvaus, another De Regis Arthurii mensa rotunda which can only be a Blois invention, (albeit under the name Melkin), which, in itself, indicates an association of Melkin with Henry Blois long before John of Glastonbury writes. All of these tracts along with Life of Gildas were written by Henry Blois. These are the annals to which Gerald refers.

4) Indeed, more than all other churches of his realm he prized the Glastonbury church of Holy Mary, mother of God, and sponsored it with greater devotion by far than he did for the rest. When that man went forth for war, depicted on the inside part of his shield was the image of the Blessed Virgin, so that he would always have her before his eyes in battle, and whenever he found himself in a dangerous encounter he was accustomed to kiss her feet with the greatest devotion.

That Arthur sponsored Glastonbury is highlighted in Life of Gildas and JG 742 where we have the king of Dumnonia interacting with Arthur about five hides on Ineswitrin which could only be Henry’s touch that Gerald may refer to.

In the Annales Cambriae in Year 72 (c. AD 516) at the Battle of Badon in which Arthur carried the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ on his shoulders for three days and three nights and the Britons were victors .... is the source of the conflation. It is mirrored also by a passage in Nennius where Arthur was said to have borne the image of the Virgin Mary on his shoulders during a battle at a castle called Guinnion. 743 Scholars seem to think that the

---

742 The reason for thinking this a Blois fabrication initially is that John of Glastonbury in chap 16 says: The glorious King Arthur gave Brent Marsh and Polden along with many other lands located in the neighbourhood. Thus a King by the name of Domp restored five hides in that land which is called Ineswitrin. It seems fairly clear that John who is more consolidator than fabricator must have obtained the knowledge from one of Henry’s works now lost. The other reason for positing this is that where Malmesbury had originally said the flourit on the 601 charter was illegible…. we now have a name of the King of Devon; a certain dubious sounding Domp of Dumnonia.

743 “The eighth battle was in Guinnion fort, and in it Arthur carried the image of the holy Mary, the everlasting Virgin, on his shield, and the heathen were put to flight on that day, and there was great slaughter upon them, through the power of Jesus Christ and the power of the holy Virgin Mary, his mother."
words for "shoulder" and "shield" were easily confused in old Welsh; scuit "shield" instead of scuid "shoulder". But this seems more like Henry Blois, writing as Geoffrey played upon this dual tradition, describing Arthur bearing "on his shoulders a shield" emblazoned with the Virgin to become its latest expanded form which Gerald has obviously read before 1192.... which connects Arthur’s acts directly to Glastonbury and its St Mary Church.

5) Although legends had fabricated something fantastical about his demise (that he had not suffered death, and was conveyed, as if by a spirit, to a distant place). The ‘hope of the Britons’ as part of the zeitgeist is evident, but until Henry had named Avalon in the First Variant as the place Arthur was last seen.... there was no previous locus for Arthur. He just existed in the netherworld to return one day. The Vulgate maintained the anonymous location also like First Variant i.e. we had no idea of Avalon’s location. However, we are left in no doubt in VM post 1155 that Avalon was also commensurate with Insula Pomorum as Arthur is taken there; just like he is taken in Vulgate and First Variant to Insula Avallonis. It leaves us in little doubt that the island of Apples is Glastonbury because Henry Blois has spelled it out for us in his etymological contortion in DA. What Gerald is conveying is that at one time no-one knew for certain where Arthur was but now:

6) ...his body was discovered at Glastonbury, in our own times, hidden very deep in the earth in an oak-hollow, between two stone pyramids that were erected long ago in that holy place. The tomb was sealed up with astonishing tokens, like some sort of miracle. There is no doubt that Gerald is convinced the grave is genuine. There is no doubt that if Arthur really was in a hollowed out oak that it certainly would have rotted in the six centuries since he was supposedly buried. We can speculate that Henry had put the bones so deep because he genuinely had dug between the pyramids thinking that Joseph might be buried beneath them. Even though Henry did not know where Ineswitrin was.... there could have been a good chance of Joseph’s body being by the two most prominent structures in the cemetery. I would suggest his reason for digging originally was that he thought they marked Joseph’s grave. We should consider that Henry who saw the 601 charter may have thought Joseph was buried at Glastonbury as both the Melkin prophecy and the 601 charter (both mentioning Ineswitrin) were
both discovered in the archives at Glastonbury. This is one scenario, but Henry Blois might also have dug deep to avoid suspicion when the grave was found, in that it would have been suspected to have been uncovered in the natural course of events in burials over the last six hundred years. A change in level of the cemetery in Dunstan’s era could also be the explanation of how a tomb lid was found so deep. For whatever reason lies behind Henry Blois having buried the body at such great depth, Gerald does not seem suspicious of the tomb.... which would indicate it has been dormant some 30 years. I think we can dismiss the curtains recounted by Adam, as Gerald does not mention them. We could presume Adam is confused with the (De Inventione) Montacute dig writing 60 years after the Arthur disinterment and over a hundred and thirty years since the search for Joseph on Montacute hill744 which eventuated the composition of De Inventione.

7) The body was then conveyed into the church with honor, and properly committed to a marble tomb. Gerald goes on to tell us of the first translation into the new building. This more sanctified location was later to be exhumed by Edward I and Eleanor of Castille. Adam says they were put in a double mausoleum with a new epitaph. Adam, the abbey’s principal chronicler (since the consolidator of DA), makes it clear that Guinevere was alongside Arthur in the new resting place they had been provided when Edward I and Eleanor of Castile arrived to have the tomb opened once more: Wherein, in two caskets painted with their pictures and arms, were found separately the bones of the said king, which were of great size and those of Guinevere, which were of marvelous beauty.....On the following day....the lord king replaced the bones of the king and queen each in their own casket, having wrapped them in costly silks. When they had been sealed, they ordered the tomb to be placed forthwith in front of the high altar after removal of the skulls for the veneration of the people.

With the reference to Arthur’s large bones and the fact that there were two skulls, it would indicate that Guinevere was there after all. This is why I am insistent that Giraldus’ testimony is the more solid than any other’s....

744 After Henry’s search at Montacute, Looe Island was appropriated by Glastonbury in Henry Blois’ tenure as abbot in 1144 because Henry knew the Island called Ineswitrin was in Dumnonia. The last event recorded in De inventione is in 1144 so we can conclude the text pertains to that era and also Henry is said to have sold his Deanship to Waltham that year.
about Guinevere being part of the manufactured gravesite that Henry Blois had planted. However, continuing with Gerald’s account:

8) A lead cross was placed under the stone, not above as is usual in our times, but instead fastened to the underside. I have seen this cross, and have traced the engraved letters — not visible and facing outward, but rather turned inwardly toward the stone. It read: "Here lies entombed King Arthur, with Guenevere his second wife, on the Isle of Avalon."

Charles T Wood, writes: In spite of Giraldus’s assurances that he himself has seen and touched the cross, its reported words fail to inspire confidence. Wood then does what no other scholar has done, he concludes the dig was genuine: It follows then, that the first dig was genuine, and it may be that the stone with its identifying cross once lay flush with the original surface before the new layers of concealing clay were added. The consequences of positing such a proposition throws up so many specious scenarios (i.e. if we start to believe in a genuine Arthur buried at Glastonbury), it is simply not worth throwing them all in the air for nothing will come of it. It is simpler just to remind the reader that Insula Avalonis is a Blois invention along with chivalric Arthur, so the cross has to be bogus.

Wood does however make one contribution by asking the question: why was Arthur somewhat tardily added to what was otherwise a group consisting purely of Saints. As we covered in DA, the discovery of Dunstan’s relics are an opportune consequence of the fire and written up by a later interpolator into DA with the concoction of a coffin (however, we have argued previously for Henry Blois having perhaps been the instigator of the coffin). King Arthur was put at Glastonbury by Henry Blois and was not ‘tardy’; the bones meant to represent him had just remained there for thirty years in the ground. Don’t forget Henry would not have buried Arthur and Guinevere until after 1158 when both Vulgate HRB and Wace’s Roman de Brut became prolific.

9) Many remarkable things come to mind regarding this. For instance, he had two wives, of whom the last was buried with him. Her bones were discovered with her husband’s, though separated in such a way that two-thirds of the sepulcher, namely the part nearer the top, was believed to contain the bones of the husband, and then one-third, toward the bottom, separately contained the bones of his wife — wherein was also discovered a

\[745\] C.T. Wood. Fraud and it consequences.
yellow lock of feminine hair, entirely intact and pristine in colour, which a certain monk eagerly seized in hand and lifted out; immediately the whole thing crumbled to dust.

We should accept that the cross stated that Guinevere was Arthur’s second wife. It is possible to speculate that the commonly held inscription (omitting Guinevere) is on a fabricated cross made by Glastonbury after the disinterment. It is this possibility which leads the scholars astray regarding Gerald. Richard Barber recounts: If Camden’s cross is that originally ‘found’ in the grave then Gerald’s account must be treated as highly unreliable. We should only enquire how it is then, that Guinevere is present in 1278 and Gerald two years after the fact wastes his time recounting facts about Guinevere’s hair.

Why Gerald is accused by Barber of not being present at the disinterment in no way correlates with the above specifics about the proportions of the grave and actions immediately surrounding the dig. There seems to be a conspiracy and overall dismissal of the earliest chronicler who wrote just after the event in preference to Adam who wrote a least sixty years after the event and mirrors what Gerald writes anyway. Why Camden’s tracing c.1600 is preferred to Gerald’s testimony where he avers that he traced it also is typical of Scholars’ contriving to fit.

Liber de Principis Instructione must have been written before the end of 1193 as Henry de Sully was elected to the See of Worcester on 4 December 1193 and consecrated on 12 December 1193. Gerald says the dig was under the supervision of the abbot of that place, Henry, who was later transferred to Worcester Cathedral... So, Gerald is definitely not confused with any other than Henry de Sully. Gerald unequivocally states in Liber de Principis Instructione (as above) Arthur had two wives.

So Wright’s assessment of a misunderstanding of the epitaph given by Adam c.1277 is misguided. Gerald actually relates the inscription: Hic iacet sepultus inclitus rex Arthurus cum Wenneueria uxore sua secunda in insula Avalonia.

---

746 Richard Barber. Was Mordred buried at Glastonbury? Gerald of Wales’s text is less likely to be an eyewitness account than a reworking in his high literary style of an earlier, genuine description by someone who was present. Again most of the scholars take this viewpoint because of the discrepancy on the newly fabricated cross traced by Camden.

747 Neil Wright. A new Arthurian Epitaph. Wright put forward the speculation that: in the epitaph the adjective secunda is used adverbially, qualifying the participle tumulata.
Grandsen seems to think Gerald conspires with the monks and commits to the ‘press release’ idea. The one problem with this theory is that Gerald is advocating what he saw and he saw Guinevere....so, he could not be in cahoots with the monks. Barber advocates also the official newsletter idea, but discounts Gerald’s testimony upon the basis that if Camden’s cross c.1600 was that which was found, then Gerald must be the liar writing a year afterward.

What if it is Gerald alone writing a year or so after the dig who states what was on the real cross before the hymn sheet was regularized and a new cross fabricated and Guinevere omitted. Guinevere’s presence is more likely to exist on a cross.... fabricated by Henry Blois’ motivation in corroborating the historicity of HRB. Therefore, when Henry was manufacturing the cross, he posits her as Arthur’s second wife as the first was adulterous. Henry, as we have seen, loves to leave confusing detail.... as if the mists of time has covered the truth. We should not forget that Guinevere is cited as being buried in the cemetery in DA (as long as one is capable of accepting the interpolation is by Henry Blois) and also Guinevere is said to be buried in Avalon in Perlesvaus also written by Henry Blois. So, the chance of her name being mentioned on the cross is dramatically increased when all things are considered. It seems Guinevere was supposed to be there, (as Henry had arranged the grave with her in it), but latterly she was expunged in accounts by the mores of propriety in that she disgraced herself with Mordred in HRB.

Queen Guinevere tries to seduce Sir Launfal and it is not by accident that both Marie and Chrétien’s sketch of Arthur’s queen is less than blameless based on the Mordred affair in Henry’s work. Marie of France’s work was in the public domain long before 1189-91 and also Chrétien portrays Guinevere and her love affair with Arthur’s chief knight Sir Lancelot before her relics are found with Arthur’s at Glastonbury. This story appeared in Chrétien de Troyes’s Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart. It is hardly likely then that Glastonbury monks wanted any relationship with the promotion of Guinevere.

Barber believes that if Gerald had actually watched the excavation in progress, he would have said as much, and even if he had done I doubt Barber would have given him any more credibility but Gerald does not mention the curtains surrounding the dig which is obviously Adam mixing up the previous De Inventione account.
If what Barber really thinks is that Gerald was not there and hears the account from an eyewitness; is Barber still going to advocate that the other extraneous detail concerning Guinevere is also made up? If he is not going to accuse Gerald of that then according to the scholastic view a fraudulent Henry de Sully put Guinevere in the grave. But then if Barber believes *Camden’s cross is that originally ‘found’ in the grave then Gerald’s account must be treated as highly unreliable.* Why would Henry de Sully have put Guinevere in the grave and excluded her from the inscription that supposedly Camden or one of the others portray; and then Barber reminds us: *We should only enquire how it is then, that Guinevere is present in 1278 and Gerald two years after the fact wastes his time recounting facts about Guinevere’s hair.*

The only way to see this indicates Gerald’s account is more believable. What more does Barber want than the intricate description of how the cross was placed relative to the slab, the destruction of the lock of hair (yet if it did turn to dust Gerald saw it beforehand); and Gerald’s comments on the inappropriate actions of the monk jumping in the hole and the three quarter proportion of the grave taken up by Arthur which is an observation made on site looking in the grave not related by a third party. When all were amazed at the size of the bone it was stood against someone. A hands breadth between the eye-sockets is so much more detailed than any other account. Why lie about the inscription? Why does Barber not think Gerald has not said he is there on site at the gravesite at the moment…. when he is part of the crowd he mentions?

In 1278 both Guinevere and Arthur are exhumed from the original re-interment. So, it makes little sense of Wood to accuse Gerald of prattling on about a second wife; when Gerald is describing her bones and lock of hair and the episode of the monk jumping into the grave…. while at the same time, accusing Gerald of hearing the ‘official version’. Gerald’s version is the first version. The omission of Guinevere is the concocted official version. Gerald wrote the Guinevere episode because that is how it transpired. Henry Blois had put her ‘bits’ in the grave as he lets us know Arthur’s wife is buried with him in DA.

Wood, along with the others, envisage Gerald as an invited guest after the fact: *Shortly after the discoveries of 1191, Gerald is encouraged to come to Glastonbury both to view the find and to write the abbey’s past glories. While there, he sees the tomb, hears the official version of the bones recovery, and*
closely examines the identifying lead cross, the inscription on which he records with scrupulous accuracy. But- and this is a crucial but-when he comes to the cross’s uxore secunda, he naturally assumes that these words must mean that Guinevere was Arthur’s second wife, surely a logical conclusion, given normal usage, and especially for one unacquainted with the specifics of Arthurian marital history. In fact the monastic makers of the cross had always intended a rather more positive message, that she was ‘fair’ or ‘fortunate’, attributes much more in keeping with Caradoc of Llancarfan and other Welsh sources at their disposal. Gerald, alas, does not know this, so when writing his account he embellishes it with a display of his own ignorance by blithely prattling on in his own voice about Arthur’s two wives. In other words, for this claim he had no source other than his own inventiveness. It is more likely Gerald is not prattling, but telling us what Henry Blois has had engraved on the cross. I think if Wood had prattled on any further with his own inventiveness he might display his own ignorance.

If we assume Guinevere was not even present we must also assume in 1278 the monks decided to mirror Giraldus’s version of events by opening the grave for which reason Edward and Eleanor had turned up. This would in effect contradict the Glastonbury monks’ previous ‘official version’ that Arthur was alone…. in that, the newly fabricated cross no longer mentions Guinevere.

Not one scholar accepts that it was Henry Blois who manufactured the grave and inserted the location where Arthur and Guinevere were to be found in DA. The reader is now better informed. Without this knowledge, no definitive solution will be accepted regarding Gerald’s account and his inclusion of Guinevere. Perlesvaus tells how Guinevere died of sorrow for the death of her son Lohot, and was buried in the island of Avalon, where it just so happens Arthur is also destined to be discovered.

10) Indeed, there had been some evidence from the records that the body might be found there, and some from the lettering carved on the pyramids (although that was mostly obliterated by excessive antiquity), and also some that came from the visions and revelations made by good men and the devout. I should remind the reader that we are looking at an account definitively written within a couple of years of the unearthing. This is not Gerald ‘blithely prattling on’. It is a record of someone having read DA knowing that the body might be found between the pyramids and explaining why the dig happened where it did and how that information was derived.
We know Gerald has read DA by the mirrored etymological account reiterated from Henry’s interpolation concerning Avalon. One interesting observation is that Gerald implies that evidence of the site also came from the lettering on the *piramide*. The reader will remember that William actually quotes those names on the *piramide* as part of his updated GR3 and those names were legible after six hundred years. 50 years later, we are told they are obliterated by excessive antiquity. Ralph of Coggeshall in his *Chronicon Anglicanum* also says the *piramides* were indecipherable. Now, it does not take much imagination for someone intent on making a fictional person come to life (in historicity) to obliterate the older names and infer Arthur was present and the *piramides* actually celebrated the grave. I only speculate this proposition because Gerald infers that. This may indeed be part of the problem in the differing renditions of the epitaph, if one was inscribed on sandstone and then worn away to pretend antiquity. We should also be aware of Henry Blois’ cunning in this regard in that it might be inferred that the smaller pyramid is in memorial of Guinevere and the larger for Arthur. Now, from where the ‘visions of good and devout men’ is derived.... is open to a multitude of speculation. What it does again infer is that there was precognition of the gravesite at Glastonbury prior to the dig; which, in effect, negates the modern scholastic view that Henry de Sully concocted the whole affair by himself. Scholars ignore Giraldus’s testimony as it does not fit the present theory of Henry de Sully staging the entire event.

11) But the clearest evidence came when King Henry II of England explained the whole matter to the monks (as he had heard it from an aged British bard): how they would find the body deep down, namely more than 16 feet into the earth, and not in a stone tomb but in an oak-hollow. The body had been placed so deep, and was so well concealed, that it could not be found by the Saxons who conquered the island after the King's death — those whom he had battled with so much exertion while he was alive, and whom he had nearly annihilated.

---

748 This would counter the argument that Arthur was hidden at such depth to avoid the Saxons etc. The supposition has little import, even if we did assume Henry Blois had etched something about Arthur on the *piramide*, as we know the whole site is manufactured between the *piramides*. The site was chosen so the location might be exposed later by an obvious land mark specified in DA

749 Aelred Watkin ignores Gerald and states: *It seems abundantly clear that there was nothing in the inscriptions on the pyramids which could have conducted to the search for Arthur.*
The scenarios are many that may explain away the conundrums and contradictions concerning King Henry. There are three main possibilities. The first is: we do not ignore Gerald, but the conundrum is that Henry II died in July 1189 and in September 1189 Richard I of England, just after his crowning at Westminster, appointed Henry de Sully, Abbot of Glastonbury. We might find a solution to the conundrum of Henry de Sully’s association with Henry II, if Henry de Sully were to have left Bermondsey to be at Glastonbury while Henry II was alive. Even though Henry de Sully was Richard I’s cousin, there is nothing to counter the argument that he was already at Glastonbury before his appointment and disinterred Arthur while Henry II was alive. Robert of Winchester, the previous abbot had died in 1180. Crick’s assessment is that the initiative for the excavation came from Henry II but the excavation was carried out in the time of Richard I.

The second possibility is: we ignore Gerald and assume that a year or two after King Henry’s death, financial constraints on the abbey became so dire with Richard I on crusade and contributing nothing, Henry de Sully invents the whole thing. Grave site, with Adam’s curtains and a fabricated cross with an inscription omitting mention of Guinevere. This is for the most part, the accepted theory today with the pick and mix conjecture put forward by scholars. A third is too long to append here so I have put it in Appendix 34 and is offered as another pick and mix speculation. Or, of course, we can believe Gerald.

12) And so because of this the lettering on the cross — the confirmation of the truth — had been inscribed on the reverse side, turned toward the stone, so that it would conceal the tomb at that time and yet at some moment or occasion could ultimately divulge what it contained. What Henry Blois had in fact done is affix the cross with the inscription facing inward toward the stone slab (an earlier tomb covering found while in search for Joseph), which, in effect, covered the hollowed wooden coffin in which he had placed the bogus animal bones. The object of this is to protect the inscription which was to be Henry’s pièce de résistance in his faux-historical romanticized authorial edifice now known as the Matter of Britain. Finding Arthur was the confirmation the doubters had needed that Avalon was truly at Glastonbury, just as the DA had already made plain.

13) What is now called Glastonbury was, in antiquity, called the Isle of Avalon; Are we really to believe in 1192 when Gerald is composing this work he has no previous idea of a connection between Glastonbury and
Avalon? When Carley assesses Gerald’s account regarding King Henry’s input he asks: *Why Henry would suggest Glastonbury for the scene of Arthur’s discovery is more difficult to determine.* Carley has no idea that King Henry could only have learnt what he knew from the person who manufactured the gravesite. Carley is also ignorant of Henry Blois’ interpolations already inserted in DA or the fact that Gerald has read DA with Henry Blois’ interpolations.... already part of the composition of the T version c.1189-91. Carley’s assessment concerning the advent of the Grail and the fact that he does not comprehend that Glastonbury was already understood as Avalon before the dig, leads to misguided conclusions: *The development of the Grail legend as we know it took place during a very few years, from shortly before 1190 to c 1230. The same period was one of the most significant in Glastonbury’s history; in c.1191 King Arthur’s body was discovered in the abbey cemetery and as a result Glastonbury became publicly identified with Avalon.*

Are we really supposed to believe that Robert de Boron mentions *Vaus d’Avaron* prior to knowledge of Avalon at Glastonbury and then King Henry II randomly picks Glastonbury as the site to fake an unearthing of Arthur. The assumption is trite to say the least; especially if (as Carley envisages the events) Robert’s Joseph is sending the Grail to Avalon c.1190 and it just so happens Arthur is unearthed in the same place in the same year at Glastonbury (which, it also transpires, has a connection to Joseph). What about Perlesvaus which predates Chretien’s work which also mentions Avalon.... which has to be Glastonbury because of the mention of the church covered in lead? We know the scholars view is that.... because Gerald does not mention Joseph, his name could not be in DA at this time. But, then how did the Grail and Joseph get mixed with Arthur in the courts on the continent. Of course we come back to Master Blehis and his output between 1160-70

We come back also to Carley’s mentor’s fatuous explanation of a ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’, which fall conveniently into place with no architect! Are we supposed to accept Gerald even comes up with the idea of explaining how ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Insula Pomorum* in VM is also ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Insula Avalonis* in HRB; and both now apply to Glastonbury.\(^{750}\) Gerald is

\(^{750}\) Carley says Geoffrey himself made no connection between Avalon and Glastonbury: in his writings Avalon is the equivalent of the Celtic Otherworld. *P xl ii The chronicle of Glastonbury abbey.* The tedium with which the Celtic Otherworld (for want of a better explanation) is peddled by one and all is excruciating. If Geoffrey does
regurgitating what was already written in chapter 5 of DA. We would then have to believe that evidence from the records that the body might be found there is not referring to chapter 31 in DA. If we follow this train of belief, we might then logically conclude in Wood’s possibility that Arthur’s grave is genuine. If it was a genuine grave we should then have to accept Arthur was a giant that resembled an ape. Like a dog chasing its tail we can go on ad infinitum as long as we keep ignoring Henry Blois’ input.

We can either accept the expert’s view and ignore Giraldus’, which would necessitate a belief in the chance ‘fortuitous convergence of factors’.... or one can accept that Henry Blois interpolated DA and is the architect behind the Matter of Britain. The real problem is that this would then have a serious consequence. One would then have to accept that Joseph’s sepulchre is on Burgh Island.

13) it is like an island because it is entirely hemmed in by swamps. In British it is called Inis Avalon, that is, insula pomifera [Latin: "The Island of Apples"). This is because the apple, which is called aval in the British tongue, was once abundant in that place. Gerald is regurgitating chapter 5 in DA where it gives also the origin of the name Avalon and how Glasteing found his sow under the apple tree and he named the island Avallonie, which means Apple Island and Avalla in British is the same as Poma in Latin.

14) Morgan, a noble matron, mistress and patroness of those regions, and also King Arthur’s kinswoman by blood, brought Arthur to the island now called Glastonbury for the healing of his wounds after the Battle of Camlann. It is staggeringly clever how Henry Blois has woven his authorial edifice together. It would also seem beyond the bounds of coincidence that the little known insular VM story of Merlin’s madness where Morgan is mentioned on Insula Pomorum, just happens to be a friend of Guigomar, Lord of Avalon in Chrétien’s Erec. Again, in the VM, Arthur is delivered to the Fortunate isle to Morgan, where, she said that health could be restored to him if he stayed with her for a long time and made use of her healing art. It is on Isidore’s Hesperides that we find Golden apples not as ‘Geoffrey’ later attests they are on the Fortunate isles from where he derives his Insula Pomorum. The Cauldron of the chief of the otherworld and the nine maidens who tended it not make the connection between Avalon and Glastonbury; who does? Are we to believe it is Gerald that is the first to put it in writing? Or is it Henry de Sully who transfixed a nation with a lead cross; who, in an instant, locates Avalon at Glastonbury? Or is it, as Carley suggests, by royal intervention? Who could it be? Maybe it was the abbot of Glastonbury the author of HRB and VM who made the connection by interpolating DA.
are conflated with the nine sorceress priestesses of Pomponius Mela’s island of Sena…. and then again, with purposeful intent, with the nine maidens on *Insula Pomorum* in VM. One would have to accept that in chapter 5 of DA, it is Henry Blois’ own words which compose the conflation with the Welsh *Afallennau*: *Apple island from avalla in British is the same as poma in Latin. Or it was named after a certain Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters….  Now, this mass of conflation Gerald accepts, because much of it is in ‘Malmesbury’s’ DA. But, Gerald even introduces into his account Caradoc’s etymological contortion of how Glastonbury got its name as witnessed in what follows:

15) *Moreover, the island had once been called in British Inis Gutrin, that is, insula vitrea [Latin: "The Island of Glass"]; from this name, the invading Saxons afterwards called this place Glastingeburi, for glas in their language means vitrum [Latin:"glass"], and buri stands for castrum [Latin:"castle"] or civitas [Latin:"city"]. We first hear of the vernacular ‘Isle de Voirre’ through Chrétien de Troyes*

Henry’s ingenious etymological conversion of Ineswitrin to Ynes Gutrin which gives the Glass Island which Caradoc (Henry Blois) first introduces in *Life of Gildas*, we have already explained was an addition to the *Life of Gildas*…. so that the 601 Charter was credible (in that it applied to an estate at Glastonbury). It is also through Henry Blois or Master Blehis and Chrétien de Troyes where we meet Maheloas as lord of the *Isle de Voirre* which relates to Caradoc’s Melvas and his *Urbs Vitrea*.

Anyway, we can see that Gerald is fairly *au courant* with how etymologies are derived straight after the excavation. Now, the one thing that flags up a suspicion here…. which indicates Gerald is squaring a DA account of Avalon and where he feels it necessary to introduce Glastonbury’s derivation from Ineswitrin, is because the two names are in DA, both posited as names for Glastonbury. There is no reason to introduce any other etymology, especially if he has only just made the connection to Avalon through the cross being produced. Gerald has seen DA…. and DA has Avalon commensurate with Glastonbury before the dig. The monks are well aware at Glastonbury that William of Malmesbury (supposedly) had posited Glastonbury as Avalon.

16 ) *It should be noted also that the bones of Arthur’s body which they discovered were so large that the poet’s verse seems to ring true: "Bones excavated from tombs are reckoned enormous"*. Indeed, his shin-bone, which
the abbot showed to us, was placed near the shin of the tallest man of the region; then it was fixed to the ground against the man’s foot, and it extended substantially more than three inches above his knee. And the skull was broad and huge, as if he were a monster or prodigy, to the extent that the space between the eyebrows and the eye-sockets amply encompassed the breadth of one’s palm. Moreover, ten or more wounds were visible on that skull, all of which had healed into scars except one, greater than the rest, which had made a large cleft — this seems to have been the lethal one.

The Skull must have been the holed head of an ape which was buried by Henry and sourced from his zoo which he had inherited from his uncle king Henry I (especially with the reference to the space between the eyebrows and huge sockets). Henry had planted these bones because this was the Arthur that fought giants. This is the description of a Gorilla skull. There seems little doubt the bones existed. The shin bone was probably the Tibia of the same animal. If all we have related about Henry Blois and his fanciful imagination has anything to do with his having manufactured a grave so that his invented persona of Arthur will endure throughout the generations of man....is it not likely he put a Gorilla skull in Arthur’s grave not Henry de Sully? The poet’s verse referred to seems poignantly directed as if already understood that there was a ditty composed (no doubt by an ancient Welsh bard) which related to the size of Arthur’s bones.

The above numbered 1 through 16 is the complete coverage of Arthur’s disinterment mentioned by Gerald c.1192-3. We should now see what he says in Speculum Ecclesiae c.1217, when he next broaches the subject, but in the brief section below Gerald is only relating the circumstances of Arthur’s exhumation relative to the corruptible nature of mankind in:

Cap. VIII.
Regarding the monk who, at the discovery of the tomb of Arthur, pulled out a lock of women’s hair with his hand, and quite shamelessly accelerated its ruin.

1) In our own lifetime, while Henry II was ruling England, diligent efforts were made in Glastonbury Abbey to locate what must have once been the
tomb of Arthur. This was done at the instruction of the King and under the supervision of the abbot of that place, Henry, who was later transferred to Worcester Cathedral.

Gerald, 25 years after having written his first account is still insistent that Henry II was connected to the dig. He would hardly mention his name again and mean Richard I. There is simply no solution to the conundrum unless the dig transpired before July 1189 and Henry de Sully had moved to Glastonbury before being formally elected.

2) With much difficulty, the tomb was excavated in the holy burial-ground which had been dedicated by Saint Dunstan. The tomb was found between two tall, emblazoned pyramids, erected long ago in memory of Arthur.

There is clear evidence that Gerald believes that the pyramids were constructed to commemorate Arthur's burial. One assumes logically, that in Gerald's mind, they were constructed at a later date, because the idea of burying Arthur so deep was to avoid being found. I suspect that when Henry Blois made known the information concerning the depth of the tomb to Henry II, he might have invented this explanation as part of the lore which explained why the tomb was at such a depth. The tomb in reality, as we have covered, was in effect a tomb of an earlier body which had been interred before the renovations to the cemetery in Dunstan's era. Henry Blois had used this tomb and its existing slab to secret the artefacts which were later found by Henry de Sully.

3) Though his body and bones had been reduced to dust, they were lifted up from below into the air, and to a more seemly place of burial.

The contradiction here is that if the tibia and skull had survived, where was the rest of the body? Gerald seems to deal with this anomaly by inferring the rest had been reduced to dust. Again, this is not something that Henry de Sully would have been able to pull off without there having been the manufactured grave planted by Henry Blois. It actually points to the fact that modern gorilla bones were mixed with ancient human remains from the previous occupant.

4) In the same grave there was found a tress of woman's hair, blonde and
lovely to look at, plaited and coiled with consummate skill, and belonging, no doubt, to Arthur’s wife, who was buried there with her husband.

Gerald expands upon his original account saying the hair was plaited and coiled. If Gerald was not present at the time he would not be describing something which at the time of the account crumbled with age upon being man handled. He also says, as an eyewitness, the hair was blonde and initially it had been in a beautiful plait before it crumbled. Gerald is recalling the event and mentioning details he had not commented upon before. I am sure scholars will still say Gerald is prattling on. However, for those who have tried to deny that Guinevere was even present, the lock is assumed to be his wife’s. It makes little sense to prattle on about a wife and her hair if the lock was not in evidence at the unearthing.

We might make the observation that there is little to be gained by Henry de Sully introducing the plait of hair; If he had indeed been the instigator of planting the artefacts in the grave. We can deduce it is more to the benefit of Henry Blois as it establishes the historicity of his HRB and this is why we should accept that Guinevere’s name is mentioned on the cross in the original, at least conceding her name upon it without stating categorically that it mentioned a ‘second wife’ (especially since she is mentioned in DA and in Perlesvaus which I maintain were published before the disinterment). I personally believe What Gerald quotes as written on the cross is what was there.

4) Standing among the crowd is a monk who sees the lock of hair. So that he could seize the lock before all others, he hurled himself headlong into the lowest depths of the cavity. Then the aforementioned monk, that insolent spectator, no less impudent than imprudent, descended into the depths.

Gerald, again, does not mention curtains surrounding the excavation, but does say there was a crowd surrounding the hole in the ground which in someway confirms that Adam, writing 60 years after the event, has confused the record of the De inventione dig at Montacute and assimilated details into his account of the Arthur exhumation.

5) — the depths symbolize the infernal realm, which none of us can escape. Thus the monk thought to pull it out with his hand, to take hold of the lock of hair before all others — evidence of his shameless mind, for women’s hair entangles the weak-willed, while strong souls avoid it. Hair, of course, is said
to be incorruptible, for it has no flesh in it, nor any moisture mixed with it. Nevertheless, as he held it in his hand, having raised it up in order to inspect it (many watched intently and in amazement), it crumbled into the thinnest dust; miraculously it disintegrated, as if reduced to granules. [There are a few words in the manuscript missing here.]

For it demonstrated that all things are transitory, and all worldly beauty is for our vain eyes to gaze upon, for performing illicit sensual acts, or for our moments that are susceptible to vanity — indeed, as the philosopher said, "the splendor of beauty is swift, passing, changeable, and more fleeting than the flowers of spring." Gerald might be perceived as blithely prattling as he makes relative his experience at the dig with his theological rationalizations of monkish mores. But there was a crowd, there were others, and many watched intently. This was not some little stage show hatched by Henry de Sully but a grave site manufactured with care many years previously and many were present to test the credibility of the age of the dig. Arthur was famous and his skull and size had to be big to take on giants, Henry had even crushed the gorilla’s skull so that it appeared to have a fatal wound.

Cap.IX.

Regarding the bones lying intact in the tomb of King Arthur, discovered at Glastonbury in our times, and about the many things relating to these remarkable circumstances.

6) Furthermore, tales are regularly reported and fabricated about King Arthur and his uncertain end, with the British peoples even now contending foolishly that he is still alive. True and accurate information has been sought out, so the legends have finally been extinguished; the truth about this matter should be revealed plainly, so here I have endeavored to add something to the indisputable facts that have been disclosed. Gerald’s intention is to put an end to the rumours concerning Arthur. Now Gerald believes what ‘Geoffrey’ wrote!!!!

7) After the Battle of Camlann . . . [A number of words are missing in the
And so, after Arthur had been mortally wounded there, his body was taken to the Isle of Avalon, which is now called Glastonbury, by a noble matron and kinswoman named Morgan; afterwards the remains were buried, according to her direction, in the holy burial-ground. As a result of this, the Britons and their poets have been concocting legends that a certain fantastic goddess, also called Morgan, carried off the body of Arthur to the Isle of Avalon for the healing of his wounds. When his wounds have healed, the strong and powerful King will return to rule the Britons (or so the Britons suppose), as he did before. Thus they still await him, just as the Jews, deceived by even greater stupidity, misfortune, and faithlessness, likewise await their Messiah.

8) It is significant . . . [Two sentences or so are damaged in the manuscript] Truly it is called Avalon, either from the British word aval, which means pomum because apples and apple trees abound in that place; or, from the name Vallo, once the ruler of that territory. Likewise, long ago the place was usually called in British Inis Gutrin, that is, insula vitrea[Latin: "The Island of Glass"], evidently on account of the river, most like glass in color, that flows around the marshes. Because of this, it was later called Glastonia in the language of the Saxons who seized this land, since glas in English or in Saxon means vitrum[Latin:"glass"]. It is clear from this, therefore, why it was called an island, why it was called Avalon, and why it was called Glastonia; it is also clear how the fantastic goddess Morgan was contrived by poets.

Is it not remarkable how clever Henry Blois has been in fabricating his conflationary salad. We know Avallon is his invention, named from a town in Burgundy. This was equated quite surreptitiously by him to be equal with Insula Pomorum in VM simply by implying Arthur was taken there. Whether or not Aval is the Briton/Saxon word for apple is debatable, but it would be a coincidence if it was. The man Avalloc is already posited in DA by Henry Blois which Gerald has read. But Gerald calls him Vallo. The Inis Gutrin is first heard of in Henry’s rendition of the Life of Gildas when he impersonates Caradoc. It was in the etymological addition that the ‘G’ was added, because if the reader remembers Henry’s agenda at that time was to make Ineswitrin appear as synonymous with Glastonbury, (the ‘G’ gutrin (made of glass) was supposed to help that transitional shift). Now, we are led to believe Ines ‘witrin’ is derived from Ines ‘vitrea’; and therefore the Glass in Glastonbury is supposed to be derived from Latin vitrea (equaling
glass). The whole thing is senseless but clever, because now the Briton ‘glass’ of Glastonbury is based on Latin vitrea. Who would now advocate that the French Grail stories which mention Isle de Voirre pre-existed Henry’s marvellous conflationary soup emanating from Glastonbury and not vice versa.

9) It is also notable that . . . [Several words are missing, obscuring the meaning of the first part of the sentence.] from the letters inscribed on it, yet nearly all, however, was destroyed by antiquity. If the text were not missing we might have had a clearer idea of whether Gerald is advocating that Arthur’s name had been recently scratched on the piramid since William had last been able to read the names.

10) The abbot had the best evidence from the aforementioned King Henry, for the King had said many times, as he had heard from the historical tales of the Britons and from their poets, that Arthur was buried between two pyramids that were erected in the holy burial-ground.

As before, in Liber de Principis Instructione, King Henry is posited as the fount for the rumour and we can only assume, by which ever method of transmission Henry Blois used to make sure the king unveiled Arthur; King Henry understood that Arthur was buried between the two pyramids. Because the bard/poet is referred to again and it was implied in Liber de Principis Instructione that a poet had commented on the size of the bones, it is likely this was another device Henry used, as only he would have known he had put gorilla bones in the grave.

11) These were very deep, on account of the Saxons (whom he had subdued often and expelled from the Island of Britain, and whom his evil nephew Mordred had later called back against him), who endeavoured to occupy the whole island again after his death; so their fear was that Saxons might despoil him in death through the wickedness of their vengeful spirit.

This is probably Gerald’s own rationalization of why the grave was so deep mixed with the true history as accounted in Gildas and Bede that there was resurgence after Aurelius Ambrosius had requited a forty year reprieve from oppression. But Gerald is in fact going on ‘Geoffrey’s’ testimony.

12) A broad stone was unearthed during the excavating at the tomb, about
seven feet . . . [A couple of words are missing.] a lead cross was fastened — not to the outer part of the stone, but rather to the underside (no doubt as a result of their fears about the Saxons). It had these words inscribed on it: "Here lies entombed King Arthur, on the Isle of Avalon, with Guenevere his second wife."

The broad stone, as discussed previously, is the lid of the grave of a previous occupant, (re-employed) to which the cross had been affixed with the inscription turned inward toward the slab. If scholars are right, we should ignore the most important part of Gerald’s testimony. Gerald for the second time refers to Guinevere as Arthur’s second wife, and the assertion (we must remember) is from one who saw how the cross was affixed to the slab before its removal....evidenced by Gerald’s comments to which direction the inscription was facing. Gerald was obviously there, even though he does not expressly say so for Barber.

What we can conclude from this is that straight after the dig in an attempt to make Arthur’s presence more believable, Glastonbury distanced themselves from fables and the unfaithful Guinevere by excluding her from any testimony.

As I have covered before, it is a pretty daft notion.... that should the grave have been real that anyone burying a body would state the location on the cross. Obviously, if someone in the future were to see the cross again, those that buried Arthur could never have envisaged a change in the Island name to warrant the name of Avalon’s inclusion spelled out on the leaden cross. We all know who wrote Avalon on the cross and for what reason. What other grave states its location in part of the epitaph??????

It is Henry Blois who has done all the previous work to translocate Avallon to Glastonbury and he knew that this cross would cement his translocation permanently. It is not at all by accident that the object chosen to make this link is a cross as Henry had learnt this ‘gambit’ from Canterbury in contention over Dunstan’s remains and the idea of certain proof in the future was based on the lead tablet mentioned by Eadmer. Henry’s work was done, his alter ego was the most famous king in history and the illusion which had evolved since the advent of the Primary Historia was complete.

13) Now when they had extracted this cross from the stone, the aforementioned Abbot Henry showed it to me; I examined it, and read the words. The cross was fastened to the underside the stone, and, moreover, the
engraved part of the cross was turned toward the stone, so that it would be better concealed.

To dispel the rumours of fraud (especially if another cross had been produced) and counter the equivocation in what the epitaph actually had inscribed on it, Gerald affirms that (at the event) after the extraction of the cross from the stone slab Gerald held it in his hand and examined it. He can hardly get the short inscription muddled as some scholars suggest.

14) Remarkable indeed was the industry and exquisite prudence of the men of that era, who, by all their exertions, wished to hide forever the body of so great a man, their lord, and the patron of that region, from the danger of sudden disturbance. Moreover, they took care that — at some time in the future when their tribulations had ceased — the evidence of the letters inscribed on the cross could be made public. Remarkable indeed that one would go to such great effort to affix across 16ft below ground 700 years previously.

Cap. X. The renowned King Arthur was a patron of Glastonbury Abbey.[Enough words are missing that the rest of this chapter heading is indecipherable.]

15) [The beginning of the sentence is lost.] . . . had proposed, thus Arthur's body was discovered not in a marble tomb, not cut from rock or Parian stone, as was fitting for so distinguished a King, but rather in wood, in oak that was hollowed out for this purpose, and 16 feet or more deep in the earth; this was certainly on account of haste rather than proper ceremony for the burial of so great a prince, driven as they were by a time of urgent distress.

Here again, Gerald is making his own rationalizations and by doing so, confirms to us that the tomb itself was in fact a hollowed out oak, just as Henry Blois had already told King Henry. This is of course explained away by pressures brought to bare by the Saxons.

16) When the body was discovered according to the directions indicated by King Henry the aforementioned abbot had an extraordinary marble tomb
made for the remains, as was fitting for an excellent patron of that place, for indeed, he had prized that church more than all the rest in his Kingdom, and had enriched it with large and numerous lands. And for that reason it was not undeserved, but just and by the judgment of God, who rewards all good deeds not only in heaven, but also on earth and in this life. [The end of the manuscript is very defective.] . . and the authentic body of Arthur . . . to be buried properly . . .

If this exhumation had transpired in Richard’s era as King, there is no mention of him. This might indeed indicate that it was Eleanor who was the driving force having been released from prison and no doubt whiled away her hours reading Arthuriana. I still would advocate this transpired in Henry II reign in 1189 as Gerald is adamant this is the case and Henry de Sully organised it. However, we will never know any more than we do and what is most important is that we now know who buried the bits and manufactured the grave in the first place.
Chapter 28

Abbadare in the Prophecy of Melkin

The ‘Grail’ is in fact the body of Abbadare and the body of Abbadare formed the image on the Turin shroud. I will be called ‘Mad’ for holding this view. However, unless we accept Abbadare as the disguised name of Jesus, we will never arrive at the solution to the Grail legend. Henry Blois did not understand the full purport of Melkin’s prophecy. Henry Blois understood that the prophecy of Melkin was genuine as he went in search of Joseph at Montacute and used his own motive for the search as the metaphor for the ‘quest’ of the elusive Grail.

Abbadare is the word used by Melkin himself to describe Jesus. It is more mad than my previous statement above to suggest he is to be identified with Baybars (in Arabic al-Malik al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars al-Bunduqdari), Sultan of Egypt and Syria, as our ‘experts’ inform us. It is fair to say that if Melkin had laid out a puzzle whereby the body of Jesus were the object of a search, the prophecy would never have survived (especially in the monastic system). Modern scholars remain bemused by the meaning of Abbadare, but most can deduce the unambiguous meaning that Joseph of Arimathea is buried on an island along with ‘something else’. From what we are led to believe, Joseph has two vessels full of the blood and sweat of Jesus. This is
simply a clever obfuscation. *Abbadare* is Melkin’s way of referring to Jesus without stating what is blasphemous.

In the Gospel resurrection there is no body. This is the foundation of the Roman religion and Pauline eschatology. If Melkin had stated otherwise, it would have ensured the prophecy’s destruction in a monastic system which is based upon belief in the bodily resurrection of Jesus. However, it was never part of the foundation of the church in ancient Briton. How could it be, if, as Augustine found on his arrival, that the Britons had a different belief and preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world. Now, this enlightened sentiment did not occur on its own, but is a reflection of the complaint of the Briton’s to Rome’s self professed monopoly. Of course the Briton’s had the same book put out by Rome because Rome invaded Britain.

As we have covered, Kim Yale’s deduction of the ‘Father’s pearl’ or the ‘Pearl of the Father’ is what Melkin is conveying. I am not starting on a theological debate, but there is much understanding in this one word *Abbadare* which is based in the understanding of the prophets of Israel. There is certainly no resurrection spoken of in the prophets as the Roman church would have us believe. There is only a miscomprehension of a few pertinent sentences. The metaphor of the ‘pearl of the Father’ or *Abbadare* is derived from the understanding of a concept....that an oyster while in the flesh makes a beautiful object that survives the oyster’s death and is valued greatly. In other words, its beauty remains long after the body of the oyster has disintegrated, yet it was fashioned while in the flesh. Melkin has understood the prophets and has used this metaphor in conjunction with Jesus’s allusion to the ‘pearl of great price’ and has presented us with the name of *Abbadare*. It is not as if it is completely obtuse and open to any interpretation.... as Melkin mentions the prophet Jesus in the prophecy itself.

So, we can conclude Jesus is associated in some way to *Abbadare* and we know Joseph was the man who claimed his body. If one was to take a cross section of two thirds of the population of the globe i.e. leaving out the Christians and asked them a simple question, I am sure upward of 90% would answer the question with the same response. The question is: ‘if Joseph of Arimathea took down Jesus’ body from the cross and Joseph and the body of Jesus are never heard about or seen again until there was a rumour that Joseph is buried in Britain with something mysterious...... what do you think the mysterious object is?
However, the point of this chapter is to clarify why it is that Joseph has brought the body of Jesus to Burgh Island. Obviously the accuracy of the data in the prophecy leads to the island. The fact that Joseph was a tin merchant and we have identified the island as Ictis where tin was stored and from which Astragali were ‘provended’ should be enough to convince the most sceptical reader. If we can accept the place where the ingots were stored has been converted to a tomb and the knowledge of this pre-made ‘crater’ (cratibus praeparatis) was from Joseph’s association with trading tin with the Dumnonian’s; it is not too silly to assert that Joseph brought his relation (read son) to be buried far from the unjust events which had transpired in Jerusalem.

However, many have debated where Jesus spent his time in the so called ‘lost years’ and it is, I believe, important to establish that Jesus spent most of his time elsewhere before returning to Jerusalem to meet his fate. The Roman church has eradicated any trace of the sanctity of British heritage by usurping a position of power and pre-eminence which does not rightfully belong to it…. but rather to the Island of Britain. As Yale and Goldsworthy proclaim, it was the Templars who had solved Melkin’s prophecy and had found the tomb of Joseph and Jesus and removed the ‘doubled fasciola’ that is currently called the shroud of Turin. This is, in effect, why the church destroyed the entire Knights Templar in a single day. After all, some organisation has built the alignment of St Michael churches (since Henry Blois era) which mark out the line from which we bifurcate at 13 degrees.

Joseph of Arimathea brought Jesus to an island which Joseph had known previously and had dealings with as a tin trader. Maybe as others have pointed in the past, Jesus had spent time in a Jewish community in Britain for a period in his youth while accompanying his father/uncle. That Jesus spent time away from his family and then returned is understood by the famous passage in Luke chapter 4:18

He went to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and on the Sabbath day he went into the synagogue, as was his custom. He stood up to read, and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. Unrolling it, he found the place where it is written: “The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim

752 We know by Diodorus’ description that large quantities of Ingots were transferred to the Island and therefore must have been stored until such time as a Phoenician ship arrived.
freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the oppressed free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour.” Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down. The eyes of everyone in the synagogue were fastened on him. He began by saying to them, “Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.” All spoke well of him and were amazed at the gracious words that came from his lips. “Isn’t this Joseph’s son?” they asked.

It is plain that Jesus is conscious of the fact that he was the Messiah and substantiates his mission and message by quoting Isaiah. The point is that the locals are trying to verify that it is Joseph’s son. I am not going to get into a theological debate over the differentiation of Joseph of Arimathea and Joseph the carpenter. There are already enough contradictions in the Gospels which clearly indicate that the writers were trying to square a virgin birth spoken of by the prophets with a husband called Joseph who disappears for most of the Gospels and reappears (in name at least) as the man who takes Jesus’ body from the cross. Suffice it to say that the two Joseph’s are one and the same and Joseph of Arimathea is Jesus’s earthly father. Mathew even traces the genealogy from Abraham ending with: Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, and Mary was the mother of Jesus who is called the Messiah.

This aside… again in Mathew, it seems evident that Jesus has been to a foreign land and learnt things that the locals are trying to square with what is known of his mundane provenance: When Jesus had finished these parables, he moved on from there. Coming to his hometown, he began teaching the people in their synagogue, and they were amazed. “Where did this man get this wisdom and these miraculous powers?” they asked. “Isn’t this the carpenter’s son? Isn’t his mother’s name Mary, and aren’t his brothers James, Joseph, Simon and Judas? Aren’t all his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all these things?” And they took offense at him. But Jesus said to them, “A prophet is not without honour except in his own town and in his own home.”

One should inquire how it is that his own Cousin John the Baptist is at odds with recognising him: The next day John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, “Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! This is the one I meant when I said, ‘A man who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me. ’I myself did not know him, but the reason I came baptizing with water was that he might be revealed to Israel.” Then John gave
this testimony: “I saw the Spirit come down from heaven as a dove and remain on him. And I myself did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize with water told me, ‘The man on whom you see the Spirit come down and remain is the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit.’ I have seen and I testify that this is God’s Chosen One.”

It is pure speculation, but I believe the marriage at Cana was Jesus’ own wedding and Mary Magdalene was his bride. In the Apocrypha a case could be made by certain evidences that Mary turned up while Jesus’ mission was already underway and there was jealousy of her proximity to Jesus by the disciples.\footnote{In the Gospel of Philip there are holes which have obliterated the text but enough remains to fill the gaps: ‘And the companion of the (lord was) Mary Magdalene. (And he loved) her more than all the disciples, and used to kiss her often on her (lips). The rest of the disciples (were jealous) They said to him “Why do you love her more than all of us?” The Savior answered and said to them, “Why do I not love you like her? When a blind man and one who sees are both together in darkness, they are no different from one another. When the light comes, then he who sees will see the light, and he who is blind will remain in darkness.’

753} I would speculate (given that Magdala was never a location) that the eponym is connected to Magi or King and that Mary could have been a King’s daughter brought to Jerusalem by Joseph for a marriage after both Jesus and Mary had grown fond of each other while Jesus was studying in southern Britain. Again this is sheer speculation and until the tomb on Burgh Island is opened up and genetic forensic tests are carried out on the three occupants it is impossible to go any further. However, since we know from Rabanus Maurus 776 – 856AD the archbishop of Mainz and the French tradition that Mary Magdalene accompanied Joseph of Arimathea, we might conclude that Burgh Island would probably be the destination.

The Devon Archeological Society has dismissed any relevance to what Goldsworthy posited regarding Arthur as they had already carried out a survey and found no evidence of his grave there or of Iron Age habitation on Burgh Island. In fact the owner of Burgh Island had related that someone had already searched for Arthur’s tomb on the Island. I am not advocating that Arthur is on Burgh Island (how could he be), but Joseph’s remains are 50ft below the surface on Burgh Island. I have no interest in Iron Age remains or Arthur’s supposed grave on Burgh Island;\footnote{Goldsworthy’s assertion that Arthur is buried on Burgh Island is unfounded. The connection of a fictitious Arthur and Burgh Island is strictly through Joseph’s remains being buried there and Henry Blois’ involvement in} just the fact that the tomb of Joseph is buried deep in the island.
If the iron age community on Folly Hill just above Burgh Island purposefully did not inhabit the island so as not to draw attention to the tin repository in both Pytheas’ era and the Roman era, it might explain the lack of previous habitation. But it is doubtful if the hobbyists that constitute the Devon Archaeological Society would even recognise Ictis as Burgh Island since the foremost expert on the subject does not even mention Burgh Island.

The fact that the Devon Archaeological society would not find the tomb first time round is simply because it is under 50ft of upended slate with a tunnel leading to it. The amateur archaeologist who once made a futile search for Arthur’s grave on Burgh Island some years ago had no chance of finding an entirely fictional character and would be looking for a tomb at the normal depth.

The hillside above the island and above Bigbury-on-sea is currently being excavated archaeologically and there is evidence of a large community stretching back at least to the time of Pytheas c.350-20 BC. This was the community which operated Ictis which was spoken of by Pytheas. The Island, which Strabo relates that a Phonecian captain ran his ship on the rocks to protect the island’s secrecy i.e. Ictis, is a couple of miles from the mouth of the river Erm. Here, the very rock described in Strabo’s account exists and the cache of ingots lie in shore of the rock on which the Phoenician scuttled his vessel. The remaining evidence concurs with Strabo’s account.

Prof. Barry Cunliffe has a pet theory and because certain artefacts have been found on Mount Batten in Plymouth sound he has concluded that this is ‘his’ Ictis. Firstly, it is not an Island and does not have a tidal causeway which Diodorus recycles from Pytheas’ account. The Rock is treacherous to land on the shoreline being inhospitable and open to seaward. No foreign vessel is able to land at all states of the tide and in nearly all conditions as is the case with Burgh Island; the spit being protected for the most part by the Island position to seaward.

changing the name of Ineswitrin for Avalon in the prophecy of Melkin and leaving this altered edition of the prophecy of Melkin to posterity. It is therefore Goldsworthy’s specious position that Arthur is reckoned to be on Avalon; not understanding that Avalon was the fictitious name for Ineswitrin…. the island which is the basis of the Melkin prophecy originally.

The ignorance of Barry Cunliffe is breath-taking. After discussing the Erm ingots he does not mention an island a few miles from where the cache of ingots was found and which fits Diodorus Siculo’s description (allowing for some distortion to Pytheas’ original account). He like many before him cannot see how the trading island of Ictis was well placed centrally to all the tin producing rivers of Dartmoor to become the tin mart of the ancient world.
It is excruciating that in an entire book on Pytheas and Ictis he does not mention Burgh Island. Cunliffe ignores Burgh Island when the recent find of tin ingots at the mouth of the River Erm is 2.5 miles distant. Instead Cunliffe states: *The river Erm is one of the five main rivers that flow south from the granite massif of Dartmoor to the channel, and Bigbury Bay is barely 25 km (c.16 nautical miles) from the Iron age port of Mount Batten in Plymouth. It is quite possible that the Erm wreck was a vessel that was about to transport tin, from the Dartmoor fringe, on the short haul to Mount Batten where traders from Armorica might be expected to barter for it.*

Cunliffe, writing a book about Pytheas and Ictis does not comment on the coincidence of Diodorus’ extract and how it fits Burgh Island: *and convey it to an Island which lies off Britain called Ictis; for at the ebb tide the space between this island and the mainland becomes dry and they take the tin in large quantities over to the island on their wagons.*

This description does not fit Mount Batten. Especially with the topography of Burgh Island close to where the ingots were discovered and with an account in history by Strabo which explains how the tin Ingots were found inshore of the rock on which the Phoenician scuttled his vessel. Such is the state of modern scholars. The reason large quantities of tin were taken to the island is because the Island of Ictis stored all the tin brought to it by tin streamers working on the rivers behind the island so that visiting trading vessels could take on cargo while beached below. Cunliffe does not even know why Burgh Island was called Ictis. Pytheas referred to the Island as *ikhthys* island or ‘fish island’ as the whole of Bigbury bay used to go dark with Fish as I explained in the chapter on Pytheas.

If the reader really wants to understand the stupidity of some commentators we should recall Ashdown’s drivel and see clearly why Avalon has remained an enigma: *I have argued elsewhere that Melkin’s reference originated in some satirical lay which had consigned the deceased Baybars and his paladins to one of the alternative Mediterranean, Oriental or Antipodean locations of an Avalon.... The amazing display of Melkin’s geometry locating Ineswitrin is now derived from a satirical lay referring to deceased Baybars apparently refers to a location anywhere else but Britain. This really should take the prize and it is evident who supplied the source material!!!!*
Chapter 29

Henry Blois and Magister Gregorius, *De mirabilibus urbis Romae*

The *Narracio de mirabilibus urbis Romae* is a strange little book by an unknown author who was from England. He describes a visitor’s account of the marvels he witnessed while visiting Rome. The author is highly educated and has a taste for statues and the architecture of buildings interest him. He is also interested in monuments such as triumphal arches. The mysterious author has taken upon himself to write a short piece in Latin of about 4,500 words of what he witnessed while visiting. Many of the descriptions though, are of pieces not traceable and may never have existed there; and appear to be derived from a pseudo-historical book supposedly written by Bede on the seven wonders of the world, the anonymous *De septem miraculis mundi*. Some of the accounts describing the Art pieces or buildings have highly original material attributed to them not corroborated elsewhere.

It would seem as if some accounts had been invented by the author Gregorius himself. He is a man not unfamiliar in forthrightly adducing a sometimes bogus historical anecdote to interest his reader. So, the question is whether this *Narracio* is written by Henry Blois on one of his many trips to Rome. It has startling similarities not only regarding the interests of Henry Blois, but also Gregorius has a fascination with a statue of Marcus
Aurelius which he dwells upon more than any other object in his short exposé.

The Narracio was first known through an extract found in Ranulph Higden’s Polychronicon a monk at Chester. A later and more complete copy was then found at Cambridge. Having now seen that Henry Blois is reluctant to put any manuscript to his name it would seem that this Gregorius calls himself Magister also, not unlike Galfredo Arthur had done when he signed his supposed charters at Oxford.

Gregorius never alludes to where he is from, but he is staying at an inn in Rome as a visitor. A few of the historical accounts relating to the objects he describes in Rome, he attributes to information supplied to him by Cardinals. This is certainly no uneducated or unconnected visitor with an interest in casual art, but a man so interested in antiquity, statuary and architecture, who, without ostentation subconsciously portrays his extensive reading by giving quotes or anecdotes arrived from Livy, Lucan, Virgil and Ovid; and these are some of the authors which ‘Geoffrey’ has used as source material for his HRB. From Dark Age sources, he refers to Isidore of Seville’s Etymologiae which constitutes a large part of the naturist source material for the VM as we have covered. Gregorius also quotes from memory a recent Hildebert of Lavardin, who as bishop of Tours he might have met. In 1125 Hildebert was translated unwillingly to the archbishopric of Tours from Le Mans, where he came into conflict with the French King Louis VI about the rights of ecclesiastical patronage, and with the bishop of Dol about the authority of his see in Brittany. Certainly Hildebert sent letters and poetry to Adela of Normandy, Henry Blois’ mother advising her on clemency, and praised her regency of Blois. Hilderert of Lavardin’s poem ‘par tibi Roma’ from which Gregorius quotes from memory the first two lines (as the sense but not the same words are used), shows that the era was awakening with a new regard for antiquity and the glories of a bygone age, much as ‘Geoffrey’ searched back to the roots of the Britons.

It is not improbable to suggest that Henry is posing as Gregorius. As usual the one place to which Gregorius is said to be returning (presumably in England), is omitted from the Cambridge text and is not mentioned by

756 Adam of Damerham witnesses that Isidore of Seville’s Etymologiae sive Origines was donated to Glastonbury abbey by Henry Blois.
Higden. In his prologue to the Narracio, similarities are found much like the dedications found in the HRB and Vita Merlini where Henry establishes that he is someone other than Henry Blois, demeaning his composition with self-deprecating humility calling it a ‘poorly composed report’ but ‘overcomes his bashfulness’ in setting down his ‘unpolished prose’ by the insistence of a Master Martin and a Lord Thomas.

It is a device so similar to that used in the dedication to Alexander in the Prophecies of Merlin and that to Robert de Chesney in the Vita Merlini. Henry Blois certainly knew Thomas a Becket archbishop of Canterbury, but by picking this name, it may indicate the date of publication to 1162-1170 when Thomas was Archbishop.

Gregory begins his exposé seeing the city spread out before him as he descended the slope of Monte Mario. He then includes a list of the city gates before telling us of the marvels found inside the walls. His first subject is that which impressed him most i.e. the Bronze statues. It is interesting that on his epitaph on the Meusan plates, Henry seems to think at the time he had them fabricated he would also have a bronze effigy of himself on display in Winchester.... otherwise I can see no other sense in the meaning of ‘Henry, alive in bronze, gives gifts to God’.

After a brief account of a bronze bull he gets into the lengthiest account, by comparison with any other piece, when he describes the equestrian monument of Marcus Aurelius in two chapters with dubious commentaries seemingly designed to explain the background story behind the bronze.... explaining the dwarf beneath the horses feet and the tale in explanation of a cuckoo on the horses head. Gregorius then attempts various fabrications which are derived from the anonymous ‘seven wonders of the world’ ascribed to Bede whose work is referred to (‘luminous tractae’) by Geoffrey of Monmouth and obviously used as a source for the HRB.

Henry Blois, (our author Gregorius) goes on to identify a head and hand having come from Nero’s Colossus, said in the Seven wonders work ascribed to Bede, to have straddled the harbour of Rhodes and also picks other items from the work while discussing statuary and other architectural marvels.

The point of all this, much like the HRB, can only be accounted by Henry’s fascination with antiquity. With his vast reading he is interconnecting history just as he had done in the HRB basing his accounts from the ancients and bringing them to life.... always with just enough
substance to seem credible, but drawing in the interest of his reader; relating accounts about certain objects that formerly were said by him to have been in Rome.

Henry is always conscious of history and is in a way re-writing it for posterity so that they may formulate an impression from his anecdotes. Henry Blois’ accounts act as a shadow of history rather than a mirror i.e. history distorted, not always accurate, but the historical eras are connected for the medieval mind and made more interesting and alive by Henry’s anecdotes. Gregorius much like ‘Geoffrey’ is bold in his assertions; the Spinario or Thorn-Plucker is confidently attributed to be Priapus a fertility god because of the size of its genitals. Our author covers marble statues and palaces and the Egyptian obelisk said to contain the ashes of Julius Caesar. This reminds him of the Pharos of Alexandria, again from Bede’s seven wonders and the ramble seems cut short and ends suddenly without conclusion.

Not surprisingly, the characters in the Narracio are Pompey, Brutus, Cassius, Tiberius, Augustus Marcus Aurelius, Scipio, Nero etc. not a thing about St Peter or Constantine as one would expect a man who mixed with the curia in Rome to be more interested in. Henry Blois has little respect for the papacy (Roman church) although he was legate and used its power to establish his own power in Britain. Cluniacs in general had a deference to the pope but Henry especially because he was cognisant of a British church which stood on a merit equal to Rome.

Henry was more remiss than most in his respect for the institution to which he often needed to appeal to and yet often had had cause to answer to. Because of his nobility he was bestowed with the legation in a power play when Stephen spurned him as Archbishop. On several occasions, Henry had been denied his wishes as a supplicant to regain autonomy from Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury once the legation had expired.

John of Salisbury relates an account where Henry Blois was before the pope when news of the persecutions of the church in England was mentioned and Henry says: ‘how glad I am that I am not there now or this persecution would be laid at my door’. Smiling the pope retorts with a fable about the devil and a storm arising causing ships to sink, where the Devil claims the same innocence for not being in a place at a certain time. The pope says to Henry Blois ‘even if you were not actually on the spot, you have certainly trailed your tail there beforehand’ ....all aimed against Henry.
Henry Blois must have reviled the pope as the pope continued 'ask yourself my brother, if you have not been trailing your tail in the English sea'. John of Salisbury relates that Bishop Henry ‘could hope for nothing more than absolution’. However, Henry ‘obtained permission from the pope before leaving Rome to buy old statues, and had them taken back to Winchester. So when a certain grammarian saw him, conspicuous in the papal court for his long beard and philosophical solemnity, engaged in buying up idols, carefully made by the heathen in the error of their hands rather than their minds he mocked him thus: “buying old busts is Damasippus’ craze”. The same man aimed another jest at the bishop when he had heard his reply to a request for advice during a discussion. He said: ‘for this good counsel Damasippus, may gods and goddesses grant you a barber’.

An insult against Henry’s beard could be connected to the weirdest tale in the HRB where the giant who fights Arthur collects beards for his coat. Not by coincidence, the sculptor at Modena must know of ‘Geoffrey’s’ invented giant episode c.1140 because in the Modena sculpture Arthur has a beard. This is not a random personal detail which a sculptor inserted by his own free will, but one assumes was relayed by the person who commissioned the work, who also would have dictated through description Arthur’s non-Norman garb as seen by comparison with his compatriots or fellow attackers.

John of Salisbury relates also concerning the statues that ‘it was this same man who was to reply for the bishop, unprompted but perhaps expressing his point of view: that he had been doing his best to deprive the romans of their gods to prevent them restoring the ancient rites of worship’. The reference “buying old busts is Damasippus’s craze.” is to Junius Brutus X, who, ‘put to death at Rome several of the most eminent senators of the opposite party.’

Henry Blois is at Rome buying old Roman statues and we know from his building projects at Glastonbury and at Winchester that he was interested in architectural aesthetics to which our English Master Gregorius has similar tastes. Is it a coincidence that our Gregorius has a fascination for antiquity and also has the same unfortunate attribute of little regard for the

---

Footnote: Tatlock p351 says Why this anecdote? Yet innocently states in consequence of comments about Henry Blois own unruly beard: Barbering of both beards and hair was a burning social matter in Geoffrey’s time...
truth and the love of inventing fictitious accounts much like Geoffrey of
Monmouth’s episodes in the HRB?

There had always been interest in putting classical objects into buildings
and the re-use of Roman materials; but Gregorius’ interest, not only of
architecture, but also statuary marbles and their composition, reminds us
of Henry’s foray into the commissioning of several pieces of sculptured
Purbeck marble stonework in Winchester cathedral. There are works
commissioned for various churches in Purbeck marble by Henry and we
know he is responsible for the importation of Tournai marble which is
evident in several fonts. It can be said that Henry was the initial patron of
the infant Purbeck marble industry and Henry is buried in a coffin-shaped
tomb in Winchester Cathedral constructed from Purbeck.

Another coincidence showing Henry’s interest in marble is to do with the
statue of Venus, because Gregorius was the first to mention this statue in
medieval literature as it entranced him so much. He relates that he went
‘back three times to look at it despite the fact that it was two stades distant
from my inn’. Gregorius states that the statue is ‘made of Parian marble with
such wonderful and intricate skill’ and the ‘Capitoline Venus’ which is the
same as Gregorius describes (as its history can be traced back to the
Quirinal hill) is made from Parian marble. An observation by someone who
has knowledge of the provenance and texture of marble! Is Henry Blois
writing this book not Gregorius?

As I have touched on briefly already, Gregorius covers the statue of a
horse man with more interest than any other object. Herein lies one of the
fundamentals in establishing Gregorius as Henry Blois, but furthermore....
the author of vulgate HRB and Wace’s Brut are at variance with the First
Variant version where certain contradictions concerning the death of
Maximianus occur. This, as I have maintained before, is due to Henry
having to follow more closely the chronology of the Roman annals because
of scrutiny. However, in Vulgate HRB: ‘What cause hast thou, Maximian, to
be fearful of Gratian, when the way lieth open unto thee to snatch the empire
from him? Come with me into the island of Britain and thou shalt wear the
crown of the kingdom.’

Before Henry Blois arrived in Rome the most likely candidate who was
thought to be represented by the horse man was Constantine; yet

758 HRB V, ix
'Gregorius' is bent on persuading us that this horseman is the image of *Marcus Aurelius Mausaeus Valerius Carausius*. If no-one knew who the statue represented.... can we see Henry Blois constructing evidence that it was a British commander so that we see a parallel with First Variant.

*Marcus Aurelius* died 293 and was a military commander of the Roman Empire in the 3rd century. He was a *Menapian* from Belgic Gaul, who usurped power in 286, declaring himself emperor in Britain and northern Gaul. He distinguished himself during Maximian's campaign against the *Bagaudae* rebels in northern Gaul in 286. This success, and his former occupation as a sea pilot, led to his appointment to command the *Classis Britannica*, a fleet based in the English Channel, with the responsibility of eliminating Frankish and Saxon pirates who had been raiding the coasts of Armorica and Belgica.

Henry Blois surely knew of him as he ran his fleet from a base near Porchester Castle which Henry Blois went on to rebuild (which we see mentioned in VM) and it is no doubt what inspired his purposeful conflation with Arthur. He was suspected of keeping captured treasure for himself, and of allowing pirates to carry out raids and enrich themselves before taking action against them.... and Maximian ordered his execution.

In late 286 or early 287 Marcus learned of this sentence and responded by declaring himself Emperor in Britain and northern Gaul. In HRB we even hear of Maximian: *Whilst that they were debating these matters amongst themselves, in came Caradoc, Duke of Cornwall, and gave it as his counsel that they should invite Maximian the Senator and give him the King's daughter and the kingdom, that so they might enjoy perpetual peace.*

As Geoffrey of Monmouth does throughout the HRB he changes a historical persona to suit his purpose, the hapless reader conflates to make the connection himself. Thus, Master Gregorius pits Marcus Aurelius against a king of the *Miseni* in his account of the story behind the statue. Anachronisms are one of Henry Blois’ ploys that he uses in both the HRB and the Vita while feigning ignorance of the connection himself. Henry Blois, the master of conflation, knows his audience will make the connection as he refers to the statue of the rider as being that of Marcus knowing that his Roman audience might think it Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus, but a British readership would immediately think it

---

759 HRB V, ix
was the British warlord sometimes confused with Arthur conflated through Gildas’s Aurelius Ambrosius at Badon and possibly through a lovely twist of Geoffrey’s into Merlin Ambrosius from Nennius’ boy.

Not to be too blatant in naming the bronze horseman as Marcus Aurelius which might expose him; instead, Henry Blois as Gregorius just refers to a Marcus. He may even wish us to associate the statue with Cadwallow from the HRB as a captured trophy. I would suggest it is from this statue seen at Rome on his first visit that gave him his inspiration for this passage in HRB: *within a brazen image cast to the measure of his stature. This image, moreover, in armour of wondrous beauty and craftsmanship, they set upon a brazen horse above the West Gate of London.*

Henry Blois’ has a known penchant for statuary and this may have led to his exposure as the author ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ if links were made between HRB and Marcus Aurelius. The intended subliminal link is obviously made to Aurelius and then to Arthur in the HRB. Henry Blois’ point is that there is a statue of an Aurelius in Rome. In this instance is Gregorius seen to be constructing a tentative link between two works (both composed by him) by inserting this proposition (given on good authority by Cardinals) of the statue being an image of Marcus Aurelius the British emperor. If he came out and said unequivocally there was a connection then suspicion would follow that ‘Gregorius’ was Henry, since prior to writing this book the statue was attributed to Constantine. The only reason for labouring this connection is that HRB indicates that (at some stage) Rome was defeated by Britons.

We should not forget Henry was in the business of re-writing History. He always tries to substantiate his authority as he does using Archdeacon Walter, hence the reference to the good authority of the account derived from the Cardinals. It is relevant to my purpose to show how ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ mind works because if we can establish that this mind is the mind of Henry Blois and Master Gregorius and the mind which authored the GS; then the reader will understand the links discussed previously which show that much Glastonbury material has also been disseminated to correlate and form a cohesive body of historicity which interrelates with other parts of Henry’s specific design.

However, we are concerned at the moment with why Gregorius found it necessary to find a representative of a mounted horseman at Rome, if this same Gregorius is the Henry Blois who wrote the HRB *Ambrosius*
Aurelianus, Aurelius Ambrosius seems to be a combination of both Arthur and Merlin and ‘Geoffrey’ does not have any particular anchor between the Ambrosius and Aurelius appellation. Ambrosius Aurelianus is one of the few people that Gildas identifies by name in his De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae, concerning a war with the Saxons, the survivors gather together under the leadership of Ambrosius, who is described as: "... a gentleman who, perhaps alone of the Romans, had survived the shock of this notable storm. Certainly his parents, who had worn the purple, were slain by it. His descendants in our day have become greatly inferior to their ancestors excellence." Again this is Geoffrey’s derogatory mention of the Welsh. How could Geoffrey be a Welshman.

From Gildas we can conclude that Ambrosius Aurelianus was of high birth, and had Roman ancestry.... a point relevant to Marcus Aurelius referred to by Gregorius especially if what Gildas meant by saying Ambrosius' family "had worn the purple". Roman Emperors and Roman males of the senatorial class wore clothes with a purple band. Given that ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ relates that Aurelius is born of Roman mother from Constantine it is not hard to see how ‘Gregorius’ would love to have a statue attributed to him in Rome: Thereupon the Britons that afore were scattered flocked unto them from every quarter, and a great council was held at Silchester, where they raised Constantine to be King and set the crown of the realm upon his head. They gave him also unto wife a damsels born of a noble Roman family whom Archbishop Guethelin had brought up, who in due course did bear unto him three sons, whose names were Constans, Aurelius Ambrosius and Uther Pendragon. Constans, the eldest born, he made over to the church of Amphibalus in Winchester, that he might there be admitted into the order of monks.760

Gildas says that Ambrosius, alone, is worthy of praise among his countrymen for his leadership of the British attack against the invading Anglo-Saxons. Gildas refers to him as a "Roman"and goes on to say that the Saxon advance was halted, altogether, by a British victory at Mt. Badon. Gildas does not name Aurelius Ambrosius as the commander, but the implication of association is there from Geoffrey trying to link his hero to a British annal when Gildas never mentions Arthur. Geoffrey of Monmouth also makes this link through Nennius the book which Geoffrey (and
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laughably Orderic) suspiciously ascribes to Gildas.... and the reader should not forget Henry Blois is the author of *Life of Gildas*.

The Venerable Bede, an eighth century monk of the monastery of Jarrow, in his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (*The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*), refers to an: "Ambrosius Aurelius, a modest man of Roman origin, who was the sole survivor of the catastrophe in which his royal parents had perished." Bede tells us also that "under his leadership the Britons took up arms, challenged their conquerors to battle, and with God's help inflicted a defeat upon them."

Nennius, however, the early 9th century monk of Bangor in his *Historia Brittonum*, has two different Ambrosius'. Firstly, he refers to a clearly legendary Ambrosius as being a fatherless child who displayed prophetic powers before Vortigern which could well be a Blois interpolation. Then Nennius also says that Ambrosius was a rival whom Vortigern dreaded, and, in a later passage, calls him *the great king of all the kings of the British nation."

Now there are problems with Nennius\(^{761}\) in that it is an ancient tract probably comprising one or two original sources and compiled to a form which was attributed to Nennius. Some also attribute it to Gildas and this may be down to Henry himself and analysis does show some Arthurian material could have been added. The Arthurian part of Nennius on the whole is tricky to know if our arch-interpolator has been at work. It would appear, however, as I have maintained before, that it was Henry who had copies made with Gildas’ name attached. There is therefore always a suspicion about Nennius.

After the reader has been appraised of the interpolations of Henry Blois exposed in this work, there would be no reason not to ascribe the reworked version of Nennius to Henry Blois as it seems to be Henry (through Geoffrey) that ascribes the adulterated 11\(^{th}\) century recension to Gildas in the HRB.

Another reason for suspecting Henry Blois is that Nennius’ *Historia Brittonum* describes the settlement of Britain by Trojan expatriates and states that Britain took its name after Brutus, a descendant of Aeneas just as Geoffrey maintains. The work also was the first source to portray King

\(^{761}\)“Doubts concerning the British History Attributed to Nennius” article from PMLA, Volume 20. W.W.Newell 1905
Arthur, who is described as a *dux bellorum* (military leader) or *miles* (soldier) and not as a king so may well be original. It names the twelve battles that Arthur fought, but like ‘Geoffrey’s’ habit in the HRB, none are assigned actual dates.

Assignment of date would automatically throw up difficulties in confluence concerning much of the HRB, but the earliest known reference to the battle of Camlann is an entry from the 10th-century *Annales Cambriae*, recording the battle in the year 537 which mentions Mordred (Medraut). The Arthurian part of Nennius is tricky to evaluate. But as I have covered earlier we just have to accept Nennius as it is.

The accusation against most of the evidence supplied in this exposé will be that I have apportioned manuscripts too often to Henry Blois or contrived evidence to make it appear as if he is the author when others believe he is not. On that basis I would rather leave Nennius as it stands holding a healthy suspicion of interpolation. I would add that often as we have covered just a changed folio can have a big effect on how a manuscript is viewed historically. But, lastly on the subject, since Henry as ‘Geoffrey’ is seen to have employed a source book for his inspiration on nearly every occasion, this adds credence that it was an extant manuscript as it stands in 1126. William Newell in his *Doubts Concerning the British History Attributed to Nennius* (1905) is no more able to elucidate further and has no suspicions that the author of Chivalric Arthur is culpable of equating Nennius with Gildas.

However, after that brief digression, we can see how Henry Blois melds Aurelius, Ambrosius, with Arthur and Merlin and how these old British annals anchor for him (now posing as Master Gregorius) his Marcus Aurelius into Rome and on such a stunning piece of statue artistry. If we were to follow Henry’s mind we get from Marcus Aurelius through the three British annals by associating Marcus Aurelius with Aurelius Ambrosius which, by his links to battles, (specifically Badon) against the Saxons and Roman heritage, imply Arthur as the hero.

Gregorius who assigns much of his small exposé to Marcus Aurelius posits an explanation of a marvellous statue of a Roman warlord or emperor, who, if one lived in Henry’s mind, might be construed as Arthur. Aurelius, with the Arthurian connection derived from the British annals, is very important to ‘Geoffrey’ and implies Arthur’s Roman roots following the
detail found in the annals and one can see the references in the *HRB* where the Ambrosius appellation is attached to Merlin as a surname, but both Aurleian and Ambrosian references are frequent.

‘Gregorius’ has not only written his short tract to perpetuate Henry’s design which substantiates the Arthur-Roman connection which readers of the HRB will undoubtedly make; but Henry is genuinely interested in antiquity, architecture and Roman art and thus the book takes the form it does. Gregorius says that pilgrims to Rome think the Horseman statue is that of Theodoric or Constantine, however the ‘Cardinals’ say the bronze horse-rider is Marcus (meaning Marcus Aurelius) or Quintus Quirinius. Gregorius explains how the statue once ‘stood on four bronze columns in front of Jupiter on the Capitoline but blessed Gregory took the rider down’, and set it up outside the Papal palace. Gregorius then goes on to say that he is going to ‘give a wide berth to the worthless stories of the pilgrims and Romans in this regard, and shall record what I have been told by the elders, the cardinals and men of greatest learning’ before launching into his own description of a dwarf king of the Miseni, more skilful than any other man in the perverse art of magic’ who this Marcus (the horse-rider) on the statue overcame. Because of his bravery ‘supposedly’ the statue was erected.

The second possibility that Gregorius provides in explanation which accounts for the statue in Rome involves Quintus Quirinius who supposedly jumped into a chasm in Rome from his horse to save the citizens of Rome. Strangely enough another account of similar date known as the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae*, or the *Mirabilia* states that the horseman is a Marcus Curtius whose story is also told by the Roman historian Livy with similar details. The name given by Gregorius in the *Narracio* is, as we have said, alternatively, Quintus Quirinus which has puzzled most commentators until we realise this tract is probably written by Henry Blois who employs the same artifices of associating people to historical events; because we have on the Roman ranks pitted against Arthur in Gaul a certain Quintus Carutius. Of course the wholly fictional ‘Lucius Hiberius’ Procurator of the Republic of Gaul in the HRB against Arthur had a nephew *Caius Quintilianus* who had his head cut off by Gwain and may be the reason for Henry introducing this

---
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possibly, but all these possibilities are highly tentative and conjectural on my part.

The only other medieval writer to refer to the *Narratio* as we have said is Ranulf Higden in his introduction to the *Polychronium* who gives the Horse-riders name as *Quintus Curtius*. Given Henry Blois’ record in conflating and providing confusing accounts of personages in the HRB; it is slightly coincidental that both of these explanations of who the rider might be, given by Gregorius, (a Magister from England), tentatively tie back to fictional characters in the HRB. Given that Henry Blois was often in Rome and the time the book was written and Henry has an indisputable interest in statuary and architecture; it is not ridiculous to suggest that this small book has many coincidental factors where Henry Blois could be the author.

Henry Blois speaks of a Bronze horse in the HRB: *The Britons embalmed his body with balsams and sweet-scented condiments, and set it with marvellous art within a brazen image cast to the measure of his stature. This image, moreover, in armour of wondrous beauty and craftsmanship, they set upon a brazen horse above the West Gate of London in token of the victory I have spoken of, and as a terror unto the Saxons. They did likewise build beneath it a church in honour of St. Martin, wherein are divine services celebrated for him and the faithful departed. Coincidentally, Henry Blois, always keen to promote those institutions he has control over, is Dean of St Martin’s. Henry Blois writes a letter to Robert Neufbourg while papal legate stating: Know that the church of St Martin of London and all things pertaining to it are mine.*

It is my suggestion that Henry Blois is trying to imply the bronze horseman in Rome came from London as a prize like many of the other trophies found in Rome. When we throw the same bronze rider into the soup from the prophecies it is not silly to suggest that Henry is implying the Horse rider in Rome was the Marcus Aurelius from Britain: *He that shall do these things shall clothe him in the brazen man, and throughout many ages shall keep guard over the gates of London sitting upon a brazen horse.*
Chapter 30

The Merlin prophecies by John of Cornwall

Henry Blois wrote all the material in the Prophecies of Merlin found in HRB, all the prophetic words of Taliesin, Ganieda and Merlin found in VM; and the Cornish rendition of John of Cornwall’s *Merlini prophetia cum expositione*, known from a unique 14th century manuscript in the Vatican Library. There are no Merlin prophecies without Henry Blois. This is not to say that there was no tradition or prophecies from the Welsh Myrddin before ‘Geoffrey’. Certainly the Caledonian Merlin in the VM appears to be based upon a more north Welsh and southern Scottish prophetic figure than the Ambrosian Merlin…. but both are concocted. The Caledonian Merlin supposedly driven mad after the battle of Arfdderydd.

Certainly, Caledonian Merlin has commonalities with *Armes Prydain Fawr* and other points of reference are found in examples such as *Afallennau* (with its introduction of apples tying in with Glastonbury lore), *Oianau*, and the *Gwasgargerdd Myrddin*. Maybe the Welsh Myrddin did inspire ‘Geoffrey’, but I believe it was the words of Quintus in Cicero that wholly brought about the introduction of the first edition of prophecies which were witnessed by Abbot Suger before 1151; and these were partly used politically when Stephen was alive.

The first set of prophecies, as we have covered, were mainly brought into existence to show that Merlin had foreseen Stephen’s reign and therefore, since it was fated, all and sundry should accept more readily what has been pre-ordained. Of course, Henry Blois would have read the Biblical prophets, but there were prophetical poets among the Greeks such
as Orpheus, Linus, Homer, Hesiod and amongst the Latins, Publius Virgilius, Maro etc. which we know Henry had read; so he was aware of how prophecy worked as propaganda.

The sense of some prophecies changed subtly from the original *Libellus Merlini* first published independently of Gaufridus’ *Primary Historia*. These original prophecies which Henry Blois’ friend Suger witnessed were the basis of those expanded and updated found in Vulgate HRB where the sense has been squewed.

The one particular prophecy which then established Merlin definitively as a seer was his prediction of the invasion of Ireland by the ‘sixth’, when the small band of Norman Knight’s arrived there in 1161 (even though Henry had thought the invasion was going to take place more immediately and on a larger scale). There were however, several prophecies which did not happen which Henry Blois had hoped would transpire when he first wrote the separate *libellus Merlini*. These were then included in the HRB version to maintain consistency in what was originally posited. Some prophecies concerning building works and engineering projects intended to be completed by Henry Blois were interrupted by events of the Anarchy and never got off the ground. Some of these prophecies of intended projects Suger would have witnessed in his copy of *Libellus Merlini*. Some of these were then eventually twisted in both HRB and VM.

It is this subtle twisting between HRB and VM and JC which identifies Henry as the author. Those Prophecies where he identifies too strongly with himself or leaves a trace whereby he may be accused as author were obfuscated further in VM and then again in JC. Also where prophecies were no longer poignant, of value, or did not come to fruition, these were scrambled in the 1155 updated Vulgate version…. but, because many saw the same words employed they assumed the change in sense was down to translation or misunderstanding.

However, Newburgh writing about 1170 a year before Henry’s death seems to accept that the prophecies were translated from a Celtic language by ‘Geoffrey’ but his accusation seems to be that Geoffrey adds to them. He seemingly has no problem accepting the prophecies existed as a separate work on their own; and originally came from Merlin. One of the reasons he thought this is because of the existence of the *Libellus Merlini* i.e. the first set of prophecies and it is likely Newburgh had read Henry’s interpolation into Orderic. Also, the reason Newburgh thinks like this is because of the
existence of HRB’s rebellious prophecies which certainly were not in the first set and because of new ones found in VM and those of JC’s version.

Many commentators have thought the Bishop of Exeter must have possessed a version written by Merlin himself and he supposedly asked John of Cornwall to translate the JC version (supposedly written in Cornish) into Latin for him. This is not how it transpired because Henry has used the same gambit of backdating dedications just as we saw in HRB.

Robert de Warelwast, bishop of Exeter died March 28th 1155, the same year the Vulgate HRB was published with the updated *prophetia* included. (This is not to say that a First Variant version did not exist with non-updated prophecies). Most scholars and commentators assume that the supposed original Celtic/Brittonic manuscript from which the translation was made actually existed. It is also assumed around 1138 or thereafter, the JC edition was in the public domain. This assumption is based upon the dedication or commission of the translation i.e. prior to Warelwast’s death. By lending credence to the dedication assumes Warelwast is alive much like the dedications in HRB imply, but this simply cannot be; because the vital ‘Sixth in Ireland’ prophecy is present in JC. Henry, just as he had done with HRB uses the same devise to backdate the prophecies with the pretence that Warelwast is still alive.

It is certainly no coincidence that Robert Warelwast of Exeter (1138-55), dedicatee of JC’s *Prophetia Merlini* is chosen as dedicatee as he had just died. Three other of Henry Blois’ circle cited the prophecies before 1170 as Henry distributed his updated version. Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux764 (1141-81), Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury (1162-70) and Gilbert Foliot, bishop of London (1163-87), (nephew of Robert Chesney), all in Henry’s sway (once he became the venerated Bishop post 1158). They were all intricately related to Henry as history records. Also Étienne de Rouen’s (d.1169) *Draco Normannicus* alluded to the dragons of Merlin’s prophecy and quoted individual prophecies in connection with events including the death of King Stephen (1154) so had the updated version.

---

764 Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, remained neutral in the Becket dispute but wrote a secret letter of advice to Becket in 1165 which relates to King Henry’s campaigns and his belief in Merlin’s prophecy concerning the Celts rebellion long after its creation (c.1155-7) by Henry Blois to incite rebellion, had become redundant: *King Henry was even disposed, so they say, to act more mildly in many ways, so that he can quickly return to put down the audacity of the Welsh before the Scots and the Bretons make an alliance with them and Albion, as prophesied....*
As Henry Blois is masquerading as Geoffrey of Monmouth, so too, he is John of Cornwall; how else could it be? Henry knew of Henry II’s intention toward Ireland and this could only be known after 1155. Only a fool would think the prophecies are vaticinatory, so how come John of Cornwall is writing for a dead person. The implication is that John is being imposter and we do not have to look too far to realise who it is.

Too many of Merlin’s prophecies in JC are contemporary and come from ‘Geoffrey’. So, it can only be Henry Blois who is the author; unless of course you believe in Merlin’s ability to prophecy. Warelwast was a good friend of Henry’s also and Henry had spent time with him after the siege of Exeter as stated in the GS. The previous Bishop, also named Warelwast, died in 1137 and was the founder of the Augustinian Priory of Plympton; and it was at Plympton we found Henry Blois as an eyewitness in GS.

Henry Blois knew Devon and Cornwall well and had no problem injecting a few colloquialisms and locations (known personally) into the script like Tamar and Brentigia, just to give the prophecies the authentic air as a direct translation from Cornish. (It should not be forgotten Henry would certainly know monks of Cornish origin). Brentigia is Henry’s feigned archaic word for ‘Brent moor’ which, as the prophecy states is by the Tamar and in reality just behind Plympton which extends toward south Brent on Southern Dartmoor.

Logically, the present day South Brent is ‘south of Brent’ or Brentigia, as southern Dartmoor was known in Henry Blois’ day. JC states: *qua spectat Plaustrum, qua Tamarus exit in austrum, per iuga Brentigie... Which faces Plymouth (aestuarium) from which the Tamar exits to the south through the ridges of Brent moor*. This is a fairly apt description from a visiting Henry Blois, possibly from twenty years previously; who even mentions the river Tavy which runs beside Brent Moor.

In the *Afallennau*, Myrddin prophesy’s that the victory of the Cymry over the Saxons will take place when Cadwaladr comes from Rhyd Rheon to meet Kynan. Of course the rousing to rebellion of the Celts (in Henry’s era) is aimed to mirror Cynan of *Armes Prydein* fame, but it has been twisted as if to foretell of Conan and Cadwalader of 1155. As we have seen Cadwallader and Conan are Henry Blois’ contemporaries both in contention against Henry II. Rhyd Rheon could now be misconstrued with Red Ruth in Cornwall especially with the mention of Fawi-mor.
Of course no Cornish Celtic original existed as these are prophecies entirely invented from the mind of Henry Blois and the reason for changes in prophecies which seem to have the same subject is purely based upon Henry’s changing agenda. Only 38 of the 139 prophecies in JC are directly related to ‘Geoffrey’s’ prophecies. This of course gave the impression to some commentators, the appearance that the prophecies come from a larger extant body of Celtic material. This would then lead them to think the parallel prophecies seemingly originate in material not ascribed to ‘Geoffrey’; who, some like Newburgh suspected of inventing.

As we covered already Adrian IV published the Papal Bull *Laudabiliter*, which was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland and apply the Gregorian reforms. The pope urged Henry Plantagenet to invade Ireland; the object of which was to bring its Celtic Christian Church under Roman Catholic rule. We have established that Henry Blois knew of this intention to invade and published this prophecy concerning the ‘sixth’ as vaticinatory prophecy which could only have been after the council held at Winchester. He thought the invasion was expected imminently as discussed at the council. JC has this ‘sixth in Ireland’ prophecy along with other HRB prophecies which we know came from Henry Blois; so it is only logical that JC is either published at the same time as the updated prophecies in Vulgate HRB or shortly thereafter using his friends name in the prologue. If we just assume he used the same principle employed in HRB by dedicating the work to dead people.... it is not surprising he would use a friend’s name who had only just expired in March 1155.

One reason for producing the fraudulent JC version of prophecies was to add credence to the assertion found in Vulgate HRB which insisted that the *Historia* was merely a translation of an ancient book; where Geoffrey had on the request of Alexander halted his translation and merely inserted the translated prophecies. These new prophecies in the Vulgate HRB were being scrutinized and Henry needed to allay accusations of new prophecies appearing by producing an independent copy also from a Brythonic source which showed that his new set in Vulgate were not recently concocted.

Many of the prophecies corroborated the fabricated history of HRB originally and were partly used to that end. If Henry could produce a Celtic source for the prophecies and show they contained even the updated prophecies before Warlewast’s death, then there could be no accusation of
additions to previous prophecies by those who suspected that additions had been made.

More specifically, JC verifies for the gullible that the book of Merlin really did exist. ‘Geoffrey’ had made the point that he had to break off from writing the Historia at the request of Alexander to translate a book of British prophecies; and now through coincidental good fortune, we have independent verification of another translation of Merlin’s prophecies through JC. We (posterity and contemporaneous sceptics) had all assumed the pretence that ‘Geoffrey’ was able to translate the prophecies from the Brittonic tongue of the ancient Britain because Henry Blois had guided us to believe that Geoffrey was from Wales. Now, through the advent of prophecies appearing in a Celtic language appears to corroborate ‘Geoffrey’s’ assertion. The logical conclusion is that the book must exist and must have been in Celtic tradition because it took a Cornishman named John of Cornwall to translate a similar version of it into Latin.

Henry was not concerned what drivel he included, but the essentials were that the subject matter reflected the same as found in the Vulgate HRB rendition and that of the original Libellus Merlini. The reader would assume, over a span of six hundred years, that the Welsh version had somewhat differed from the separated Cornish version. The faked commentary (written by Henry to accompany the JC version as if they were John’s insights) was either used to point out certain features which contemporary twelfth century commentators had misunderstood; or it was used to confuse them by laying a false scent where earlier prophecies were too closely linked to Henry Blois. Either way, the concept of writing an appended commentary was genius.

Henry Blois in JC becomes unambiguously British as he is allowed to do the speaking as John of Cornwall and relating what is supposed to be a Brittonic prophecy. Henry, writing as JC, at times, pretends to critique and correct ‘Geoffrey’s’ material, but his real desire, like passages in VM, is to cause insurrection against Henry II. In the JC version, Henry Blois allows himself to seemingly express his Celtic polemic in a much more overt way, but still combining the politics with the same known subject matter of the Vulgate HRB prophecies which link back to the Libellus Merlini prophecies which Suger possessed. Some of these seem the same subject matter as in VM but are subtly changed in purport and then twisted further in JC.
The dedication of the JC version is to: Venerated Robert, Prelate of Exeter.... I John of Cornwall, having been commanded to set forth the prophecy of Merlin in our British Tongue, and also esteeming your affection for me more than my ability, have attempted in my humble style to elucidate it in a scholarly manner. No matter how I have fashioned my work, I have achieved nothing without labour. I did however strive to render it, according to the law of translation, word for word.

There is simply not one word of truth in the prologue. Notice how Henry Blois affects he is of Celtic background and has an affinity with Brittania or the ‘Britons’ who were the Celtic occupants before the Saxon invasion. Geoffreay does the same in HRB using the word ‘our’ as pertaining to be of British descent. This also helps to explain why the Normans are considered allies in ridding Britain of the Saxons at certain times in HRB prophecies when reflecting the early Libellus Merlini sentiment, but never in JC. The prologue feigns false humility just like the dedication to Robert of Gloucester and Alexander in Vulgate HRB. The same faked humility is found also in the faux prologue to Gildas-Nennius. The coincidence is that John of Cornwall was a student of Thierry of Chartres and it was at Chartres where a copy of Nennius was found. Henry may also have chosen to impersonate John having met him there. John says he is leaving out events following Conani’s lamentable exit up to William I’s time, ‘until he knew how his work was received’. So how come he is translating word for word?

John of Cornwall’s commentary notes are a devise used by Henry Blois to seem as if he (as JC) is having trouble with unravelling the meaning; while at the same time, seeming to give a slightly different translation than that of Geoffreay. Another motive for the production of JC is to corroborate narrative found in HRB. The effect is that, the gullible are accepting of the proposition that Merlin’s words were indeed Celtic and that John is indeed translating them and of course HRB’s historicity seems more valid by corroboration. However, Henry Blois only gives sporadic interlinear details and notes in the commentary, not conclusive elucidation or interpretation. In fact any number of interpretations are admissible often on grammatical grounds and on historical grounds; ambiguity being Henry’s mode d’emploi.

I think it pertinent to inform the reader that the attached commentary in no way narrows the interpretations; as the commentary’s own assessments are often so far from the mark so as to appear genuine commentary. The commentary is purely a devise used by Henry Blois and has little value as
an aid in understanding or interpreting the prophecies and deflects from the underlying reasons for Henry Blois concocting and impersonating JC. Often the comments in the commentary are *inutile* and create the aura of a translator struggling to interpret the manuscript he is transcribing into Latin. Another artifice is used where corroborative material is supplied which backs up or could be conflated with HRB.

Throughout the HRB, VM and JC, part of Henry Blois’ artifice is a studied ambiguity or employs obscurantist constructions; but when the three works are taken together as a whole, much more can be gleaned when it is realised they are by the same author. For example, this becomes clearer as we interpret JC in relation to the man on the white horse, always associated with *Periron*, where a different perspective is added.

We should now as briefly as possible see what changes Henry affects between updated Vulgate HRB prophecies, VM and JC.

In the HRB version we have Dragons: *The seed of the White Dragon shall be rooted out of our little gardens and the remnant of his generation shall be decimated.*

1) JC: *the East wind will be rooted out by the south wind and their young shoots will be decimated from our gardens.*

Henry’s intention here is to seem as if the prophecy is genuine, but ‘Geoffrey’ might have mistranslated it (or even embellished Nennius’ version); or it is intended to give the air that through Celtic translations in a Welsh and Cornish version there has been confusion. Henry’s gambit is to make the reader accept that from antiquity translation differences have occurred, but the essence of the Vulgate prophecies are the same.

In HRB we have: *For a people in wood and jerkins of iron shall come upon him and take vengeance upon him for his wickedness. He shall restore their dwelling-places unto them that did inhabit them before, and the ruin of the foreigner shall be made manifest.*

2) JC: *Crossing over in timber, his people in iron coats who shall war in the field, protected by triple arms, a nation eager to do battle, to slaughter the Saxons. Later those who used the plough and the rake should not spare their mother (earth) by tending his own heart as their servile yolk they owe for their treachery, and I am not ashamed to recall it.*

In Vulgate HRB, even though published in 1155 after Stephen was dead; there was a necessity for Henry Blois to hold to a commonality with those
prophecies already published in the earlier *libellus Merlini*. In this case of the early *libellus Merlini*, Henry Blois is politically charging the prophecy so that the Normans are seen as the rescuers of the Celts who had been oppressed by the Saxons. This of course was part of his initial reason for writing the prophecies to show the Normans in a good light (especially since his brother was King). It is the Saxons who pay for their treachery (night of the long knives) just as ‘Geoffrey’ has posited; to till the earth in slavery.

3) JC: *To the restoration of our prince how many years will he live? Twice seven and the same again is the number reckoned. Savage Normandy, parents of a fruitful seed rejoice, vindictive Heirs, two burning dragons the first of the two died in contention with a bow, the other got rid of passing mournfully under the shadow of a name. Four times two and five years shall he be feared.*

HRB: *Two dragons shall succeed, whereof the one shall be slain by the arrow of envy, but he other shall return under the shadow of a name.*

William Rufus ruled for thirteen years and was killed by an arrow in the New Forest on 2nd August 1100. ‘The other’ was Duke Robert who was eradicated by jailing him until his death, dying mournfully in a dungeon in Cardiff. The shadow of a name, as I have covered already, is the fact that he is Duke of Normandy and not King of England and neither King of Jerusalem as he could have been. Henry in JC is really playing the part of the ancient seer providing a hocus pocus twice seven and the same again; so that it appears that Merlin is receiving his prophecies in such form. Henry Blois is saying 2 multiplied by 7=14 and add the same again = 21. It is certainly not by coincidence that his grandfather, William the conqueror, reigned 21 years from 1066-9 September 1087. Nor is it by coincidence that his Grandfather’s coming is seen by Merlin as the restoration of our prince.

4) The four times two and five years are the years in this skimble skamble, faux-vaticinatory view by Merlin pretending how the prophecy is received. Essentially, the meaning is 4 multiplied by 2 + 5 = 13. William Rufus reigned from 1087-1100 i.e. 13 years. One would have to be a fool to accept John of Cornwall is translating anything!!! Henry Blois has in fact introduced the dates at this point. The reader will find out why when we get to the last sentence at the end of the entire JC prophecy. That sentence then does not seem to be out of place. We will see it defines the advent of the Seventh king. In other words, it pre-empts the supposed counting of the
years of Kings Rule. We know there is no seventh King found in HRB or VM. For the moment, let the reader be aware that even though King Stephen is dead and Henry II is on the throne, Henry Blois has not given up his ambitions or the pursuit of regaining power in dislodging Henry II from the throne.

5) JC: But the Lion of Justice, who truly excels all others, shall add twice seven over eight.

HRB: The Lion of Justice shall succeed, at whose warning the towers of Gaul and the dragons of the island shall tremble.

Henry continues to count the years of his own ancestors reigns in this same pretentious hocus pocus fashion. We know from the HRB prophecies already covered that the ‘Lion of Justice’ is Henry Ist. The wording shall add twice seven over eight is just more mumbo jumbo; Henry is merely seeming to be prophetic as if math were perceived differently while perceived in the dark art of the Dark Age seer. It is quite ridiculous that any person with a modicum of common sense should accept this as prophecy.

2 multiplied by 7+8 = 22. With the word ‘add’, Henry Blois means Henry Ist shall reign 22 years more than the thirteen years of William Rufus. Henry Ist ruled 1100-1135 i.e. thirty five years. So, here in effect Henry Blois’ is pretending to see by means of the dark art of prophetic foresight…. numbers representing the 13 years of William Rufus and 22 years of King Henry Ist…. which of course brings us up to his brother’s accession.

6) JC: Trimming the claws of Kites and the teeth of Wolves, he provides security in the forests and harbours everywhere. Whenever this one roars the towers which are washed by Sequana shall tremble and the islands of the dragons in the ocean.

HRB: The ravening of kites shall perish and the teeth of wolves be blunted.

Henry has decided to mix up and interchange certain clauses which appeared next to other subjects in HRB. The towers of Gaul become those of the River Seine, (an impossible mistranslation). Sequana was the goddess of the river Seine, particularly the springs at the source of the Seine, and the Gaulish tribe in the area were the Sequani. One thing ‘Geoffrey’ seems to have a good handle on is the tribal or regional people of France as witnessed in HRB and elucidated by Tatlock. Strangely enough, Merlin seems to have that same attribute. A Welsh ‘Geoffrey’ would simply not know this detailed information as we have already covered. Experts on ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth need to realise ‘Geoffrey’ is also JC.
Again, Henry is trying to appear archaic and seem to be using forms or names from Merlin’s era. In either case, the ‘towers of Gaul’ or ‘Paris trembling’ is the allusion to King Philip’s fear of Henry Ist. As we saw in the VM the wolf sometimes means Henry Blois, but the icon is interchangeable with the intention of confusing the reader. Here it would seem to mean the kites are the Barons and the Wolves are the Bishops. King Henry Ist, as we saw, had stringent rules concerning forests and secured the ports in both Normandy and England. JC gives in the commentary ‘because of pirates’. The Seine is a reference by location to the Frankish fear of King Henry’s power. The Islands of the Dragons are the Celtic islands of Britannia and Ireland and is probably meant to include Scotland; as some in antiquity assumed Scotland was a separate Island as we covered while elucidating the VM. Is it not strange that the writer of VM, who we know to be Henry, who has gleaned this geographical error from Isidore, is now positing the same fictional position concerning Scotland…. when the author in reality knows full well it is part of mainland Britain. ‘John of Cornwall’ in his feigned commentary also suggests Norwallia, north Wales and Ybernia Ireland.

7) JC: *Then he with crimped hair and multi coloured garments; his scandalous clothes will not be protection from a crooked mind.*

HRB: *They that go crisped and curled shall be clad in fleeces of many colours, and the garment without shall betoken that which is within.*

It becomes apparent that the inter-relation of these prophecies are confused on purpose. John’s commentary occasionally aids in elucidation, but also posits obviously erroneous deductions. These are made for the most part so that no affiliation is made between ‘Geoffrey’ and ‘John’ and to hide their common authorship. The prophecies are interchanged in JC from the order they appear in Vulgate HRB. This is perhaps so that it appears they have come from different traditions (i.e. Cornish and Welsh), and their sense has been mistranslated from different translations. The sense of the prophecy above is that in Henry Ist reign, a fashion started which Henry Blois strongly disapproved of and which continued throughout his life. Henry Blois was making the point that the outside ‘dandy’ clothing, should in no way be taken as representative of the filth and corruption which went on in the mind of the wearer. Mostly aimed at the courtiers.

8) JC: *Gold will be squeezed from the narcissus and the shrub and will pour from the hooves of grazing cattle.*
HRB: *In his days shall gold be wrung from the lily and the nettle, and silver shall flow from the hooves of them that low.*

As we covered before, Henry definitely has something in mind. It could be some sort of tax on cattle instigated by Henry Ist. However, it might have been a tax proposed in Stephen’s time which never came to fruition. If the prophecy was posited as a future event in the early *Libellus Merlini*; it would therefore be included for authenticity’s sake thereafter in HRB. Henry Blois kindly suggests in his commentary while posing as John of Cornwall that ‘this kind of metaphor is common in our poems’ i.e. ‘from the good and the bad’. It just shows that Henry is out to obfuscate and one person is generating these prophecies as Gold and Silver are not interchangeable nor specifically Lilly and nettle interchangeable with Narcissus. This is not a translational error but a deliberate change in the latter set of prophecies found in JC. ‘John’ admits in the commentary to having abbreviated the Merlin original in this case so that his narcissus and thorn represent the idea of good and evil. The commentary references Geoffreys’s ‘nettle and Lilly’ however, which shows that Henry’s intention is that JC’s translation should be accepted as authoritative and implies a position that ‘Geoffrey’ might not have truly represented the intended sentiment of Merlin. This is part of Henry’s ploy in providing the commentary. He poses as a first hand translator of Merlin’s words but states in his introductory letter of his intention to suppress some of the material of the prophecy especially concerning Conan. Yet the question is why would he expose or elucidate material he was supposedly suppressing? He is merely pointing to his purpose by his pretence. Why suppress what Merlin wrote concerning Conan if indeed it related to the Saxon era? His very mention and sham of reticence concerning Conan shows his contemporaneous political relevance. The whole is a ploy; both commentary and the idea of a translation from Brittonic language. John is careful to mix anti-Saxon sentiment so that it applies to anti-Norman sentiment with the pretence of suppressing what might be politically volatile material.

9) JC: *Like it or not, a paw will be chopped off; those that bark make a treaty with the stag.*

HRB: *The feet of them that bark shall be cut off. The wild deer shall have peace, but humanity shall suffer the dole.*
We have already covered this point while elucidating the passage in HRB prophecies and the Orderic interpolation concerning Henry Ist hunting laws and the crippling of hunting dogs. The pact the dog makes with the stag is merely that it is now constrained and unable to hunt. The content of the prophecy here is not consequential but relevant to his present audience and recognisable to the present generation. That Merlin might have seen through the mists of time to hit on all these events relevant to the present audience is silly; but this is the bogus ‘hocus pocus’ that Henry affects while composing the prophecies. The above prophecy like some others adds nothing new and is included just to corroborate those prophecies found in the earlier *Libellus Merlini* which were originally published before Vulgate HRB version; i.e. Henry includes them here just for consistency’s sake. The fact that Merlin is foreseeing grave events concerning the Saxons and then turns his attention to mundane forest laws and comments on fashion and the money supply really shows that the subjects of the prophecies were chosen as historic events which were supposed to have the appearance of predictions…. but recognisable by the contemporaneous audience. It is amazing Merlin is able to focus on events concerning the era of Henry’s ancestors and nothing further beyond 1157 in the VM and 1159 in JC.

10) JC: *The shape of money shall be divided and this too shall become a round form.*

    HRB: *The shape of commerce shall be split in two; the half shall become round.*

    We covered this earlier also as pertaining to a statute of King Henry’s in 1108. Henry Blois obviously thought this was going to happen in Stephen’s reign and was certainly minting coin in York of his own. Misguidedly, Mathew Paris took the reference to apply to monetary reforms by King John c. 1210. But, there are many more commentators who believe the prophecies are credible…. and worse, they are anciently from Merlin. John of Cornwall fortuitously helps us in the commentary suggesting ‘plans to introduce the half penny’ as if the contemporary audience were not aware of the acute problem of splitting coins.

11) JC: *Afterwards, on top of Aravium the famous bird will seize her nest and England will weep for her cubs.*

    HRB: *and his Eagle build her nest upon Mount Aravius.*

    Alani de Insulis seems to have a different reading *Morianum montem* which he took as a reference to the Alps. As I have covered earlier, while
elucidating the passage, this is in reference to a mountain boundary implying Rome and Matilda being Empress of Rome. Rome for Henry was across the Alps and the Aravis range. This would be a prophecy written by Henry during the Anarchy like the others in the *Libellus Merlini* and we can witness how the prophecies are written by one person and could not interrelate purely on translational errors. We should not forget either the coincidence of Wace referring to the St Bernard pass also as a geographical reference (on the same terms) to Rome. The ‘Third Nesting’ applies to Matilda and so do the prophecies above concerning Aravium. In this case in JC the sense is changed; Matilda is seizing her nest and England’s cubs are in Henry Blois’s mind, himself and his brother. Anyhow, one can witness the subtle changes which appear, but they all inter-relate. The nest applies to Matilda and the eagle of HRB now morphs into a ‘famous’ bird; certainly not translational differences but purposeful obfuscation.

12) JC: *Alas, the sea criminal comes in the third year and he that has no pity will be infamous for his triple cruelty.*

HRB: *Wolf of the sea.*

Henry Blois, feigning that he is non-plussed by the prophecy, pretends as John of Cornwall to explain that the prophecy applies to prince William (Clito)...’the third year of his reign was the last of his life’. The sometimes spurious commentary in effect neutralises any suspicion that JC was written by ‘Geoffrey’/Henry Blois. Many commentators believe the prophecy applies to William’s third year based upon ‘John’s’ fatuous suggestion; i.e. just because many had sworn fealty to him three years before the white ship disaster. In the VM and HRB, the relevance to the Danish invasion found in the *libellus Merlini* has been squewed and made (in both) to appear to refer to Robert of Gloucester: *The fourth from them shall be more cruel and more harsh still; a wolf from the sea he will conquer in fight and shall drive defeated beyond the Severn through the kingdoms of the barbarians.*

The ‘Sea Criminal’ in JC is now definitively Robert of Gloucester (and Matilda) who invades in 1139, the third year of Stephen’s reign (which as we can see in the VM also related to the fourth King as Stephen). Henry Blois, as we discussed earlier, now decides in this prophecy to include the triple fault of Malcolm of Scotland which he introduced into a VM prophecy. Henry Blois was obviously annoyed about Malcolm’s treachery, mentioning it twice in GS and then showing his annoyance here again. The original ‘sea
wolf in HRB was changed to apply to Robert of Gloucester/Matilda in VM in relation to the ‘fourth’ which is Stephen; and now in JC, it is King Stephen’s third year on the throne in which the Sea Criminal comes.

Henry Blois has put out four sets of Prophecies. The original set which comprised the *Libellus Merlini*, is updated and squewed and added to; where Icons in previous prophecies are now applied to different people in more updated versions. *Libellus Merlini* prophecies included events up to 1139-43 and were constructed to substantiate the pseudo-history as seen in the *Primary Historia* and to pretend to foresee various events up to c.1139-43. The *Libellus Merlini* version separate from *Primary Historia*. These prophecies foresaw some building projects in the future. Obviously the canal system around Winchester did not transpire and the ‘Holy hole’ did. As I have covered already; these surfaced around 1144. These were added without dedication to First Variant but have since been updated with the more recent set found in the Vulgate HRB i.e. the whole of the First Variant set of prophecies has been updated to be synonymous with the Vulgate version…. but this now has the dedication added. The original set which were in the First Variant HRB were the prophecies which Abbot Suger witnessed. The Vulgate prophecies were basically the same but some were up dated, up to 1155 and others introduced. The original prophecies corroborated historic details in the *Primary Historia* i.e. the prophecies seemingly predicted a recap of certain events in ‘Geoffrey’s’ pseudo-history of Britain, couched in skimble skamble oblique allusions. Because the prophecies were presented by ‘Geoffrey’ as a seemingly separate extant body of work from antiquity, the prophecies then added corroborative credibility to details found in ‘Geoffrey’s’ history and appeared to coincide with information provided in Nennius.

However, the VM prophecies were drawn up to appear to be the same prophecies but were designed to unseat Henry II in a work which was also written by ‘Geoffrey’ (which to all intents and purposes, ostensibly proved they existed before ‘Geoffrey’ died and therefore are prophetic). At the same time though, Henry Blois thought it propitious to cover more events in the ‘Anarchy’ through the prophetic talents of Ganieda,\(^\text{765}\) which, Merlin had not covered in *Libellus Merlini* or in the Vulgate HRB version. The JC edition or set of prophecies is even later in production and date; and is

\(^{765}\) Henry actually felt confident releasing Ganieda’s prophecies because ‘Geoffrey’ was supposedly now dead.
mainly designed to substantiate the Brythonic rebellion and to set the scene for Henry Blois's takeover of the English throne should the insurrection be successful. This will become apparent shortly.

13) JC: *Six Frenchmen united in the blood of their Mother, sorrowful and blushing at the throne, so many deaths, so many evils will cry out and exclaim, Oh Normandy do you know what happened, how recently I have suffered and spilt my guts, there are only funerals to console the agonies.*

HRB: *Venedotia shall be red with mother’s blood and six brethren shall the house of Corineus slay.*

JC's commentary, which exists just to give the impression of a curious Cornish translator, explains that the prophecy applies to *Frewinus Vicecomes*. As we have discussed this is who it originally pertained to when the *Libellus Merlini* was written by Henry Blois and was pointed out by Alain de Lisle as pertaining to the six sons of Fremun, who was viscount of Cornwall under Henry Ist (the house of Corineus). More importantly since it is Henry Blois writing the commentary we know that this is who he originally had in mind when the prophecy existed in the *Libellus Merlini*.

Dr Padel thinks the six French born brothers were sons of a certain Toki and were killed at Treruf also mentioned by JC. It is all part of Henry's device to mislead the reader into thinking the prophecies are derived from a Cornish Brythonic tradition. Dr Padel may well be right about Toki and the death of Toki’s six sons. This was the Toki, whose renown was for supplying a horse for a desperate king William at the battle of Gerberoi in 1080. The Viscount of Cornwall tends to fit better with the Corineus allusion and it is definitely the original sense. But, here in JC, Henry is continuing the practice of squewing prophecies. Frewinus and Toki have little to do with the ‘throne’ (as mentioned in the JC prophecy above) and six French brothers.... as posited in the JC version only. Henry Blois affects being a Cornishman by calling the brothers French. Given that Henry is the author, it can only have two referential advantages for him. The reader needs to

---

766 What is lovely is that Michael Curley makes the comment: *the prophecies concerning Vendotia and the house of Corineus are the last prophecies in the PM based on actual events. Everything that follows is truly visionary.* I cannot understand the naivety of such a position because it is obvious to all that the prophecies are fake; so how could they be visionary? If certain are corroborating fake historicity and others refer to Henry’s ancestors and the anarchy and the birth of Matilda’s third child etc. would not any rational person consider how prophecies came to fruition in the future except by a process of backdating. This process is evident anyway in the way a sixth century seer is made to appear to see future events which are already past in the corroboration process of HRB’S historicity, which Curley certainly understands!!!
understand the concept that this newest squew is intended so that when Henry Blois's wish (of Henry II's demise) came to fruition, it could be understood to have been fated; it would be accepted more readily as it was ‘predicted’ in the Merlin prophecies. It is a reference to himself and his five brothers; overtly made plain now in JC, as it introduces the word ‘throne’. Henry twists and intermingles both subject and object clauses from the original sense in the Libellus Merlini. In the early Libellus Merlini the Kings were numbered only to 4 as Stephen was alive. So, in the Libellus version the original meaning of the prophecy in all likelihood pertained as we have said to the Viscount of Cornwall. However, when the numbering of 5 and 6 in reference to the Kings was introduced at a later date the sense was twisted.

14) JC: Oh island soaked with tears, scarcely is there a king who uses the sword sparingly. Here the possessor is compassed by disloyal horrors. Dark nights (days) have closed off the head of the Lion. New rebels strive to make new the stars.

This is one of Henry’s new prophecies injected into JC which form propaganda against Matilda and Henry II implying that Henry II is king against what is preordained. It essentially shows disfavour against the ‘rebellion’ of Matilda and portrays that Henry II should not be the rightful inheritor. I think Henry Blois sees himself as the rightful inheritor and this sentiment comes more to the fore as we continue through the JC prophecies....until at the end it is blatantly obvious.

15) JC: with the eagle of the broken covenant calling out in anger to the whelp, those who lurk in the forests will come close to the city ramparts and those who hated the bull will one day fear him.

HRB: This shall the Eagle of the broken covenant gild over, and the Eagle shall rejoice in her third nesting. The roaring whelps shall keep vigil, and forsaking the forests shall follow the chase within the walls of cities.

One can see Henry’s method of mixing up the prophecies. But instead of ‘cutting out the tongues of bulls’, I believe Henry is now the bull in JC. The broken covenant alludes to breaking the oath sworn by Barons to Matilda and the whelp is obviously Henry II. Henry’s aspirations went as far as being elected pope. If he got to this position or indeed unseated King Henry by inciting rebellion this interpretation would make the most sense.

16) JC: No love for a brother or true loyalty existed between allies, no rest or at least hardly any; and that even precarious.
Henry Blois was shocked that his brother betrayed him so easily over the election to Archbishop of Canterbury of Theobald of Bec. King Stephen’s opinion was poisoned by advisers adverse to church power. Mainly it was the Beaumont brothers who thought Henry the powerful bishop of Winchester wielded too much power two years into Stephen’s reign. However, Henry was shocked at one the lack of loyalty and no love from a brother who had in essence put him on the throne. If he and Stephen had worked as allies (as per their pact at coronation), there may not have been the ‘Anarchy’. For those years of civil war, there was little rest for Stephen as the prophecy alludes to. This is another biographical detail not in the HRB or in *Libellus Merlini*, but is clearly perceived by the peeved slant in words of Henry Blois in GS. Henry Blois opines in the GS that Stephen had to deal with various anxieties and tasks of many kinds which continually dragged him hither and thither all over England. It was like what we read of the fabled hydra of Hercules; when one head was cut off two or more grew in its place. That is precisely what we must feel about King Stephen’s labours, because when one was finished others more burdensome kept on taking its place without end and like another Hercules he always girded himself bravely and unconquerably to endure each.

17) JC: *Thorns will overgrow the willow. Alas, too much power will be given to the Kites and Wolves, Three times six revolutions and three more shall this age last.*

Henry is injecting more specifics into his vaticinatory skimble skamble. The thorns are the Angevins overgrowing the Blois reign. The Kites and Wolves are the opposition to Stephen most probably Barons and clergy. 3 multiplied by 6 + 3 = 21. As the reader will recall from VM, Henry accounts the years of Stephen as 19 years: *Here once there stood nineteen apple trees bearing apples every year; now they are not standing.* So if we were to use Dec 1135-1154 there are the 19 years of Stephen’s reign. If we start at 1136 because it was only a few days before the end of 1135, this will now bring us to 19+2 years to make up the 21 revolutions and a date of 1157-8. We can conclude therefore that JC is probably written just after VM because (as we will get to shortly).... the last prophecy foretells of Henry Blois as King in 1159. This in Henry’s mind was dependent upon a successful rebellion by the Celts. It is plain to see that the ‘age’ referred to is plainly the age before Henry Blois sees himself as returning as the ‘adopted son’
18) JC: Oh thou, house of Arthur, subjected to a treacherous people, can you not see the robbery of cattle on the plain of Reontis.

‘John’ in his commentary says ‘it is not useful for me to define this treachery’ but says it concerns a raid by the ‘men of Devon’. He does not want to enlighten us ‘so as not to seem abusive’. Rhyd Reont is mentioned in a few Welsh poems and is probably included in the prophecies just to provide the reader with a conflation with a possible ‘Redruth’. Henry’s gambit throughout is to provide a tenable correlation, now linking Welsh Arthurian with Cornish Arthurian and Welsh Rhyd Reont with Cornish Rhyd-ruth. Henry Blois has a specific event in mind which he hopes his contemporary audience identifies with. This unidentifiable event could have been that which Henry witnessed while in the southwest after the siege of Exeter. I will just say here that if it had not been for the GS and knowing that Henry authored it; many of the Ganieda prophecies in VM would not have been openly exposed to events in the Anarchy had Henry himself not given account of the same events in prophecy and to which he referred to in GS so explicitly. Our scholars still don’t accept GS as Henry’s apologia.

19) JC: but what can be done against the Victorious for these times to cease. Why are we in colored yarn like women and in curls. Oh lost nation, whose abuse of clothing is like the barbaric veneration of the circles; what accustomed love of the trivial! Your punishment is a plague, a pain caused by the almighty. Your solemn cubes (rooms of solace) are desolate, your only government in flames, fasting and disease will be your final fate; you conspire to strike your allies.

Henry starts the prophecy with the thing foremost in his mind asking himself what can be done against the Angevins. In the JC commentary, Henry feigns misunderstanding of orbiculata thinking it has to do with patterning on clothing. This is not easy to make sense of, yet I think Henry as the writer is equating with Merlin’s Giant’s dance in HRB or stone circles and yet he knows that his desolate cubes are churches. Henry writing as JC feigns quoting his Cornish source ‘guent dehil’ as meaning venti excussio a wind which shakes off the leaves. I think the gist is: the state of affairs in Britain is just like the foreboding of the biblical east wind.

20) JC: All at once in a hard thunderbolt, despoiled by his father, it is made ready for the excellent head of the peaked helmeted one.
This again is tricky in translation, but I think the gist is that after Stephen’s death Henry sees himself as a future King. But this could just be a squew on the Hemeted one from earlier prophecies for consistency’s sake which as we know referred to the pope. Henry had already referred to himself in the earlier prophecies as the shadow of the ‘Helmeted one’ in HRB and Libellus Merlini probably indicating the prophecy hailed back to when he was Legate. Is he now referring to a hope he has of himself in JC; the prophecy aiding in bringing his wish to fruition. Henry is the white haired adopted man who becomes king as will become apparent. Henry Blois when posing as John, also terms this set of prophecies by John ‘the prophecy of Ambrosius Merlinus concerning the seven Kings’, when he terminates the JC prophecies. Henry II is the sixth King and Henry Blois sees himself as the automatic choice of the seventh as he is the last surviving Grandson of William the Conqueror. I can find no proof from a chronicler that Henry Blois had a white horse. We can speculate with Henry’s love of beautiful things that he had a beautiful horse (as this was the main mode of transport for a Bishop Knight), and one could speculate it was white. If we assume that the River Parrett is Merlin’s Periron (probably in the Libellus Merlini originally ‘Periton’ but then changed) then we can now see the association of the mill being built on it and the association of the river with the venerable man on the white horse which is found in HRB and JC. Originally Henry might have alluded to himself in no uncertain terms and then tried to cover it up. What we do know is that the bishop Henry Blois built a mill on the Parratt, so we can guess his horse was white.

21) JC: The adopted venerable old man is walking up and down where the ‘Perironis’ springs up.

HRB: An old man, moreover, snowy white, that sits upon a snow-white horse, shall turn side the river of Pereiron and with a white wand shall measure out a mill thereon.

Hyreglas of Periron\(^{767}\) was one of Arthur’s fictitious British nobles and maybe there is the clue in ‘glas’. Possibly the earlier Libellus Merlini prophecy originally referred to Henry at Glastonbury because in the earlier set he was much less guarded. However, as there was much work done in his time concerning the drainage around Glastonbury, Henry did make a

\(^{767}\) HRB X, v. I would not be surprised if it was indicative of Henry Rex from Glastonbury just as we have already come across Blihos Bilheris resembling an anagram of H.Blois but it’s a long shot.
mill on the Parrett. I think this early prophecy was so highly poignant to Henry, a definite squewing was carried out subsequently. Many suspect ‘Geoffrey’s’ additions to the book of Llandaff which has Periron near Monmouth. To allay any further suspicion that this might have referred to him too closely, when Henry interpolated the book of Llandaff establishing Geoffrey as flesh and blood and Caradoc as continuator of HRB Henry also steered suspicious minds away from the Parret to make Periron near Monmouth. Since Henry had moved it once, he writing as JC locates the river at Tintagel which matches snugly with the Cornish provenance of the book he is now translating from Cornish. Is Henry Blois backtracking in case people associate a mill built by him on the river Parrett? Don’t forget the white-haired old man diverts the course of the Periron and is mentioned after the Sixth and the lynx (Henry II) and measures a mill on its banks. In other words the man on the white horse is important to our author and important enough to get a mention along with the grandees like Kings and some hated adversaries who feature in the Merlin prophecies.

The book of Llandaff locates the ‘aper periron’ not far from the town of Monmouth but no-one has located it. Unlike most modern scholars on the heels of Geoffrey of Monmouth, I believe it was not ‘Geoffrey’ but Henry Blois who interpolated the book of Llandaff. Henry had back peddled after writing too specifically about himself in the original prophecies. ‘John’ shows his innovativeness in randomly stating the prophecy refers to the venerable adopted man’s ‘entry into Cornwall, for he then laid siege to the castle by the Periron, that is Tintagel’. In JC Henry locates Periron at (Dindaiol), Tintagel which has confused everyone that believes the commentary is ‘John’s’ genuine attempt at elucidating or interpreting the prophecies.

Tintagel as a posited location for Periron confirms this is Henry Blois mixing the salad. He knows that any interested reader will confl ate the castle at Periron to Arthur’s Castle. This highlights the authorship of Henry Blois, in that it is JC’s commentary which redirects us to this conflation. It is also pertinent that Henry Blois is author of Perlesvaus where the castle at Tintagel is mentioned and also in andn Iseult where ‘Breri’ is the source. It is all part of Henry’s artifice; while appearing to supply the ancient Cornish rendition of the name of Tintagel; especially when it is ‘Geoffrey’ who has Tintagel Castle being the site of Arthur’s conception.
If John of Cornwall were really writing this manuscript, why is JC trying to connect this Periron to the castle where Arthur supposedly held his court? Obviously, it is a direct attempt to substantiate the fictional court at Tintagel. The logical answer would be that the author of both fictions is one and the same person. The spelling of Dindaiol was not then and never was the accepted spelling of Tintagel. Henry is affecting an air of antiquity and ‘Cornishness’ to his manuscript.

Also, if I am correct in my suggestion that the castle in GS named as Lidelea is synonymous with Kidwelly, we may posit Henry’s use of Kaer Belli as an alternative name for the Castle in JC’s commentary. Henry’s gambit is not dependent upon accuracy. His whole edifice is propped up by conflation and tentative correlation and corroboration. Scholars will flatly deny my position concerning the invention of chivalric Arthur by Henry Blois, but while on the subject of Tintagel, it seems pertinent to inform them that the original Latin text of Tristan and Iseult\(^{768}\) (which they deny existed) may also have been written by Henry Blois: \textit{In Parmenie, a domain in Brittany, there lived a noble lord named Rivalin. Wishing to gain the experience and learning that can only be obtained by foreign travel, Rivalin set sail for the mighty castle Tintagel in Cornwall, where he wished to join the court of King Mark, whose chivalry, polish, and courtly grace were known well beyond his double realm of Cornwall and England.}

However, the point of writing JC’s rendition of the prophecies of Merlin is that Henry achieves his goal of stirring up insurrection and positing himself by prophecy as a future replacement for Henry II. The JC rendition of prophecies also acts as corroborative evidence to the prophecies in HRB. Henry also likes to give the impression that he is translating from an ancient Britannic or Celtic tongue. His previous hoary old man on a white horse he re-works with ‘Canus adoptatus’ or with a Cornish take in the commentary: \textit{michtien luchd mal igasuet}. Our Henry Blois is the master of illusion and obviously knows Cornish monks who may indeed have

\(^{768}\)There are some astounding similarities to other parts of Henry’s output (Wace’s \textit{Roman de Brut}) which makes me think that Tristan and Iseult was Henry’s first foray into Romance stories. Tristan fights a giant on an Island in Cornwall and also slays a dragon which just happens to be near a pool…. and Isolde’s hair is emblematic of Guinevere’s and then both are buried together like Arthur and Guinevere. The Tristan-story \textit{Chevrefoi}l by Marie de France (Marie of Champagne) follows Tristan and Iseult also. But our surest indicator is that in the fragmentary remains of Thomas’s Tristan, we have a passage in which the poet refers, as source, to a certain Breri, who knew “all the feats, and all the tales, of all the kings, and all the counts who had lived in Britain. Now does this sound like our ‘Geoffrey’ or What?
translated his new array of prophecies into Cornish from which he has included a few examples in his commentary. *Niveus quoque senex in niveo equo* was Henry Blois’ depiction of himself. The fact that the hoary, venerable, white bearded old man has now become ‘canus adoptatus’ is fascinating. This is no trick of translation. JC in his prologue warns us he might change a few things. The ‘adopted’ one then becomes king by implication from the Cornish quoted above which is subtly made plain in the commentary…. as if it had come from the original Cornish manuscript.

If we take into account that the six kings in Henry’s numbering system starts with William the Conqueror and goes up to Henry II, it really looks as if ‘John’ is following Henry Blois’ (Geoffrey’s) or more correctly Merlin’s numbering system. Especially, if one follows the reasoning behind the production of JC…. and Henry Blois posits himself as the seventh. Logically the only way John of Cornwall can have the same numbering system is if Merlin really existed and really wrote these prophecies. If so, why in HRB and VM does the numbering system stop with the sixth King? The simple reason is that John of Cornwall’s rendition is the latest and counts on the rebellion of the Celtic tribes defeating Henry II.

The person in self imposed exile (because of the King Henry II) is more likely to be seen as a ‘returning adopted son’ when the King is defeated if he was a churchman; and especially, if he was rich enough to create a power base and knew every baron in the land. Also this man had a right as the only surviving Grandson of William the Conqueror who would unite the warring factions of the Celts. This was an easy persuasion to make once King Henry was out of the way as Gildas had blamed the Britons downfall on internal battles. Now Henry Blois in his own mind is going to return as the rightful heir to bring together the warring Celts and unify Britain.

This would of course be facilitated if two sets of prophecies upheld that a man on a white horse was returning to be the seventh King. If there was an anecdote which shows Henry Blois had a white horse, I think this would vindicate my assumption that originally the prophecy defined Henry too precisely.

22) JC: *What is his condition? What is the hope for our offspring? Serving or perishing, if he loses his fame or fortune the nobles of England will be weakened.*

Henry’s own epitaph on the Meusan Plates is witness to the similarity with the prophecy above. Henry believes his importance and role that he
foresees for himself in the outcome of English affairs: *May the angel take the giver to Heaven after his gifts, but not just yet, lest England groan for it, since on him it depends for peace or war, agitation or rest.*

JC actually wrote *colles Albani translaterales* which means ‘hills that straddle England,’ but JC in his notes shows the meaning as ‘nobles of England’. Henry had definitely lost his fame. By goading Conan and Cadwallader to rebel against Henry II along with the Scots through these prophecies of Merlin, Henry foresees a way back into power as King once he is ‘adopted’ as the new heir; once Henry II is unseated. In the last prophecy, he sees this as taking place in 1159. Henry Blois now reverts to ‘hocus pocus’ in the next part of the prophecy which correlate to prophecies in HRB and VM. Is it a coincidence that JC asks *what is his condition*, mentioning a loss of fortune?

23) JC: *From the shores of Armonicis (Armorica) the brazen pest will be formed. The winged one of the third nesting will bridle the boar and bring back the time of her ancestor.*

JC lets us know the ‘ancestor’ is Henry Ist and infers the *enea pestis* is ‘war’. Previously, the ‘pest’ had become a ‘lynx’ (being lesser than a Leo) through scribal error or purposeful twisting, but it is Henry’s first introduction of a ‘brazen pest’ just so that it fits with the ‘forged’ from HRB. However, originally in the *Libellus Merlini*, the allusion was to Matilda being bridled (by her husband) *‘quod in Armorico sinu fabricatur’* as Geoffrey V was Count of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine i.e. on the inward parts of Armorica (not the bay). That has now been squewed to allude to Henry II as the ‘pest’. One mind is generating these prophecies and as we have established, it is not Merlin; but someone living in the twelfth century.

In this prophecy, Henry is telling of Matilda’s (JC writes *Aquila*) arrival, but it is interesting that the boar is now here confirmed as being Stephen, which, as I posited earlier; Henry saw himself and Stephen as the offspring of the Boar of Cornwall which is of course the appellation he gives Arthur when pretending to affect prophecies pertaining back to sixth century events in HRB. Henry Blois would have us believe that John of Cornwall in his commentary interprets *Armonicis* as Armon in North Wales. The mention of his brother’s capture at Lincoln is all part of the act of feigning geographical ignorance along with a phony interpretation. However, from the original rendition of this specific prophecy in the *Libellus Merlini* which held continuity into HRB: *A bridle-bit shall be set in her jaws that shall be*
forged in the Bay of Armorica. This shall the Eagle of the broken covenant gild over, and the Eagle shall rejoice in her third nesting... we now have a rendition which refers to Henry II. The way the subjects or icons are swapped and interchanged and the sense warped or completely changed.... implicates a living Henry Blois as the impostor of John of Cornwall as he distorts his own original prophecy.

24)JC: She will make all fall, everything for a second time round. What is left of the year will be turned over, the sceptre of London ruling.

John of Cornwall in the commentary proffers his interpretation that the prophecy speaks of ‘when England was without a king for a year’. Why does no-one seem to find it ridiculous that a prophet in the sixth century called Merlin is focusing on minutiae concerning Henry Blois’ brother? It is quite simple; we know whover wrote the prophecies wrote HRB. Crick understands that the prophecies corroborate the erroneous history of HRB and could only come from one author. How is it that in this case John of Cornwall interprets correctly an obtuse prophecy found nowhere previously and it just happens to refer to Henry’s brother and his capture and refer to the time in the Anarchy when Henry trailed around after a haughty Matilda, while his brother was in prison? (as recorded in HN).

JC goes on to feign ignorance of the interpretation in the commentary, positing that the ‘third’ nest was Matilda’s attempt on the English crown, the ‘second’, her marriage to Geoffrey of Anjou. As we know from the elucidation of prophecies in VM, the ‘third nesting’ is Matilda’s third child, the very cause of Stephen becoming King; and so we can see it is direct obfuscation on Henry’s, part posing as John of Cornwall, to suggest the second or third is anything else but the birth (referred to in the early libellus).... which in fact (by pregnancy worries) led to the circumstance which allowed Henry to manipulate his brother onto the throne.

The commentary is just a ruse so that the JC manuscript seems to be authentically from a different source, other than ‘Geoffrey’... and ‘really genuinely Celtic’ if one is gullible. The logical assumption for the reader of JC is that ‘Geoffrey’s’ assertion in HRB in his dedication to Alexander is true; that he is translating and setting his rustic reed to the writing of these little books, and have interpreted for thee this unknown language. The fact that Merlin’s existence is even substantiated by JC’s supposed Celtic tract supports the erroneous position that Merlin actually existed. Worse is that Henry Blois’ pseudo-history featured in a certain most ancient book in the
British language which ‘Geoffrey’ had borrowed from Walter and was literally translating.

The fact that we are not deluded and Merlin is focusing on the year that came to an end through the Londoners chasing Matilda from London.....is mentioned at the end also, which leads back into the second half of the Anarchy and She will make all fall, everything for a second time round.

25) JC: The first wonder provides the second marvel, the fourth or fifth will soon rise from fortress Britonum, truly the dart will increase to become a lance.

How could scholars really believe John of Cornwall to be translating from an ancient Merlin script. ‘Geoffrey’s’ Merlin did not exist apart from being formed in HRB in one character and another in VM. So why would anyone be credulous and naive to believe Merlin’s prophecies focusing on the ancestors of William the Conqueror (all being numbered or identified), focusing on events in the Anarchy and in the early set, mundane events in Henry Ist er? How is it possible not to understand the improbability of this being a sixth century seer and the likelihood of the author living in the twelfth century?

The first wonder is Matilda and the second her son eventually taking over from Stephen the fourth to become the fifth. JC in the interlinear notes implies ‘fortress Britonum’ is London (Lundonia). The whole point of including this last prophecy is to appear to mirror another prophecy in the HRB where ‘Geoffrey’ (Merlin) has overstated his case: Thenceforward from the first unto the fourth, from the fourth unto the third, from the third unto the second the thumb shall be rolled in oil. The sixth shall overthrow the walls of Hibernia. In actuality when the libellus was written and this prophecy was pronounced c.1144 only the first ‘four’ were mentioned. It just so happens they were anointed in the original Libellus Merlini. Obviously in the updated version the fifth which was Matilda was never anointed, thus not numbered. Is it not by coincidence that in the updated version of the Vulgate prophecies.... no fifth is mentioned and then we have the sixth invading Ireland?

In this HRB prophecy, suspicion might be falling on Henry as to who might be the promulgator of these prophecies. It is too obvious that all the first four were anointed (thumb rolled in oil). Matilda never gets mentioned and we know she was not anointed or referred to as the fifth; just counted as part of the sequence. The sixth is obviously her son Henry II, the new
king; and the Irish issue is fresh in people’s minds. Nobles, clerics and certain of the intelligentsia must be thinking, how is it that Merlin has focused his visions in our era? We could speculate that Henry, imitating the prophecy in HRB, now makes the same passage more obtuse in JC. He decides by way of commentary to obfuscate more by positing that Henry Ist son William is now counted among the kings of England when so obviously he is not.

Henry is clever in writing a commentary which at once makes one believe he, as John of Cornwall, (a mere translator), is as much in the dark as to the interpretation of the prophecies. Yet we know full well John of Cornwall’s prophecies exist side by side with the fabricated prophecies in HRB; they (coincidentally) surface in the same era and were supposedly commissioned by a friend of Henry Blois (just like Suger). If we understand HRB’s prophecies were written by Henry why would someone parallel many of those and write new ones which coincidentally seem to pertain to Henry Blois’ agenda also.

Stephen is definitely not the ‘fifth’, Stephen is the fourth otherwise VM and updated HRB prophecies would not make sense. JC’s suggestion that the fourth is William is purely to obfuscate and prove to the gullible that John himself is not inventing the prophecies. However, if the insurrection had been successful, the ‘seventh’ would be abundantly clear (based on HRB’s numbering) and could then be confirmed pointing to Henry Blois as an adopted Norman. Henry only wanted this to be fully understood and confirmable (by reference to the JC version) once the rebellion was successful. He did not want to be in any way culpable for inciting rebellion by way of prophecy. What one has to understand throughout these prophecies is the changing agenda and how the prophecies are twisted (but not through translation).

26) JC: *Everyone who is entombed in the woeful machine is eliminated, death will be envied; nor will the form of money be simple.*

Henry Blois in the sporadic interlinear commentary of JC, after letting us know the ‘fortress’ is in London, implies the machine is in a ‘towne’ and those living in the machine envy the dead. Henry, the author of both texts, commentary and prophecy, follows on with ‘all will keep their money in his castle’. There is absolutely no way that this money part of the prophecy, correlating tentatively in HRB could ever be linked to the newly introduced ‘machine’. Henry Blois again is purposely obfuscating and affects the aura
of the mystical Merlin ‘looking through a glass darkly’, having an imperfect vision of the future reality.

The prophecy is about the Tower of London. Henry Blois pretending to be Merlin prophesying, affects the position of never having seen a stone castle, so to seem anciently vaticinatory, he calls it a ‘machine’. The tower is mentioned in HRB: ... *a tree will rise up above the Tower of London, that thrusting forth three branches only shall overshadow all the face of the whole island...*

Henry’s fascination with the Tower of London is that it was the first stone castle built in England and it was built by his Grandfather William the Conqueror. He also has a fascination with construction of fortifications as we saw in the GS and comments on Robert of Gloucester’s more recently built castle at Devizes. As the Tower was considered an impregnable fortress in a strategically important position, it also played a vital role in securing London when Stephen first came from the continent when it was in the charge of William de Mandeville. It played an important part in the Anarchy, Mandeville swapping sides and then back again selling his allegiance to Matilda after Stephen was captured in 1141. Once Matilda’s support waned, the following year he resold his loyalty to Stephen. Mandeville was Constable of the Tower and had control of the city and was responsible for levying taxes, enforcing the law and maintaining order. Once freed, Stephen changed this hereditary position to someone more loyal. The part of the prophecy about envying death is pointed out by JC in that those consigned as inmates preferred death to being entombed in its bowels.

27) JC: *When all is done you will learn Cornwall, you will learn to labour; we will be forced again from our grieving cradles as it was with the Saxons.*

This prophecy intonates that the Cornish will again be enslaved by the Normans the commentary giving ‘reproving their greed who take our freedoms’. The prophecy is directly anti-Norman which puts their invasion in exactly the same category as that of the Saxons. Whereas, the *Libellus Merlini* saw the Normans as saviours (while Stephen reigned).... they are now accounted as foreigners now he is dead. This is all part of the effort to entice the Celts to revolt, but is aimed at the Cornish because the prophecy is supposed to have been written in Cornish. The next prophecy establishes that Henry is trying to make his prophecies genuinely appear to have come from Cornish tradition.
28) JC: Why are we so generous? From now on, who shall be considered free. Where we can see Plymouth, whereby the Tamar exits to the south through the high ridges of Brentigie where the Gauls (French/Norman) rule is everywhere.

Here again, Henry is affecting being Cornish by referring to the Norman overlords as Gauls. JC in his commentary says the Tamar separates Cornwall and Devon. Brentigie, however, we are told is a deserted place in Cornwall and ‘called in our language goen bren and in Anglo Saxon Fawi Mor’. We know full well that the commentary is part of the device in which Henry feigns being Cornish and so little credence should be given to Fawi-mor (obviously Bodmin) being synonymous with Goen Bren or Henry’s Brentigie. Henry is merely connecting the name he knows for Bodmin moor with Dartmoor. We know Henry Blois has been to Plympton and he is our only source for Plaustrum which must be some pretence and invention of an archaic name for Plymouth. Plaustrum is usually defined as a cart or Wagon and therefore some commentators have associated Plaustrum with the astrological constellation of the ‘Plough’. In my mind the astrological ‘Plough’ has little to do with where the Tamar exits or Brentegia. I believe Henry is trying to imply it is the ancient name for Plymouth which was Plymentun c. 900.

Henry, in the GS, calls Plympton Plintona. Henry, in the GS, gives a detailed account (which must be eyewitness) about a large body of archers arriving at Plympton at dawn and taking Baldwin’s castle there by surprise. Henry knows this area and by the GS description knows the locale from the tribulations in settling the unrest in early 1136 when his brother first came to the throne. South Brent and Brent moor are on the southern part of Dartmoor and is probably from where Henry derived his name Brentigie for Dartmoor. The River Tavy is one of the main tributaries running down from Dartmoor and joining the Tamar at Plymouth. Making a pretence of being Cornish, Henry Blois says the area is dominated by French people; and whether Angevin or supporters of Stephen, Henry affects a collective name of Frenchmen (Gauls), just as a Devonian or Cornish native would perceive them. Henry attempts to feign empathy with the southern inhabitants so that the manuscript appears to be not only translated by a Cornishman but also originated from a Celtic background which has the vestiges of Brittonic names embedded in the text.
29) JC: If you wish to live on Oh Queen! you will need to plough and sow; At which cost the cats trap you and your goats stirring the winds of madness and the rebellion of every one of your citizens since you were woefully afflicted and enraged by the Thunderer.

HRB: Wherefore the vengeance of the Thunderer shall overtake him, for that every field shall fail the tiller of the soil.

Again, this is hard to translate.... to make sense, as it is all part of the salad. The Queen would appear to be in reference to Matilda and JC's commentary does not help much in clarifying the issue; but we are told that Merlin's word 'Ventorum' was awel garu or the wild wind. The ploy is of course to have the reader believe the document is a direct translation of Merlin's. The prophecy was created to mirror words like the Thunderer (God) found in the previous version and probably has no great purport but is mere skimble skamble about how Matildas citizens rebelled which we get from GS and have covered already; but Henry understood she was woefully afflicted with a dreadful haughtiness which became her downfall, so it would seem the thunderer may be God's judgements on her. Obviously the earlier prophecy that this is attempting to mirror in word only applied to a confirmation from Henry to Stephen of events happening, i.e. fields were empty due to the Anarchy and again in GS Henry explains all of Stephen’s misfortune as God’s judgements on him.

30) JC: Divided are the poor people not esteemed; the popular man of the people is approved and during that time he does not keep his vows.

It is not coincidence that much of the prophecy in HRB and VM is about Stephen and Matilda. What is stranger (if JC were truly genuine) is that the same sentiments found in JC are found in GS. Henry makes plain what he sees as the fault in his brother in GS. Stephen did not keep his vows. Henry pretends as JC that Stephen was approved as a popular man of the people. During the anarchy the peasants’ ‘allegiances’ were divided and were dependent upon who the nearest baron was and where his allegiance lay.

31) JC: Religion weeps, those who wear the cloth pray in vain. Thou who makes the heavens revolve, hear us! Thou who wields the thunderbolts, hear us!

Throughout the Anarchy there was decimation of the churches. Is it not strange how Merlin is concerned about the changing of Sees, palliums, the state of religion, legates, archbishoprics, Winchester’s Holy hole and now
priests prayers being heard? One might be tempted to think that the author of Merlin was a twelfth century cleric. So was ‘Geoffrey’!!!

In the following prophecy, we have the defining prophecy. Do not be fooled into thinking any of these are real prophecies. Henry Blois included this in HRB believing the Irish expedition was about to take place. This could in no way be Celtic by translation and most certainly is not a prophetic word from antiquity.

32) JC: *Under the western sun Ireland (Ybernia) will fall to the Sixth.*

One will find that nearly all sensible commentators assume this to be an insertion in JC because they are taken in by the ruse that JC’s rendition was derived from a Cornish version of Merlin prophecies. It is astounding that scholars don’t apply the same skepticism to those prophecies thought to be generated by Geoffrey. The same statement is found in HRB, VM, JC and the interpolation into Orderic. One knows now that all these versions (even the interpolation into Orderic) is post 1155. One would have to be dim to believe this prophecy was truly a prediction.... given the nature of the rest of the prophecies and for the most part their focus on events concerning Henry Blois’ family and the Anarchy.

This prophecy was the one prophecy with which Henry was to establish Merlin as a seer into the future because at publication of Vulgate HRB in 1155 the event had not transpired. Even more conclusive in adding to the public delusion (contemporary and in posterity) was the fact that many of the other prophecies concerning the Anarchy had also been foreseen by Merlin. This backdating effect, giving the illusion of genuine prophecy, can only be believed by contemporary readers and posterity, by what was avowed in the dedications to dedicatees all of whom were already dead and none ever read what was dedicated to them. In other words, the date is assumed by belief that the dedicatees were alive at the time the dedication of HRB was written. The sixth in Ireland prophecy was updated included in VM around 1156 and also interpolated into Orderic sometime after 1155 as I have covered. However, I have dated JC to be subsequent to these works; written around 1157 as the reader will realize shortly. The VM concurs with JC in the aim that it is intended to incite rebellion; but only JC goes as far as to proffer Henry Blois’s candidacy for the throne as the seventh King.

33) JC: *To the West (Western wind) the descendants of the North reach out.*

Henry Blois, is re-iterating what he believes is a certain fact.... having heard it as a plan which was agreed upon at the council in Winchester in
1155 at Michaelmass and Henry had no reason to understand that the plan would not be put into action. JC in the commentary spells out the phony vaticinatory symbolism supposedly derived from Aquilonaris or Aquilonius both having a connotation of ‘North’, we are told now symbolizes the Normans; hence *Aquilone creati* are Normans; a name from antiquity and the nation of Neustria. This is invention of course by the master of invention; a hocus pocus of ‘Northmen’ and certainly not a deduction of John of Cornwall. The prophecy is a new (corroborative) invention and so is unsurprisingly not mentioned by Merlin in connection to the Irish campaign in either HRB, VM or in the interpolation into Orderic .... and does indicate that JC prophecies were the last to be created.

34) JC: *and why is it so they are fatally hung in a row at the castle and a lawful belonging made possible the payment of the fare for the sea passage.*

It is difficult to know what Henry has in mind here. JC’S explanation of *Naulum* is ‘Precium mais’ and has nothing to do with financing the Ireland affair. This prophecy may be about some personal detail which has not been related by chroniclers which relates to the seizing of Henry Blois’ castles while he was in self-imposed exile at Clugny. I think one incident is specified by a chronicler where a castle of Henry’s did not surrender; and when besieged, the occupants were eventually hanged for resisting the King. Henry is also thinking that the trip to Ireland has been financed from the seizure of his castles; his ‘lawful belongings’. Some castles were destroyed.

Henry Blois knew that such highly specific details would cause worry to Henry II when he read them especially if the castles ‘lawfully belonged’. King Henry II had carefully studied Roman history. He had noted the way Emperor Augustus had successfully managed to gain control over the Roman Empire and realised, like Augustus, his first task must be to tackle those that had the power to remove him. This is why Henry Blois had indeed fled without licence from a Devon or Cornish port to land at Mont. St Michel without passing through Normandy. All his moveable wealth had gone before him transported to Clugny by Peter the Venerable.

Henry got the gist of what was going to happen to him at the council of Winchester when he got told by Henry II to hand over his castles. It is obviously one of these Castles at which occupants loyal to him got hung in a row to which the prophecy alludes, but I have not found this specific event written by a chronicler. Henry himself in his *apologia* of GS does not
express his anger at the loss of all that property; and on his return in 1158 all had been acquired or burnt by King Henry II during his exile.

JC’s seeming innocence at the interpretation is conveyed as he pretends in his commentary to interpret the castle as that of a ‘fatal castle’ which in English is called Ashbiri. Henry Blois in a pretence gets his message across to Henry II, but gives the appearance that the castle referred to is that of King Alfred’s at Ashbury; foreseen by Merlin. King Alfred won a great victory against the Danes at the Battle of Ashdown, in AD 871 at Ashberry camp in Oxfordshire. Henry then goes further in providing erroneous clues that the castle is synonymous with Kair Belli or Castel uchel coed, the ‘castle in the wood’. Is this Henry’s castle at Kidwelly?

35) JC: Even more controversial is that piety approves his raising to arms leaving the walls destitute, turning forests into plains, he will lay bare the hills and renew the laws and regulations. He who at first had his wings clipped from around his sides, now has his hair set like a lion’s mane and having obtained the peoples affection shall fly (high) up to the highlands, for the holy men are separated from their temples, lest the Dragon kings send out the watchmen into the pastures.

We are pointed in the right direction by JC’s commentary that this prophecy pertains to Henry II. Certainly, this did not need establishing nor pointing out to his contemporary audience. The ‘forest into plains’ allusion is matched to the sixth in Ireland prophecy in HRB and VM.... so we know what HenryBlois in the JC version is alluding to. What Henry finds controversial is that ‘piety’ i.e. the popes Laudabiliter approves of the invasion of Ireland. There are two scenarios here that the prophecy alludes to. Firstly, the reference is to the young Henry Fitz Empress who in the beginning had his wings clipped but then went up to Scotland and was knighted by his Uncle.

There is only one holy man separated from his temple that Henry Blois is concerned about and that is the bishop of Winchester on the continent at Clugny. The tone is very anti Henry II. Again, I stress that this is not from a Cornish angle and specifically not ancient.... but specifically from the hand of Henry Blois; politically motivated and intended for the public domain. Secondly, Henry Blois as JC is alluding to Henry II leaving the Britain and

769 The Laudabiliter was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry II the right to assume control over Ireland.
going to Ireland raising to arms leaving the walls destitute i.e open to Henry to come back. I am fairly sure this was his plan when he left. To keep his castles loyal to him until Henry II left for Ireland and then He would come back and renew the laws and regulations. He who at first had his wings clipped from around his sides, now has his hair set like a lion’s mane and having obtained the peoples affection shall fly (high) up to the highlands, for the holy men are separated from their temples, lest the Dragon kings send out the watchmen into the pastures. One can take a pick at either option; but when one considers the next verse:

36) JC: Cities and gems are profitably fitted out by his kindness, and to his virgins, gifts are distributed happily.

Henry Blois contributed much to architecture in England. It is this rebuild of Winchester along with costly gifts he sees as an act of kindness as is made out in the epitaph on the Meusan plate. In regard to gems he gave one to St Albans and also feigned the find of a gem at Glastonbury which supposedly had been hidden there and belonged to St David (but more probably came from Waltham). I believe these and other gems possibly from Hyde are the gems he refers to. The Virgins allude to the nunnery at Winchester set up by him that he has specifically donated to. The ‘Gifts’ in general ring true of his epitaph on the Meusan plates where Henry is ‘giving gifts’.

37) JC: Out of which he will ask one of them to gladly marry himself.

Being highly speculative, I would say Henry Blois has fallen for a nun having just alluded to virgins and possible gifts to the nunnery he established at Winchester. Henry envisages himself returning to England as an adopted son a churchman and rightful ruler. However, in practical terms, one must have an Heir or the dreaded cycle of the Anarchy would repeat itself. So Henry finds the solution by predicting that the adopted son would ask a nun to marry him and then again what was fated in prediction had become reality and therefore Henry becomes the rightful ruler of Britain.

38) JC: This will be brief in his hastening years, for the little ones.

Henry Blois is putting this in the public domain so that when the time comes and the prophecy has come to fruition and he becomes king, he can marry and create an heir (in his hastening years); and guess what: the great prophet Merlin has foreseen it all. Henry Blois has this all mapped out in his
mind but alas as history revealed Henry II was not deposed because he made a pact with Conan and Cadwallader.

39) JC: Gone are the days of the Lynx. The German worm will be ashamed, you and your gods are ended and devoured by ours.

Henry Blois associates the lynx with Henry II, so we cannot get clearer than this. Henry is definitely thinking Henry II will be beated and de throned by the Celts as predicted in the updated prophecies of HRB, VM and now JC. Henry is likening or confusing the reader into thinking the reference is mixed up with prophecies concerning the Saxons as it was in the originall libellus Merlini where the Saxons’ downfall was predicted. But for those of his audience who are perceptive reading the JC prophecies the lynx can only be Henry II and now ‘his days are gone’. Henry wants the Scots, the Welsh the Cornish, and the Bretons to understand this is what will happen should they rebel i.e. ‘our’ God’s will rule.

40) JC: These rages will be of his own making. Why are the Normans drawn out so slowly?

We know in the early Libellus Merlini version (when Henry’s brother Stephen was alive), the Normans were saviours. Now the lynx’s days are hoped to be over by our author and in keeping with Merlin’s nationalistic tendencies, the Normans are drawn out of the land and Merlin even calls them foreigners now. How else, but to explain this volte face except through Henry inciting rebellion!!

Henry Blois is still referring to King Henry II. He appeals to the Celts (Scottish, Cornish, Welsh and Breton) to get rid of the Normans. Speaking as a native Briton of course in the guise of Merlin he asks.... why it is that it takes the Celts so long to rid themselves of the Normans. None of the Celts would be chosen as a future King because none of them would ever agree if the rebellion did ever succeed. This is why Henry sees himself as the perfect candidate to take over the throne and bring ‘peace’ to Britain.

41) JC: like an old buttress, Anglia will put on its old name. This is how it is, may my race exterminate theirs.

Henry Blois speaking in character as Merlin, harks back to the days when Britain was named of Brutus i.e. Britain.... not named of the Angles i.e. England. As Merlin, Henry feigns that the Celts are ‘his’ race. He makes it perfectly clear now of his intention to get rid of Henry II by inciting Conan and Cadwallader and returning the name of the nation to Briton as it used to be named from Brutus.
42) JC: May the weather be fine for Conan to sail on the waves; may Kadwalader be on his side against those who command to the East.

May there also be no contention about Henry Blois’ motives. As we have covered already, it is Conan IV that Henry Blois sees as the person to fight alongside the Welsh Kadwallader to re-establish the ‘Crown of Brutus’ as it plain in updated HRB and VM. (Originally, as we have covered, Conan would have been Cynan in the *Libellus Merlini*). Henry Blois sees himself as the powerbroker who brings Conan from Brittany together with Welsh and Scots under one crown.

HRB: Cadwallader shall call unto Conan, and shall receive Albany to his fellowship. Then shall there be slaughter of the foreigners: then shall the rivers run blood: then shall gush forth the fountains of Armorica and shall be crowned with the diadem of Brutus. Cambria shall be filled with gladness and the oaks of Cornwall shall wax green. The island shall be called by the name of Brutus and the name given by foreigners shall be done away.

VM: it is the will of the highest Judge that the Britons shall through weakness lose their noble kingdom for a long time, until Conan shall come in his chariot from Brittany, and Cadwalader the venerated leader of the Welsh, who shall join together Scots and Cumbrians (Welsh), Cornishmen and men of Brittany in a firm league, and shall return to their people their lost crown, expelling the enemy and renewing the times of Brutus...

The confusion of course is one of conflation and caused purposefully by Henry Blois. Welsh poetry\(^{770}\) possibly from the tenth century has Cynan and Cadwaladr as restorers of British sovereignty and as conquerors of the Saxons, but the Welsh poetry does not have Cynan hailing from Brittany. This contortion is left to ‘Merlin’.

Conan had inherited the title Earl of Richmond from his father Alan the Black and became duke of Brittany when his mother died in 1156. This in conjunction with the final prophecy of JC helps to date JC to late 1157 or early 1158. By the end of 1158, Henry II finally received submission, from Conan of Brittany as Robert of Torigni relates. This was the end of Henry Blois’ attempt at sedition and he returned to Winchester; yet he had already released the date at which he thought Conan and Cadwalader would have beaten the Normans/Plantagenets out of Britain.

\(^{770}\)Armes Prydein, Williams 11, 89, 163, 182.
Henry Blois as the ‘adopted venerable old man’ would have taken rule as the seventh king. Even though a number of Welsh Myrddin poems put Cynan and Cadwalader as allies, it is fortuitous for Henry Blois in his devise of conflation between Cynan and Conan. Certainly Conan comes from Armorica if he needs fair weather to sail, but Welsh Cynan did not come from Brittany. In HRB however, Cynan Meiriadog was ancestor to the kings of Brittany and an ally of Maximian, who was rewarded by him with the lands of Brittany. It is only when sedition is on Henry Blois’ mind that contemporary Conan is purposefully conflated with Cynan of old.

43) JC: The face of the knight on a snowy white horse as a taskmaster of so many together, he officiates the changes to the course of the Perironis, with his white staff held in the middle, the river flow circulates around as he measures out the place for the Mill. \textit{Oris eques niuei niueo dans lora iugali totus in officio Perironis gurgite uerso.}

With the translation as I have rendered it (probably not well), it sounds like an engineering feat. However, we are now getting closer to my suggestion which posits that Henry Blois is the ‘white horseman’ and we shall get to Perironis shortly. The reader will remember in the translation of JC, which I have numbered 21 above previously.... that the adopted venerable old man is walking up and down where the ‘Perironis’ springs up. Then in the HRB, which for consistency’s sake mirrored what was written in the \textit{Libellus Merlini}, we see the parallel to that which Henry had written originally: \textit{An old man, moreover, snowy white, that sits upon a snow-white horse, shall turn aside the river of Periron and with a white staff shall measure out a mill thereon.}

We are not informed who the horseman is. I linked him tentatively through the ‘glas’ of Hyreglas of Periron to Glastonbury where I suggested Henry Blois built a water driven mill; and therefore the mill’s inclusion in the previous HRB version from the original \textit{Libellus} version. Now, the reader will remember, that in John’s commentary, when the adopted venerable old man or ‘Canus adoptatus’ was mentioned, John tells us in his commentary that in ‘Britannico’ i.e. the Cornish Celtic language, \textit{michtien luchd mal igaset} was how he derived ‘Canus adoptatus’. One cannot be derived from the other. So what is Henry up to?

I think the answer lies in the fact that Henry has asked a Cornish monk to translate his new version of Latin prophecies into Cornish or has asked how to translate certain sentences or phrases. This is the reason he is able
to refer back to certain clauses in ‘Britannico’. Now a certain Leon Flobert has found that Myghtern loes avel y Gasek which means ‘a king as grey as his mare’ in today’s Cornish, is what Henry’s michtien luchd mal igaset was meant to convey in John’s commentary. With this in mind we have a completely different take on the personality of the horse rider; he is the King; (and don’t forget the JC set of prophecies is known as the prophecy of the Seven kings).…. and the present ruler at the time of writing is King number six, Henry II.

It seems fair to speculate that Henry Blois sees himself as king number seven. I also believe Perironis was meant to be the river Parrett near Glastonbury on which Henry built a mill, mentioned in its original sense in the Libellus Merlini. The name was changed before publication of the updated prophecies included in Vulgate HRB because the association was too obvious. Given the manner of the trickery and subtlety used so far, I do not think that Perironis existed in Monmouth (Book of Llandaff) or in Dindaiol as suggested randomly by John. However, perhaps the man on the White horse rode up and down the river Parrett, and the same man built a mill on it; and the same man was venerable and hopefully going to be adopted; and at the same time it is implied by what is written in Cornish (which Henry has purposefully included) that this person is a King.

44) JC: After great disasters and so much repeated suffering, the river Severn (Sabrinum) will hear the sound like of old with so many warriors mixing in battle; they will laugh at the river Tavy and the spikes of the twins tents will be ripped up and transplanted.

The Twins tents refer to Waleran de Beaumont, the Count of Meulan who was first Earl of Worcester who died 9 April 1166, and Robert de Beaumont who was the second Earl of Leicester and was Justiciar of England between 1155–1168. He died 5 April 1168. These Twins were the bain of Henry Blois life. They had affected the decision to make Theobald of Bec Archbishop of Canterbury and had turned King Stephen against Henry Blois. Henry Blois hated these twins and like others he disliked, he made Waleran a dedicatee of HRB. It is hardly surprising he sees their lives being ripped up and transplanted back to Normandy. The Beaumont twins through pressures on their Norman lands, defected and took up with Henry Fitz Empress on his return to England. Maybe these pivotal players in the
Anarchy were the twins whose tents (lands/loyalties) were transplanted. Southern Wales was in flux between Norman and Welsh forces and the southern side of the Severn was also likewise with Angevin supporters. Henry Blois foresees his predicted rebellion of the Welsh and Cornish coming to fruition. The river Tavy is known by Henry Blois as it runs down as a tributary to the Tamar into Plymouth and is mentioned because the Cornish are joined in this supposed rebellion about to take place and Henry predicts laughter once the battle is fought. Henry knew this area and knew Dartmoor as Brentigia. He is includes the name Tavy to give the appearance of translation from the Cornish or Dumnonian document which has localised names in it (and probably to conflate with Teiffi).

45) JC: Firstly payment is due to Reont; then elsewhere. Spears, stakes, swords and arrows shall the foreign enemy receive in their warm ribs. Their blood will flow and discolour the rivers, the waves in the current will be joyous and the happy sand banks will testify to it.

We know the name Reont came from Welsh literature and Henry now applies it to Cornwall. The reason for including this prophecy is that it provides a generalised assertion that the rebellion will start in Cornwall and spread. This is supposedly where Henry imagines Conan will land in his ships. The intention is to bolster confidence in the rebellion.

46) JC: It would have been preferable if the Teuton tyrants (Saxons) had yielded long ago. Those who were strengthened with horses and held well in close quarters with their lances, they vanquished those who yielded and left behind only a few to torment. Oh Shame on us. Out of eighteen thousand who were there moments before, four remained to turn their backs and flee in disgrace.

The Prophesy of Britain or Armes Prydein, is an early 10th-century Welsh prophetic poem from the Book of Taliesin as we have covered previously. The exact figure of eighteen thousand and the four remaining derive from the poem. It is not coincidence that Henry Blois had used this source as its sentiments coincided with his agenda of seeming empathetic with the Briton demise. In a rousing style, characteristic of Welsh heroic poetry, the poem describes a future where all of the Brythonic peoples are allied together, succeeding in driving the Anglo-Saxons from Britain forever.
Henry’s gambit is to use this Brythonic resentment to foreign occupation to incite rebellion against Henry II; but his aim was to use this prophetic hope expressed in the poem as a means to carry forward his agenda. Yet, it was necessary to hide his intentions by making it seem as if he is just paralleling or reiterating the hope of the poem. More correctly, the poem supposedly reflects the sentiment of a much older Merlin tradition. The reader of ‘Geoffrey’s’ prophecies is confused by a pretence of referring to the Saxons; a purposeful conflation. This in no way diminishes but parallels the contemporary sentiment held against the Norman invaders; but, by naming Cadwalladr and Conan, Henry brings the prophecy of sedition into contemporaneity with his era. The *Armes Prydein* is also significant as one of the earliest mentions of the prophet Myrddin Wyllt and it is probably where Henry derived his Merlin. We should also consider Henry being aware of this literature in the construction of VM where Taliesin is a friend of Merlin but even accompanies Arthur and Barinthus to *Insulam pomorum*.

47) JC: *This is what Venedotia (north Wales) wishes for, to flourish again with a glittering leader of the people; one who brings them together. Women will exchange their fleeces for purple cloth; Men will wear the silver which was stolen from Urbs Legionum.*

I hope now the reader is no longer taken in by the format in which Henry interweaves segments of his prophecies together from various versions and injects totally new meaning into some. It should be noted the new material is usually connected to the new agenda. The mention of Urbs Legionum or Caerleon, the Arthurian centre of government, whose glory and importance were entirely fabricated by ‘Geoffrey’, shows that ‘Geoffrey and John’ have a common author in Henry Blois.

We must remember that even though ‘Geoffrey’ cast a spell on the ninth city named in Nennius, *the City of Legion which is called Cair Lion*; we still should be aware that Arthur’s royal court there with all kings and leaders in subjection is historical piffle. So, why is John advocating a location of Arthurian splendour when we know it is a ‘Geoffrey’ invention? Why is it mixed in with the verse with the dress code imagery from the *Libellus Merlini* which Suger had? The only answer is that ‘Geoffrey’ who wrote the Arthuriana (who we know by the corroboration of backward looking spurious history) also wrote the prophecies…. and this must also be the person inventing the John of Cornwall prophecies. It is not ‘Geoffrey’ but Henry. However, even if Nennius did name the two places as coinciding
(because the legions wintered in ‘Car Lion’, it was ‘Geoffrey’ who brought both to fame. How could John possibly be translating a genuine Cornish Merlin script? If John was genuinely translating a Cornish tract, how is it that it correlates with ‘Geoffrey’s’ fantasia.

It does not take too much imagination to work out who might be the ‘glittering leader’ he has in mind, once Conan and Cadwaladr have been convinced to form an alliance and rout the Norman King Henry II. This prophecy is in fact a harangue in prophetic form to uplift the Brythonic people to realize Henry Blois’ will, with the admonishment of a better living standard (if they would only take up the fight); to flourish again from foreign suppression.

48) JC: The valleys shall rise up and the oaks too shall be verdant; the mountains of Arfon will reach the clouds with their peaks.

This is just Mumbo Jumbo prophecy employing biblical motifs of valleys and mountains with a biblical sounding grandeur and expectation. If Merlin had existed and Cornish John was really translating Merlin’s words, why would he miss the fact that the oaks were Cornish as in HRB? As the reader will remember from VM, Henry was in fact the oak when he had squewed the prophecy so that his brother would represent the boar of Brittany: The Boar of Brittany, protected by an aged oak, takes away the moon, brandishing swords behind her back. The moon of course is Matilda. The mediaeval Welsh cantref of Arfon however, is in north-west Wales opposite Anglesey and was the core of the Kingdom of Gwynedd and later became part of Caernarvonshire.

49) JC: Posterity will raise up the royal diadem of the Britons, the stature of our wonderful leader will merit deserved praise in the middle of the wonderful two who have granted him by virtue this benefit.

If the reader is still in doubt that Henry is improvising to make sure his Celtic audience understands that his future position has been foreseen by Merlin, we should understand that Henry Blois takes up the crown of the Britons as a ‘wonderful leader’ raised there by Conan and Cadwaladr as he ascends the throne as the adopted venerable old man. Is there any further doubt that JC has been written with a political motive in mind. How is it that this incitement to rebellion which is in VM and Vulgate HRB prophecies now has a specified unifier of the people; he is venerable and going to be adopted and the two leaders appealed to carry out this rebellion (we are forewarned) have granted this ‘wonderful leader’ the crown ‘granted him
by virtue’. Obviously ‘Geoffrey’ could not have come up with all this additional persuasive material for the sake of consistency. This grandiose future could never have been portrayed as the squewing had already caused enough confusion and contradiction from the original *Libellus Merlini* prophecies. The idea of Henry Blois as future King could only be conveyed through a new set of prophecies and this is why Henry has decided to come up with the JC version. To all my critics who think I just account every manuscript in the twelfth century to have been written by Henry Blois I would suggest that in this specific example they would give me the benefit of the doubt. Many of the critics already are scholars who would doubtless believe this manuscript is genuine Celtic prophetic material.

50) JC: Three hundred and sixty three years will be the finish of these years when the heavens will be free and the sky brightly coloured. Here endeth the prophecy of Ambrosius Merlinus concerning the Seven Kings.

Why does John see fit to Latinize Merlin’s name, who, (if he had any substance), so readily accepts ‘Geoffrey’ s version of the Nennian boy prophet into Ambrosius. We know in Gildas’ *De Excidio Britanniae* where Ambrosius Aurelianus organized a British resistance is where ‘Geoffrey’ does his best to conflate Ambrosius with Arthur. When Geoffrey invents Merlin he even has the audacity to conflate Merlin with the name ‘Ambrosius’ Merlinus. We know Nennius has Badon as the place of King Arthur’s last battle and Ambrosius Aurelianus fought at Badon. So if Merlin Ambrosius is a ‘Geoffrey’ invention’; how is it at all possible that ‘John of Cornwall’ is translating a book which could not have been written.... because logically, the person purported to have written it is an invention. Henry Blois is the only person who foresees himself as the seventh King. The whole tract is a clever hoax.

Finally, to put Henry Blois chronology in perspective and to show how I am not mistaken that he is behind the prediction of himself as the seventh King.... let us see how he arrives at the figure of three hundred and sixty three years.

King Offa ruled from 757-796 and was the last of the house of Mercia. It is the formation of the house of Wessex from which Henry Blois starts his three hundred and sixty three years until he foresees that he is going to take the throne of England as the seventh king.... the adopted venerable old man. Henry sees himself as a continuation of his Grandfather’s line superseding the house of Wessex. So, from 796 in Henry’s mind when the
Britons were over run by the Saxons, the house of Wessex ruled until the Danes came. From 1016-1035 Cnut ruled the house of Denmark with Harold Harefoot taking over.... up until 1040. Harthacanut then ruled from 1040-1042 before rule returned to the house of Wessex with Edward the Confessor, followed by Harold II, until the battle of Hastings in 1066.

From then on, commencing with Henry Blois’ Grandfather, the Normans ruled England and Wales and Henry, prophesying up to his own era of the composition of the JC prophecies, foresees himself as the Seventh king; the natural successor of this line of Kings. If we fast forward 363 years (Three hundred and sixty three years will be the finish of these years) from the end of Offa’s rule i.e. the start of the house of Wessex, up until when Henry’s prophecy is supposed to come to fruition, we arrive at the year 1159. It is for this reason I posited an 1157 date for composing JC. We can see why the manuscript is called ‘The prophecy of the seven Kings’. Henry Blois while still at Clugny hoped that by his prediction and the success of the Celtic rebellion, all and sundry would recognise the natural successor as Henry Blois, the ‘venerable old man’, the ‘adopted one’; especially as the Briton Merlin had foreseen it and therefore it was fated. Henry was to be adopted!

As I have already stated: ‘there is no objectivity found in the vain’. Henry was out of the country at the time of the rebel lion and if the rebellion had succeeded, Henry Blois would have been the blameless choice of Leader to unite the Celts. Or at least that is how Henry saw the situation and he had even estimated a timeline for all his dreams to come to fruition.

As we know, Henry’s scheming seditious plot never came to fruition. Conan submitted in 1158 and Henry Blois under intense pressure, returned to England under the orders of the king. However, Henry Blois had stirred up the Welsh and Henry II had continual problems with them.... and in future decisions was always aware of this prophecy and made sure it never came true. We can see by Theobald of Bec’s letters in (Note 1) that Henry Blois is worried about his return to England and we know he has desperately attempted to avoid his authorship of these prophecies being unveiled through the back dating of dedications, the HRB colophon, and even going to the extent of inventing Gaimar’s epilogue. He also has

---

771 Contrary to the attitude put forward in his pseudo-history created for Matilda which had many fictitious Queens, and originally posited that the Britons held the Trojan custom of primogeniture, this changed as his brother became King. Henry’s later attitude was that the hereditary Norman line was Patriarchal since he was not writing now for a future Queen. This is Tatlock’s confusion of ‘Geoffrey’s’ seeming inconsistency
provided a complete persona for Geoffrey. If Henry had been found as the author of these prophecies, he would have been put to death and ridiculed.

Modern scholars’ view that both ‘Geoffrey’ and ‘John’ have two Brittonic versions of a real *Libellus Merlin* and their prophecies are derived from a common exemplar is a ridiculous notion, once Henry Blois is recognised as the author. Myrddin may well have prophesied, but both of ‘Geoffrey’s’ and ‘John’s’ versions of prophecies were concocted from the mind of Henry Blois for political ends. The prophecies in HRB, VM, and JC are not prophecies and the two Merlin’s as presented by ‘Geoffrey’ are entirely concocted from the mind of Henry Blois. John’s Cornish glosses are a philological hoax designed to corroborate ‘Geoffrey’s’ position of a Brythonic tradition and the prophecies were constructed for political purposes. They have no validity as prophecies and any notion put forward that they have any predictive ability in the events of insular Britain beyond 1159 is plainly unfounded.

One accomplishment achieved as a by-product of the composition of JC, VM and the updated HRB prophecies... is in bolstering ‘Geoffrey’s’ status as an historian. Henry’s whole edifice corroborates his assertion that all information is derived from an ancient source. When William of Malmesbury’s DA is also employed we can see how scholars have been unable to see the wood for the trees because no-one could imagine a corroborative fraud on this scale. This is the foundation upon which the edifice of HRB and the *Matter of Britain* is built. Is it not strange that Gildas, Bede, nor Nennius had come across this ancient source or material before ‘Geoffrey’?

When Henry returns to England in 1158 all of this material which created a fictional history for Britain (this monstrous lie of Henry’s) is now mixed with his real Brythonic source for inspiring his greatest accomplishment i.e. The Melkin prophecy.

Henry’s Grail material melded with his previous lie. It became known as the *Matter of Britain* and most definitely had an architect up to the point where continuators of Grail material and monk craft, furthering Glastonburyana, carried on from Henry’s propaganda concerning King Arthur and Joseph of Arimathea. The one vital fact that has a major bearing on the rest of our investigation is that instead of fabricating history and passing it off as truth, where Joseph is concerned, Henry Blois uses the truth contained within the Prophecy of Melkin and passes it off as a tale.
Chapter 31

The Grail legends

Much has been written on the Grail legends and the Grail’s connection to Arthur and Joseph. The conundrum has been the connection between the Grail, Arthur and Joseph and what makes them all common to Glastonbury. We have two options; Firstly, it seems to me one could not add more with the hope of elucidating the shambolic theories which currently exist without understanding their commonality being derived from Henry Blois. Secondly we could resign ourselves to the scholastic considered opinion that the salad made itself by a fortuitous convergence of factors. What I have attempted to elucidate up to the moment is Henry’s connection to the *Matter of Britain*, but unless modern researchers accept that Henry Blois is the author of the HRB and the initiator of the Grail legends…. there will be no further understanding of the relationship between our three genres. These obviously link through the prophecy of Melkin and Henry Blois’ knowledge of it, which effected events and lore at Glastonbury. The modern consensus and acceptance of what appears to be random associations will remain a quagmire of pick and mix theories as long as certain baseless *a priori* positions are defended by modern scholars.

Much of the piecing together relies upon our current experts pet theories and specifically some erroneous assumptions have dated certain manuscripts which has made it less likely to uncover that Henry Blois could
have been the originator of the *Matter of Britain*, i.e. it is a common assumption that Chrétien is the first to mention the Grail in writing. But Chrétien is surely not the first. This for the main part is based upon Robert de Boron’s mention of Chrétien in his manuscript and the presumption indicates that Robert followed or had heard of Chrétien’s lead concerning the Grail. It is a fact that both Robert and Chrétien heard the same story from Bleheris. Bleheris could only have promulgated Grail legend up to 1170 as he spent the last year of his life blind at Winchester. Any scholar who thinks that the initial Grail legends were formed after this date is seriously deluded.

The guesswork not only denies Henry Blois as the originating author of Grail literature but supplies no comprehensive theory as to how these *histoires* were transmitted to Chrétien or who wrote the book Chrétien attests to. We should also not forget that Henry Blois hiding his identity as the promulgator of the initial Grail legends was patron to Gerald.... and Giraldus Cambrensis’ Bledhericus is the ‘famosus ille fabulator’ who had lived "shortly before our time".

It would be a madness to think that a *fortuitous convergence of factors* made Chrétien randomly connect the ‘Glass’ of Glastonbury and coincidentally find it transliterated in French. It is hard not to see that Chrétien de Troyes has heard a version from Henry Blois or *Maistre Blehis* when in *Erec* at King Arthur’s court Erec is married by the Archbishop of Canterbury in front of guests:

> Along with those whom I have just mentioned came Maheloas, a great baron, lord of the Isle of Voirre. In this island no thunder is heard, no lightning strikes, nor tempests rage, nor do toads or serpents exist there, nor is it ever too hot or too cold. Graislemier of Fine Posterne brought twenty companions, and had with him his brother Guigomar, lord of the Isle of Avalon. Of the latter we have heard it said that he was a friend of Morgan the Fay, and such he was in very truth. Davit of Tintagel came, who never suffered woe or grief.

It would also seem beyond the bounds of coincidence that the little known insular VM story of Merlin’s madness where Morgan is mentioned on *Insula Pomorum*, just happens to be a friend of Guigomar Lord of Avalon.

---

Are we supposed to believe this has nothing to do with Master Blihis? Does this coincidence transpire entirely independently in the Chrétien rendition emanating from the court of Champagne where Henry’s two Nephew’s and their wives (known proponents and promulgators of Grail literature) were situated and were known patrons of Chrétien?

One Arthurian episode appears in Caradoc of Llancarfan’s, Life of St. Gildas and also Chrétien de Troyes’ The Knight of the Cart. The fact that it is in a work by Chrétien becomes relevant once we understand that the court of Champagne is hearing of the Grail through a Master Blihis. The point right now is that... it is Arthuriana which is closely connected with Glastonbury, long before the famed discovery of Arthur at Glastonbury.

Chrétien himself testifies to the fact that his knowledge of the Histoires came from Master Blihis. Strangely, Robert de Boron prefixes his own name with the title Meistres in one case followed by ‘Bouron’ and secondly as Messires followed by ‘Beron’. ‘Blihos Bleheris’ is Robert de Boron’s greatest teller of tales at court and also ‘Blaise’ is given the honour of having recorded three of Robert’s Histoires.

Modern scholars misunderstanding of the provenance of Grail literature and their blindness to Henry Blois’ relation to Melkin’s prophecy…. where it is witnessed as ‘Geoffrey’s’ inspiration (and specifically scholars dismissal of the directions to the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea by Melkin’s prophecy), has prevented Joseph or the body of Jesus being re-discovered. Hundreds of ‘experts’ have tested the shroud of Turin which once covered the body of Jesus, yet, not one scholar admits the image was made (formed) in Cedar oil from the human corpse of Jesus as put forward by Goldsworthy. But, without accepting that there was a body of Jesus long after his death, how could experts possibly concede that the shroud image was made over time by the body? They could not.... as this would deny the very essence of Christianity.

One would have to accept the theory that Jesus’ body existed somewhere on earth which goes directly against the eschatology presented in the

---

773 In Chrétien’s Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart, it is fairly obvious that he is supplied the material: Since my lady of Champagne wishes me to undertake to write a romance...... Here Chrétien begins his book about the Knight of the Cart. The material and the treatment of it are given and furnished to him by the Countess, and he is simply trying to carry out her concern and intention..

774 Michael Goldsworthy. And did those feet
Gospels. Scholars deny the image of the Turin Shroud was formed in Cedar oil not because they can definitively say the residue image is not formed from dried Cedar oil and anaerobic bacteria deposits.... but simply because they cannot conceive of the body of Jesus on Burgh Island. The Scientists or experts in this field are totally ignorant that the Templars having discovered the shrouds whereabouts, shortly before they were all exterminated on orders from the pope. The fact that the Shroud of Turin first appeared in the hands of a Margaret de Charney granddaughter of a murdered Templar seems irrelevant. Especially if one cannot conceive of the body of Jesus still being preserved in Cedar oil c.1300AD. What is a fact is that all these Scientists after the tomb is unveiled will concur that it came from Burgh Island and hey presto it will carbon date to c. 35 AD.

We have the same problem also with our expert on Geoffrey. She refuses to accept that HRB and the Merlin prophecies were not authored by Henry Blois. How may we have any real furtherance of understanding of Arthuriana. Shoaf a supposed expert on Arthur also chooses to remain ignorant and like most scholars insults those independent researchers like me who have differing views by dismissing them in a haughty display of arrogance in her ignorance. If Carley refuses to accept that the Melkin prophecy is a real encrypted document then ignorance is the repository of the unconnected.

Nearly every theory put forward to date is conjectural and cannot be tested. Most certainly the theory which puts Joseph of Arimathea on Burgh Island can be. The Devon Archaeological society has taken advice from the ‘expert’. The present Jewish owner of the Island who denies permission for a ground penetrating radar to locate the tomb has been advised by ‘experts’ that there is no merit in such a search. Ironically enough the owner of the Island wants to cover the tomb with 200 Solar panels and the residents of Bigbury are up in arms that it might destroy the ambiance of the Agatha Christie Hotel. What is laughable is that by the time the scholars have understood that Joseph’s relics are on the island, no-one will be able to put a ground penetrating radar over the tomb because it will be covered in panels. The real problem is that the various disciplines of scholastic

775 Goldsworthy indicates that the scientists admit it is an organic resinous residue surrounding the fibres.  
776 Geoffroi De Charney was burned at the stake with Jack de Molay, the final Grand Master of the Templars in 1314.  
777 See image 5
endeavour are so protective of their own specialised domain that the various branches remain insular with no cross-over. Hence our three genres of study remain unconnected.

We can see plainly it is not in the interest of either of Carley or Crick or Cunliffe to expose the truth because the indifference of their so called ‘scholarship’ will be exposed.

A set of events of such importance which would expose the ‘Vatican lie’ of a bodily resurrection is being repressed by the very people who profess to enlighten us through their scholastic efforts? My dissatisfaction at modern scholarship and the establishment’s complacent ignorance having been stated, I hope to elucidate and show the reader how it is that Henry Blois has been able to hide himself as the author of the Matter of Britain while propagating his ethereal propaganda in the trappings of a tale.

Therein is hidden a truth which will change modern religion. The real problem is that no-one wishes to find the bodies for fear of the ramifications. The anonymous author of the primary Grail legends such as Perlesvaus, Chrétien’s Percival and Robert’s source all came from one mind. The elusive Master Blehis, Blihos-Bleheris, or Blaise has purposefully secreted his authorship. He has used the same ploy as ‘Geoffrey’ in advocating a mysterious book from which his authority is derived. The only problem is that it is not a book; the inspiration for Henry Grail is the prophecy of Melkin.

There are only two authors who concern us here regarding the early promulgation of Grail literature. Chrétien de Troyes who was a trouvère at the court of Marie de France at Troyes and Champagne in the heartland of the Blois region; and Robert de Boron, who, as we shall see, is either a

---

778 A recent discovery of a bible dating as far back as 2,000 years turns modern Christianity on its head. The Gospel of Barnabas indicates that Jesus may not have been crucified (or at least lived) and does not claim him to be the son of God, but instead a prophet. It states that the Apostle Paul was “The Impostor.” In the Book of Barnabas, Jesus wasn’t crucified, but ascended to heaven alive, and Judas Iscariot was crucified instead. Not that this is any more accurate than the four gospels, it shows that there was a discrepancy about where the body of Jesus went from a very early date. With Joseph’s connection to Ictis and Melkin’s prophecy directing us to the body of Abbadare, it should not take academia too long to figure out the rest.
pseudonym for Henry Blois or Henry Blois is the direct source of versified material from which a living Robert de Boron transposed into prose his trilogy. At this stage I think we can safely say that ‘The High History’ and *Perlesvaus* derive from Henry. There may never have been a person called Robert de Boron in reality, but we shall get to that shortly. Scholars have always dated Robert’s material after 1191 just because it fits their erroneous theory concerning the appearance of Avalon and Joseph at Glastonbury. Robert’s material was contemporary to Chrétien’s material regardless of when Arthur was exhumed.

It is necessary to understand that Henry Blois was a man of immense power, who, due to his blood line and Norman aristocratic connections, commanded influence through the most powerful courts in both England and on the continent. After the death of his brother Theobald and the Empress Matilda, he was the last surviving grandchild of William the Conqueror.

We have seen how the HRB went through a transition up until its completed Vulgate form in 1155 and to understand its transmission and the capability of Henry Blois to remain in the shadows as the author, we should also understand that Henry held sway over several monastic institutions where monk scribes resided who were conversant in Welsh, Cornish, French and Latin. Because no manuscript was released in the same environs where it had been copied or produced, the likelihood of it being traced back to Henry was reduced. We can look upon Henry as a courier and propagator of his own propaganda through the monastic system and continental courts and in England.

It was possible to spread Arthuriana on the continent which had been transcribed by insular monks and vice versa to spread his French versifications to the Norman aristocracy in Britain without being discovered. A presentation manuscript to a court or to an influential personage could be passed off as an inconsequential gift. Henry nonchalantly could appear as having picked up some manuscript on his travels, or he could disseminate his propaganda by any such deception. In my opinion this is how Helinand in *Froidmont* had heard of the Grail and the story of it from a British monk.

\footnote{It is my opinion that a verse edition of Robert’s four manuscripts once existed which may have come from Henry Blois. The reason for thinking this is because Robert’s work brings together loose ends found in HRB and consolidates Henry’s position concerning the Grail, Joseph, Merlin, Blaise and a host of other loose ends.}
The copying of any amount of manuscripts to most struggling authors like a ‘realistic’ Geoffrey of Monmouth would have been difficult and costly. As we know, the dedications of HRB are falsified retrospectively and the dissemination of the HRB manuscripts was carried out by the wealth of Henry, not by patronage of the dedicatees as is pretended. With Henry’s influence over various scriptoriums full of monks ready to do his bidding, it is not difficult to see how the edifice which eventually was to become the Matter of Britain was made popular initially as the Arthurian epic presented in the latter half of HRB and then popularised by the supposed Wace.

By the time HRB manuscripts were being dedicated to dead people and dead people were being referenced as patrons post 1155…. ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ was also already supposedly dead and no-one could trace him or Walter’s book. There is not a single record of someone talking to a living Geoffrey (excepting the fictitious meeting between him and Theobald of Bec with two spurious witnesses); and any that took offence at what he had written did not comment until after his supposed death.

How the dissemination of Grail literature took off was slightly different in its proliferation because an appetite for Arthurian adventure tales had been prompted by the chivalric Arthur in HRB and by ‘Wace’s’ versification of it. Arthuriana c.1159-60 was now of some renown in aristocratic circles. The real difference in dissemination is that the stories concerning Arthur, his knights, Joseph and the Grail were shorter and were transmitted by conteurs at court in verse rather than incorporated in the all-encompassing vulgate tome of the more highbrow historicity of HRB.

The Grail legend’s popularity was forged not so much through the manuscript but through the trouvère tradition after the initial material had been exposed at the Court of Champagne by Henry. This may well have been carried out by reading from a book to a court audience by someone Henry Blois had employed at court and probably serialised in the longer versions. In the shorter versions like Chretien’s and the various offshoots, by continuators and imporvisors (mangling his tales and mixing his icons, places and personages) these were made shorter. There is even a strong possibility that on occasion Henry disguised himself as a trouvère. It is certain that Henry Blois is the propagator of these stories and therefore even though the evidence in written form suggests that Grail literature
emerged in the 1170’s, the origins through Henry were surely proliferated from 1164-1170. By 1170 Henry Blois was old and blind.

There is reasonable evidence, which we will cover shortly, that Robert de Boron’s three prose works were originally derived from versified originals which were read out at the various courts (including Marie of Champagne’s) and this is how Chrétien first came to hear of the Grail and its connection to Joseph related by Robert’s material.

The very idea of a quest or search for the tomb of Joseph (as we have already covered) was carried out in Montacute by Henry Blois and the fact that the _duo fassula_ is the forerunner or inspiration for the Grail is significant. This possibility of the Melkin prophecy acting as an inspirational template is especially highlighted in Glastonbury’s connection to Henry Blois; Henry’s connection to HRB; and Melkin’s prophecy being connected with Glastonbury and Avalon. All these coincidences must lead one to see that the puzzle that Melkin set posterity is Henry’s blueprint for the idea of a quest or search for the Grail. In other words the prophecy itself is in fact the originator of a quest to find the Island on which the Grail (_duo fassula_) exists. If one can unlock the riddle of the Melkin prophecy, one will find Joseph’s tomb.

For the prophecy to have such ‘coincidence’ in its geometry, it would be astounding, if as Carley suggests, it was put together from various sources. In essence therefore, it would have no cohesion and must be meaningless and yet in reality locates an island in Devon by the data. By whatever method the subsequent material to HRB concerning Arthur, his knights, Joseph and the Grail was transmitted, its initial proliferation in the period from 1159 to 1170 is plainly through the aristocratic court contacts Henry Blois had both in England and France.

If we were to briefly look at the contacts at court where an association to Philip of Flanders is specifically mentioned by Chrétien and of course Marie of France, we can grasp how easy it was for Henry to disseminate his material as his familiar connections were the highest of the aristocracy and they ran the very court milieu where Arthuriana was soaked up.

If for example we take a brief detour to highlight the connections, we see Theobald the Great (Thibaut de Blois 1090–1152), Henry’s brother, who was Count of Blois and of Chartres (as Theobald IV from 1102); and who was Count of Champagne and of Brie as Theobald II from 1125; he held Auxerre, Maligny, Ervy, Troyes, and Châteauvillain as fiefs from Odo II, Duke of
Burgundy. He was of course son of Stephen II, Count of Blois, and Adela of Normandy, also Henry’s mother and father. After Adela’s retirement to Marcigney in 1125, Theobald had rule over the Blois family properties. However, King Louis VII of France became involved in a war with Theobald by permitting Count Raoul I of Vermandois, the seneschal of France, to repudiate his wife Eleanor and to marry Petronilla of Aquitaine, sister of the (then 1137–1152) queen consort of France Eleanor of Aquitaine. The Eleanor who was slighted by Raoul was Theobald’s and Henry Blois’ sister and the insult caused a war which lasted two years from 1142–1144 while Stephen was still alive.

The war was marked by the occupation of Champagne by the royal army and the capture of Vitry-le-François, where many persons perished in the deliberate burning of the church by King Louis. This Ralph I of Vermandois (Raoul) who caused the offence was son of Hugh I, Count of Vermandois, and Adelaide, Countess of Vermandois and paternal grandson of Henry I of France. Ralph’s uncle was Philip I of France. Through him Ralph was a first cousin of Louis VI of France and a first cousin, once removed of Louis VII of France.

Anyway, under pressure from Queen consort Eleanor of Aquitaine, Louis allowed this Ralph to divorce his wife Eleanor, (the said sister to King Stephen, Theobald and Henry) in favor of Eleanor of Aquitaine’s sister, Petronilla of Aquitaine. However, to connect another grandee in the courtly web; Philip of Flanders reign began in 1157, and he became regent for his father, Thierry, who was frequently on crusade. In 1159 Philip married Elisabeth of Vermandois, elder daughter of this count Ralph I of Vermandois and Petronilla of Aquitaine. Now, more importantly and greatly having a bearing on this investigation…. when Louis and Eleanor’s marriage was annulled in 1152 custody of Marie of France and her sister Alix, was awarded to their father, King Louis. As we know, Eleanor of Aquitaine their mother, married Duke Henry, Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy, who later became King Henry II of England.

In 1160, when Marie’s father, King Louis, married Adele of Champagne, he betrothed Marie and Alix (his daughter’s by Eleanor of Aquitaine) to Adele’s brothers, Henry and Theobald V (Henry Blois’ two Nephews) not forgetting Adele of Champagne, was the daughter of Theobald II, Count of Champagne, Henry Blois’ brother.
So, as we have mentioned, Henry Blois was the last survivor of the illustrious Blois brothers and uncle to the young Henry and Theobald and they of course were married to daughters of King Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine before their separation. Now, this is only a small cross reference which shows the coincidences of the names which are linked to the initial propagation of the Grail stories i.e. Eleanor of Aquitaine, Marie of Champagne (Marie of France) and Alix, King Henry II, Philip of Flanders and the count of Poitiers before he became Richard I and their connection to Chrétien and to Henry Blois. The old city of Troyes where Henry Blois’ father had been count, was where Marie held her court, and was the womb of continental Grail literature. It was at Troyes that Chrétien was led to write romances which form the ideals of French chivalry which of course was the zeitgeist of the 1160-70’s.

This fascination with Arthuriana had been brought to the fore by ‘Geoffrey’s’ chivalric Arthur in HRB and flourished in the continental courts after the Anarchy was over when Henry II became King; mainly through the introduction of King Arthur by Henry Blois’ impersonation of Wace.

As an ideal of social conduct, the code of chivalry was the aspiration of the aristocracy, the concept of the "honette homme". That Henry Blois was a part of its emergence is seen in its portrayal by Arthur in HRB upholding its moral code and also by the code of conduct mentioned by Henry Blois as the author of GS; especially escorting Matilda to her brother Robert at the beginning of the Anarchy and such episodes as the jousts before the rout of Winchester. The pastimes of the aristocratic class of readers and courtiers were jousting, hunting, and making love and the poetry of those who entertained them reflected their interests. The descriptions of women famed for their beauty are many throughout Grail literature, but so was the interest of Women in the literature and hence the preponderance of these matters in the poems of love affairs to entertain the leisure hours of such at the court of Marie.

Chrétien’s romances, written in eight-syllable rhyming couplets, treat respectively of Erec and Enide, Cliges, Yvain, and Lancelot, but "Perceval le Gallois", was composed for Philip, Count of Flanders who had given Chretien the source book of the material c1160-70. What we know of Chrétien we learn from his works. The dedication of Lancelot or the

780 See appendix 35
Chevalier de la Charrette informs us the work was composed for Marie de Champagne daughter of Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine. It was Marie who became countess of Champagne by her marriage to Henry’s brother Theobald’s son also called ‘Henri’ in 1164. Therefore we can know Lancelot was composed after that date.

The prologue of Perceval or the Conte du Graal is dedicated to Philippe of Alsace who became Count of Flanders in 1168. However, he could have been referred as Count of Flanders before that date as reign began in 1157, while he acted as regent and co-count for his father.

He died at Acre in 1191 so the Conte du Graal was started between these dates. My guess would be from 1165-69. Marie was widowed from Theobald’s son Henry in 1181 and Philippe of Flanders is known to have proposed marriage to Marie, but this was long after Henry Blois’ death. But still, the proximity of the relationships to the known patrons or propagators must be taken into account when making any conclusions on the provenance of the primal material in Grail literature having come from Henry Blois. Most commentators have expressed the view that this material arrived after 1189 because of the erroneous belief that Avalon at Glastonbury is only possible after Arthur’s unearthing; automatically excluding Henry Blois from being connected with Grail literature.

If we can accept that Henry Blois is the instigator of the Grail legends propagated in various forms, separated by characters, episodes and motifs, yet linked purposefully and loosely corroboratively, we can get a better grasp of the transitions through which the tales have been reworked and how it is that scholarship has been left bewildered.

There can be no understanding of the Grail or the Arthurian and Josephian literature which connects it to Glastonbury without including the name of Henry Blois or Melkin. There is simply no present day credible authority on the Grail; although many would put themselves forward as such in an instant. R.S Loomis is the closest to being accepted an expert, but in his compendium of rationale regarding Arthuriana and Grail literature Henry Blois is not even named. Until scholarship accepts the Prophecy of Melkin as existing in the era of Henry Blois (even though it is not attested until John of Glastonbury’s Cronica) there can be no
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781 Roger Sherman Loomis (October 31, 1887 – October 11, 1966) an American scholar hailed as the foremost authority on medieval and Arthurian literature.
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furtherance in understanding of the provenance of the Grail, Grail Literature or Glastonburyana.\textsuperscript{783}

The fact that one single man has been capable of engineering what became known as the \textit{Matter of Britain} and has been able to keep his identity secret has left all theories which deal with the spawning of Grail literature incomplete. Henry Blois himself was mystified by the item of the Grail (which was based on Melkin’s \textit{duo fassula}). What we know of ‘Geoffrey’s’ methods in his composition of HRB, we can see that there is barely a single item which we cannot trace to another source for its inspiration.

We know by the Meusan plates Henry refers to his own muses. The one story that Tatlock could not find a source for was the story of King Lear but even that has a source and is based on Henry Blois’ own father’s rejection on his return from the crusades in disgrace and thus is of familiar source.

We can trace many of the pivotal parts in the \textit{Matter of Britain} which are inspired by the prophecy of Melkin once it is understood Henry Blois had a copy.\textsuperscript{784} For instance, one might say the most important inspirational part of the Melkin prophecy to influence events in the \textit{Matter of Britain} is the burial of a body to be found in the future on Avalon; the mystical location of an island. The same is of course posited of Joseph’s remains in the original prophecy on Ineswitrin. The forerunner of the Grail itself is the \textit{duo fassula} and the ‘Quest’ for the Grail itself (or Joseph’s tomb) is part of the purport of Melkin’s puzzle. Therefore, it should not come as a shock that Henry’s Graal is directly related to the \textit{duo fassula} (or at least the understanding of it by Henry himself).

Henry's comprehension of Melkin’s words was that there were two ‘vessels,’ one of which held the Lord’s blood. As we know from my previous

\textsuperscript{783} As I have stated, Henry Blois’ use of the Melkin prophecy spawned, not only the sacred vessel, and the search for the vessel, but provided the template for Arthur’s body to be found in the future on Avalon and Britain’s eventual re-instatement to God (once the question is asked in Grail legend or likewise when the \textit{duo fassula} is discovered in the prophecy). Yet, the whole of the \textit{Matter of Britain} is based upon the genuine burial of Joseph on Ineswitrin. The fact that both the prophecy and Joseph become part of Glastonbury’s later lore does not preclude the existence of the prophecy in the time of Henry Blois; especially when we can plainly see the prophecy’s connection to the etymology of the Graal itself (i.e. \textit{sang real}).... as the medieval mind would naturally think Jesus blood was contained in the one of the vessels mentioned. If the prophecy itself had been included in DA, Henry Blois would have been exposed by all the commonalities which lead back to Glastonbury, but all the commonalities to Henry Blois shows that he originally was inspired by the prophecy of Melkin.

\textsuperscript{784} He must have had a copy because we know the geometry does not apply to Avalon but Burgh Island. It was Henry who converted Glastonbury to Avalon in DA and Perlesvaus.
coverage of the meaning of ‘blood and sweat’ found in the prophecy; the actual wording alludes and directly relates to what constitutes the Turin Shroud itself (or what Melkin thought the shroud image was composed of). It seems to me that Henry’s miscomprehension of the prophecy was that the blood of Jesus would be focused upon as a visualization of an episode of it flowing from Jesus’ body... as was described in the Gospel of John 19:34. In Robert de Boron’s Percival it leaves no doubt what the Grail vessel contains: And this vessel, called the Grail holds the blood that Joseph gathered as it flowed from His wounds to the earth. It is just macabre to think that one vessel contained sweat and is probably why the Grail became singular. In reality though, the Turin shroud contained both blood and sweat as is stated in the prophecy.

Now, if it is Henry Blois that is the propagator of the legend concerning the Graal and he is doing this in vernacular French and basing it on what he had understood was being alluded to in the prophecy of Melkin, then we should understand that the Graal is based quite simply on sang réal, which in vernacular French translates as “royal blood”; and is based entirely on what Henry assumes has been collected by Joseph of Arimathea at the crucifixion site. Henry Blois as the inventor of insula Avallonis and the person who had substituted its name for Ineswitrin on the Melkin prophecy would know that Ineswitrin was in Devon as it is corroborated as such in the genuine 601 charter found also at Glastonbury.

However, because of Henry’s different outlets and modes of transmission for his Grail propaganda; by the time that Chrétien or Robert de Boron had retold what had been told orally or had been written down by Henry as verse; the sang réal had morphed into a san graal or san gréal by oral transition just as Roi Pecheur may have evolved to or from Roi Pescheor (King of the sinners). Probably through Henry’s initial inability to grasp its dual substance (two vessels), the Grail became a singular ‘un Graal’, but still un san Graal by its connection to Jesus and ultimately by later translation becoming the ‘Holy Grail’.

Henry ties what could be conflated as an ancient Welsh magic cauldron with the concept of the Grail to which Arthur is then connected. It is also Henry Blois’ ploy in both HRB and Grail literature to pretend its source is from antiquity by saying there are ancient volumes or volumes in Latin.

Barber states: The origin of this material is clearly Celtic, but the form in which it is preserved is interesting: these fragments, notably the story
contained in the first item above (which is paralleled in the opening scene of Perlesvaus), represent a stage in the evolution of Arthurian romance of which little remains—the Latin versions of Celtic or traditional local stories. How extensive these Latin versions were must remain a matter for conjecture but it is possible that the claims of the romance writers to have used Latin texts should not be totally dismissed; they may well have taken incidents like these from Latin sources and woven into the larger tapestry of their stories. 785

Commentators have thus assumed that the source of the Grail emanates from its association with the Celtic otherworld. But, this is simply a concept of the Grail caused by the purposeful conflation of Henry Blois to the Spoils of Annwfn. Thus we hear from Loomis et al. about the Christianization of a Pagan object which is pure piffle which is regurgitated by Carley. The Cauldron of the chief of the otherworld and the nine maidens who tended it are conflated with the nine sorceress priestesses of Pomponius Mela’s island of Sena and then again with purposeful intent with the nine maidens on Insula Pomorum in VM. One would have to be sedentary not to accept that in chapter 5 of DA it is Henry Blois’ own words which compose the conflation with the Welsh Afallennau: Apple island from avalla in British is the same as poma in Latin. Or it was named after a certain Avalloc who is said to have lived there with his daughters....

To believe, as Gaston Paris did (who taught Jessie Weston), that Chrétien crossed the channel to obtain his accurate knowledge of places in Western England, or to assume that Joseph d’Arimathie and his ‘vessel’ (fassula) was brought to the Vaus d’Avaron in the west, independent of Henry’s influence, ignores Glastonbury’s connection to Avalon as early as 1156-7 in VM as Insula Pomorum. Especially, when taking into account that the author of the Perlesvaus has understanding of Glastonbury topography and the old church.

Scholarship has been so severely duped by the invention of the persona of ‘Geoffre’, few have even considered the connection from bishop Henry Blois to Monseigneur Blehis, Master Blihis, or Blihos Bleheris. The common denominator of our three genres of Glastonburyana, Arthuriana and Grail literature is their connection to the Prophecy of Melkin and Henry Blois. If we deny Melkin’s prophecy as a fake and choose to remain ignorant that Henry Blois impersonated Geoffrey, and Henry interpolated DA; then an

785 Richard Barber, *Was Mordred buried at Glastonbury.*
answer to this salad of material and confused opinion will never unlock the bigger issue that remains hidden in the trappings of a tale.

To deny that the fount of these *Histoires* came into being at the exact time (i.e. 1160-70 and onward) when Henry Blois was at liberty to expand and embellish his self-motivated propaganda is ignoring the solution and circumstantial evidence to many unanswered problems. Henry Blois developed an historical chivalric Arthur from an unremarkable warlord in antiquity whose worth had been partially aggrandized by Nennius recycled by Lambert of St Omer, and who had been mentioned anecdotally in Saints lives and Welsh poetry, and was a part of an oral tradition of the hope of a conquered populace…. to become part of Henry’s evolving tapestry of ancient British History.

Initially the embellished Arthuriana in HRB was built upon a foundation of an already written pseudo-history composed as a work initially intended for Empress Matilda. It was in 1137 a pseudo-history, the purpose for which it had been written now made it redundant…. before becoming the *Primary Historia* found at Bec. This too was driven by the popular cult of Arthur current at the time, obviated by the reference at the end of EAW. But, the embellishments of Arthur and his Avalon does not negate the truth or accuracy of the Melkin prophecy or the certainty of Joseph of Arimathea having been buried on Burgh Island and having brought the body of Jesus to Britain…. all deposited in an ancient tin vault. Especially, the Joseph lore is obviated how the circumstances transpired…. when the Island of Ineswitri happens to be an island known as Ictis, spoken of in the ancient world.

There is substance to these ‘rumours’ of the Britons as attested by Augustine.\(^\text{786}\) It is impossible to see how the British could prefer their own church over any other if it did not have its own established tradition which made it separate in its tradition from Rome. The Roman Vatican’s monopoly of power over souls encompassing a third of the population of the Globe rested upon expunging any reference of Britain’s connection to the Holy family. This transpired early in Britain’s history, but should not make the geometry in Melkin’s prophecy worthless or deny the blatantly obvious fact that the body of Jesus must exist somewhere. If this is too hard to believe for a Christian, then at least we should recognize that Joseph’s body has not

\(^{786}\)“who preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world”see chapter36
been found. Bodies do not evaporate to Heaven, Spirits do!! They say that knowledge which is readily accepted by the mass is only fully understood when at last the *intelligencia* has grasped it and articulated it.

Who amongst the British scholars would deny British independence from the Roman church, the early evidence for which is apparent throughout Cornwall from the earliest dawning of Christianity? Most in the modern era believe the English church’s separation from Rome was caused by Henry VIII’s division on some facile point of marriage. This is true, but derives from a deeper and subliminal understanding of the British church’s independence from Rome.

The real separation is rather a consequence of the earliest Jews close to Jesus and Joseph, fleeing Jerusalem to join their long lost cousins from the earlier diaspora. This was the reason Joseph chose to bring Jesus’ body to Britain as he had been here as a tin trader and found the remnants of like minded people from the diaspora waiting for a Messiah. In all likelihood (but it will be a speculation too far for most), Mary Magdalene was from Britain and this is why she suddenly appears in the New testament accounts (maybe at a marriage) and thereby affecting the decision of the body of Jesus being transported to Burgh Island. To dismiss the link of the Jews from the Diaspora settling Dumnonia, we should only look to names of Jonas King of Dumnonia 530-540 and several named Judicaël King of Domnonia also King of the Bretons after the Saxon incursion.

There are still scholars today who believe that the story of the vessel and the ‘Quest’ to find it originally sprang from the mind of Chrétien de Troyes. Why this is still posited seems ridiculous given the testimony of both Chrétien, Robert de Boron and the author of Perlesvaus, who all attest to a previous authority... all authorities on the Grail having a similar sounding name to Henry Blois’s surname.

There is little other rational explanation as to the sudden appearance of *Un Graal* except it having originated from *sang réal* to become *san Greal*. The fact that Helinandus c.1210 explains the meaning of this previously unknown word as a dish has commonalities with the rationalisations of
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787 Ptolemy, writing c.140 A.D says of the British Isles, ‘they were peopled by descendants of the Hebrew race who were skilled in smelting operations and excelled in working metals’. This is a reference to the people in the south from Dumnonia of the same stock who first traded with Phoenicians in Pytheas’ era at the island of Ictis. 788 See note 6.

789 At this time a certain marvellous vision was revealed by an angel to a certain hermit in Britain concerning St. Joseph the noble decurion who deposed from the cross the body of our Lord, as well as concerning the paten or
Chrétien and Robert de Boron who both derived their understanding from Henry, who clearly had to understand it as a vessel.... as in the Prophecy of Melkin. That Helinand finds the need to provide an explanation shows there was still uncertainty to the meaning of Un graal forty years after Henry’s death. Between Henry’s initiation of a sang réal which morphed to a san graal to Un graal there is a period of transformation from Henry Blois’ terming the vessel ‘the vessel of the Holy Blood’ which over the 40 year period since its inception and arrival into the public domain, Helinand thought needed clarification. The Grail’s initial derivation must be found in Henry’s interpretation of the Melkin prophecy as a vessel containing the blood of Christ.

There is no-one in their right mind who would attest that the prophecy of Melkin was meant to bolster a cult of Joseph at Glastonbury when half of the text seems unintelligible or irrelevant until deciphered recently by Kim Yale. Logically, why make a fraudulent text which is not relevant to the purpose? On the other hand, it would be a freak of coincidence if a geometrically oriented puzzle about an island was randomly constructed (even from various sources) and when every word of the prophecy was utilised (and could be found to have relevance),...it then constructed a geometrical line that just happened to locate an Island in Dumnonia.

So, besides constructing a line on a map which adheres to exact measurements, we then find that all the other material in the prophecy is relevant, (otherwise we could not construct the line which is the point of the Prophecy). The St Michael line of churches sited along the line we are sent to bifurcate also (not by coincidence) has two other churches dedicated to St Michael on the very line which we are encouraged to construct. One at the point on the hill at Montacute....for which I have maintained Henry carried out a search because he was aware of its association with Joseph of Arimathea (as Father Good relates). The other St Michael church is actually on Burgh Island as Camden attests.\(^790\) Given that coincidence.... it would be silly to think that whoever laid out this design was not cognisant of the

\(^{790}\)Camden: ‘where the Aven’s waters with the sea are mixed; Saint Michael firmly on a rock is fixed’ refers to the River Avon arriving at the sea around Burgh Island.
solution to Melkin’s prophecy. The churches were certainly in place long before John of Glastonbury recycles the prophecy. Since many of the Crusaders were Templars and were predominantly from the courts of Europe and would have heard of the Grail.... it is hardly surprising that they discovered what is today called the Turin Shroud. They could only achieve this if the Melkin prophecy existed and had been deciphered. The Roman church organised the Templar’s demise, because by locating the body of Jesus (and being able to produce the burial shroud), the Roman religion would become redundant.

The very aim of every scholar is to find a niche of expertise and own it for one’s life; to be an expert on some subject. Like a baton, the field of scholarship involving our three genres has been passed on and our experts are so well read on the voluminous opinion concerning the Matter of Britain that it is virtually impossible to independently arrive at any other conclusions than those built by previous generations. Each budding graduate’s understanding is guided by the construct of their mentors. The scholastic community, by not recognising Henry Blois as the common denominator has, over the generations, built their own erroneous edifice which has no definitive conclusion. If the foundations collapse the very essence of scholarship is seen for what it is. The same goes for religion.

This aside, what I can maintain is that the original connection of the Graal to Arthur made by Chrétien and the propagation of the Grail’s existence in connection with Joseph in French literature by Robert de Boron, both stem from Henry Blois and his knowledge of the Prophecy of Melkin found at Glastonbury when he was abbot there.

A Grail, wondrous but not explicitly holy, first appears in Perceval le Gallois, an unfinished romance by Chrétien de Troyes and additions to Perceval are six in number and two of these are referred to as prologues. These are the Elucidation and the Bliocadran. The Elucidation survives in only one manuscript and the Bliocadran in two.

Chrétien’s lack of sense of proportion and at times proper motivation of many disorganized episodes is indicative of his having heard such stories second hand from which he has used the characters and motifs. This may well have stemmed from hearing Latin Grail poetry and similar stories in vernacular. This might explain some tangles and plot contradictions with similar episodes recounted at different times.
The Perlesvaus itself (High History) with its disjointed branches seems to be a compilation of pre-existing more complete histoires. Henry Blois himself had no duty to continuity which is evidently apparent in the three transitional versions of HRB and can be largely held responsible for many of the contradictions found in chronologies concerning Grail literature as a whole. It is virtually impossible to divine which constituent parts of Grail literature stemmed directly from Henry himself given the fact that his motivation is often that of conflation.

What we can be certain of is that the Grail itself (as it exists in the Melkin prophecy) was misunderstood by Henry Blois, but Grail is based directly on its perceived description in Melkin’s Prophecy in Henry’s promulgation of references to it. What can also be stated as a certainty is that Robert de Boron’s association of Joseph of Arimathea with the Grail stems directly from Henry Blois having read the Prophecy of Melkin. This of course will be verified when the tomb is opened and the prophecy is validated.

We should not dismiss the coincidence of Henry Blois being abbot of Glastonbury and no mention of that place in HRB. This would only be for one reason. The fact that Melkin’s prophecy turns up there to be recycled by John of Glastonbury is not by chance either. John of Glastonbury obviously had a copy of Perlesvaus and other output from Henry no longer extant today. Arthur and his knight’s connection to the Grail is directly a consequence of Henry Blois having read the Prophecy of Melkin and Henry’s authorship of HRB. Henry invented the chivalric King Arthur in HRB and without the Melkin prophecy there would not have been the object of the Grail or the manufactured grave of Arthur at Glastonbury.

Robert de Boron’s reference to a ‘vessel’ more commonly than the ‘Grail’ stems from the fact it was the earliest source (whether oral or written). It was more directly connected to the fassula description from which the Grail is derived. Robert had also heard of the object known as the Grail, as it had already gone through the transition from sang réal to San Greal, yet both

Commentators have pondered over the introduction of chess into Perlesvaus, but if I am correct about Henry having first written Tristan and Isolde…. it too has allusions to the game also. The story of the Chess board is elongated in Gautier’s continuation of Perceval, but it does indicate to me that Perlesvaus preceded Chrétien’s stories. I will be castigated for positing this as a theory, but I believe it was Henry who improvised an earlier game which resembles chess and named all the pieces on the board which gives us our current game today. A castle, a knight, a bishop, a king and queen and all the little people; a game designed in Henry’s era. Henry was fanatical about castles, he was a Knight and invented the most famous of them all; he was a bishop, and surely thought he was going to be King…. and initially wrote the Historia to highlight queens in British history.
Chrétien and ‘Robert’ have heard of the object second hand. From this point we might deduce that it is Henry himself who has made the confusing transition from Christ’s blood to a Holy Vessel. I cannot gauge if ‘Robert’s’ vessel of the last supper was a Henry Blois invention or not; but to my mind, the fact that Robert introduces Bron, smacks of a Henry Blois conflation which ties the Grail to the Welsh Bran just as he had done in VM by locating Merlin Caledonius with Rhydderch. These would not have been efforts or associations made by Robert.

However, in the Mons manuscript we find the Bliocadran prologue concerning Perceval’s father. Just looking at the name sends up an alarm in its similarity to other phonetic names commencing with ‘Bli’ and their association with the Grail. In the Bliocadran prologue a composition of 800 verses, Percival is not even mentioned. The Bliocadran/Bliocadron is in direct contradiction to Chrétien’s family history as told by Perceval’s mother, yet the poem has come from a common source; in that La Gaste Forest (The Waste Forest) has the same name; the forest around Clugny being the backdrop for Merlin’s madness in VM.

The point is that, understanding Henry’s disregard for the superfluity of detail, adds to the very aura of in-preciseness and legendary all-inclusiveness upon which the Matter of Britain is built. Chrétien does not name Perceval’s father, yet the Didot Perceval calls him Alain le Gros. Much of the hodge-podge detail of names in contradictory situations and episodes, throughout the surviving Grail literature, has nothing to do with this investigation. It may lead one to deduce that the original form of the various stories/episodes told by Master Blehis to have been transmuted in the 1160’s orally.

So, Percival was originated by Henry and this story was taken up by Chretien. It is so evident that Robert’s work has to be very closely aligned with Henry which I will get to shortly. But Percival and his story is the way Henry Blois deals with the subject of the Grail removed from Joseph’s association with it and thus it becomes mystical more than religious i.e. to Henry both were derived from Melkin’s prophecy a real duo fassula and a real Joseph of Arimathea sepulchre, but Percival was about the search and the adventures along the way (very much part of Henry’s life).

---

792 One could posit the name derived from the work by Henry’s friend Suger on Louis Le Gros
If the legends were transmitted by manuscript, such as an original *Queste, Perlesvaus* or Grail book… then intertwined with Henry’s already existing oral tradition imitated by Chrétien; and then embellished by subsequent continuators cross referencing the original output of Henry; it seems fairly pointless looking for an original as this ground has been amply ploughed by French and German commentators in the past.

If Henry Blois’ verse manuscripts ever existed and were read by *conteurs* at court, it is only the later versions by Chrétien and Robert which we are left with and these probably have their own embellishments incorporated. Whereas HRB has survived in the continuity of the monastic system (through its seemingly more historical content and Latinity), Grail literature cannot be said to have survived in the more fractured court system.

Whatever we are to make of the *Bliocadran* as a work, we can see many similarities which tie the work to Henry Blois. *Bliocadran* had twelve brothers and Glastonbury was populated by one of twelve brothers; a certain Glasteing who found his sow sucking ‘old church apples’ there. Apart from the relevance for the apples linking Pomorum to *insula Pomorum* of VM fame and Glastonbury (through the apples) with Avalon,… the twelve brothers had several territories in Wales. One of which was Gower and the other Kidwelly and this *Bliocadran* was the father of Perceval.

There is a designer to this array legend and since we know Henry is Abbot of Glastonbury and ultimately this all concentrates itself at Avalon or the *Vaus d’Avaron* or the vales of Avalon it is hardly surprising that the protagonist is *per-ce-val* (singular) ‘through this vale’ is incorporated in a book called Perlesvaus *per-les-vaus* (plural) ‘through the vales’. You have to give Henry credit for a good sense of humour!!!793 The story of Perceval was Henry’s way of including the quest or search for the Grail which he had himself carried out, but now portrayed in the form of a mystical procession based upon the mass processional but mystified by Henry’s muses with the objects solemnly passing by a speechless Percival. Because Henry Blois did not have the answer, nor did Perceval; but he was blamed for not asking the question. It is hardly surprising then that we hear of *Perceval le Blois*.

---

793 Henry placing Gorilla bones and a plait of blonde hair in Arthur’s grave with a ridiculous cross from Avalon inside along with the string of names beginning BL which all are sources of the Grail legend and his several books of authority must have given him a smile in old age. But for me the prophecies of Merlin were his finest poke at posterity.
The whole edifice of the *Matter of Britain* is built on tangential coincidences which taken as a whole have to have been interrelated by an architect. The literary composer who evolved the design from unconnected works mentioning *Ynis Gutrin* to an *Isle de Voirre*; and the anachronism of Arthur’s connection to Joseph, had a fortuitously long life. The fact that it all ties to Glastonbury as Avalon is by ‘haphazard design’ partially dictated by events over time, if we look at the sequence of events tied to Henry’s agenda’s, but its inter-connectedness is derived from one mind. Henry constructed the *Matter of Britain* as it could only take shape by design.

If it had not been for the great fire at Glastonbury in 1184, where so many books were destroyed, I am sure Henry Blois’ part in the manufacture of the false historicity which constitutes the *Matter of Britain* would have been discovered many years ago. The strange circumstances of a man who wrote an utterly unique book in HRB and who was in the unique position to do so; with a unique intelligence at an opportune time in history and who was in possession of a unique prophecy.... made it possible to compose a unique legend. No crime committed (except the second biggest lie in history) so, why look for a culprit? It is only when the relics of Joseph are exposed that the Roman crime will be revealed and then Henry’s part in the *Matter of Britain* will come to light.

Do we really live in an age where a conclave of Cardinals, some of which have abused young boys, are capable of choosing a man in each generation who is deemed infallible? 794

Henry Blois seeing his fate and the potential destruction of his powerbase after the 1155 royal council meeting conducted at Winchester (at which the invasion of Ireland was discussed), put plan into action to escape the pending revenge from Henry II and had Peter the Venerable carry all his transportable wealth to Clugny a month prior to his departure. In verse 635 of the Bliocadran prologue: *One whole month before, the lady had taken her treasure, which abounded in silver and gold, and sent it out of the land.*

---

794 Observations upon the Prophet Daniel. Issac Newton commenting on the fourth beast: *By its eyes it was a Seer; and by its mouth speaking great things and changing times and laws, it was a Prophet as well as a King. And such a Seer, a Prophet and a King, is the Church of Rome....* With his mouth he gives laws to kings and nations as an Oracle; and pretends to Infallibility, and that his dictates are binding to the whole world; which is to be a Prophet in the highest degree.
In the *Elucidation*, in line 12 we hear of "Master Blihis". Blihos-bleheris, (anagram H.Blois) is mentioned in Chrétien’s Eric and Enid. What has come down to us is a mixture of Henry Blois’ own tongue in cheek play on words of his own name included in his literature and the genuine reverberations of Henry Blois having stood in French courts in disguise or having employed someone to read his verse under the name of Master Blehis. It is not by accident or coincidence the Bleheris who, according to Wauchier, had ‘told tales concerning Gawain and Arthur’s court’; and the Master Blihis, ‘who knew the Grail mystery’, and gave solemn counselling about its revelation; the Blihos-Bliheris, ‘who knew the Grail, and many other tales’; the Bréri, ‘who knew all the legendary tales concerning the princes of Britain’; and the famous story-teller Bledhericus, of whom Gerald of Wales speaks are all coincidental concoctions. These are not separate people, or mere inventions of the separate writers. It would seem as if Henry, may well have deserved the title ‘famosus ille fabulator’, and it is not by chance that the similarity of his name appears in many forms in connection with and as an authority on the Grail.

The ‘master’ of Master Blihis has its derivation from ‘Monseigneur’ through *Monsieur* and even *Blaise*, the writer of the supposed ‘Grail’ book posited by Robert de Boron is ‘master’ of Merlin. Wauchier the continuator of Chrétien refers to what he thinks is the original author by name and calls him ‘Bleheris’ the first time. On the second occasion he states specifically that this Bleheris was of Welsh birth and origin, ‘né et engenuïs en Galles’. He says this in connection with a tale being told to a certain, Comte de Poitiers, whose favourite story it was, saying ‘he loved it above all others’. This anecdote infers that it was not the only tale the said ‘Bleheris’ had recounted to the Count. As we saw in the prophecies when

---

795 'Tristan who never laughed sat beside Bliobleheris'.

796 Robert de Boron’s prose Merlin from the Modena manuscript. *So said Merlin to his master Blaise, explaining what he had to do. Merlin called him ‘master’ because he had been such a support and guide to his mother.*

797 We can see that there is a possibility of three candidates for which Count of Poitier could apply. Henry Blois entertained his *Compte de Poitiers* (which was synonymous with Poitou) before Wauchier gives us the name of Bleheris. In the Middle Ages Poitiers became part of Aquitaine. Louis VII of France (1137–1152) obtained the title through marriage to Eleanore and can be discounted as the Compte to whom Wauchier refers. Henry II of England (1152, 1156–1189) obtained the title through marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine. William IX (1153–1156) son of Eleanor and Henry II of England was only two when he held the title. Richard Ist, (son of Eleanor), also held the title (1169–1196). Henry II would have most probably been referred to as King of England post 1156, and we know that Henry commenced his Grail literature in the era 1158-70. So, one might assume the
Henry Blois refers to himself as Hericus the Hedgehog that built the Holy hole under Winchester we now see him as Blehericus. If he is not laughing at our expense he must be Tristan!!

From the beginning of Henry Blois’ impersonations, he bases the source of all his Arthurian pseudo-history in Wales; as he does also through the persona of a Welsh ‘Geoffrey’. He continues this façade as the original Chrétien/Wauchier’s storyteller. However, Robert’s Blaise is firmly placed in Northumberland. Henry Blois had differentiated his Merlin Ambrosius of HRB fame to create a new Merlin Sylvestris or Merlin Caledonius in VM. This was solely to tie in with Welsh poetry and the mention of Myrddin Wyllt, Myrddin Emrys, who became Merlinus Caledonensis, or Merlin Sylvestris by association with such people as Rhydderch who came from the Old North of Britain and by connection to Taliesin etc. This indicates that Robert de Boron’s Blaise (who was Merlin’s master) was in fact the newer Merlin Caledonius fabricated while Henry was at Clugny in 1155-8.

The ‘Elucidation’ prefaces the account of the Grail Quest by a solemn statement of the gravity of the subject to be treated as: ‘God moveth the High story of the Graal. And all they that hear it ought to understand it, and to forget all the wickednesses that they have in their hearts’. These stark warnings are said to have come from a certain Master Blihis, concerning whom we hear no more. Scholarship needs to accept that the phonetic coincidence of the name Blaise, ‘master’ of Merlin and Master Blihis Maistre Blihis (given the likeness to a genuine Monsiegneur Blois) and the coincidence of the similar sounding Biobleheris, Bliocadran, Blihos-Bliheris, Bréri, Bledhericus, Bleobleheris, Bliheris is beyond coincidence that a source originator of various tracts concerning the Grail all have similar phonetically sounding names. The name must have stemmed

likely candidate for Wauchier’s reference to the Count is the future Richard I, especially with his connection to Marie of France. Certainly, our Bleheris was not interested in Grail literature while he was at Clugny as there is not a hint of evidence in VM (which was written at this time). I personally believe Wauchier’s reference to Richard I where Wauchier refers to him retrospectively as he was known to have had an avid interest in Arthur and was versed in poetry. He had, while in prison, written Jans ons pris or Ja nuls om pres, which is addressed to his half-sister Marie de Champagne (read Marie of France) and he wrote it in song, in French and Occitan versions.

798 Funnily enough Jessie Weston is up against the same intransigence from haughty but dim minded critics who accounted themselves as scholars. Jessie was an independent researcher who was up against the same insults I have already received, but she got nearer to the truth than any of them when she states: With regard to the
historically from a ‘real’ Henry Blois as the propagator of Grail literature who covertly disguises his association to these *Histoires* but at the same time is having a laugh at our expense.

It seems pointless to rearrange and correct certain *a priori* standpoints made by commentators such as Heinzel, Birch-Hirschfeld, Nitze, Bruce, Lot, Nutt, Potvin, Pauphilet, Loomis etc. who have tackled this subject of the provenance of Grail literature and who have all conceded to the existence of an archetype or common theme. Yet not one of them implicates Henry Blois as author. The same *a priori* that Carley and Logario use prevented any of the above researchers finding a solution to the Matter of Britain, yet none thought to look at the similarity of the name of the propagator and think ‘well that’s a coincidence’; especially since Avalon is at Glastonbury and the abbot was called Henry Blois and Blihos is an anagram of his name!!!!

Now, if we accept there is no mention of Glastonbury in HRB and there is no mention of Glastonbury in Grail literature yet both genres concern themselves with Avalon and Arthur; surely we might look at a common composer of both genres and for a person who wishes to hide his connection to both. Henry Blois is without doubt intricately connected to the third genre of Glastonburyana as the dedicatee of DA and the fact he was abbot shortly before Giraldus recognises Glastonbury as Avalon. This must be recognised as the era that the material which constitutes the *Matter of Britain* took place i.e. between William of Malmesbury’s death in 1143 and Gerald’s account c.1192-3 just after the disinterment of Arthur.

Considering all that we have covered previously, it does not take spurious conjecture to implicate Henry Blois. I can only conclude that it is HenryBlois himself who interpolated the DA. It is after all, the interpolations in DA which provides the very glue by which the whole *Matière de Bretagne* is transformed from fable into the possibility of having

---

*attitude taken up by certain critics, that no evidential value can be attached to these references, I would point out that when Medieval writers quote an authority for their statements they, as a rule, refer to a writer whose name carries weight and goes on to say: But are these references independent, was there more than one Bleheris? I think not. The name is a proper, and not a family, name. Jessie Weston trying harder than any scholar to find the answer got insulted by those who thought she had no right to voice opinion on their hallowed gravy train which excluded those of having more insight. She says: A critic of my Quest volume remarks that ‘we have as little faith in Wauchier’s appeal to a Welshman Bleheris as source for his continuation of Chretien’s ‘Perceval’ as we have in Layamon’s similar appeal to Bede and St Austin at the beginning of the ‘Brut.’’ Quite rightly she answers them back: The remark seems to me singularly inept, there is no parallel between the cases. F U Lot.*
realistic historical provenance. Arthur’s historicity depends upon him being unearthed. The curiosity and fame surrounding Arthur’s character was spread abroad by Henry Blois in HRB through the British and continental monastic system and popularly through his impersonation of Wace and Arthur’s adept connection to the Grail in romance literature.

The possibility that Henry Blois had initially searched for Joseph at Glastonbury (given the Melkin prophecy was found there) is augmented by Henry’s name’s associated with the Montacute fiasco in the form of the *De Inventione*; allowing that Henry Blois was Dean of Waltham also and had a motive to create such a concoction. If Henry Blois wasn’t looking for an island on which Joseph might exist, then why would Henry appropriate Looe Island in 1144 if he was not looking for an island in Dumnonia because he knew Ineswitrin was in Devon or Cornwall.

Henry secretly attached the leaden cross on the underside of Arthur’s grave slab at Glastonbury in between the two pyramids while probably inferring to other monks present that they were involved in a simple re-interment of a saint. He then waited until the monks (and himself) were dead. On his death and the release of DA amongst all the books donated to the Abbey by Henry, the interpolated contents just became part of Glastonbury lore, and became accepted as having been written by the great historian William of Malmesbury 30 years previously.

Most modern scholarship has centred upon the inter-relationships of the various early Grail works in an attempt to hone in on Grail literature’s primordial form by comparing the various works. Comparing Grail episodes.... looking for a source.... is as futile as Crick’s work on Geoffrey of Monmouth without discovering who the originator of the HRB was. There can be no understanding of the construction of HRB or of the relationship between *Primary Historia*, First Variant and other variants and Vulgate versions, unless the events behind the production of each edition are elucidated. If nothing is known of the author (except what has been left behind to misdirect his contemporaries and posterity).... it is likely the naive researcher will be duped.

What I find truly irritating is that Crick says at the beginning of her book: *It is known that a manuscript was at Le Bec at an early stage, but not what proportion of continental copies stem from manuscripts introduced in the twelfth century.* The research should be focused upon which copies closely replicate the differences found between EAW and the variants’ not
what proportion of continental copies stem from manuscripts introduced in the twelfth century. For example, since the Primary Historia is the earliest known copy.... is there another copy which closely resembles what Huntingdon describes in EAW regarding Arthur’s fight with Mordred which differs greatly from Vulgate? She could then realise that Vulgate through variants evolved from Primary Historia.

As a generalisation, what makes most scholars inept is how their limited practical knowledge relates to reality. It is this use of common sense over conditioned and unquestioned loyalty to predecessors’ opinions, (all of them quoting in reverence of each other’s learning), which has hampered the progression in understanding of the three genres we have discussed. Some experts still maintain that Chrétien is the inspiration behind the Grail or worse, that Robert is the inventor of Joseph and the vessel and its connection to Avalon.

The denial of the accuracy of the data cached in the Prophecy of Melkin by Carley is an act of ignorant negligence. By Carley's own admission, he is entirely in the dark as to the prophecy's meaning. The Island's location is plainly indicated in the prophecy once it is decrypted. If you can’t accept that Melkin uses nautical miles as a measurement of the numerical value of 104 stated in the Melkin prophecy, then you will not accept Pytheas's accurate calculation of the latitude of Marseille in 350 BC. If one can’t accept the Beltane line, then how did the St Michael line appear? If Meridianum Anglum is not there, then how is it that when the line on the landscape is bifurcated at 13 degrees two other St Michael churches pop up on the line, one at Montacute, the other on Burgh Island/Ineswitrin; the only two places in the world connected to Joseph’s burial. The island in the Melkin

799 As we saw above Barry Cunliffe’s notion of the ingots being found inshore of the rocks is ridiculous in that a coastal navigator setting off with a very precious cargo from the Erm estuary and capable of sailing 25 km, would hit the first obstacle in the mouth of the estuary. This can happen when the crew are drunk like the White ship incident but doubtful c.350 BC. To understand the practicalities which determined Burgh Island as the Ictis of old, one has to understand seamanship and what makes Burgh Island the ideal landing spot. Firstly it is an Emporium which provended tin as the classical writers suggest, central to the largest tin deposit in Belerium for tin streamers; and secondly a perfect place to land a trading vessel at all states of the tide day or night. And it is semi hidden from seaward and not apparent as an island. Mount Batten by comparison is not an easy place to beach and more practically it does not dry out with the tide over land which carts can traverse at low tide as Diodorus recycles from Pytheas. Any one remotely competent of handling a small vessel would keep well clear of landing a craft there or at St Michael’s Mount in Cornwall except when tidal conditions are perfect. A Phoenician trader could land under almost any sea condition and tide at Burgh Island by comparison. Strabo tells us why the ingots are inshore of the rocks in the Erm entrance close to Ictis yet Barry chooses to ignore this very relevant episode to Ictis
prophecy (Ineswitrin) is the same island which was given by the Devonian King to Glastonbury and on it is the body of Joseph of Arimathea and what is currently understood as the Grail (i.e. the *duo fassula*). We even have a reason for the Island’s donation at the Saxon incursion.

The singular most important event which has confounded Grail questors and researchers into the truth behind the Matter of Britain is Robert’s account of Joseph of Arimathea. It is Joseph’s connection to the Grail and how his association to Glastonbury came into being which has been accounted a fortuitous convergence of factors by Lagorio. I hope now that the reader is cognisant of the fact that Melkin’s prophecy is the key to the Grail. There would have been far less confusion if Henry Blois had not substituted his own invention of Avalon onto the prophecy in place of Ineswitrin. But it is HRB’s corroboration of the existence of Avalon which has tricked scholarship into believing that the island and the prophecy itself are also a fabrication based on the fact that Geoffrey’s work is a composite fiction.

However, rather than the truth being understood, we are left with two gross fabrications of Henry’s; one being the chivalric King Arthur and the other Arthur’s fictitious association with Avalon. These became cemented both in history and in location by the discovery of Arthur’s body. We now know who planted the body of a bogus King Arthur. This is no way belies the fact that Joseph was buried in Britain on Burgh Island, but it was Henry himself as the original source of Robert de Boron’s material who brought Joseph and the ‘Grail’ into connection with the mysterious Avalon, just as it was he himself who had promoted Avalon as Glastonbury in DA. We should therefore look specifically at Robert de Boron and how much of his work can be seen to be more aligned and closer to what may have originally existed as one strain of Henry’s propaganda.

The most poignant point to be made about Robert de Boron’s *Joseph d’Arimathie* is that it is a compilation of known history from the Gospels and embellished Apocrypha…. interwoven with a rationalisation of the truths which exist in the enticing description of the *duo fassula*. The tantalising suggestion that Joseph’s remains as indicated in Melkin’s prophecy are somewhere extant in Britain on Avalon can only be connected to Robert’s mention of the *Vaus d’Avaron*. Few commentators have tried to understand how it is that Joseph is even posited as being buried in England and have summarily dismissed the possibility because of scholarships erroneous
assumptions concerning the Melkin prophecy. Henry Blois understood that Joseph of Arimathea came to Britain and died here and was buried on an island.

The piffle which the scholastic community has written about Robert’s part in the Christianisation of the Grail (in whatever form and by whoever) is redundant. The Grail of Henry Blois’ muses, was always associated with Jesus. Henry has done his best to make an association with previous Welsh literature in conflating the Grail with the cauldron. The Grail is in fact Jesus’ body which was brought by Joseph of Arimathea to Burgh Island/Ictis to be buried in a secret vault that Joseph had knowledge of through his tin merchant connections with the community which protected and operated Ictis.

Henry Blois did not understand fully Melkin’s prophecy but he did make the connection that if the blood and sweat of Jesus existed somewhere, it must be in a vessel. One would expect his deduction; because of the wording of the Melkin prophecy that the blood and sweat was in two separate vessels. The only way one could imagine two vessels containing the fluids of Jesus is through some macabre recuperation by a disciple. The supposed disciple would have been collecting droplets of sweat from a suffering suspended Jesus. So, more than likely, Henry Blois just refers to the one vessel of blood which he imagines was collected after Jesus was speared. The grim connotation in collecting sweat is therefore eliminated along with the spurious vessel that supposedly contained it.

Henry Blois splices together two of his inventions. He introduces the round table firstly through Wace’s Roman de Brut and then an extension where the table of the last supper comes into conjunction with a singular vessel to be that used by Christ at the last supper. Un grail entre ses deus mains une damoisele tenoit.

The fact that the Modena manuscript E.39 of the Biblioteca Estense in Modena contains the entire trilogy of Joseph, Merlin and Perceval may be purely coincidental given Henry’s past association with Modena; but more likely it is just another way for Henry to propagate disparate material which would eventually collide far away from its source yet have corroborative detail on the arch outside of Arthur’s existence at Glastonbury. This to my mind might implicate Henry having a closer tie to Robert than is commonly understood.
To my mind there is something highly suspicious about Robert de Boron’s telling of these three tales which seems to correlate very closely with Henry’s known output in HRB and Henry’s obvious association to Avalon Joseph and Melkin. Blaise, the recorder of events which we are led to believe are in ‘the Grail book’, provides the whole trilogy with a provenance to the 12th century listener. ‘Geoffrey’ had used the same gambit of a source book from Walter in HRB. The Grail book provides the reasoning behind how it is that the various tales have been recorded and have been passed through time to be heard by listeners in the twelfth century.

However, the whole histoire of Joseph is partially corroborated in the acts of Pilate and the Gospel of Nicodemus and the rest of the story can be accounted by Merlin who exists at different points in time and has related the account to the recorder Blaise. The ambiguity that the redactor of the Modena manuscript has left us reflects a previous rationalisation of Henry Blois which has been foisted on Robert: ‘My lord Robert de Boron, who tells this story, says, like Merlin, that it is in two parts, for he could not know the story of the Grail’. I believe the implication is that Henry has let us know that the story concerning Joseph and the Grail has been related by Merlin; and then Blaise and Merlin have recorded their own contemporaneous events in the sixth century and hence the provenance of the record. All so neat.... and one must ask, why is Robert explaining what is so obviously an invention of Henry Blois?

Robert refers to the ‘High book’ just as Chrétien speaks of the book given him by Count Philip of Flanders which does suggest a written source created by Henry. However the references are ‘to hear’ or to ‘hearing the book’ and supposedly Merlin instructs Blaise to set it down in a book ‘for many people who hear my words will benefit from them’ and ‘the book of the Grail will be heard most gladly’. Henry’s greatest asset in the proliferation of his edifice is summed up by Merlin saying ‘all who would willingly hear this book and have it copied’...

---

800 Meanwhile Merlin went to Northumberland to tell Blaise of these events, and Blaise wrote them down- and it is by his writings that we have knowledge of them still. In Robert de Boron’s prose Merlin this sentence is repeated twice so that all understand the provenance and transmission of the Grail stories.... much as Henry had used the authority of Walter’s book in the supposed translation which constitutes HRB. In effect, what we are supposed to believe is that, a time traveller (Merlin) relates to Blaise in the sixth century what had transpired after the crucifixion. By this clever concoction we now can believe in the events being recorded as we understand how the tale was transmitted.
Alas, unlike the HRB, it was not copied as the Vulgate HRB had been in the monastic system for obvious reasons…. and with Henry’s failing health and the onset of blindness in his last year, much of the Grail episodes in their original form were transferred orally while Henry was alive and some corroborative works were burnt in the fire in 1184. If I was to posit what happened given the definite agendas which are dealt with in Robert’s trilogy; I would say that Robert is putting into prose what Henry Blois had originally created in verse.

It is not Robert’s place to think out how the tale arrived logistically but just to tell the tale. It would be Henry’s task to do this in making it seem as if there could be some truth in the tale. The only person in that era who knew of the possibility that Joseph is connected to Britain and may be buried on an island is Henry because he had the Melkin prophecy. So it is more likely he is trying to rationalise to the listener how this tale could possibly be told and hold true unless he explains the chronology of events and how ‘Blaise’ got his information. One very solid reason, apart from the huge consolidation attained in the trilogy to link this with Henry’s mind is the fact that Blaise is written into the text as part of the explanation of how the story reached the twelfth century. In all the other accounts where Master Blihis and Bliho-Bleheris etc are involved, they are just referenced as the source but not an integral part of the rationalisation in the text. Anyway, we should not be dwelling on how Robert got his work because it is stated it was from Blaise and we know who Blaise is.

Henry Blois could not link back Joseph to the Vaus d’Avaron without the Melkin prophecy as this was his…. and only his template. So obviously if a real Robert did write the prose versions, it would seem Henry would have written the verse versions first. I am on the fence with either outcome. But one should consider the glaring coincidence. Robert’s prose trilogy found in Paris, BnF, fr 7489(c) and Modena(e) with the coincidence of Joseph going to Avalon with the Grail in the text, with an engraving just outside on the archivolt of an event which had taken place at Glastonbury, just seems too coincidental that there is not some underlying close connection to Robert. Even though these texts date from c.1230 and are heavily revised it does not mean a previous copy did not exist there. Why there?

So little is known about Robert de Boron and most assume that he wrote between 1202 and 1212 mostly due to the connection of the Lagorio and
Nitze’s thesis. But Robert says: At the time I related the history of the Grail with my Lord Gautier in peace who was of Mont Belyal, it had never been related And (en cui service je suis). Many have taken this to be that Boron, a village situated eleven miles from Montbéliard must be the Mont Belyal. A certain Gautier de Montbéliard set out for Italy in 1202 and took part in the fourth Crusade and died in the Holy land in 1212.

If I was to come off the fence I would ask why the author has put Mont Belyal instead of Montbéliard, a typical Henry Blois ploy and the fact that Montbéliard is near Autun and Clugny (see note 4). Henry surely knew it was called Montbéliard. He knows this area in the Blois region and would have passed through Boron/Montbéliard. He might have known a lord Gautier or son and even stayed with him before going into the Aravis range nearby on one of his several trips to Rome. Because of the content of Joseph d’Arimathe and Merlin we know Henry has to be the source, Joseph is derived from Melkin’s prophecy and Merlin from HRB and VM. But what dates this is the fact that Henry has Chretien and ‘Robert’ writing about Perceval and the story of the Grail. So my guess would be that Henry versified all Robert’s Trilogy if we hold to the adage ‘Verse is first’ and had a jongleur read it at the court of Champagne. It really makes no difference if Robert existed as a person and he put the trilogy into prose or from where Chrétien or Philip got his book; the main point is all the seedling of the Grail come from Henry. There is no alternative!!!!!! Because he had Melkin’s prophecy in his possession!!!

This Prophecy originally was the only other document with Ineswitrin named on it .... the other was the 601 charter which was 100% genuine... so that makes the prophecy genuine. We know it is a real encoded document because of what Island it indicates by geometry in Devon. So the Melkin prophecy with Avalon on it could only come from Henry because Robert puts Joseph in connection with Avalon (vaus d’Avaron). It will take years for a scholar to get this because the Melkin prophecy has been decreed a fake!!!!!!

For all those sceptics who have doubted Giraldus’ assertion concerning Glastonbury’s already established synonymy with Avalon in 1189-91, we

---

801 William Nitze. Robert de Boron. Enquiry and summary. It was Robert who connected the Grail story with Biblical history and thus gave the impulse to its complete Christianization.
surely have corroboration here as Robert’s *Vaus d’Avaron* can hardly be construed as anything else but the marshlands surrounding Glastonbury.... and it is hardly likely that Robert ever visited Glastonbury. So at what date did Robert hear or read Henry’s versified editions or is there a Robert in reality?

To me, there is so much in Robert’s trilogy that ties closely with Henry Blois’ agenda, I would assume that through ‘Robert’s’ clearer presentation of Henry’s propaganda (tying up loose ends and consolidating) and taking into account Henry’s attempts to conflate and align his earlier HRB with his secondary agenda concerning Avalon, Joseph and the Grail; it would almost seem as if Robert’s rendition of events is remarkably close to how we might imagine Henry’s own consolidation would be. It could be that somehow Robert’s *histoires* are a direct reflection of Henry’s post 1158 developments of the Grail saga. You would have to be a scholar to think the Glastonbury monks could draw such a neat circle.

All is conjecture, because in the thirty years or so from Henry’s death to c.1200, what seems to be three early sources are known to stem from Master Blehis or Monsieur Blois (or some phonetic residue of his name) i.e. he was still known as the original propagator of the Grail by the various continuators and *repetiteurs* and re-workers. How is it that continuators of Chrétien are using a common source and still referencing an oral tradition of Master Blehis? Yet, it seems also that Henry must have committed at least two strains of Grail literature to writing. Certainly a case may be put forward for Chrétien, Robert and the writer of the *High History* all acting as *repetiteurs* of a previous account, but what strikes me most about Robert’s work is the similarity of how he presents events and consolidates technical positions i.e. the logistics of how the account survived through time, with how Henry Blois would similarly have consolidated these conundrums. Basically whatever took place...Robert did not think up the trilogy as Nitze insists

Henry Blois maybe has an idea that the body of Jesus was brought to Britain, but understands from the Melkin prophecy that one or two vessels connected to Jesus exist in Joseph of Arimathea’s sepulchre. Henry understands how a vessel needs to be tied back into the crucifixion episode

---

802 *For Instance: It was then that Merlin began to make mystical pronouncements of which the book of his prophecies was composed.*
(because the vessel contains the blood of Jesus according to the prophecy in his possession); and he links this to the vessel he associates with Jesus at the last supper. He then has Pilate say to Joseph: ‘I have a vessel of his given to me by one of the Jews who were present at his capture’. This motif, I believe, may have derived from Henry himself as a rationalisation of the word ‘vessel’ found in the prophecy and its connection to Joseph. Also another telling factor that the Melkin Prophecy pre-empts Robert de Boron is that; in the vessel is the blood of Jesus, just as is stated in Melkin’s prophecy. And our lord replied: Joseph, you must be its keeper… Joseph was on his knees and our Lord handed him the vessel and he took it, and our Lord said: Joseph, You are holding the blood which contains three powers…

Of course modern scholars assessment is that the Melkin prophecy is composed on Chretien and Robert’s Grail stories simply because Adam of Damerham does not mention the Melkin prophecy in his writings. He does not mention it because he does not understand it!!! Just like Malmesbury. It was not in DA because the obvious connections to the Grail being synonymous with its source material i.e. the duo fassula would leave a trail back to Henry Blois…. and his other interpolations in DA would then be clearly exposed.

Now, one other vital part about the Melkin prophecy’s duo fassula is that one vessel contains sweat, the other blood; or at least that was the literal translation as understood by Henry Blois. So, it is hardly surprising to find a reference to the sweat of Jesus, knowing Henry’s technique of encompassing as many ways of joining disparate information so that conflation occurs. Robert de Boron has Veronica meet the lord when: the people who were leading the prophet through the streets, his hands tied, followed by the Jews. And he asked me to wipe away the sweat that was running down his face. It is hardly likely that Glastonbury monks in the fourteenth century are going to invent the duo fassula (two vessels) to incorporate some version of Robert’s Grail story so they can possess both blood and sweat in two ‘cruets’.

Strangely enough, considering the duo fassula is in fact Melkin’s reference to a ‘doubled fasciola’ (i.e. the Turin Shroud); it is a huge coincidence that the cloth with which Veronica wiped the lord’s face is the ‘Veronica cloth’ when she says: when I got home and looked at the cloth, I found this image of his face. This anecdotal episode was obviously invented also to coincide with the ‘Veil of Veronica’.
The *Veronica Sudarium* was in place by 1011 when a scribe was identified as keeper of the cloth. Giraldus, after a visit to Rome made direct reference to the existence of the ‘Veronica’. Henry was never aware of the cloth with the Lord’s image doubled on it, (i.e. the Turin shroud)…. but it was found by Templars after he had died; and is the very reason the Roman Church had the Templars wiped out on Friday 13th October 1307 by means of the forces of the French King. Since the Templars entered the tomb of Joseph and removed the shroud, one can only imagine they had deciphered the prophecy.

Since De Charney’s granddaughter produced the shroud, it must have been found by De Charney before John of Glastonbury recounted the Avalon rendition of the Melkin prophecy. So again is the proof that the prophecy was not fabricated by JG or monks in the era. (depending upon whether you think the Shroud of Turin did come from Joseph’s tomb). But some organisation has aligned those churches; especially the two St Michael churches (no longer extant) on the 104 mile line to be the only two possibilities as locations mentioned in historical documents where Joseph is said to be buried i.e. Montacute or Ineswitrin. This in itself is a remarkable coincidence, as this very line decrypted in the Melkin Prophecy terminates on an island 104 miles from the bifurcation point and yet the churches were aligned at an angle of 13 degrees to the St Michael line.

We know the only person who would have reason to substitute the name of Ineswitrin on the Melkin prophecy would be Henry Blois as he had planted the grave of Arthur and had the leaden cross fabricated to indicate and corroborate that Glastonbury was Avalon (where King Arthur was to be unearthed at some future date).

One other indicator that the *Joseph d’ Arimathie* story might have come from Henry Blois in a direct form (i.e. an original verse to Robert’s prose) is that there is no need for the coyness of Robert in not divulging what is written in the ‘book’ about the Grail. The simple point is that not even the original propagator of the Grail stories (i.e. Henry) knew of what the Grail consisted; and so all future continuators concocted a mystification of the object and its powers: *Then Jesus spoke other words to Joseph which I dare not tell you- nor could I, even if I wanted to, if I did not have the High Book in which they are written: and that is the creed of the great mystery of the Grail. And I beg all those who hear this tale to ask me no more about it at this point*...
Henry is uncertain of the *duo fassula’s* function or what the *duo fassula* exactly is; except by his misunderstanding of what he conceives to be the description given in the prophecy. So, he weaves his impression of it into the story by asking the very question he has asked himself. ‘What purpose does it serve?’ In the end he has Percival ask the Fisher King: *Sire by faith you owe me and all men, tell me the purpose of these things I see.*

In *Joseph d’ Arimathie* it is made clear that the object was a vessel first and then received the name of ‘a Graal’: *And what can we say about the vessel we have seen...what shall we call it? Those who wish to name it rightly will call it the Graal....and hearing this they said, ‘this vessel should indeed be called the Graal’.* Why, would the Glastonbury monks, (who Carley proposed fabricated the prophecy of Melkin), go from an established ‘Un’ Graal to ‘Duo’ vessel like jugs or *cruore* in the fourteenth century? The mystery of the vessel (from which Henry has understood as *Vassula*) in the prophecy, precedes the naming of the Graal ....coming from Sang Rèal through San Graal (in oral recounting) and thus Holy Grail.

The other odd thing about ‘Robert’s’ account of Joseph is the introduction of Petrus and his letter. I am fairly sure the point of the letter existing is to explain the existence of the prophecy of Melkin which Henry knew would appear in Avalon. Petrus is miraculously inspired to take the letter to the west, to the ‘vales of Avalon’. Petrus says: *You never saw a message more entrusted than this. I shall go to the Vales of Avalon.* Now if the message or letter is mentioned to rationalise the existence and contents of the prophecy of Melkin by Henry Blois originally, it would not be difficult to accept that the person who changed the location on the prophecy is the same as the person constructing an episode of how it arrived in Avalon.\(^8\)\(^0\)\(^3\)(We should not forget Avalon is a construct by Henry Blois as composer of HRB based on the name of the Burgundian town).

Henry must have been aware of the tin trading connection of Joseph in Cornwall because as we have already discussed Henry acquired Looe Island thinking it might be the Ineswitrin mentioned in connection with Joseph’s sepulchre and so he would have had no difficulty in working out why Joseph was in Britain in the first place. Petrus was told to deliver the vessel

---

\(^8\)\(^0\)\(^3\) The real reason for the prophecy’s arrival at Glastonbury is of course its link to the 601 charter and because the Island was donated to Glastonbury. The link of Ineswitrin has for evermore been obscured by Henry having changed the name of the island to Avalon about which the prophecy is written on the Melkin prophecy divulged by John of Glastonbury.
to Britain by the Lord’s will and obviously Bron was to be the next guardian because Henry was conflating the Welsh Bran with his invented Bron (just as he had made it appear in VM as if Merlin really did have a Welsh or northern Briton provenance, paralleling Welsh bardic material). It also seems fairly plain that Robert is trying to rationalize or give meaning to an anecdotal part of a previous rendition of a story that once existed concerning the Roi Pescheor (the king of the sinners) i.e. Jesus. Somehow it would seem in oral transition the name became the Roi pecheur and ultimately ended up as the ‘Rich Fisher King’ with another account where Bron is the Grail keeper.

Robert de Boron, who is supposedly unaware of the association of Joseph’s burial in Britain (spelled out by the Melkin prophecy) has Joseph end his days in the land and country of his birth which is never specifically stated.... but Henry knew he was buried on Ineswitrin not Arimathea. No-one has ever determined where Arimathea was. The opaqueness of the reference diverts attention away from a certain burial at Glastonbury as that would be just too much considering what Henry had left to posterity in DA. Now we in posterity are left with only one choice according to Henry’s muses. When we find Joseph to deduct he was born in Britain. Why if Henry does not stipulate where Joseph’s burial location is I wonder why he even brings it up. Freudian or what!!!! Or did he think future monk craft would reveal his bones in Avalon.

Another odd coincidence that implies the originator of the Joseph histoire is more informed of a connection to the Melkin prophecy than a ‘Robert de Boron’ is evident in the Merlin histoire. Blaise is told to write the Book of the Grail by Merlin and: *when you have done this great work for Joseph and his ancestors and descendants, and have earned the right to be in their company, I will tell you where to find them and you will see the glorious rewards that Joseph enjoys because he was given the body of Christ.*

There is only one document which purports to show where one can ‘find’ Joseph (when deciphered), so how is Robert on the same track unless it came from Henry Blois and his knowledge of the Melkin prophecy. This is again, another indicator of the prophecy’s existence before the fourteenth century. Another achievement of the Merlin histoire is that it makes out that Blaise originally wrote down the story concerning the Grail, but very cleverly infers that there is another book which could be construed as the book *ex Britannia* (from where Uther and Pendragon have come from),
which coincides with what is ambiguously implied in HRB. In Robert’s Merlin we hear: Merlin had commanding influence over Pendragon and his brother Uther. When he (Merlin) heard that his predictions were to be written down he told Blaise and Blaise asked him, ‘Merlin will their books be similar to the one I am writing?’ ‘Not at all’ replied Merlin they will only record what has happened’. Merlin returned to the court... It was then that Merlin began to make mystical pronouncements of which the book of his prophecies was composed.

Basically, this just adds credence to Henry’s works on the prophethia assuring us and the contemporary audience Merlin saw into the future. ‘Not at all’ like now because Blaise is recording the past. It really does not take the sharpest knife to cut through Henry’s corroborative synthesis. So just like HRB’s historicity and credence is bolstered by Merlin corroboratively confirming ‘Geoffrey’s’ historicity in HRB by recounting past events forwards we now hear of Blaise corroborating what Merlin has given witness of how events transpired in the past. Merlin the great ‘corroborator’ is not being used by Robert but the inventor of Merlin and the Prophecies which seem to revolve to an alarming degree about Henry Blois. So why ever would any scholar in the past, not even have suspected that Robert’s, source was Henry Blois; because of Logario’s reversed theory about Joseph material filtering back to Glastonbury!!!

Since the prophecies of Merlin were constructed by Henry Blois, this to my mind adds to the supposition that Robert’s account is closely related to a propagandist consolidatory account in ‘Robert’s’ trilogy composed by Henry Blois which helps to square many ambiguities and contradictions, but in actual fact tosses the salad more in the whole web of lies he has created.

Also, as I have maintained, the ‘round table’ first mentioned by Wace is in fact a device of Henry’s, (given the fact that it miraculously appears at Winchester), we also see in Robert’s Merlin that: our lord bade him (Joseph) make a table in memory of the last supper.... and then there is a third table. Know then, that our Lord made the first table, and Joseph the second and I (Merlin) in the time of Untherpendragon ordered the making of the third. One would think that the man who had the table made for Winchester is the man who started the whole façade about the various tables and Utherpendragon decides to ‘have it made at Carduel in Wales’. A veritable quagmire and this is early Grail literature!!!
There is only one prophecy as such which speaks of the spiritual restoration of the land of Britain (as long as one does not think it applies to a climatic condition), and also refers to the blood of Jesus. This of course is the prophecy of Melkin. The Melkin prophecy, as we know, refers to spiritual blessings once the tomb of Joseph has been opened to the whole world (the healing of the Wasteland). There is more to this than meets the eye when tale becomes reality!!

It is not by coincidence then that Robert (who has his source as Henry Blois) informs us…. that once the question concerning the Grail has been asked the Fisher King will at once be healed. Then he will tell him the secret words of our Lord before passing from life to death. And that knight will have the blood of Jesus in his keeping. With that the enchantments of the land of Britain will vanish, and the Prophecy will be fulfilled.

Given the Fisher King’s interchangeability with Joseph of Arimathea in later Romance…. Robert has three major pieces of Melkin’s prophecy in one sentence. To what other prophecy might this passage refer except the Melkin prophecy?

Given also, Henry’s love of Castles…. is it not odd that Chrétien’s Percival also mentions the Fisher King who directs Percival to the Grail Castle? Both Robert and Chretien have heard from a common source.

It is during the feast in the castle at every course where the procession containing a candelabra, a bleeding lance, and the Grail are all brought through. No-one, not even Henry knows what the duo fassula refers to…. but Henry knows it is connected to Jesus, hence the lance, and so to spice the salad further…. the missing Menorah also. Most interestingly of all in Robert’s Perceval is the processional of the Grail:

And as they were sitting there and the first course was being served, they saw a damsel, most richly dressed come out of the chamber; she had a cloth about her neck, and in her hands she carried two small silver platters. After her came a boy carrying a lance, which shed from its head three drops of blood. They passed before Perceval and into another chamber. After this came a boy bearing the vessel that our lord had given Joseph in prison; he carried it in his hands with great reverence.

It seems again a remarkable coincidence that in Melkin’s prophecy the common understanding which we are led to interpret (without deciphering) is that there are two vessels one of them silver: Joseph has with him in his
sarcophagus two vessels, white and silver, filled with the blood and sweat of the prophet Jesus.

Even though the vessels are differentiated from the vessel that our lord had given Joseph in prison which is the Grail; in Robert’s Percival we can witness a closer relationship to the origins of the Grail having been established from Melkin’s prophecy.

It is quite ridiculous that if Robert and Chretien wrote c.1165-80 and Arthur’s Avalon was already commensurate with Insula Pomorum c.1155-7 in VM (which inferred Glastonbury in Somerset).... that it took until 1345 until John of Glastonbury composed a supposed ‘composite prophecy’ about Joseph’s sepulchre on an island; especially when Robert de Boron infers the ‘message’ which pertains to Melkin’s prophecy (as we have just covered) was sent to ‘the Vaus Avaron in the West’ by Joseph over a hundred and eighty years previously in ‘Robert’s’ account.

But, we should not forget that the experts have informed us that the Melkin prophecy which concerns Joseph and Avalon has little to do with an Island in Britain but a certain al-Malik al-Zahir Rukn al-Din Baybars al-Bunduqdari, Sultan of Egypt and Syria, who had captured the fortress of Safed or one of the alternative Mediterranean, Oriental or Antipodean locations of an Avalon. You would need a PhD just to make this stuff up!!!

Again, in Perceval, a beautiful woman says to Percival: You were at the house of your Grandfather the rich fisher King and saw pass before you the vessel that contains the lord’s blood which is called the Grail. Given the preceding evidences, the prophecy of Melkin and its mention of Jesus’ blood surely precedes the Grail and its connection to Joseph and is the model upon which the sang real became the Grail... by way of verbalisation to San Graal.

If one assumes the Melkin prophecy is the product of an assimilation of French Grail material.... a composite; the real purpose of which supposedly relates material about Baybars and a fortress in Syria and yet at the same time is supposed to have been composed to locate Joseph’s sepulchre at Glastonbury through its composite propaganda about a line from the old church; the question is therefore: should we defer to the experts and deny there is any relevant geometry in the Melkin prophecy which points to Burgh Island?

Why did the supposed fourteenth century monk’s make it so complicated that even our brightest peers today look to the East to the Mediterranean
Orient or Antipodean locations of an Avalon, when Robert says Avalon is in the West. One would think the monks who intended us to comprehend that Joseph’s sepulchre was at Glastonbury could at least use relevant vocabulary to aid their propaganda.

The two silver platters are become part of the relics which make up the Grail: And did you not see the Grail and the other relics pass before you. Know then that if you had asked what the Grail was for, your Grandfather the King would have been healed of his infirmity and restored to health and the prophecy that our lord made (about) Joseph would have been fulfilled.

Is it not by coincidence that there is mention of a prophecy and Joseph? I can understand how our modern scholars believe that the Melkin prophecy with the duo fassula full of the blood of Jesus…. along with its having a connection to Joseph, could have been formed from the descriptions of the various pertinent parts in Robert’s work. How is it accounted as unimportant that mention of the number thirteen randomly associated with the figure of 104 in the Melkin prophecy, along with the random inclusion of a non-translatable word like sperula is just all coincidence? One digit added to these numbers and the geometry in Melkin’s prophecy which locates Burgh Island would be unsolvable.

Do these vague numbers for which scholars have no explanation for their inclusion into a bogus prophecy exist for any other reason than measurements? These vagaries of Geometry just happen to construct a line which falls on an island in Devon and moreover passes through Montacute. Are we silly enough to believe that they coincidentally (completely randomly) form a line on a map104 nautical miles long which just so happens to bifurcate an English Meridian within a sperula. Especially when the end of the constructed line (of stated length and angle), created by following the instructions, indicates precisely Burgh Island which I have identified has a connection to Glastonbury’s Ineswitrin. We are informed that Joseph’s relics are to be found there.

Robert’s version of events in the trilogy we have covered reflects closely Henry Blois’ own propaganda. ‘Blaise’ is the authority by which the account of the Grail reaches us: But Chrétien de Troyes says nothing of this- nor do the other trouvères who have turned these stories into jolly rhymes. But we will tell only what matters to the story: the things that Merlin dictated to his master Blaise who lived in Northumberland...and he had Blaise record these
adventures for the worthy people who would be eager to hear them told. And we find in Blaise’ writings dictated with authority by Merlin...

What confirms for me that Henry Blois is the instigator of the main content of Robert’s work is the fact that Robert has no motive for consolidating corroboratively the persona of Merlin found in ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB and in VM. Yet Robert goes well beyond a story-teller’s expansion of events found in HRB in confirming parts which were blatantly invented by ‘Geoffrey’ concerning Brennius and Belinus.

So Merlin the time traveller dictates to Blaise and we get the meistre in the service of lord Gautier belittling Chrétien and other trouvères for their lack of knowledge the Joseph and Grail story.

It is Henry Blois who has supplied the original main content of Robert’s work as he is seen to be adding credence to Henry’s own pseudo-history. Then the city was surrendered and Brenes was crowned emperor and the Romans paid him tribute. That is why it seems to me that you should have lordship over the Romans; you should be emperor of Rome. But one thing more sire; remember how Merlin came to your court the very day you became King. He said there had been two Kings of Britain who had been King of France and Emperor of Rome...

Robert de Boron has no motive whatsoever to complement and add credibility to Henry Blois’ pseudo history found in HRB. There is a whole historical section inserted in Perceval to corroborate and give flesh to that which had been questioned concerning the historicity of HRB and even Arthur himself.... and the question of whether he died or not:

Mordred was killed there and so was the Saxon King who had harboured him. And King Arthur was mortally wounded, struck through the chest with a lance.804 They gathered about Arthur, grieving bitterly but he said to them, ‘stop this grieving for I shall not die. I shall be carried to Avalon where my wounds will be tended by my sister Morgan’. So Arthur was borne to Avalon, telling his people to wait for him, for he would return.

One thing is a certainty; there is only one person who knew before the unearthing of Arthur’s body in 1189-91 where the body was going to be found. He was the person who had inserted in DA where Arthur’s and Guinevere’s tomb was located. There is only one person who would have added the Vera Historia to the First Variant and would know that Arthur

804 This is also found in the Vera Historia de morte Arthuri in a copy of First Variant HRB.
had been hit by a lance.\textsuperscript{805} There is only one person who could have known that Arthur and Guinevere were laid in Avalon as specified in the colophon to Perlesvaus.\textsuperscript{806} Scholars could accept that Perlesvaus was written before or contemporaneously with Robert or Chretien’s work because of certain storyline commonalities; but it is still denied by most. This has had to be denied, because the construct of present day scholar’s theory of chronology concerning the Grail texts would be seen as unfounded if Perlesvaus existed before Arthur’s disinterment.

Concerning Perceval and his quest for the Grail; the nature of the quest should be understood to be modelled upon Henry’s own quest to locate the tomb of Joseph. The quest for the Holy Grail is based on Henry’s potential find of the island just as it is portrayed in Melkin’s prophecy as a quest (in deciphering the code). The secondary subject of the Grail in the Melkin prophecy (i.e. the \textit{duo fassula} not Joseph’s sepulchre) is entwined by location in the same quest. Find Joseph’s relics and you find out what he brought with him from the Holy Land. What the Melkin prophecy portends most clearly is that it is formatted as a quest to first find an island and then a tomb and then uncover some mystical object. What one has to do is unlock the riddle by asking the right questions and one will undoubtedly find both the remains of Joseph and the truth about the Grail on Burgh Island which directly relates to events after the crucifixion.

The outcome of the discovery of Jesus’ body will be that all the three major world religions will have to reassess their understanding of the prophets of Israel. The experts will still insist that the Prophecy of Melkin is a fake to save face. They will say the instructions in the prophecy are groundless. They will insist there is no tomb on Burgh Island. They will even prevent a search taking place. Let him who denies the tomb exists before he pillories me\textsuperscript{807} or this rambling exposé, be certain that Joseph’s tomb is not there…. for it will be opened at the appointed time.

\textsuperscript{805} See Chapter 32 Vera Historia de Morte Arthuri
\textsuperscript{806} The author of the High Book of the Grail even claims that his text is copied from a Latin manuscript which was found in the Isle of Avalon in a house of holy religion which sits atop tidal waters reaching to it where King Arthur and Queen Guenievre lie’.

\textsuperscript{807} Cicero. ……nor should I fear the imputation of arrogance while speaking the truth.
Chapter 32

Vera Historia de morte Arthuri

The authority on the *Vera Historia* is Michael Lapidge who dates the VH by what he thinks is a connection to the Welsh Princes claim for metropolitan; specifically Llywelyn the Great 1194-1240. We saw Henry Blois had tried to assist his friend Bishop Bernard in his campaign for metropolitan status by including the reinstatement of the Archbishopric of St David’s as a prophecy of Merlin. Lapidge, not knowing of any relationship between the writer of the VH and Bernard, dates the VH to an era post 1199-1203 when pope Innocent III rejected the letter from the Welsh princes: *bishop Bernard is probably too early to be relevant to the Vera Historia, given that the text draws on Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia regum Britanniae, which was only completed in 1136/7.*

If we look at the VH in its original form we can see that it can be most probably dated to c1144-50. Bishop Bernard died in 1148. I am in no way implying that Bernard was conscious in any way of what Henry Blois had tried to do for him. Henry told nobody of his secretive authorship. Henry and Bernard were friends and both were after the same thing. That is as far as it goes, but the advantage for Henry Blois in helping Bernard in his pursuit of metropolitan (as seen in the Merlin prophecies) is that, if metropolitan status were granted to Bernard at St David’s, it would all the more be granted to Winchester or London.

There are several factors which would indicate that the VH was written by Henry Blois. The first is that it must have been written before 1189 as in its original form it is still unaware of where Arthur’s body is. The second is that we can understand that it must be written by Henry Blois the instigator of *Insula Avallonis*, who is surely the only person who (at one stage) would have wished to imply Avalon was in Wales. The point in doing this is that after the presentation of the First Variant at Rome people were starting to
get suspicious. Hence, as we covered earlier, in a time between 1144 and 1155 the First Variant evolved into the Vulgate HRB and the persona of Geoffrey of Monmouth was invented to replace the author Galfridus Arthur. The reference to Gwynedd would in effect negate any suspicion falling upon Henry Blois; if, like Alfred of Beverley believed, the author of HRB was Welsh.

What I am proposing here is that the VH was in fact written after First Variant where Avalon is initially introduced and before composition of VM c.1156-7 where it is entirely clear that Henry Blois has the intention of situating Avalon at Glastonbury. As we covered earlier, if Huntingdon had heard the name Avalon while writing his synopsis of the Primary Historia, he surely would have divulged the name in association with his last comments that he makes in EAW regarding the ‘hope of the Bretons/Britons’. Therefore we have witnessed an evolution from no mention of Avalon, to its inclusion in First Variant. As we covered also, when Alfred of Beverley describes the passage found in a transitional form of HRB Vulgate (i.e. undedicated and probably authored by Gaufridis Artur), where the mortally wounded Arthur is being taken to the island of Avalon to have his wounds tended, Alfred recycles this passage and here mentions Avalon, (but not concerning Caliburn) but significantly, omits the ambiguous word letaliter ‘mortally wounded’ which indicates that, like the account that Huntingdon saw and summarised, Arthur’s certain death is left open to accommodate the ‘hope of the Britons’.

What the VH achieves by locating Avalon in Gwynedd, is an apparent confirmation that HRB was written by a Welsh man. We are set forth an account of the circumstances by which it is explained how the ‘hope of the Britons’ came about. The added gambit for Henry Blois is attaching a genuine zeitgeist concerning Arthur the warlord directly to Henry’s chivalric Arthur. The hope of the Briton’s (or Bretons) had never been entirely connected to Henry Blois’ chivalric Arthur except by Huntingdon in EAW.

VH in effect connects the genuine traditional messianic hope of the populace by explanation of how it transpired, interweaving a narrative of its appearance in the public consciousness with Henry’s fictional chivalric Arthur. Henry Blois, who is more intent to secret his authorship (and we have witnessed to what extent he is willing to go) has now convinced the reader through his insinuation that Avalon is in Gwynedd that the author is
full blooded Welsh. Thus, should there be any discrepancy as to the author’s nationality; the person who no-one ever met, must be Welsh (thus confirming the Geoffrey of Monmouth/Galfridus authorship). One must not forget that the only place where people had heard the name Avallon before was in connection to a town in the Blois region.

Whereas, Lapidge assumes, like the rest of the Arthurian scholars, that the name Avalon was included in the Bec copy of HRB (and the assumption is that it was a completed Vulgate version at that date), I see a progression and evolving story line for Henry’s invention of the chivalric Arthur toward where Arthur was eventually to be buried in the manufactured grave at Glastonbury. Lapidge is unaware of Henry Blois’ authorship of HRB, but says that: The author of the VH was a well trained Latin scholar who had considerable stylistic pretensions. His prose makes use of Latin vocabulary that is characteristic of verse, and abounds in reminiscences of Vergil and other Latin poets. Does this not sound just like our ‘Geoffrey’. Does this not sound like Henry Blois and his known pretentions to become greater than Cicero. Does not this sound exactly like Potter and Davis’ description of the author of GS.

My proposition is that the introduction of VH is the product of a stage of Henry Blois’ evolving of the story surrounding Arthur’s final whereabouts. It is part of his agenda at a certain time after having introduced the name Avalon and is a reflection of a development before VM was composed 1155-7. Richard Barber says regarding VH: The most interesting discovery is the insertion of the text into a copy of the First Variant version of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s HRB in the previously unrecorded manuscript, Paris Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal MS982, noticed by Julia Crick and examined by Neil Wright, who found that it included the VH. As I commented earlier, the text seems to be distinctly designed to continue Geoffrey’s account of Arthur’s reign, replacing the last paragraph which sums up the results of the battle, Arthur’s fate and the handing over of the Kingdom of Cador. In this manuscript, the piece is simply inserted as a supplement between 178 and 179 of the original text.

VH is simply a later insertion into a particular copy of First Variant. In one manuscript where the VH is found, Barber also says it is quoted as if it were by Geoffrey himself. As we have already covered, First Variants were rare before the full copying and production of Vulgate HRB commenced.... once ‘Geoffrey’ had been consigned to death. Could VH be a part of Henry
Blois’ own evolution of what to do with Arthur? Maybe only later it dawns on him, post 1158, that he is going to inter a set of bones at Glastonbury to be found in the future. The manufacture of the grave in the cemetery certainly follows the translocation of Avalon made in VM (as *Insula Pomorum*). What must be understood is that VH definitively has Arthur die in Avalon, It is not by coincidence that on Avalon there is a small chapel dedicated to St Mary:

> they take the corpse of the dead king to a certain small chapel dedicated to the honour of the holy mother of God, the perpetual Virgin Mary.

I will use Lapidge’s translation:

**The True History of the death of Arthur.**

Accordingly, when the onslaught of the battle (which was being waged between Arthur King of the Britons and Mordred....I dare not say his nephew but rather his betrayer) had ended, and Mordred had been killed, and here and there numerous warriors had been laid low and many of the enemy had been left for dead, the king.... even though he had gained the victory..... did not nevertheless withdraw without some bodily injury. For he had sustained a wound which, although it was not bringing an immediate death, nevertheless boded ill for the near future. At length he gave thanks to the Creator of all things and to his mother the blessed Virgin Mary; he offset the bitterness of the remorse he had suffered for the loss of his men with his triumphal joy. When these things had been done, and, suffering from exhaustion, he was leaning on his shield, he sat down on the ground for the sake of recuperating; and while sitting there he summoned four of the leaders of his people; and when they had been summoned he ordered them to disarm him carefully, lest perchance in proceeding carelessly they might increase the anguish of the pain of his wounds. When the king had been disarmed, suddenly a certain youth, handsome in appearance, tall in stature, evoking by the shape of his limbs a strength of immense power.... took to the road, sitting on the back of a mare, with his right hand armed by a shaft of Elm. This shaft was stiff, not twisted or knotted but straight, and sharpened to a point in the manner of a lance (yet sharper for inflicting injury than any lance), since indeed in times gone by it had been fired to make it hard (and its hardness had been tempered with equal care by plunging it in water), and it had been daubed with adders’
venom so that, what it might perhaps harm less when cast as a result of a deficiency in strength in the person casting it, the poison would make up for. This audacious youth, proceeding straight at the King but staying his course immediately in front of him, hurled the aforementioned missile into the King and so added a more serious wound to his already serious wounds. Having done this he flees quickly: but does not escape for long, inasmuch as the King, brooking no delay, like an active soldier fixes the quivering spear in the back of the fleeing youth and pierces his innermost heart. Thus transfixed the youth immediately breathed out his last breath. Accordingly, when the author of the King’s death had himself received the death sentence, a pallor immediately crept over the King’s visage, and he explained to those people carefully attending him that he was not to enjoy the breath of life for much longer. When this was disclosed, a wash of tears flowed down the faces of those who loved him dearly and lamentation disheartened everyone, because they despaired that anyone could safeguard Britain’s liberty like him- since, in fact, if according to the common proverb, ‘a better man rarely succeeds a good man’, much more rarely does an even better man succeed the one who is best.

2) At length the King, slightly restored by an improvement in his condition, gives orders to be taken to Gwynedd, since he had decided to sojourn in the delightful Isle of Avallon because of the beauty of the place (both for the sake of peace as well as for easing the pain of his wounds). When he had arrived there, the physicians concerned themselves with the King’s wounds with all the diligence of their art; but the King experienced no restorative remedy from their efforts. Because of this he despaired of any cure in this life, and he commanded the Archbishop of London to come to him. The Archbishop, with the additional company of two bishops- namely Urien of Bangor and Urbegen of Glamorgan- presented the fulfilment of the mandate to him who had directed it. (St David, the Archbishop of Menevia (St David’s) would also have been present if he had not been prevented by a serious bodily affliction). With these prelates present therefore, the King confessed his deviations from the Christian faith, and rendered himself answerable to his Creator’s complaisance. Then with the generosity of Royal munificence, he rewarded his followers for their service; and he settled the rule of Britain on Constantine, son of Duke Cador. When these things had been done, in the manner of the church (following the Divine sacraments) he bid his last farewell to this wicked world. And (as the story relates), extended full-length on his hair shirt in the manner of those doing real penance, with his hands stretched
towards heaven he commended his spirit into the hands of his Redeemer. Oh how sad was this day, how worthy of mourning, how charged with lamentation, nor ever to be remembered by inhabitants of Britain without cries of distress! Not undeservedly: for on this day the rigour of justice grew slack, all servants of the laws became a rarity, the calmness of peace was shattered, the excellency of liberty was taken captive; because, when glorious Arthur was taken from her midst, Britain was deprived of its unique claim to victory- in so far as she who held dominion is now totally enslaved. But lest I seem to wonder too far from the sequence of my narrative, my pen ought to be turned back to the funeral rites of the deceased king.

3) Therefore, the three aforementioned bishops commended the soul returning to him who bestowed it with deepest prayer through the sweetness of orisons and devotions; the others lay out the royal corpse in a royal manner: they embalm it with balsam and myrrh and prepare it to be committed to burial. On the following day they take the corpse of the dead king to a certain small chapel dedicated to the honour of the holy mother of God, the perpetual Virgin Mary- just as the King himself had appointed (so that no other earth would receive his earthly remains). For in that place wished to be enclosed in the earth; there he wished his flesh to return to its origin, there he commended his dead self to the vigilance of her whom he venerated with the deepest devotion while living. But after the cortege arrived at the door of the aforementioned chapel, the small and narrow opening prevented the entry of the corpse’s bulk; for that reason it was fated to a resting place outside adjacent to the wall, placed on its bier-the force of necessity deciding this: for the entrance of the oft mentioned chapel was so small and narrow that no one could enter it unless, having wedged one shoulder in, he drew in the other with a great effort of strength and ingenuity.

4) The inhabitant of this chapel was a certain hermit who, the more he had been remote from the squalor of sins, the more did he taste how sweet is the Lord. Why do I delay? The bishops enter; the holy services are performed for the soul of the King; and outside, so it is said the dead man’s body remained. Meanwhile, while the bishops are performing the last rites, the air thunders, the earthquakes, storms pour down relentlessly from on high, lightning flashes, and the various winds blow in terms from their several quarters. Thereupon, after a short interval of the briefest space of time, a mist followed which absorbed the brightness of the lightning, and obscured the attendance of the royal corpse with such blindness that they saw nothing, though their
eyes were wide open. The mist continued uninterrupted from nine in the morning until three in the afternoon. And at no point did the atmosphere, with the frequent passage of the hours, grow quiet from the crash of thunder. And finally, when the mist is dispersed and clear air is restored, they find no trace of the royal corpse; for the King had been transported to an abode especially prepared for him; and they look on the bier deprived of that which had been committed to it. They are seized by annoyance as a result of the Kings removal, to such an extent that great doubt concerning the truth arises among them: whence will this mighty power have come? Through whose violence was he carried off?—And even up to the present time they have detained under shadows of ignorance, as to where King Arthur was destined to find his place of rest. Wherefore certain people say that he is still alive; both sound and well, since he was carried off without their knowledge. Others contradict their audacious conjecture, affirming without the slightest scruple of doubt that he paid the deaths of death, relying on argument of this sort, that, when the aforementioned mist had been dispersed and visibility had returned, the sealed tomb appeared to the gaze of those present to be both solidly closed and of one piece, such that it rather seen to be one single stone, whole and solid as if fashioned with the mortar and craft of a builder, one after the other. They think that the king is enclosed in its recesses, since they had discovered it already sealed and closed. And since this discovery has been made there is no small disagreement among them.

5) He governed the realm of Britain for 39 years in the power of his strength, the wisdom of his mind, the acuteness of his judgement, and through his renown in battle. In the 40th year of his reign, he was destined to the end of the human lot. Therefore with Arthur dead Constantine, the son of Duke Cador, acceded to the British realm; and so on.

The VH may have been inserted into the First Variant into a manuscript which did not get copied much. This may indicate a transitional stage of Henry’s development of the outcome of Arthur’s remains. We can see that the VM’s Morgan has not been developed as yet and when King Arthur had arrived at Avalon, ‘the physicians’ concerned themselves with the King’s wounds. The author of VH is fully aware of the state of affairs in HRB and we can see Henry’s purposeful artifice in making slight inaccuracies in that David is ill not dead and the bishop’s names are changed. But since we know that the bishops attending Arthur and the island of Avalon itself are
concocted fictions; we can say the author of VH is Henry Blois. Henry brings the VH account into line to coincide with making both ‘Geoffrey’s’ accounts seem to corroborate each other, but not too obviously as we see here in the section in Vulgate: *Even the renowned King Arthur himself was wounded deadly, and was borne thence unto the island of Avalon for the healing of his wounds, where he gave up the crown of Britain unto his kinsman Constantine, son of Cador, Duke of Cornwall, in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord five hundred and forty-two. When Constantine was crowned King, the Saxons and the two sons of Mordred raised an insurrection against him; but could nought prevail, and after fighting many battles, the one fled to London and the other to Winchester, and did enter and take possession of those cities. At that time died the holy Daniel, that most devout prelate of the church of Bangor, and Thomas, Bishop of Gloucester, was elected unto the archbishopric of London. At that time also died David, that most holy Archbishop of Caerleon, in the city of Menevia, within his own abbey, which he loved above all the other monasteries of his diocese, for that it was founded by the blessed Patrick who had foretold his nativity.*

The author of VH like ‘Geoffrey’ assumes a total dominance of an empire in Arthur’s era, which, corroborates HRB, but is absolute fiction. *Arthur was taken from her midst, Britain was deprived of its unique claim to victory- in so far as she who held dominion is now totally enslaved.*

Henry Blois is one of the main proponents of furthering the cult of the Virgin Mary at Glastonbury and an association with Arthur. Henry’s craft is that already King Arthur is associated to Glastonbury by ‘Caradoc’. Regardless of the fact that Gwynedd is mentioned as Avalon’s geographical location, (to deflect suspicion of the name having been picked from the same region where Arthur fought his continental battle), we are still led to believe this might be a mistake because the small chapel of the Virgin Mary is at Glastonbury: *they take the corpse of the dead king to a certain small chapel dedicated to the honour of the holy mother of God, the perpetual Virgin Mary- just as the King himself had appointed (so that no other earth would receive his earthly remains). Strangely enough.... no other earth except Glastonbury was where Arthur ended up.*

The VH is leading toward providing the explanation of how the rumours started regarding Arthur’s death, non-death or return as was the hope of the Britons. Conveniently therefore there is the rationalisation of the zeitgeist in the VH’s insert into First Variant: *and outside, so it is said the*
dead man’s body remained. This last sentence is vital in that it is the starting point of how such a rumour of the hope of the Britons prevailed amongst the populace: they find no trace of the royal corpse; for the King had been transported to an abode especially prepared for him; and they look on the bier deprived of that which had been committed to it. They are seized by annoyance as a result of the King’s removal, to such an extent that great doubt concerning the truth arises among them: whence will this mighty power have come? Through whose violence was he carried off? And even up to the present time they have detained under shadows of ignorance, as to where King Arthur was destined to find his place of rest.

In my opinion, the author is again our Henry Blois, as even to the time of writing of VH, Arthur has not been discovered. The two salient points are that Arthur is in Avalon and he is not unearthed as yet. The fact that this is in the transitional First Variant would indicate ‘Geoffrey’ at this stage has decided to make it known that Arthur did die. The fact that all this is at the St Mary church does indicate ‘Geoffrey’ already has a plan as we know eventually Avalon becomes Glastonbury. So the Gwynedd connection for Avalon could just be another way of convincing all and sundry that the First Variant version they are reading is composed by a Welshman.

All the ridiculous detail of the storm and that it went on from 9 to 3 is supposed to make us believe that all these eyewitness details came from people at the event and over time discrepancies have crept into the accounts. Firstly, the body is gone and then the tomb is sealed; and none are sure if the body is inside etc. So, Henry Blois imitates the confusion of the tattle by inventing his own confusion: Wherefore certain people say that he is still alive; both sound and well, since he was carried off without their knowledge. Others contradict their audacious conjecture, affirming without the slightest scruple of doubt that he paid the deaths of death, relying on argument of this sort, that, when the aforementioned mist had been dispersed and visibility had returned, the sealed tomb appeared to the gaze of those present to be both solidly closed and of one piece, such that it rather seen to be one single stone, whole and solid as if fashioned with the mortar and craft of a builder, one after the other. They think that the king is enclosed in its recesses, since they had found it already sealed and closed. And since then discovery of the facts are uncertain and there is no small disagreement among them.
The last sentence highlighted has been changed in one version of VH to: *cuius sepulchrum apud Glastoniam ubi (ut dictum est) sepeliebatur tempore regis Ricardi cruce plumbea super pectus, nomen eius inscriptum declarante repertum est*.... which has obviously been inserted after the discovery in 1189-91.
Marie of France

Marie of France, the medieval poet is also known as Marie Countess of Champagne 1145 –1198…. as her married name. She was the elder daughter of Louis VII of France by his first wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine.

Scholars today think that Marie of France, the poet, is another individual completely. This view is held simply because they believe she lived in England because she wrote at an undisclosed court and mentions places in England i.e. a Celtic backdrop. It is quite ludicrous to think this when the evidence is exposed; and like Henry Blois, she has half hidden her identity.

Scholars like Judith. P. Shoaf seems to think Marie of France was an English nun. When I explained my reason for thinking Marie of France might be the same as Marie of Champagne, I was informed by this breed of modern scholar that no ‘amateur proves conventional scholars wrong’ and me deigning to put forward a theory was akin ‘to telling the Pope the sun doesn't rise in the East’.

So let us see what conventional wisdom in the form of Shoaf the expert has to offer in her translators note:
Firstly she states: **We know nothing about Marie de France. For various reasons, it's thought that her twelve Lais date from around 1170, that their author was a woman named Marie.**

Shoaf then goes on to tell us: **She may have been an aristocratic woman, her French is "easy" (a widely-read Anglo-Norman literary language) and the poems are relatively short (the longest is only about a sixth as long as the verse romances being written at the same time by Chrétien de Troyes); readers usually seem to have read them in French.**

Shoaf then goes on to inform us: **Marie's language is Anglo-Norman, the dialect spoken among the aristocracy of England and large parts of Northern France; she was part of a generation of writers (notable among them Chretien de Troyes) who were in the process of inventing the French verse romance. Marie uses an "historical present" tense often, switching from past to present and back again in a way that is much commoner in French than in English.**
Yet with all that said above and a name of Marie of France to boot; Shoaf thinks that our poet is *perhaps a nun, living in England*.

When about 25 years old c.1164-5.... when she was married to the eldest of Henry Blois’ nephews by his brother Theobald, Marie of France was involved in writing poems which are directly related to Arthuriana, some of the ideas of which came by way of her husband’s Uncle at the same time Chrétien’s work was composed. Marie’s work mainly embodies love and lust from a female perspective in the chivalric era when the work of Wace became popular in France.

Her work was known at the Royal court of King Henry II mainly because Marie’s mother was Eleanor of Aquitaine King Henry II wife and she writes: *In your honour, most noble and courteous King, to whom joy is a handmaid, and in whose heart all gracious things are rooted, I have brought together these Lays, and told my tales in seemly rhyme. Ere they speak for me, let me speak with my own mouth, and say, "Sire, I offer you these verses. If you are pleased to receive them, the fairer happiness will be mine, and the more lightly I shall go all the days of my life. Do not deem that I think more highly of myself than I ought to think, since I presume to proffer this, my gift." Hearken now to the commencement of the matter.*

Scholars have dated Marie's works to between about 1160 and 1215. It is probable that the *Lais* started to be written c.1165 after Marie got married. As we can see by the preamble above one is dedicated to a "noble King" who presumably is her step father. Why would a nun think by giving this gift (even if she had contact with the royal court), that by doing so she might deem that *I think more highly of myself than I ought to think*. This is a woman who understands the family feuds between the Blois and Angevin camps which have transpired in the very recent past.

Blois and Angevin camps had been polar opposites during the Anarchy; and now Her Mother was married to an Angevin and Marie to a Blois. Marie is simply writing to her Mother’s husband in the hope this will amuse his taste and his courts and she is in trepidation of how it will be received. Poems at court were mainly a male pastime. It was probably the first time
that poems from a female perspective were read in court and Marie may have been nervous of how her poem was to be received.

This is again, a classic case of scholarship closing its eyes and steering everyone in the wrong direction while decreeing virtually ‘nothing is known of her life’. Marie of France was an older maternal half-sister to the future Richard I of England who was the Count of Poitiers (1169–1196) son of Eleanor of Aquitaine (Marie’s mother) and Henry II of England.

*Lanval* is a poor knight at King Arthur's court, mixing with Gawain and Guinevere and a host of others brought to life by Henry Blois through his poems read at court and in some part orally transmitted. But, more specifically, Marie of France knows of Avalon and employs the iconic island and is devising poems about characters that were initiated by Henry Blois while Henry is still alive. We have already covered that Marie’s brother Richard had heard Chrétien’s work before Wauchier and wauchier stating Bleheris was the source.

It is not by accident that Robert de Boron knows of Chrétien. It is also hardly surprising the author of the Elucidation quotes both a 'Master Blihis' and a knight Blihos-Bliheris. We could speculate that it was Henry's influence which encouraged Marie to feature Avalon as the place of unknown whereabouts: *The Bretons tell that the knight was ravished by his lady to an island, very dim and very fair, known as Avalon*. Marie of France’s material c.1165-70 which has so much in common with what we know Henry Blois was propagating at Marie of Champagne’s court is not being found from supposed Breton conteurs while residing in an nunnery in England.

Marie's parents' marriage was annulled in 1152, and custody of Marie and her sister Alix was awarded to their father, King Louis. Their mother, Eleanor of Aquitaine re-married King Henry II. In 1160 her father, King Louis VII also re-married to Adele of Champagne just five weeks after his previous wife, Constance of Castile, died in childbirth. Queen Adèle was the mother of Louis VII's only son, Philip II, who was Marie’s step brother. Adèle of Champagne (Henry Blois’ niece) was the daughter of Theobald II, Count of Champagne, and was named after her grandmother, Adela of Normandy, (Henry Blois mother).

As a family marital arrangement for his new wife, King Louis VII betrothed Marie of France and Alix, his two daughters by Eleanor of
Aquitaine to Adèle 's brothers, Henry Blois' nephews. Even though Marie attended the abbey of Avenay in Champagne to further her education, she still held court with her husband and had a large library. It was at this court Chrétien de Troyes heard Henry’s expansion from Arthuriana into Grail lore where both Robert and Chrétien derived their material.

So, in 1164, Marie of France as she was commonly known married Henry Blois’ nephew Henry Ist Count of Champagne and they had four children, one of which was also named Marie of Champagne, who died 1204 not long after her mother.

Marie of France was also a patron of literature, including Andreas Capellanus, who served in her court, and Chrétien de Troyes and she may well have been the source or connection to the Grail book which Chrétien suggests came from Philip of Flanders. Philip may also have been the patron of Chrétien while Chrétien was writing his romance ‘Percival and the story of the Grail’. In the opening lines, Chrétien heaps laudatory praise on Philip for having provided him with the book he adapted into the "best tale ever told in a royal court".

Henry Blois had many royal connections to Flanders where the Perlesvaus scripts seem to emanate from and Henry was a great uncle of Philip.

However, a deep relationship existed between Marie and her half-brother the future Richard I of England and his celebrated poem *J'a nuns hons pris*, lamenting his captivity in Austria (at the time Arthur’s body was dug up at Glastonbury), was dedicated to Marie.

It is in the opening lines of the poem Guigemar that Marie first reveals her name to be Marie; she refers to herself "Marie ai num, si sui de France," - ‘My name is Marie, and I am from France’. Scholars seem to have assumed she is otherwise a different person from Marie of Champagne because they have determined that she lived in England not understanding that much of her base material thought to be of Celtic origin was based on her husband’s uncle’s characters and output.

She, like Henry Blois does not wish her views expressed in some of her *Lais* to be attached to herself; so explicitly hides behind her name as she was known before she was married. Marie from France could be anyone called Marie who is from Ile de France. Before she got married she was the only ‘Marie of France’ of note.
As Henry Blois had provided a source for ‘Geoffrey’ so that should he ever have been found out posing as Geoffrey of Monmouth, the source material appeared to be written by another. So too, Marie claims in the prologues to most of her Lais (too often and with too much ado⁸⁰⁸) that she has heard the stories from Breton minstrels.

It is not by accident that so few positive indications of her circumstance are given in her poems for this is purposefully hidden. For a woman in the twelfth century to express herself publicly (especially with such avantegarde views) was almost impossible, so she hid behind the fact that others composed the themes. This was instigated so that themes feminine could be expressed but seemingly appear to derive from Breton jongleurs. Marie at times gets graphic and expresses themes that aristocratic ladies like herself should not have knowledge of.

If she was not wealthy and really was just an ordinary poet squirreled away in a nunnery in England; how easily she transfers her acclaim for such exquisite poetry to another and how intricately she represents the sentiments of the female aristocrat. The obvious reason for being coy or not being explicit about her identity is that the views expressed are not traceable to her and do not reflect her own experiences.

Marie’s adulterous sentiments which pervade her Lais are personal reflections dramatised. It is also probable Marie is trying to rationalize her own mother’s divorce from Louis VII and explores the problems of love in highborn women in loveless marriage reflecting the modern female sentiments of those of her friends and family. The Crusades had taken many men from their women for lengthy periods and thus lustful affairs are themes de rigeur.

The Fables, another of Marie’s works, is dedicated to a "Count William", who may have been either William of Mandeville who grew up with Philip

---

⁸⁰⁸ 1) Hearken now to the Lay that once I heard a minstrel chanting to his harp. In surety of its truth I will name the city where this story passed.
2) Listen, oh Lordlings, to the words of Marie, for she pains herself grievously not to forget this thing.
3) Now will I tell you a story, whereof the Breton harper already has made a Lay.
4) Now will I rehearse before you a very ancient Breton Lai. As the tale was told to me, so, in turn, will I tell it over again.
5) I will tell you the story of another Lay. It relates the adventures of a rich and mighty baron, and the Breton calls it, the Lay of Sir Launfal.
6) The story of their love was bruited so abroad, that the Bretons made a song in their own tongue, and named this song the Lay of the Two Lovers. Etc…
of Flanders or Count William may refer to William Longsword, the illegitimate son of Henry II. As Marie was Henry II's half-sister, through Eleanor of Aquitaine, a dedication to his son is a strong possibility. After all it was her other half-brother Richard who claims to have heard Chrétien’s *Le Conte du Graal* from Bleheris as it was his favourite and we know where Chrétien was based and from whom Chrétien got his source material at her court.

The English poet Denis Piramus mentions in his *Life of Saint Edmund the King*, written in around 1180 that the *Lais* of a Marie were popular at court: "And also Dame Marie, who turned into rhyme and made verses of 'Lays' which are not in the least true. For these she is much praised, and her rhyme is loved everywhere; for counts, barons, and knights greatly admire it, and hold it dear. And they love her writing so much, and take such pleasure in it, that they have it read, and often copied. These Lays are wont to please ladies, who listen to them with delight, for they are after their own hearts."

It seems highly improbable and English nun is the source!!!

The presence of an Anglo-Norman dialect in her writings and the survival of many of her texts in England suggest that she and Henry Blois may well have promoted (exchanged) each other's works. Three of the five surviving manuscript copies of the *Lais* are written in continental French and it seems unfounded for scholars to insist the writer of the *Lais* is any different from Marie de France, sister of Alix of France and to insist that she was English; where most of the evidence, even by Shoaf's reckoning is leaning toward her using her old title before she became married.

One can assume she is highborn by the rationalisation of employing her time to some good purpose rather than succumbing to a life of idleness:

*Whoever wants to be safe from vice should study and learn (heed this advice) and undertake some difficult labor; then trouble is a distant neighbor— from great sorrows one can escape. Thus my idea began to take shape: I'd find some good story or song to translate from Latin into our tongue. (prologue)*

The setting for Marie's *Lais* is the Celtic world but this is based initially on the stage set by Henry Blois. Marie reflects the feminine embellishments of Arthurian romances. Henry Blois originally as ‘Geoffrey’ creates the Chivalric Arthur and then post 1158 expanded upon this idea in romance material expressed through Master Blehis etc. orally and in written verse.
In most of Marie de France’s *Lais*, love is associated with suffering and most involve an adulterous or improper relationship. Rather than the male orientated jousts, battles of Knights and adventures reflecting the male aspects of the Arthurian stage…. Marie opens up the lot of women in her *Lais*…. from the feminine aspect set in the same romance era. In Marie’s *Lais*, love always involves suffering and frequently ends in grief. Just from the prologue above by alluding to ‘escaping sorrows’ it seems her marriage was not perfect.

In *Bisclavret* and *Equitan* the adulterous lovers are severely condemned, but there is evidence (based on the personal dramatization of her own lusts) that Marie approved of extramarital affairs in some instances. It is plain that Marie like her mother was lustful. She puts the handsomeness of men on an equal footing as the beauty of women; where women ravish men and yet women have the power to besot men. She knows what it means to lust after men and express this appetite in *Yonec*….yet, more frequently, it is the women in her tales that have power over men through their beauty and condescend to sharing their body to satisfy the male lust; going the whole way!!

If Marie of Champagne’s husband Henry had his attentions elsewhere, surely the pre-occupations of adultery would be a cause for her rationalizing such scenarios in her poetry. However, Henry of Champagne made his court at Champagne one of the most powerful of the era and the Count’s court at Troyes became a renowned literary centre where the likes of Walter Map was among those who found hospitality there. The Lancelot prose cycle claims him, "Gauthier Map," as the author, but scholars have discounted him as dying too early i.e. 1210. Some have conceded that the original is a lost ‘Lancelot’; but ‘Lancelot’ having emanated from Marie’s court authored by Map is certainly possible only if scholars were not intransigent on how they have looked upon the proliferation of Grail material.

As I mentioned before, after the death of Count Thibaut II of Champagne in 1152 (Henry’s brother), Henry Blois would have been like a father figure to Henry of Champagne. To my mind, between Count Henry and his wife, much of the proliferation of Henry Blois’ Grail propaganda can be witnessed to have been perpetuated and embellished as a direct result of their court and the people who frequented it.
I have speculated elsewhere that the original Tristan and Isolde poem originated with Henry Blois c.1133 in the period of constructing the pseudo history. This is based upon the common links of Merlin, Tintagel, and Arthur becoming intertwined so easily in later cycles and the fact that Breris was the originator. We know also from John of Cornwall’s rendition of the prophecies that Henry has been in Cornwall and thus locates Arthur’s Camlann battle near Tintagel. Thus, where Marie is concerned we can speculate that her reference to Tristan and Isolde in Chevrefoil is based on her having obtained this story directly from Henry Blois.

From the viewpoint of Henry Blois, any furtherance of the fictional chivalric Arthur and his knights could only increase the groundswell of interest and further provide an historical backdrop for his chivalric invention resurfacing in reality back at Glastonbury. We know he has already planted Arthur’s grave and Glastonbury is going to become Avalon and we already know beforehand from two sources that Guinevere and Arthur are going to be found when the grave is unearthed.

What existed once in the seedling of the Primary Historia..... a brief account of chivalric Arthur (thirty five years previously) had then blossomed, so that the vestiges of Arthur the Warlord and the Arthur understood in ‘the hope of the Bretons’ had become synthesized and expressed as one with Henry’s fully developed chivalric Arthur.

It seems fairly obvious in Lanval that Marie exposes herself as pretending to source her material from the Breton minstrels when it is obvious she is recounting not only ‘Geoffrey’s’ work but also that of Wace: *King Arthur was staying at Carduel– That King of valiant and courtly estate– His borders there he guarded well against the Pict, against the Scot, who would cross into Logres to devastate the countryside often, and a lot. He held court there at Pentecost*\(^{809}\), *the summer feast we call Whitsun, giving gifts of impressive cost to every count and each baron and all knights of the Round Table.* Are we to think this same scene, which opens Chrétien de Troyes

---

\(^{809}\) The Only reason Geoffrey has Arthur holding a court at Whitsun was because he had attended his Uncle’s feasts and the jousting events that accompanied them with foreign dignitaries in attendance. It is hardly surprising then that Chrétien hearing the same at the court of Champagne writes: *Arthur, the good King of Britain, whose prowess teaches us that we, too, should be brave and courteous, held a rich and royal court upon that precious feast-day which is always known by the name of Pentecost. The court was at Carduel in Wales*
romance *Le chevalier au lion* (Yvain) is found by a nun in England at the same time Chrétien’s work is exposed.

To fully understand this one has to be cognizant of the fact that the Bishop of Winchester is both Wace and Geoffrey of Monmouth and the last grandee of her husband’s forebears; but most importantly, he is the elusive master Blehis who has supplied both Marie and Chrétien with the same material. Obviously this last passage chimes with Chrétien’s work, Shoaf just needs to ask herself where is Chrétien based.

Leogres is Geoffrey’s invention of part of Arthur’s kingdom (where giants once existed *l’ogres*) in which was held the state fair at Caerleon and Henry Blois is also responsible for the invention of the round table. So, we can see Marie of France carrying out the same ploy as Henry Blois in pretending the source of her material is from elsewhere…. and no doubt it is Henry Blois who advises her to express herself fully under the cloak of secrecy.

Marie of France writing after 1164 (when she became Countess Marie of Champagne) publishes her work under her own former appellation which just so happens to describe any other person called ‘Marie from France’.

In Marie’s *lai* titled *Yonec* we could speculate that Henry Blois may well have intoned to Marie that Arthur was in a tomb. Apart from the mound (which can be equated to Glastonbury Tor), her mistreated lady locked in the tower has her lover Knight that is buried in a tomb in an abbey. He is un-named, yet was the king of the country and she is buried beside him at her death. Is this derived from seed material which put Arthur and Guinevere at Avalon in an original Perlesvaus? Do not forget Henry is responsible for the authorship of Perlesvaus before his death in 1171. Arthur’s bones did not surface until after 1189

So from the start of Henry’s conversion of Avalon into Glastonbury c.1157-8 based upon VM’s *Insula Pomorum*; to a time when Henry is likely be proliferating this connection to the court of Champagne, which is from 1164 onward, after the marriage of Marie to Henry’s nephew; we have the most likely 6 years to 1170 that Master Blehis was actively involved in propagating Grail material at the only court known for Grail propagation. Henry had no other family to visit not having children except Nephews in the church.

This continental Grail material’s attachment to Glastonbury could only emanate from Henry given that it is so associated with Arthur, Joseph, and
Melkin’s prophecy. Now, if you are a scholar in the long established tradition of picking a corner of expertise and holding to it no matter what evidence is put before you (even advocating 1170 and all the rest of the observations made by Shoaf above) you would never see the wood for the trees even if they fell on you; and God forbid that a scholars’ bubble is burst!!!

Thus we have Shoaf the Arthurian aficionado likening herself to the infallible pope and my theory on who might be the real Marie of France is summarily dismissed; likened to Gallileo telling the Pope the sun doesn't rise in the East (her words). Henry Blois is Master Behis and Marie of Champagne is one and the same with Marie of France. Gallileo was ordered to abandon his opinion and arrested, but he was right. Scholarship has become the Church of the Matter of Britain refusing to go against dogma.

One wonders where they have put their heads. Carley refuses to see the Prophecy of Melkin as a real document and the source of the Grail; Crick thinks Geoffrey of Monmouth is a real person; Cunliffe does not even mention the real location of Ictis in his book about Ictis; Shoaf will not get a grasp on who Marie of France really was; even if you made her read her own biography of Marie. She will remain ignorant of the author of the Chivalric Arthur... like the pope, infallible. Lagorio who thinks that Joseph lore at Glastonbury is a chance event and R.S Loomis, after questioning why Avalon came to be identified with Glastonbury, tells us it is not the scheming of an Angevin King or the cupidity of Glastonbury Monks but it all rests on the mistaken logic of a Breton minstrel; and to heap coals states: Robert died in 1147 and Alexander in 1148 and thereafter a dedication to either would have no point.

Marie of France expressed in her poetry what transpired around her and what she had seen in her mother’s own love life (who was known to be highly sexed). Marie captivates the female court audience with adulterous affairs, women of high stature like her mother who seduced other men, women seeking escape from a loveless marriage. Marie wrote Lais expressing her own risqué sentiments that were contrary to the traditions of the Church, and marriage and therefore…. the Lais are posited as stories having been told by others i.e. Breton minstrels: This adventure chanced in Brittany, and in remembrance thereof the Bretons made a Lay, which I heard sung by the minstrel to the music of his rote.
The ploy is that what is expressed cannot be accounted as the feelings and views of Marie of Champagne, but the stories and the avant-garde views appear to originate with minstrels: *Many a one, on many a day, the minstrel has chanted to my ear. I would not that they should perish, forgotten, by the roadside. In my turn, therefore, I have made of them a song, rhymed as well as I am able, and often has their shaping kept me sleepless in my bed.*

Again, another example is found in Bisclavret where Marie re-affirms the lais are not of her imagination: *Some time later (not very long, I think, unless I heard it wrong), The King went riding in the wood*....

There is no proper way that a woman could express the feelings of lust and love in beguiling circumstances and be the respectable wife of a Count, daughter of a King and not be accused of ‘owning’ much of the emotional impropriety witnessed in her poetry. The only way of expressing herself is to disown the provenance of the material avowing (too frequently) that the tales derive from Breton conteurs.

What seems evident is that Marie did hear Breton Jongleurs and to my mind where Chaitivel and Laustic are concerned, an original lai existed. In Chaitivel, Marie tackles every women’s dilemma (as propriety dictates only one suitor), by having four lovers all at once.... and desire fulfilled from four loves. In others obviously the material came from Henry to her and at the same time Chrétien.

The Lais also exhibit the idea of a stronger female role and power, which is exactly as Henry Blois viewed women.... as his own mother was the power broker of the Blois region. To my mind, Henry encouraged Marie and propagated her poems in Britain; and at her court his own seedlings of the Grail legends were born, coalesced and initially propagated. We are reliably informed by experts that the essence of Marie’s stories is of Celtic (rather than of Breton) origin when neither is categorically true.

Marie of Champagne was the former Marie of France. It seems only fair to propose that she and Henry Blois knew each other well as she feels at liberty to use what is an Arthurian background to convey her feminine sentiments by using icons and characters which in all likelihood came from the uncle of her Husband just as Chrétien’s work is seen above from the same source at the same court in the same era. That Marie uses Avalon as a mystical island where Lanval lands on the lady’s palfrey, and the two ride together to Avalon.... *an island, very dim and very fair, known as Avalon* and...
are never seen again…. indicates that the man who invented Avalon as this mystical isle has encouraged her to write the *Lais* and she understands his symbolism.

Marie is concerned with affairs of the heart (female and male love) and it is obviated on the one side by the content of Marie of France’s *Lais*; on the other there is clear evidence that Countess Marie of Champagne is the same person because Marie is called to judge (as an authority) the affairs of love, clearly indicated by the following letter from a certain noble women A and Count G:

> To the illustrious and wise woman **M. Countess of Champagne**, the noble woman A. and Count G. send greeting and whatever in the world is more pleasing. Ancient custom shows us plainly, and the way of life of the ancients demands, that if we are to have justice done we should seek first of all in the place where Wisdom is clearly known to have found a home for herself and that we should seek for the truth of reason at its source, where it is abundant, rather than beg for its decisions where it flowers scantily in small streams. For a great poverty of possessions can scarcely offer to anyone a wealth of good things or distribute an abundance of fertility. Where the master is oppressed by great want it is wholly impossible for the vassal to abound in wealth. Now on a certain day, as we sat under the shade of a pine tree of marvellous height and great breadth of spread, devoted wholly to love's idleness and striving to investigate Love's mandates in a good-tempered and spirited debate, we began to discern a twofold doubt, and we wearied ourselves with laborious arguments **as to whether true love can find any place between husband and wife and whether jealousy flourishing between two lovers ought to be approved of**. After we had argued the matter back and forth and each of us seemed to bolster up his position with reasonable arguments, neither one would give in to the other or agree with the arguments he brought forward. **We ask you to settle this dispute, and we have sent you both sides of the question in detail**, so that after you have carefully examined the truth of it our disagreement may be brought to a satisfactory end and settled by a fair decision. For knowing clearly and in manifest truth that you have a great abundance of wisdom and that you would not want to deprive anyone of justice, we believe that we will in no wise be deprived of it; we most urgently implore Your Excellency's decision, and we
desire with all our hearts, begging you most humbly by our present address, that you will give continued attention to our case and that Your Prudence will render a fair decision in the matter without making any delay in giving the verdict.

Now why would this man and woman the noble woman A. and Count G. be appealing to someone other than the person renowned for their lais to pronounce a judgment on who might be wrong or right before either end up as one of Marie’s ill fated protagonists. In all Marie’s lais, it is that sole endeavour which the listener, hearing the words, subconsciously carries out while wrested in thought; i.e. making judgements upon whether the characters have received justice for their deeds or how they were wronged in love. Marie’s lais are about the pitfalls of relationships and love, so who better for the noble woman A. and Count G to go to for advice. That nothing is known of Marie of France the composer of the lais is ridiculous. Marie of France is the same person as Marie of Champagne and the earth revolves around the sun for the likes of Shoaf.
Chronology of events concerning Henry Blois and the Matter of Britain.

1125. Possible arrival of Henry from Clugny to act as prior of Montacute. Regarding the accuracy of the data in Melkin’s prophecy which produces the line which runs through Montacute....one can only assume it must be connected to the dig put forward in De inventione. Montacute could only be known by someone who has decoded or constructed the prophecy. It is not inappropriate to suggest Henry Blois’ affiliation with Montacute has him searching for the body of Joseph of Arimathea which led to the concoction of the De Inventione when he became Dean of Waltham. Throughout this investigation it must not be forgotten that the man we propose went in search of the body of Joseph is one and the same who invented the story for the search for the Grail and we know the Grail is based upon the duo fassula found in the same prophecy... said to be in Joseph’s tomb. Henry’s connection to Montacute is unclear except through his being Dean of Waltham, producing the spurious De Inventione and the fact that The Red Book of the Exchequer, stated that Henry was prior of Montacute previous to his appointment as Abbot of Glastonbury. If this had been the case it would have been in 1125.

1126. Arrival at Glastonbury of Henry Blois. William of Malmesbury is already at the Abbey, writing the Glastonbury saints lives. William is also finishing the GR1. Rumours are started by Henry Blois concerning the translation of Dunstan’s relics to Glastonbury; the aim of which was to increase alms.... eventuating Eadmer’s letter.

1127. Henry Blois hatches a plan to cover the history of the Britons having understood there was a blank canvas prior to Gildas. This probably came about in discussions with William of Malmesbury. The intended recipient of a book on British History was his uncle King Henry Ist and his daughter the Empress Matilda. The idea was to present an honourable and flattering history of Britain with many queens prior to Matilda the Heir.
apparent to set a precedent of rule by women in Briton.... to offset the uncomfortable position felt by many of the Baron’s.

Eadmer’s letter to the monks of Glastonbury is written. William of Malmesbury is commissioned by the monks to write the life of Dunstan to back up Henry’s false claim that Dunstan’s bones resided at Glastonbury through a concocted story. VSD I is started. It is felt by Henry Blois that VSD I is not going to achieve clarity or respond adequately to the Canterbury’s previous accusations of Osbern concerning Glastonbury abbey’s antiquity. Henry’s brother Stephen was fighting William Clito in Normandy. 810 Henry has set about putting affairs in order at Glastonbury and reclaiming certain lands using the clout and influence of his uncle Henry Ist.

1128. Henry Blois might be in Normandy with his Uncle and brother, providing ‘knights service’ from Glastonbury. This assumption is based upon what Huntingdon relates concerning a certain ‘somebody’ (Huntingdon did not like Henry) reciting the Franks’ history from a Trojan provenance.... much as he later did in HRB. It is felt by Henry Blois that VSD I is not going to achieve purpose regarding what the monks required to be written concerning Dunstan’s translation to Glastonbury in the times of the Danish incursion; or respond adequately to Canterbury’s accusations by Osbern stating that Dunstan was the first Abbot. William of Malmesbury after such discussions is asked to write a book laying out the history of Glastonbury abbey. William commences research on DA going through all the old records. He starts DA with the 601 charter as his primary evidence.

1129. On November 17th Henry Blois becomes Bishop of Winchester and moves there. He places Robert of Lewes at Glastonbury to oversee building projects already started and the overseeing of general affairs but remains abbot. William of Malmesbury has finished VSD I and is currently residing at Glastonbury while researching the DA and composing VSD II. William has a large chest at his disposal full of old charters. He works out the list of abbots from these charters. Henry Blois is at Woodstock in December with his Uncle and King Henry Ist holds court at Winchester over Christmas. 811

1130. Henry Blois on May 4th is at Canterbury for the dedication of Christchurch with William of Corbeil. 812 Henry Blois is still constructing his pseudo-history of the British people from Brutus.

---

810 William of Malmesbury. HN
811 Farrar. An outline itinerary of Henry I.
812 Farrar. An outline itinerary of Henry I.
1131. Henry Blois instigates building projects at Winchester and works on the pseudo-history the precursor to *Primary Historia*. The work at this time consists of a partially fictional history with content concerning the founding of Britain by Brutus. This inspiration is gleaned from a similar French tradition which I have suggested, Henry Blois is witnessed by Huntingdon to have recounted to his uncle while in Normandy. Henry Blois carries out considerable research from ASC, Gildas, Bede and Nennius and continues to compose a history of Britain with his knowledge of classical literature and Roman annals…. some of which he surely was exposed to at Clugny. What Henry truly achieves is the assimilation of Chronicled histories from various sources into a form of literature through his muses.

Facets from his love of the classics are incorporated into the book on the British History to spice up the narrative and speech content. Henry Blois is at Waltham with his uncle. In September he attended King’s council at Northampton where his Uncle signed a charter in favour of Clugny.\(^8\) It was at Northampton that the Barons were asked to swear fealty to Matilda.

1132. Henry Blois continues composing his history in order to present it to the Empress as a much more readable volume than William of Malmesbury’s GR. Henry oversees building projects both at Glastonbury and Winchester. Henry Blois is again with his Uncle at Marden.\(^9\)

1133. At Christmas, Henry Blois was with King Henry at Windsor where he signed a charter concerning the foundation of the Monastery of Rievaulx in Yorkshire. It was at this meeting he met Walter Espec whose name he would later use in an epilogue to a previously written work when he impersonated Geffrei Gaimar. Henry Blois on August 1\(^st\) was at Westborne where he witnessed a charter to St Mary’s of Cirencester.\(^10\) King Henry Ist departed Westborne and England for Normandy on August 4\(^th\) and was never to return alive. William of Malmesbury finishes the DA and works on finishing VSD II. The monks wished for more superlative material regarding the honour and sanctity of their abbey…. with embellishments William was not willing to include. William in his mind had completed the ‘original plan’ by producing evidence of the 601 charter as the start to his original DA. William has seen the Melkin prophecy which alludes to Joseph on Ineswitrin but since this seems spurious he does not mention Joseph’s name

---

\(^8\) Farrar. An outline itinerary of Henry I.
\(^9\) Farrar. An outline itinerary of Henry I.
\(^10\) Farrar. An outline itinerary of Henry I.
in DA and he had no idea where Ineswitrin was or what the prophecy’s indecipherable Latin pertained to.

1134. Henry Blois continued writing his ‘History of the Britons’ and attended to matters in his diocese of Winchester and at Glastonbury. William of Malmesbury snubbed slightly by the monks at Glastonbury presents the DA to Henry Blois in the hope of some pecuniary recompense. William now leaves Glastonbury.

1135. The barons were made to swear allegiance to the Empress for the second time. It is probable following this forced pledge to Matilda by the Barons....that murmurings began to be heard against a female ruler of Normandy and England. Possibly it is in this period when prior contact is made between Stephen and Henry Blois concerning Matilda as heir apparent and a plan is tentatively hatched and accord is made to replace Matilda with Stephen. On November 25\textsuperscript{th} the King falls ill from eating lampreys. On December 1\textsuperscript{st} the King dies. By the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of December Henry Blois has convinced William of Corbeil to crown his Brother. On the 26\textsuperscript{th} of December King Stephen’s coronation takes place.

1136. Stephen had to intervene in the north of England immediately after his coronation. King David of Scotland invaded the north on the news of Henry I death, taking Carlisle and Newcastle and other strongholds. Henry Blois is writing a diary of events later to be used in the compilation of GS. The GS, recounting how Stephen acquired the throne picks up with events at Winchester where Henry tries to bribe William de Pont de l’Arche to release his uncle’s treasure. The treasure is released to Stephen and the new King consolidates the crown buying allegiance from several barons. There is however contention over the usurpation of the crown between the Barons; because all of them had knowingly pledged fealty to the Empress after the white ship disaster. The Welsh use this Norman disarray to their advantage. While King Stephen is in a fragile situation politically, the Welsh burn churches and rebel. The Welsh uprising takes place recorded in GS by Henry Blois and a defeat at Gower. It is at this period Henry Blois is probably present while Stephen is fighting against King David. However, Henry Blois is in southern Wales and is present at the defeat of a Welsh army at Kidwelly\textsuperscript{816} sometime between June and November 1136 but was also involved during the following months with a campaign to suppress De

\textsuperscript{816} A castle which he refers to as Lidelae and says belongs to the Bishop of Winchester
Redver’s rebellion in Exeter. Henry Blois learns of the history *Brut y Tywysogion* written by Caradoc of Llancarfan and obtains a copy of his life of St Cadoc. (Caradoc’s work may have existed at Glastonbury but it seems unlikely). Henry Blois has his brother restore the estate of Uffculme to Glastonbury causing rebellion from Robert Bampton. There is also the rebellion of Baldwin de Redvers. Stephen chases Baldwin to the Isle of Wight but Baldwin does a deal with the King and crosses to Normandy and reneges on the deal. William of Corbeil dies on 21st of November and Henry Blois becomes Archbishop of Canterbury ‘in waiting’. One should assume this was the brother’s agreement, one to be King the other head of the church. Orderic informs us that in Advent 1136, Henry Blois went to Normandy and was content to stay there while he sent envoys to search out pope Innocent at Pisa because Henry: *was elected metropolitan. But since by canon law a bishop can only be translated from his own see to another church by the authority of the pope....* It was while Henry was in Normandy that the backstabbing Beaumont twins counselled Stephen to curb Henry’s power from becoming Archbishop of Canterbury. Franklin\(^{817}\) has Henry visit a papal court Nov-Dec 1136.

1137. Franklin has Henry in La Hogue, Bayeaux and Evereux in 1137. Henry’s time would have been spent carrying out duties on his brother’s behalf.... but also in re-hashing his pseudo-history into a *Primary Historia*. Henry is in Normandy to quell the Angevin strife stirred up by Baldwin de Redvers who had sided with the Empress’ cause. The pseudo-history which Henry Blois had initially composed for Matilda is no longer fit for purpose. Henry, after his experience in Wales having learnt much about Caerleon’s Roman architecture and Welsh topography and Geography (in his brief excursion).... now has the Arthuriana added to the pseudo-history. This was finished in 1138 and constitutes the *Primary Historia*.... from which we only have witness from Huntingdon’s EAW. It is not wrong to suggest that Henry Blois spent time at Bec carrying out his affairs and constructed the book written by *Galfridus Arthur* which I have termed the *Primary Historia*. It is possible though that Henry Blois deposited the book in the library without notifying anyone. It seems improbable that the abbot who was Theobald of Bec at the time was unaware of the book in his Library. It was Robert of Torigni that showed the book to Huntingdon (both being chroniclers). This

\(^{817}\) Franklin 1993, 218
is why I have assumed Robert would have asked about Gaufridus and may be the cause of Robert de Torigni having been fobbed off with the misinformation that ‘Geoffrey’ was now the Bishop of Asaph in 1155.... when Henry Blois (passing through Mont St Michel) had already consigned ‘Geoffrey’ to death. This is based upon the assumption that Robert heard this news from Henry Blois as he travelled (without permission) across to France to the safe haven of Clugny by a circuitous route landing at Mont St Michel.

1138. Henry finishes the *Primary Historia* and signs his name Galfridus Arthur for want of a better name based upon his recent addition to the ‘Briton History starting with Brutus’. He deposits the *Primary Historia* at Bec before returning to England and is seen at the siege of Bedford and at Bristol. Henry Blois starts to compose the *Life of Gildas* under the pseudonym of Caradoc of Llancarfan, while based upon the *Life of St Cadoc*; to provide an independent witness to Chivalric Arthur and to show Glastonbury abbey had an abbot in Gildas’s era directly contradicting Osbern’s aspersions.

English barons persuade King Stephen that his brother Henry is becoming too powerful. Theobald who had only just been installed as Abbot of Bec the year previously, now obtains the coveted position of Archbishop of Canterbury. It would not be irrelevant speculation to suppose Henry had been at Bec when abbot Theobald had become aware of some indiscretion of Henry’s. He had betrayed the indiscretion and was awarded with the position that Henry had coveted. The election of Theobald of Bec took place on 24 December. King Stephen was present with the papal legate, Alberic of Ostia, and a group of barons and bishops, but Henry Blois was conveniently absent overseeing the ordination of deacons (apparently). These events are obviously omitted in GS. There is nothing in GS to indicate a rift between King Stephen and Henry which there obviously was. If GS had been authored by an independent third party author these details would have been noted.

1139. In January Theobald of Bec sets out for Rome to receive the Pallium. Huntingdon while accompanying him and his suite is ‘amazed’ to discover the *Primary Historia*. Henry Blois worked quickly to counteract the slight of his brother by electing Theobald as Archbishop of Canterbury. On 1st March, Henry Blois obtained a commission as papal legate, which gave him higher rank than Theobald of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury. There is
obvious enmity and this situation might not only be explained by Theobald having obtained Henry’s coveted post, but may have something to do with why the appointment was denied to Henry and given to Theobald personally. This can only mean that Henry Blois met with the pope to explain the chaos in the church caused by Stephen’s advisers and the plundering of the Bishops of Salisbury, Lincoln and Ely.

While passing through Modena, Henry Blois commissions the engravings on the Modena Archivolt which represents an episode of the ‘Kidnap of Guinevere’ from his recently concocted tale which contains the Arthurian anecdotal episodes from the *Life of Gildas*. Caradoc is already dead c.1129. On the 30th of September, the Empress Matilda and Robert of Gloucester land at Arundel. The Anarchy begins. It might not be unfair to posit that in the visit to Rome in January and February (when on the continent), Henry Blois had made a deal with the Empress and Robert since he had been roughly treated by his brother Stephen. The *apologia* of the GS leads us to think otherwise, but William of Malmesbury’s *HN* tells a more accurate portrayal of events. Henry Blois was now Legate and may have made a deal with Matilda.... a betrayal of his brother which he had likewise inflicted on him. The opposite viewpoint is related in GS.

1140. Henry Blois is evidently at Ely according to the eyewitness account in GS and at Devises. The Anarchy ensues.

1141. Events concerning the Anarchy affect Henry Blois. The events surrounding the Rout of Winchester on September 14 transpired and Henry is held responsible for much of the fallout. William of York elected in January who had been staying with his Uncle Henry Blois takes a copy of the evolved *Primary Historia* northward to Yorkshire.

1142. Aelred, novice master at Rievaulx in Yorkshire has a discussion about a fabulous tale concerning Arthur with one of his novice monks. The earliest recorded record of ‘Geoffrey’s’ *Historia* after Huntingdon’s discovery of the *Primary Historia* at Bec. The copies of the *Primary Historia* are few in this era. Unlike modern scholarships assumption that Vulgate HRB was a completed work.... the prophecies of Merlin were not yet incorporated into HRB or were there any dedications affixed to any work. In fact, even though the First Variant was designed to influence Papal authorities in 1144 naturally it must ensue from *Primary Historia*. Certainly Vulgate is a final version of both *Primary Historia* and First Variant combined with the evolvement of the Arthuriana but the church bias
removed and speeches fleshed out. Vulgate is definitely a later version, but naturally our experts like Crick are even unaware of the author of HRB.... let alone why First Variant differs from Vulgate and still believes Huntingdon saw the Prophecies of Merlin at Bec. It is a madness to assert this on so many levels. An earlier first Variant seems to be the case if one can accept that ‘Wace’ started with a First Variant version and ended versifying into French with a Vulgate version; so one might assume Henry had started his vernacular version as ‘Wace’ before 1155.

1143. William of Malmesbury dies. On the 24th September 1143 pope Innocent II dies. Henry Blois loses his legation and power. He travels to Rome in the hope of re-establishing his Legation. It is not granted by pope Celestine.

1144 On the 8 March 1144 Celestine II dies. Henry Blois sees that the only solution to free himself from subordination to Theobald is to become an Archbishop himself. On the 12th March, Lucius II is made pope. Henry interpolates William of Malmesbury’s GR3, which to all interested parties assume was first published in 1125-6. Also Henry Blois interpolates DA for the first time with a tame version of an apostolic foundation of Glastonbury and interpolations which inferred Gildas was an Abbot of Glastonbury prior to Augustine’s arrival. In other words there is a complete version of DA with interpolations which coincides with the much earlier publication of GR. However, the version presented at Rome is the GR3 with B version of Henry’s interpolations. Henry Blois composes the First Variant version of the Historia with updated details from the Primary Historia witnessed by Huntingdon. It is tailored to an ecclesiastical audience and does contain the Eleutherius and Lucius connection, but probably mentions the three Archflamens. It is difficult to assess if the changes in speeches in the first Variant are toned down against Anti-Roman sentiment from the Primary Historia or whether they have been specifically embellished and expanded in the Vulgate HRB. My deduction is that there is an element of both whereby the First Variant was tailored for an ecclesiastical audience and thus many battle-descriptions and other emotive passages are omitted by comparison to the Vulgate. What is sure though, the Historia was an evolving work from a Primary Historia (1139) in the Bec tradition which

818 Even though we only know of the contents of this version through the précis version of Huntingdon’s letter to Warin, there are numerous changes some significant in storyline. These can be witnessed in Diana Greenway’s analysis and translation of Huntingdon’s EAW which is included with her translation of the Historia Anglorum.
evolves through a first (1144) and possibly second (1147-9) Variant to the finalised Vulgate HRB of 1155.

Henry Blois goes to Rome to apply for metropolitan status from pope Lucius. In the presentation of his case for the antiquity of a Briton church prior to Augustine, Henry employs GR, DA, and the First Variant version of HRB. The *life of Gildas* may have had the additional last paragraph added as most certainly the 601 charter will have been offered in evidence at this time. Obviously with the assertions in the First Variant that there was a monastery at Winchester in Constans era, Henry is granted metropolitan for south western Britain.

1145. The granted metropolitan is not officially ordained. On the 15th of February Lucius II dies. Pope Eugene III a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux refuses to grant the metropolitan to Henry Blois.

1146. The first set of the prophecies of Merlin (*libellus*) are composed around this era presenting known history in the form as if it were prophesied and pertained to future events. Some of these are very pertinent to Henry Blois. These obviously do not include the latest prophecies about the ‘sixth’ in Ireland and prophecies with foretell of a Celtic uprising. These are specifically added to in the final Vulgate HRB post 1155. The first set just deal with kings up to 4.

1147. The prophecies of Merlin are circulated as a separate *libellus* and Henry’s hoped metropolitan is predicted along with that of St David’s. Cistercian Pope Eugene III, starts proceedings to have the archbishop William of York deposed in favour of the Cistercian Murdac. William of York was formally deposed as archbishop by Eugenius early in the year.

1148. Abbot Suger receives a set of innocuous Merlin prophecies from Henry Blois. William of York’s deposition was confirmed at the Council of Reims on 21 March. FitzHerbert worked to secure his restoration to York, which he finally achieved after the deaths of both Murdac and Eugene III. During this period William FitzHerbert was looked after again by Henry Blois at Winchester. William FitzHerbert probably gave Alfred of Beverley a copy of the First Variant or it found its way to Beverley by William but his version is an evolved First variant, which may have had an early edition of prophecies like Suger’s attached. Bishop Alexander of Lincoln died in

---

819 It is not clear if this was the case. It may be that the First Variant which now has the updated post 1155 prophecies existed with earlier prophecies from the *libellus*. It is impossible to say from Alfred of Beverley’s
February 1148, so it is a certainty his name was not attached to the prophecies before this date.

1149. Henry Blois' case for metropolitan is put forward again to Eugene III. The DA now contains the charter of St Patrick. There are now three archflamens to help Henry's case. The fact that there was a third metropolitan prior to Augustine's arrival in Britain has been added since Huntingdon’s appraisal of the *Primary Historia* where EAW only states there were 28 bishops. There are two vital points which Huntingdon would have included if they existed in the *Primary Historia*; Firstly, the mention of Phagan and Deruvian as the first named proselytisers of Britain and secondly, that there were three archbishops in Britain.... both facts unknown to Huntingdon as he had not read *Life of David* nor had anyone seen the St Patrick charter until this date. This clearly shows the progression to the First Variant version and it is at the second attempt where the St Patrick charter, which names Phagan and Deruvian, is employed at Rome. Metropolitan is still not granted.

1153. On the 23rd December, the peace treaty of Winchester was ratified at Westminster. Henry after all witnesses have signed the treaty and left it in his possession adds one name to the list: *Gaufridus episcopus sancti Asaphi*. Henry Blois starts to realise his investment in Eustace, Stephen’s son, has come to nought as Stephen makes a pact to pass on the crown to Duke Henry at Stephen’s death. On the 8th July 1153 pope Eugene III dies.

1154. On the 13 of January Duke Henry, King Stephen and Henry Blois met at Oxford. It was on this occasion that Henry Blois went to the scriptorium in the castle at Oxford where the treaties and charters were stored and randomly signed Galfri on 5 documents. The final Vulgate HRB was not yet complete. It was while at Oxford signing the charters that Henry Blois first conceived of employing the name of Walter. Henry saw the Archdeacon’s name was on the charters also. The First Variant version does not include Walter’s name. Also Henry Blois saw the name of Ralph of Monmouth on the charters. It was from this time onwards Henry was to rename his author of HRB as Geoffrey of Monmouth and to aver the contents were not invention but merely a translation. Henry lighted upon the idea of employing Gaimar's work to show an old book account whether all were added to the exemplar of the first Variant by Henry post 1155 or some existed and later corrections were added.
existed. He wrote Gaimar’s epilogue and interpolated parts of Gaimar’s work. On the 25th of October King Stephen dies. On the 3rd December pope Anastasius IV dies. Nicholas Breakspear pope Adrian IV becomes the first and only English pope. Henry finalises the last edition of HRB suitable to show the gallant history of the Britons in one last final attempt at metropolitan.

1155 Henry Blois completes the final version of HRB adding in the updated prophecies and completes the numbering system of Kings to Six. Henry Blois backdates the HRB by adding a dedication to Robert of Gloucester in the Vulgate HRB. Other facile dedications to Stephen and Robert or Robert and Waleran are added to the copying of versions along with the dedication of the prophecies to Alexander. Versions are copied and distributed by his own hand and the Colophon which includes the three historians is concocted. All three historians are dead at the time of inclusion of the Colophon. Walter has appeared since the First Variant as the provider of the Old book from which ‘Geoffrey’ supposedly translates. The last version of HRB may have been for the English pope as the biblical portions of the first Variant were refreshed and a Briton history contrary to the Roman annals was fully expanded for general distribution. The rhetoric in some of the speeches is anti-Roman. The glorification of a British empire and its defiance of Roman rule is expanded from First Variant to Vulgate, since the decision lies with an Englishman concerning Henry’s request for metropolitan.

A court at Winchester is held in 1155 and Henry feels an unfair wind blowing and the invasion of Ireland is discussed. Peter the venerable, abbot of Clugny transports Henry’s wealth abroad. Henry is told to dismantle or hand over his castles by Henry II. Henry Blois flees to Clugny from the south west, via Robert of Torigni on Mont St Michel evading Normandy as he leaves without the King’s permission leaving still his castles in his own possession. It is not lame to suspect that at this time the ‘round table’ was commissioned. (Rumours of the table having been built by Cornish carpenters may have foundation). No connection is made to Henry Blois as it is delivered to Winchester and he is out of the country for three years. Henry lands at Mont St Michel and Henry Blois informs Robert of Torigni of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s (or more correctly) the bishop of Asaph’s elevation to Bishop. Robert Warelwast, who was Bishop of Exeter and a personal friend of Henry Blois died.
1156. Henry composes the VM and looks back introspectively over the last nineteen years of his brother’s reign. These are the nineteen apple trees. Henry composes John of Cornwall’s prophecies backdating them as usual as John of Cornwall supposedly translates for Robert Warelwast while he is alive. He employs some prophecies from the *libellus* and some newly invented ones and changes a few icons so they seemingly resemble the version found in the Vulgate.... but they now have a malevolent propagandist intent to rouse the Celts. About a third of Merlin’s prophecies were mixed with others entirely freshly concocted, designed to create rebellion against Henry II and to place Henry Blois as an ‘adopted son’ over Britain once the Welsh, Scottish, Cornish, and Bretons had been successful in their rebellion. Henry also inserts the interpolation of Orderic c.1155 to make sure that there is evidence of the existence of the prophecy which incites the Celts which appears to have been written before king Henry Ist died. Theobald writes letters suggesting Henry Blois return to England.

1157. Henry Blois impersonates Wace and writes the Roman de Brut to spread his HRB pseudo history to the continent. He introduces the ‘round table’ into Arthurian lore and other small expansions which show that Wace and the composer of HRB are one and the same. Archbishop Theobald instructs Henry Blois to return to England.... with a guarantee from the King, which suggests Henry was nervous of what the repercussions may be. He had not surrendered his castles and left without permission. It could be suggested that he was nervous of being found out to be the inventor of the prophecies. This may in deed have been the cause for the unusual depth to which he went to cover his tracks. Any potential hope of inciting rebellion is now lost as a pact is made with the Welsh and Conan.

1158. Henry Blois returns to England. All hope of power is lost. Henry starts his second agenda now he is back in Britain; the conversion of Avalon into Glastonbury and the connection of Joseph lore at Glastonbury.

1159. Henry commences two aims which are to change the course of history; firstly, the conversion of his invention of Avalon from HRB into a fixed location at Glastonbury. Sometime before the advent of Perlesvaus he manufactures Arthur’s grave. Henry also is interpolating DA further; putting Arthur firmly at Glastonbury/Avalon and begins the introduction of Grail lore. Secondly, Henry starts on a ten year course of action which sees the creation and proliferation of his Grail edifice under the auspices of Master Blehis, which links back to the Arthuriana found in his HRB. Henry
writes the precursor to Perlesvaus and the book thought to have been written by Melkin i.e. ‘De Regis Arthuri mensa rotunda’.

Henry Blois involved in affairs of state but his main legacy from this period is the introduction of Grail literature to the court of Champagne. Henry writes in verse that which later Robert de Boron puts in prose. The circle is complete and the Matter of Britain is set on its course because: *For there is nothing hidden that will not be disclosed, and nothing concealed that will not be known or brought out into the open.* (Luke 8.17)
Chapter 35

Summary

My initial aim, as stated in the preface, was to alert anyone interested that the bones of Joseph of Arimathea were on Burgh Island. Others have come to the same conclusion. The relics have not been unearthed simply because our scholars have advised the owner of Burgh Island that the prophecy of Melkin is a fake and the geometry displayed therein has no substance. It is a question of competency versus credentials. One does not have to be an authority to realise that all the geometry in Melkin’s prophecy is exact and this could not happen by chance. The reason no scholar has counteracted what Yale and Goldsworthy have pointed out is simply because there is no way to counteract the truth without seeming in denial, especially in Carley and Crick’s case.

There are also glaring questions to which we may never find an answer and these are mainly to do with the alignments of the Michael line deriving from the Beltane line or English Meridian as Melkin calls it. We can understand it is perfectly possible for Melkin to measure the 104 nautical mile line, but how is it that that line passes through Montacute and terminates on Burgh Island? It is these types of questions which have made the decryption of Melkin’s prophecy seem to be highly incredible. All the icons mentioned are relevant thus the thirteen degrees are relevant to the sphaerula at Avebury at the bifurcation of the line conveyed by the prophecy of Melkin.

So, let us recap on how we got here and how the scholastic community missed what common sense (for the most part) lights upon. If we start with the prophecies of Merlin and conclude Henry Blois has written them, which
I feel I have exposed in this exposé.... we know Henry Blois must have written HRB.... because it is painfully obvious the author of the prophecies is the author of the HRB and VM and the JC version.

Once we understand that it is Henry Blois, we can then conclude that an array of misinformation has been proffered regarding Geoffrey of Monmouth. We can now also clearly understand the circumstances and stages under which HRB was composed and that the misinformation regarding the person of ‘Geoffrey’ was meant to mislead to mask Henry’s authorship. We then should ask, what other manuscript material has been tampered with? Now, someone who links themselves so closely with Cicero and who accounts authorship greater than any worth is hardly not going to write anything in his lifetime. So scholars even if they do stick their head above the parapet will dismiss my findings on the basis that I have cited too many works composed by Henry Blois. Well, check out Cicero’s output!!!

We find that after Henry’s initial authorial foray with the Psuedo Historia and Primary historia it is his next endeavour which sets him on a course; Caradoc’s life of Gildas puts a chivalric Arthur at Glastonbury.

Because it is stated that on account of his wife Gwenhwyfar, (in life of Gildas) that Arthur is brought into association with Glastonbury, we can deduce Henry Blois is the instigator because Guinevere is Henry’s invention in HRB. So then, we understand how the Modena archivolt has an engraving of an episode from the book connecting Arthur to Glastonbury and we know Henry Blois must have passed by Modena on several occasions. We can conclude therefore, that the trips over the snowy mountains, the Alps, and Aravian range (mentioned in the prophecies) are all constructs of a person having made the trip to Rome. We can also understand that Wace’s allusion to the ‘Bernard’ pass is from the same mind along with other specific expansions in Roman de Brut which parallel the author’s thinking in HRB which indicate both are one and the same author.

So, if we follow the Glastonbury connection, because Henry was Abbot there.... we find Malmesbury’s book (DA) convinces us that Avalon is Glastonbury. The book was not only dedicated to Henry Blois, but the name Avalon was indeed invented by Henry Blois.... the author of HRB. Then, we must understand that the Melkin prophecy, which we know is accurate to within yards, has the name Avalon on it and yet we now know Henry has
transposed that name from a Burgundian town and implanted it in HRB and replaced the name of Ineswitrin on the Melkin Prophecy.

Therefore, if the prophecy’s directions are accurate and the name of the island which it locates is deemed invented, we should ask: which island name did the prophecy originally have on it? Then we find that an Island mentioned by William of Malmesbury is donated to Glastonbury in 601 AD and one can assume that Island is located in Devon as it was donated by its King.

If the data which constructs the line (when decoded from the prophecy), locates an island in Devon called Burgh Island, we can assume that the chances are that it could be Ineswitrin. When we then look at the etymology of Ineswitrin, we find that it means possibly ‘white tin Island’. We should also ask, (if we understand that Ineswitrin is in Devon)....who might it be, and in what tract, are we misdirected to believe that Ineswitrin is synonymous with Glastonbury?

We find it is in Caradoc’s *life of Gildas* and the book of DA which was dedicated to Henry Blois. We also find out that Caradoc died c.1130 so the author of HRB’s famous colophon is misdirecting us. We find also that an episode from Caradoc’s book is found on the Modena archivolt before 1140; just a year after the discovery of *Primary Historia* at Bec. So, if we look to the author of HRB and *life of Gildas* we find he is a bishop making regular trips passing Modena with ample wherewithal and enough clout to have commissioned the engraving which relates to the kidnap episode at Glastonbury.

Joining the dots out of pure common sense, we find that Diodorus describes an Island which traded in tin on the south west peninsula and his description of an Island matches Burgh Island. We have confirmation that Burgh Island is the Island of Ictis to which Pytheas referred, because tin Ingots of the same date are found two miles away with an account from Strabo which explains how the tin ingots came to be found at the head of the Erm estuary.

The confirmation that Burgh Island is Ictis is deduced simply because a Phoenician ship wrecked itself in order to preserve the ‘secrecy of Ictis’; and this island which sold tin to the ancient world had the biggest deposit of tin just 12 miles away and ample rivers behind the island for tin streaming. Once Ictis is established as a tin trading Island in Devon, we remember that Joseph of Arimathea by Dummonian/Cornish tradition was a tin merchant.
Once we establish that Burgh Island (Ictis) and Joseph have a connection through the tin trade, we also remember that Melkin’s prophecy directs us to the same Island purporting to contain Joseph of Arimathea’s sepulchre… with an amazing display of geometric precision. Once we establish why this Island has a connection to Joseph through two different sources i.e. tin trade and Melkin Prophecy; we find that the only two places to which Joseph is assigned a burial place in literature i.e. Montacute and Ineswitrin….. are these two places existing on a line that Melkin, through an encrypted document, has asked us to construct such a line, providing angle, length, and both start and termination points…..which terminates on an Island in Devon called Ineswitrin.

We then ask how is it that Avalon and Joseph are linked and we find that the author of the book HRB who first mentions Avalon is the abbot of Glastonbury, the same place where a prophecy is found which links Avalon to Joseph. Glastonbury is also linked to Joseph very early on by Perlesvaus and Robert de Boron’s allusion to vaus Avaron. If we follow this trail, we can see there is no natural connection between King Arthur and Joseph (except they are both linked to Glastonbury and Avalon) and we should then ask; in what material do we find this connection to them both?

We see it in DA as both King Arthur and Joseph are connected to Glastonbury. We can also grasp that the Grail literature which anachronistically joins Arthur to Joseph emanates from the Blois region and its provenance can be connected to close family relations of the Abbot of Glastonbury in Champagne, who are known as the patrons of Chrétien and Walter Map.

This literature speaks of the Grail which is a vessel which contains the Lord’s blood and it is connected to Joseph and Arthur in continental literature (supplied by the like of Bihos-Bleheris); but also in a tract called the Perlesvaus. The Perlesvaus tract relates to the Old church at Glastonbury and its lead roof. It mentions in the colophon to Perlesvaus that Guinevere and Arthur are buried at Glastonbury…. but more importantly, it speaks of the vessel which is also related to the mysterious ‘duo fassula’ in the prophecy of Melkin at Glastonbury.

We then find that features of the prophecy relate to the composition of the HRB in that the Island of Avalon which has been substituted by name in the only extant example of the Prophecy of Melkin is named as the
mysterious island where Arthur is last seen. This island, as we all know, turns out to be Glastonbury, established for the naïve by the existence of a bogus ‘leaden cross’. The cross reiterates spuriously (redundantly naming) where it is, obviating where it is found is in Avalon; not forgetting, Avalon is Henry’s own invention in HRB from a town in his family’s region.

Not only does the Melkin prophecy portend the finding of Joseph’s relics in Avalon, but we are led to believe (by it being named as the last place Arthur is seen), that King Arthur (if we are naïve) was also buried and found in Avalon. We see that the Grail object is modelled on the *duo fassula* (if we have our eyes open).

Also the search for the relics of Joseph, (the whole point of the prophecy of Melkin) suggests that the prophecy is encoded and involves the locating of an island; followed by a search for the tomb itself. We find that two pieces of evidence i.e. the purchase of Looe island and the search at Montacute indicate Henry Blois is looking for Ineswitrin. Both the enigmatic *duo fassula* is mirrored in Grail literature and the search for the same object in *la quête du Graal* or Chrétien de Troyes *Perceval* or *le Conte du Graal*. Here it is presented as a quest for the same enigmatic object that is said by the prophecy to be in the tomb along with Joseph’s relics.

Because Henry Blois is employing the prophecy as an inspirational template, he too invents a totally fatuous semblance of a hidden meaning (mirroring the decryption of the prophecy) in which the gullible search for meaning in the Grail procession.\(^{820}\) This vast array of linked material, which, by association is known as the *Matter of Britain* (as we have covered by repetition and I hope not tedium), and looking from every perspective throughout these pages…. has two factors which are inextricably linked: Glastonbury and Henry Blois.

The one extraordinary piece of this entire puzzle is wrapped up in the book of DA which coalesces what would seemingly be disparate associations and we know this book was dedicated to and interpolated by Henry Blois. We know it could only be him who transformed his own invented name of Avalon to be commensurate with the physical

---

\(^{820}\) The Grail procession is a fatuous invention with seemingly mystical relevance, which in fact uses two other icons, the Menorah and the lance mentioned in the Gospel of John 19:34. *One of the soldiers, however, made a thrust at His (Jesus) side with a lance, and immediately blood and water flowed out.* Henry recognises the *duo fassula* as a religious object but has no idea what it is except from the allusion to two vessels in the prophecy. However, at the battle of Ascalon where Henry’s father was killed, Raymond of Aguilers carried the relic of the Holy Lance which had incredibly been discovered recently at Antioch.
Glastonbury because Gerald says the location of Arthur’s body was previously known and was written in Glastonbury annals.

If we ignore the ignorant decrees of the experts…. it could only be Henry Blois (who has the copy of DA) who lets everyone know the location, because whoever planted the body knew where he had located it between the pyramids. It is for this reason Arthur and Guinevere are said to be buried in Avalon, in Perlesvaus (a tract written before the disinterment of Arthur). It could only have been Henry Blois who knew that Avalon was situated at Glastonbury in the interim years (where it becomes widely accepted) between his death and Arthur’s disinterment. It could only be Henry Blois for he is the first to state *Insula pomorum* is at Glastonbury c.1155.

Therefore, it has to be Henry Blois who had the leaden cross constructed (which ludicrously states in which location it is, when it is discovered) and who pointed out where to find the grave. It does not take a huge amount of imagination to understand that his inspiration for manufacturing Arthur’s grave to be found in the future is based on the prospect of finding Joseph in the future…. spelled out in the Melkin Prophecy. It was originally this prophecy which spoke of an Island named ‘White tin Island’ (which we know exists in Devon because of the 601 charter)…. that Joseph’s relics are said to exist there (and the reason for them being there is because Joseph was a tin merchant). Therefore, to those who use common sense, the prophecy of Melkin is not a fake, but was extant in the era of Henry Blois.

What has prevented these events coming to light is simply the arrogance of the scholars. They have made some money on the gravy train regurgitating the same drivel from generation to generation postulating untenable positions employing a method peculiar to the modern medievalist scholars much like a pick and mix. Some scholars have positively made a cottage industry of inviting all and sundry to contribute papers which they compile into books which agree with their views. I do not pretend accuracy in every statement, far from it; but I have put forward an explanation because I have understood that no scholar wants the gravy train to stop. Joining the dots goes against the very nature of Medieval scholarship in that focus on one area of expertise has its just rewards. Without an overall explanation provided to the scholars, common sense cannot prevail hence the trail of erroneous theories concerning our three genres of study. Scholars will continue to hide behind an impenetrable wall
of learning, which, up until now, has had to be accepted because they are supposedly the experts.

There are three critical premises upon which modern scholarship’s erroneous edifice is built and when these *a priori* are not accepted (founded upon an unclear chronology of events), a clearer picture emerges.

But before anything can begin to unfold the start of comprehending the *Matter of Britain* begins with the acceptance that Henry Blois is ‘Geoffrey’. The only way to that conclusion is through the prophecies of Merlin.

Firstly, if one does not insist that a mention of Arthur could only transpire by interpolation after the exhumation of Arthur’s bones, the answer to several questions become more discernible because several solutions become tenable.... which, by erroneous chronology had been previously denied. Avalon had existed at Glastonbury since Henry’s death and the place of Arthur’s burial was pointed out in DA.

We do not have to ask why Gerald is saying there is previous knowledge of the location; why dig in that spot etc. The only previous solution before was to ignore his testimony!!! Who cares when it happened it is how and why it happened.

If we accept that the location was pointed out in which Arthur was buried with his wife, in between the pyramids in DA; we have to accept it is highly probable it was Henry Blois (once we have allowed this possibility). There is no rational reason why the interpolation in DA mentioning the location of Arthur’s grave could not have been in DA before Arthur’s disinterment. The reason we should allow this possibility is there is no other information surrounding the dig given in DA. If the mention of Arthur’s gravesite had been a later interpolation (after the disinterment) some circumstances would have been related and certainly the cross would have been mentioned.

Henry Blois provided the only information he could before the event (while remaining incognito). The entire account of Arthur’s disinterment would not have been left in the hands of Gerald to relate. Once this position is understood....it opens a multitude of positions concerning not only chronology of the events but also who did what and who wrote what when.

Secondly, if there is no intransigence and insistence that Avalon was not previously known as Glastonbury before the leaden cross was discovered, this then allows that in the interim between Henry Blois death and the
disinterment.... an understanding of Avalon as Glastonbury at least was known at the abbey because it was written in DA. It then becomes possible to explain how it is that the forerunner of Perlesvaus, said to be in Latin and written at Avalon, which tells of Arthur and Guinevere’s burial at Glastonbury, could have existed prior to the disinterment.

Therefore, it enables us also to implicate Henry Blois as the original inventor of Grail material which ties the Grail, Avalon, Arthur and Joseph all to Glastonbury. But, more importantly to Master Blehis.... said by Gerald to have lived ‘shortly before our time’\textsuperscript{821}. He has now become a chronological possibility as a promulgator of early Grail material as the similarity of his name is found always connected as the originator of Grail literature.

But this position confutes entirely Logario’s synopsis of events and allows that Joseph in Perlesvaus could pre-exist Arthur’s exhumation; and of course to be present in chapters one and two of DA in 1171 at Henry Blois’s death.

Lastly, the most despicable act of negligence and intransigence by modern scholarship is the insistence that Melkin’s prophecy is a fake. On this subject in particular there are only haughty pronouncements of hot air. The denial of the geometry found in the prophecy of Melkin could only be maintained by someone with a good reason to reject it; and it is not the geometry which lacks veracity.

It is simply not possible to possess so many distinctions after ones name, and not understand that the geometry locates Burgh Island; and also to be cognisant of the fact that an island in Devon was donated to Glastonbury. The real crux to finding the solution to the Matter of Britain is that any investigator has to realise that there has been single-minded fraud at Glastonbury and this same mind has proliferated Grail lore and Arthuriana to the continent.

The general consensu of scholarship which promotes a view that many different monks over time each added his own interpolation into DA; and then miraculously Joseph lore at Glastonbury just evolved by a fortuitous convergence of factors is shown to be incorrect and fatuous; especially in

\textsuperscript{821} The passage in which Gerald of Wales refers to Bledhericus, famosus ille fabulator who tempora nostra paulo praevnet, was written c. 1194. So, Gerald has no idea the man who he refers to who had died 20 years previously, was in fact his patron in his youth.
terms of storyline where much of this consolidation is carried out by Robert
de Boron.

If we don’t recognise Henry Blois as supplier of all material to Robert, then Robert is a very clever chap since he never was in possession of the prophecy of Melkin to associate the Grail with Joseph. Nor would he take it upon himself to tie together Merlin from the *Vita Merlini* with Ambrosius Merlin from HRB; wrapping up so many inconsistencies to make a consolidated Merlin. So to think that Robert’s/Henry’s story of Percival is not heard at the court of champagne while Henry is alive is untenable as an opinion or Theory. This invention is the start of the edifice of the Grail that all continuators including Chretien get their inspiration from. It is the architect who managed affairs at Glastonbury who ties Joseph and the Grail to Glastonbury but it is Henry’s Percival that gives the Grail its mystical origins in the trappings of a tale.

This exposé may have seemed like a rant against scholarship and expertise and it is plain to see I excel in neither in my turgid and wearisome report. My attribute is that I am not a scholar and as I said at the beginning of this exposé .... what I have said is verifiable.

Now, the reader may enquire how it is that I know Joseph’s relics exist on Burgh Island. There are two ways of answering this and only one would you find credible and that is the explanation found in these pages. My credibility lies in the fact that hopefully the reader has been able to follow my erratic (and apparently mad) explanation of how the *Matter of Britain* transpired. The proof is in the pie. But unless one presents the facts so that scholars can have it explained to them; Joseph and Jesus’ relics will never see the light of day and the Roman religion will continue to perpetuate the lie.

F. U. Lot.
Tunnel entrance, which then follows the line of the cliff path for about 100 yards to the old tin vault. The cratibus praeparatis.... A cavern or crater already prepared, becomes a tomb.
Approximately fifty feet under the cross is where the tomb is located. Radar imaging equipment will confirm this. The tunnel entrance leads to a bricked up wall. This was resealed after the Templars had discovered the grave. The sad fact is that none of them lived to tell the tale. But, the Grand master’s granddaughter produced the burial shroud of Jesus shortly after.

The End.

Chapter 36
The missing Chapter 29 of the Acts of the Apostles

We have seen in our investigation, the persistent rumours of Joseph of Arimathea in Britain and how it is that we have been misdirected as to his burial place by the propaganda put out by Henry Blois. When we start to search into how it is that the Britons have a tradition of St. Paul coming to Britain and whether this is true, it seems any early apostolic tradition has been expunged just as the tradition of Joseph of Arimathea visiting Britain. These traditions as Augustine found in Britain were very much alive when he arrived: "who preferred their own traditions before all the churches in the world". From a very early period there could only be one culprit; the very empire which morphed into the self-professed inheritor of Christ.... the corrupt Vatican empire. The Roman church to maintain their monopoly has been behind editing the sequence of events that transpired directly after the crucifixion. Both Joseph of Arimathea and St. Paul came to Britain, but since the very beginning of the Roman Church's claim to primacy... wherever possible, any evidence of these visits has been purposefully obscured. One can understand how the tradition of Joseph fell silent as the very core of the Christian religion was kept a secret by the Dumnonians, the inheritors of a portion of the Jews who reached Britain after the Diaspora. The fact that the body of Christ lay on Burgh Island was probably only known by Royalty, until the King, under pressure from the Saxons, bequeathed the Island to Glastonbury. If Melkin was the King whose name is illegible on the 601 charter, it would certainly explain how it is that he is cognizant of where Joseph’s body is.

So, why did St. Paul so wish to visit Spain and the British Isles? We should look at a little known and often dismissed document that has much in common with our investigation. The document is now understood to be chapter 29 of the original Acts of the Apostles and was translated by C. S. Sonnini from an original Greek manuscript found in the Archives at
Constantinople, and presented to him by the Sultan Abdoul Achmet while visiting Constantinople. It gives an account of trips undertaken by St Paul after his two years enforced residence in Rome in his own hired house. This lost Chapter 29 of the Acts of the Apostles was found interleaved in a copy of the French naturalist Sonnini de Manoncourt ‘Voyage en Grèce et en Turquie’. It was purchased at the sale of the library and effects of the late Right Hon. Sir John Newport, Bart, MP (1756–1843) in Ireland, whose family arms were engraved on the cover of the book. It had been in their possession for more than thirty years, with a copy of the royal decree (firman) of the Sultan of Turkey, granting to C. S. Sonnini, permission to travel in all parts of the Ottoman dominions.

No trace of the original Greek manuscript has been found to date and for this reason the document is considered a fake. Also the document appeared at a time when supposedly a ‘new theory’ was in vogue that the Britons were part of the lost tribes of Israel. Few have considered that if a Frenchman had been handed the original, he would most certainly have handed it to a Catholic authority for verification. The original would never be heard of again if it glorified holy links to Britain. The title page of Sonnini’s work, in which the English translation of the document was found has this written upon it:

"Travels in Turkey and Greece undertaken by order of Louis XVI, and with the authority of the Ottoman Court by C. S. Sonnini, member of several scientific or literary societies of the Society of Agriculture of Paris, and of the Observers of Men.'Mores multorum videt et ubes.' — HOR., London; Printed for T. N. Longman and O. Rees, Paternoster Row, 1801."

The text first came to light in London in 1871 when it was printed as a six page pamphlet by Geo. J. Stevenson entitled: The long lost chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: containing an account of the Apostle Paul's journey into Spain and Britain, and other interesting events.

Should we look upon this Chapter 29 document as being eradicated from all extant copies of the Acts of the Apostles by the Roman religion at a very early date, specifically to nullify any notion the British might have of testing primacy over Rome? The manuscripts from the Western text-type (as represented by the Codex Bezae) and the Alexandrian text-type (as represented by the Codex Sinaiticus) are the earliest surviving texts of Acts. The version of Acts preserved in the Western manuscripts contains about 10% more content than the Alexandrian version of Acts. Why should some
unadulterated version not exist in Constantinople, far from the desire of those ready to re-write history and who were bent on establishing their own monopoly by extension of the Roman Empire.

It also may have been the long hand of Rome trying to eradicate Father Good’s testimony concerning Montacute as we discussed earlier. The finding of Joseph of Arimathea would confirm the primacy of the British church. Even though Father Good had initially deposited his information in the English College in Rome, had it not been for the existence of Maihew’s Trophea remaining unadulterated in Stillingfleet’s private collection...... perhaps knowledge of Melkin’s marker point on the 104 mile line would have been lost. Certainly without this reference point (on a line) there would be less chance of verifying one has found the true location of Ineswitrin. Perhaps, by chance, this extant copy of Chapter 29 has survived; preserved far away from the hands of Rome. The Papacy has perverted the truth about events after the crucifixion and eradicated evidence of St. Paul’s visit to Britain. An argument put forward for Paul’s visit to Britain can be found in a book first published in 1861 subtitled ‘The origin of British as opposed to Papal Christianity’ by the Rev R.W. Morgan better known as ‘St Paul in Britain’.

However, as to the genuineness of Sonnini’s work and the fact that he did witness chapter 29 in Turkey, seems beyond doubt when one considers he was travelling during the reign of Louis XVI, who reigned from 1774 to 1793 and would have published during this period or soon thereafter. Why, one must ask, would a Frenchman fabricate or bear witness to a manuscript which confers on Britain a visit of Saint Paul? This could have been understandable as a work of polemic written by the British, but a work possibly faked by a Frenchman tends to confirm its validity.

In the second letter of St. Paul to Timothy (2 Timothy 4:21), St. Paul sends to Timothy the greetings of “Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, Claudia and all the brethren”. Claudia, the only woman to be mentioned is said by tradition to be the wife of Pudens and that she was the mother or sister of Linus, who was the second Bishop of Rome and St. Peter’s successor after his death. Some have assumed that Claudia Rufina is the same Claudia being greeted and who was married to Aulus Pudens a senator and friend of Martial, the poet.

She was definitely British and described by Martial as `sprung from the woad-stained Britons'. It is not sure if she was the daughter of an exiled
British King, living in Rome, Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, who ruled as a Roman client in the late 1st century or the daughter of the British resistance leader Caratacus who gave the famous speech in the Senate. If this is the same Claudia as the friend of St. Paul, Claudia and Pudens were also the hosts of St. Peter and their house (which became the church of St. Pudentiana in Rome) was the place where St. Peter celebrated mass i.e. the First Church in Rome was in fact established by Britons.

The Roman Church founded on St. Peter had been entertained by offspring from a Royal King that had already accepted the truth of Jesus as the Messiah. Such readiness to receive the truth could have been established by the presence of Joseph of Arimathea in Britain straight after the crucifixion. It is this presence of Britons in Rome and persistent rumours of the Holy Family settling in Britain, which at a later time has caused the Roman Church to assert its primacy. Especially, when these pretentions became a point of contention between Bishops partly later, due to a struggle to establish creeds and dogma and also due to the contention of events provided by British sources as to what transpired after the crucifixion. Three hundred years after these contentions, St John Chrysostom (347-407 AD) writes in his ‘Contra Judacos’: “Even the British Isles have felt the power of the Word, for there too churches and altars have been erected: there too, as in the extreme East, or in the South, men may be heard discussing points of Scripture, with different voices, but not with different belief.”

The end result of these events as we can see today is that the Roman Church has nullified into fable or myth any account of Joseph’s arrival. Cornish tradition still survived about Joseph’s contact with the south west. For the Roman Church to sanitize any mention of St. Paul’s visit to England makes one conclude there were early contentions as the Roman Church tried to bring the British traditions into submission which as we have seen is corroborated later on by St. Augustine.

Chapter 29 is written in the style of the Acts and reads like a continuation of it. The places named are the Roman appellations and the peoples named are also likewise in their ancient forms such as Helvetia and Belgae and Lud. The original text would have been written in Greek and in the same style and tone as the Acts of the Apostles. It would seem that a feasible answer as to how it has survived is that it was preserved in the Archives of Constantinople, far from the meddlers of history in Rome. None
can say emphatically who the Acts of the Apostles was written by, but it would appear to be Luke ‘the companion of Paul’ (named in Colossians 4:14)... for reasons that both prefaces are addressed to Theophilus. In the preface of the Acts it explicitly references "my former book". Acts may well have been a joint venture with anecdotal evidences added by Paul himself or a travelling companion. However, there is no Amen at the end of Chapter 28 and in every book written by Paul it concludes with the word "Amen" just as it does here in Acts 29:26.

Whether St Paul went on to Spain at this occasion as he had planned in Romans 15:24, *I plan to do so when I go to Spain. I hope to visit you while passing through and to have you assist me on my journey there, after I have enjoyed your company for a while*, or again in Romans 15:28, *So after I have completed this task and have made sure that they have received this fruit, I will go to Spain and visit you on the way... or was prevented until later*, is not evident. He does however state that his visit was only for a short period and can be seen as heading back in the direction of Rome.

Chapter 29 has barely been dealt with by Papal theologians since its discovery as it has largely been ignored. This is probably because it tells of St Paul going to Spain, and then on to the British Isles and this raises too many inconsistencies in the now standardized Roman version of events. The implications of this visit by St. Paul also add credence to the rumours of the Holy Family’s voyage that it has taken the Roman Church millennia to stamp out. The Vatican had managed to reduce the story of Joseph’s voyage to Britain to the rank of rumour, romance or legend, (until Henry Blois finds Melkin’s prophecy), but St. Paul’s visit to Britain would add credibility to the Britons professing primacy in the establishment of the first Church.

Theodoretus, in his commentary on 2 Timothy 4:6 wrote, *‘When Paul was sent by Festus on his appeal to Rome, he travelled, after being acquitted into Spain, and thence extended his travels into other countries and to the islands surrounded by the sea’*. This (given that we have a St Paul’s cathedral), surely was the British Isles. Paul’s travels might have occurred after his acquittal. Theodoretus was the Bishop of Cyropolis and he attended the General Council at Ephesus in A.D. 431 and at Chalcedon in A.D. 451 consisting of 600 Bishops...... so his witness should be taken seriously.... since it also concurs with this account given in the chapter 29 version of events. In A.D. 435 Theodoretus wrote, *"Paul, liberated from his first captivity at Rome, preached the Gospel to Britons and others in the West. Our*
fishermen and publicans (the Disciples) not only persuaded the Romans and their tributaries to acknowledge the Crucified and His laws, but the Britons also and the Cimbri (Cymry).” Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, wrote in A.D. 320, "The Apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles." In A.D. 600, Venantius Fortunatus wrote of Britain as having been "evangelized" by St. Paul.

The Sonnini Manuscript is almost certainly the concluding portion of the "Acts of the Apostles", and gives an account of Paul's journeys after his two years enforced residence in Rome. The following is the English translation of the Sonnini Manuscript, which was originally written in Greek.

Acts 29:1 "And Paul, full of the blessings of Christ, and abounding in the spirit, departed out of Rome, determining to go into Spain, for he had a long time purposed to journey thitherward, and was minded also to go from thence into Britain."

Acts 29:2 "For he had heard in Phoenicia that certain of the children of Israel, about the time of the Assyrian captivity, had escaped by sea to the isles afar off," as spoken by the prophet, and called by the Roman's Britain."

Acts 29:3 "And the Lord commanded the gospel to be preached far hence to the Gentiles, and to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

Acts 29:4 "And no man hindered Paul; for he testified boldly of Jesus before the tribunes and among the people and he took with him certain of the brethren which abode with him at Rome, and they took shipping at Ostium, and having the winds fair, were brought safely into an haven of Spain."

Acts 29:5 "And much people were gathered together from the towns and villages, and the hill country; for they had heard of the conversion of the apostle, and the many miracles which he had wrought."

Acts 29:6 "And Paul preached mightily in Spain, and great multitudes believed and were converted, for they perceived he was an apostle sent from God."

Acts 29:7 "And they departed out of Spain, and Paul and his company finding a ship in Armorica sailed unto Britain, they went therein, and passing along the South coast they reached a port called Raphinus."

Acts 29:8 "Now when it was noised abroad that the apostle had landed on their coast, great multitudes of the inhabitants met him, and they treated Paul courteously, and he entered in at the east gate of their city, and lodged in the house of an Hebrew and one of his own nation."
Where exactly the port of Raphinus was is not clear, but if this whole chapter was an invention why not use a more plausible port and not one that is unheard of.

Acts 29:9 “And on the morrow he came and stood upon Mount Lud; and the people thronged at the gate and assembled in the broadway. He preached Christ unto them, and many believed the word and the testimony of Jesus”.

St Paul's Cathedral stands today at Ludgate hill in London.

Acts 29:10 "And at even the Holy Ghost fell upon Paul, and he prophesied, saying, behold in the last days the God of Peace shall dwell in the cities, and the inhabitants thereof shall be numbered; and in the seventh numbering of the people, their eyes shall be opened, and the glory of their inheritance shine forth before them. And nations shall come up to worship on the Mount that testifies to the patience and long suffering of a servant of the Lord."

Acts 29:11 "And in the latter days, new tidings of the Gospel shall issue forth out of Jerusalem. And the hearts of the people shall rejoice, and behold, fountains shall be opened and there shall be no more plague."

Acts 29:12 "In those days there shall be wars and rumours of wars; and a King shall rise up, and his sword shall be for the healing of the nations, and his peace making shall abide, and the glory of his Kingdom a wonder among princes."

Acts 29:13 "And it came to pass that certain of the Druids came unto Paul privately, and showed by their rites and ceremonies they were descended from the Jews which escaped from bondage in the land of Egypt, and the apostle believed these things, and he gave them the kiss of peace."

Acts 29:14 "Paul stayed and lived there for three months. He was confirmed in the faith; and preached Christ continually."

Acts 29:15 "And after these things, Paul and his brethren departed from Raphinus; and sailed unto Atium in Gaul.

Acts 29:16 "And Paul preached in the Roman garrisons and among the people, exhorting all men to repent and confess their sins."

Acts 29:17 "And there came to him certain of the Belgae to enquire of him of the new doctrine, and of the man Jesus; and Paul opened his heart unto them, and told them all things that had befallen him, how be it that Christ
Jesus came into the world to save sinners; and they departed, pondering among themselves upon the things which they had heard."

Acts 29:18 "And after much preaching and toil Paul and his fellow labourers passed into Helvetia, and came unto Mount Pontius Pilate, where he who condemned the Lord Jesus dashed himself down headlong, and so miserably perished."

After arriving in northern France and travelling through Belgium and Helvetia; the writer seems to think he arrives at the place that Pontius Pilate found death in Switzerland. Eusebius, in his Historia Ecclesiae ii: 7 quotes some early apocryphal accounts (for which he gives no source) which relate that Pilate met with misfortune in Caligula’s reign 37–41 and was exiled to Gaul and eventually committed suicide there in Vienne where a monument called Pilate's tomb can still be seen.

Acts 29:19 "And immediately a torrent gushed out of the mountain and washed his body, broken in pieces into a lake."

Acts 29:20 "And Paul stretched forth his hands upon the water, and prayed unto the Lord, saying, O Lord God give a sign unto all nations that here Pontius Pilate, which condemned thine only begotten Son, plunged headlong into the pit."

Acts 29:21 "And while Paul was yet speaking, behold there came a great earthquake, and the face of the waters was changed, and the form of the lake like unto the Son of Man hanging in the agony upon the cross."

Acts 29:22 "And a voice came out of heaven saying, Even Pilate hath escaped the wrath to come, for he washed his hands before the multitude at the blood-shedding of the Lord Jesus."

Acts 29:23 "When therefore, Paul and those that were with him saw the earthquake, and heard the voice of the angel, they glorified God, and were mightily strengthened in spirit."

Acts 29:24 "And they journeyed and came to Mount Julius, where stood two pillars, one on the right hand and one on the left hand, erected by Caesar Augustus."

Paul then travels to "Mount Julius" (the Julian Alps between Italy and Austria) then onto Illyricum, on his way to Macedonia and Asia, from where he wrote the Pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus.

Acts 29:25 "And Paul, filled with the Holy Ghost, stood up between the two pillars, saying ‘Men and brethren, these stones which ye see this day shall testify of my journey hence; and verily I say, they shall remain until the out
pouring of the spirit upon all nations, neither shall the way be hindered throughout all generation'."

Acts 29:26 "And they went forth and came unto Illyricum; intending to go by Macedonia into Asia, and grace was found in all the churches; and they prospered and had peace. Amen."

There seems little point to such an invention. One can barely see any advantage even if the chapter were composed by someone British and designed to prove that the British were one of the lost tribes as Pliny already has said that there were Jews in Britain.
Appendix 1

Libellus of Henry Blois

I, Henry, unworthy abbot of the church of Glastonbury, assessing carefully that the words or deeds of ancestors are injured at length by detractors and often weakened by descendants, have judged worthy to commit by pen anything which I have earnestly done at Glastonbury to future memory, so that I shall both make distant the words of the detractors and make known to posterity the truth of the matter. In the 1126th year from the incarnation of the Lord, when at God’s assent and the favour of Henry King of the English, I had received the control of the church of Glastonbury, I found the place, once very renowned, mocking the deeds of the priors: in their cottages it was threatening near ruin; and because it was bearing down more in the present, the monks were lacking in the necessities of life; and the church was devoid of many great possessions. I confess that upon seeing these things I was pained; deceived by promised hope, I was ashamed to such an extent that my passionate mind brought me to chaos, because I had preferred until now to be a poor man of Cluny, to be close with the poor, than to be in charge of anything, selected for such a burden. I was able to not be rich and famous and be deemed rich and famous. Among these and certain other setbacks, which either by their disgrace or overabundance I am ashamed or fail to name in writing, now swelling to such an extent that it was preferable to run away from the proposition, unexpectedly divine compassion extended the hand of its support to me, so that with certainty not doubting anything, I might be lighted on by a little bit of faith, it brought about even a love of the mother of God, to whose protection the said place is known to be assigned, and also whose memory is solemnly delivered for daily use there. It compelled me to not abandon the deference of those serving her, to remove enemies, to bring
together the scattered. Therefore I set out to describe what was promised, so that, just as it must all be prayed for me, the reader and the hearer may decide equally.

A certain knight Odo by name, at the gift of my predecessor abbot Sigrid, for the sake of thanks of a certain relation which Odo had led as a wife, the dapifer of the church, had committed to him three manors of his demesne. He, as I received his homage, asked that I grant the dwellings carefully. Whenever I requested the deed from him, which he had received at a certain tenor from the said abbot with the brothers reluctant, he brought it forward altered: fraudulently changed with many witnesses, so false that he refused to be placed under judicial investigation concerning both these things which he possessed and the false deed. Thus defeated, thus found liable by the lawful examination of those who were present, he parted with what he held wrongly, and for the disgrace of the case, he promised and paid money. In short, at the order of the King (in whose ears the said Odo had instilled some cunning) in sight of many nobles, all these things were reported. Therefore, to those examining the case carefully, Odo was found liable, embarrassed and ashamed; overcome, those things which he held wrongly were given in my hand, and afterward he yielded them up on the altar of St Mary with many witnessing. But it sounded to my ears that, with the rod flourished, he was not to be thoroughly intimidated. At the request of some, I promised him 40 solidates of land and the service of a certain knight of Esseberia. And because he was outstripped by death, what I had promised to the father I paid in full to his son Roger.

On Melnes

Another person, Roger de Mara, just as he reported and his charters grant, at the gift of the Abbot, the grant of the King, yet without the consent of the brothers, possessed the manner which is called Melnes. He, when neither by promising money, nor by mentioning obsequies, nor by speaking suitably, was able to advance; and when the craft of his low birth had travelled from here to there enough, to the great, the neighbours, and the judges, and he had not found refuge or a place for escape, unwilling, he yielded what he had held wrongly to God and the church through my hand. But I would not altogether crush he whom I had weakened, I accepted his homage; I bestowed 20 solidates of land to him. I also entrusted the manors for a time to him so that, by the custom of the country he would pay rent there. And when for certain cases, emerging not much after from the side of the King (whom he had
offended) poorly against him, I had received those manners from him; in their stock from the owed rent he owed me a sum of 40 pounds. Meanwhile before the King he positioned me as a guarantor with others and compelled me to pay for 10 marks. All these things he was drawn into the case, when he feared trial, for the absolution of each debt he returned 20 solidates of the land which he had received.

**On a land in Brentemaris**

One Ralph namely from St Barbara, requested from the Abbot Herluin, my predecessor in Brentemaris, some land adjacent to the River Axe. Which just as he presented, profited the church in no way, nothing could be useful in the present or in the future. He took possession of this, described in such a way, noted likewise in a charter, by a gift of the Abbot. Therefore, when on a certain day he entered the said manor, by wondering through twisted causeways, I scoured my paths, I found a land in circles here, fortified there by a mud wall, surrounded by the depth of the River. In there I saw a crop of reddening with the gold colour, murmuring sweetly to gentle breezes, wide on its surface, displaying and even flatness, so that no surplus could grow out in the opposite direction, nor did anything springing forth underneath on the other side separate the joined branches, with their density picking bundles more than dividing ears of corn. When I asked the name of the land, I learned that he had contracted it from the said knight, “of no profit”. Therefore, when on the established day, such fraud had been eliminated by many assembled men, I guaranteed by their judgement the said land now deserved a changed name. When my predecessor Sigfrid had crossed from Abbot to Bishop, Geoffrey the Chancellor took up the possessions of the church of Glastonbury to be administered. He sold five churches, pulled out by his mother; he transferred them for his role and his use. I seized these, and I did not wish to yield to the promises, threats, or fears blowing against me. Conquered at last by the request of the King, I retained two, three I gave up to him on such a condition that the mother church would not lose whatever among these it had possessed in tithes or others. He, living in that position and condition, presided. However in dying, he changed into something else and gave them up free to the mother church.

**On some land in Moorlinch restored and given to the estate.**

At the permission of Thurston the Abbot, a certain Ansketill, his brother seized upon two and a half hides of land in the manner of Moorlinch, from the demesne of the Abbey from before. And he, when he made a border of the fief
opposite me, because he held it by right of the knight of that Abbey, he publicly returned that land of the demesne, unreasonably taken from the church, through me, at the favour of God, deraigned, and conceding it for the supplement of the estate of the monks, lest any of my descendants at any time should presume to corrupt my grant, offering through the text of the gospel, upon the altar of Glastonbury, in common presence I confirmed it.

**On the church of Pucklechurch, given to the sacristy.**

I also granted, on the same day by similar confirmation, the church of Pucklechurch, so that from their revenue the candlelight be had continually in the church of St Mary, which on account of its age the ancient church is called Ealde Chirche by the people. And on this conclusion; that Edward the clerk, to whom as long as he lives, I had granted the church of Pucklechurch, he would yield 20 shillings to the sacristy, just as he used to give me. And as long as Edward himself completes that, in addition, the sacristy has 20 shillings from my estate; so that would be 40 shillings. Also with Edward completing it, it shall remain entirely to the consideration of the sacristy for the said light.

**Likewise on some land in Moorlinch.**

Hugh de G. brother of Odo had claimed for himself 3 1/2 hides in the manor of Moorlinch at the consent of Abbot Thurstan, with the convent un-consulted and unknowing, from the demesne of the monks. Which, when it reached my notice, H. now dead, I met with William, his son and successor in inheritance, concerning that land. And he, acquiescing to my just request, at the Council of his friends, gave that land without claim for the future; this was also Matilda's, wife of the said Hugh. But, lest I be no one for cruelty and greed I granted one hide in the manner of Midleton to her, so long as she lives, for her keep and for the mercy of God. The witness of this matter are a coulter upon the altar, cantors, and a shepherd.

**On Uffculme.**

In addition, when I had perceived the manor of Uffculme, which Robert fitz Walter Flandrensis possessed then, but was under the jurisdiction of Glastonbury from old, had crossed into the jurisdiction of another, I confess I was of two minds by the age of the matter. Equally, I considered on behalf of the time, I put off the charge. Then with King Henry my uncle dying, my brother Stephen succeeding in the reign, the said Robert paid homage, in addition swore fealty, with other nobleman of the country because of custom; but not much afterwards, with all duty of fidelity and legality thoroughly neglected, he became wilful and rebellious against the law and the King, and
with some accomplices of his negligence, he was compelled to repudiate not only his own duties but also all of England, with justice prevailing. Then, when the place was considered; the opportunity had, because it was of the jurisdiction of the church; and had been carried off from the church together with violence and fraudulence for a long time, I accused him publicly. I put forth the charge in front of the entire Curia. And by their consent (not custom) with the authority of God in all things, the King, satisfying the holy Church, a member to the mother, liberally restored the said manner to Glastonbury through me.

**On Syston**

A certain matron by the name of Ratsenda freely present possessed a vill of Syston, bordering upon the manner of Pucklechurch. She, from the beginning of my arrival coming to pray at Glastonbury, then sought my conversation. And speaking with her among other things, when the said possession was away from the charges of anyone else, I learned the vill was hers. By the aid of God and my council it was done so that she herself promised it to the jurisdiction of Glastonbury, whether alive or dead, with her own possession, suitable witnesses have been summoned. And then, at the passing of a moderate amount of years, when I felt that she, death imminent, was greatly ill, I sent some men of mind to see that she was ill and urge the memory of the said promise at my succession. Further on, when my men arrived, there arrived certain other monks (cenobites), whom, so they said, the grace of that matron had invited, pleading to both her funeral processions, and the investiture of the possession promised to them. Here, they put forward my charge openly to me, and forbade the trifling of others of any sort. To others passing the charge was heard (and not the obstacle), hence the case was industriously pursued. For the second time, I sent monks and knights from my own men, who urged the matron to correct her error and satisfy the previous promise, indeed the truth. Which, finally, returned to memory, the error was recognised, she confessed her negligence. Pardon too, when she was able to try, was humbly requested. She satisfied my arbitration, naming herself with her possession of Glastonbury especially. And these have been related to me, 40 marks of silver to herself, with which she paid debts, and a share was given and bestowed to the church where she prayed, for the remedy of her soul, I saw that they were granted. And at last, she concluded her life in a catholic manner; her body was honourably taken and buried in Glastonbury. Then I granted entirely the vill of Syston, determined by the disposition of the matron
of Glastonbury, for the demesne of the mother of God, and confirmed by the
seal of the patroness of the principal church and royal authority.

**On Camerton and Certain Others.**

But I shall not omit through forgetfulness what must certainly be recalled
especially. A certain knight Robert, by the name of Cotele, adequately and in
addition grateful to Herluin, at the consent and (as it was said) the imprest of
the Abbot, had claimed for himself portions for some of the manors of the
Abbey. Meanwhile the Abbot died, he claimed several things from the gift of
the Abbot. And not much later, Robert himself dying, gave up the said parts to
his wife and children, as if they were of hereditary right, namely the manor of
Camerton, the manner of Ure, two hides or more of Pucklechurch, likewise of
Dulting, one hide of Damerham, likewise of Deverel, and very many others.
After this, Sigfrid, succeeding Herluin into the Abbey, claimed Camerton for
the demesne of the church, but he instantly relinquished it to Roger Bishop of
Salisbury for thanks. When I succeeded Sigfrid, since I had investigated these
things, said and by the beginning of my control (except Camerton, regarding
which it must be yielded to the reverence and diligence of Bishop Roger, and I
determined it to be supported in accordance with his discretion) all the rest I
restored to ecclesiastical freedom from occupation. Longer after this and not,
however, calmly putting up with the ownership of Camerton, when the Bishop
died, I did not delay in restoring that manor to the demesne of Glastonbury.
Also in addition to this, I had seized another vill (concerning which the service
of one knight was owed to the church, which the said Sigfrid yielded to the
said Bishop as well) just as the demesne, until he, who possessed it before by
military right, requited me, and when at last from him homage for fealty to
the church was accepted, I yielded so that he would pay the right of the Knight
to the church. The name of that vill is Pillesdone.

**On Damerham**

And I shall not omit that I found in the manner of Damerham (which
seemed especially to be under the jurisdiction of Glastonbury,) I found six who
were called canons, possessing individual prebends. On account of this the
demesne was not occupied reasonably. Although I made light of it, I
nonetheless wished to recover nothing recklessly. What more? With each of
the canons departing by dying in turn, I did not wish to be defeated or
softened by prayer or pay. Whereby, I granted them conditions as something
other than one and the same demesne. Thus, each of the college had their
own. And now, I suitably placed the chaplain, who would carry out the rights
of the church in that very place. Through me by the grace of God, the church was renewed and ecclesiastical decorations were customarily repaired better in every respect. Thus, in truth, I also made the manor, which I spoke of especially before. In addition, suitable buildings were founded not unsuitably.

On Ashcott and Pedwelle.

Then in advancing cases, when I exacted the service of two Knights for the service of the King from a certain Ivan who possessed two vills, Ashcott and Pedwelle, by right of a knight (for I had learned as much was formally owed there from fellow knights), he resisted with every effort, imploring that he was liable for the service of merely one knight. Whereupon, (so as to make much short by abridgement) at last we met, when considered publicly, he fell into an opinion of disinheriting. And for this redemption he owed much more than he was able to pay. Moderate in my mercy, so that I would acquiesce to some circumstances, both because I had accepted his homage, and because it seemed unfeeling, with his father dead, I gave the man up entirely free. Moved by humanity, thus I sensibly exercised moderacy, so that I would neither thoroughly disregard my own benefit, which was evident, nor completely keep disaster or ruin on Ivan. Then Council was held. I gave up the vill of Milton (near Givelcestriburgo) to Ivan for his keep; however, the church of his vill and its appurtenances were taken for the demesne of Glastonbury. Also of such a tenor that Ivan, who will at first be burdened for the service of the two Knights for the said two vills, content with this vill, thereupon he will be acquitted of one knight. Hence it was done on both sides so that Ivan is discharged and the demesne of the church is increased. And not to be made light of is the nearness of the said two vills, and not to be undervalued is the opportuneness of the use, when seen as though in view of a door. These things were done in the presence of Robert Bishop of Bath, with the present and favouring convent of Glastonbury.

On Andersea, gained and given to the sacristy.

Godwin son of Edwin of Scipam, offering his son to be given instruction in monastic disciplines, gave to God St Mary and me the land of Andersea, which he possessed before by hereditary right from that same church through the time of three Kings (namely William senior and his son William Junior and Henry their successor), in the time so long as he wished, at their consent and authority, retaining only half a hide from there; on the tenor that he give up another virgate after his death to the church, and another for the key of his wife and children, which they also would recognise as from the demesne of
that church. These were done and confirmed in the presence of very many suitable witnesses, with me standing before the altar with vestment and crosier, and with the communion of the holy Church excommunicating all those who strive to stay away, by any means or trick, the said land from the church’s demesne. I also granted on that same hour, the land of the church to the sacristy for administration of the lights of the church.

The point in composing this is to show that Henry is concerned with the rights and wrongs of the mundane and has no affiliation with the construction of HRB, the burial of Arthur, the invention of Joseph at Glastonbury, the invention of the St Patrick charter, the composition of the Life of Gildas, the interpolations in William of Malmesbury, and the invention of Grail literature. Who would associate such a mundane composition on par with any of the above works which we have covered which have Henry’s hand upon them? Is it not astounding that this is the only composition from a man who likens himself to Cicero and puts the work of an author above all things worldly? Henry’s Libellus is the most artful ruse even though it reflects the truth of what transpired at Glastonbury.
Appendix 1.5

Not with impunity, however, for the leader shall be killed; he shall have the name of a horse and because of that fact shall be fierce.

Henry Blois’ device here is to pretend that Merlin is predicting the coming of Horsa or as ‘Geoffrey’ calls him in both HRB and VM Horsus. By feigning prediction of the Saxon arrival through prophecy he adds historical accuracy to both VM and HRB. A record of both Hengist and Horsa are attested in Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum and in Nennius’ Historia Brittonum.

Their names are also recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, all of which Henry Blois used as source material to construct the HRB. Because their names are found in the British annals as two Germanic brothers in the Anglo-Saxon era who led the Angle, Saxon and Jutish armies which invaded the territories of the Britons in the 5th century, Merlin is supposed to be seeing their arrival as part of his prophetic vision.... regardless of the anachronism. He is staged in the later era of Rhydderch in VM. The point is, his audience is unaware of chronology yet the two brothers both establish authenticity for Geoffrey’s works as they are part of the Briton’s history. In the VM:

The Saxon people, in fact, arriving in their curved keels had come to serve him with their helmeted soldiery. They were led by two courageous brothers, Horsus and Hengist, who afterwards with wicked treachery harmed the people and the cities. For after this, by serving the King with industry, they won him over to themselves and seeing the people moved by a quarrel that touched them closely they were able to subjugate the King; then turning their ferocious arms upon the people they broke faith and killed the princes by a premeditated fraud while they were sitting with them after calling them

822 It becomes clear that Robert de Boron derived his work from Henry. In this work the point is made that Merlin appears at different times in history to explain the many anachronisms throw up by ‘Geoffrey’s’ work.
together to make peace and a treaty with them, and the prince they drove over the top of the snowy mountain.

Hengist and Horsa arrived in Britain as mercenaries serving Vortigern, eventually leading to the ‘Night of the Long Knives’, when Hengist's men massacred the Britons at a peace accord. However, Henry forgets his own plot as it was Cadwallader, renouncing worldly things for the sake of God and His Kingdom everlasting, came unto Rome. (the prince they drove over the top of the snowy mountain). ‘Over the snowy mountain’ refers to a sojourn in Rome. However, ‘Geoffrey’s’ notion that Cadwaladr died in Rome is fiction and derives from a confusion of his own making where he originally read that it was Caedwalla, King of Wessex who died on a pilgrimage to Rome in 689.\textsuperscript{823}

\textsuperscript{823} Lloyd, history of Wales. I:230
Appendix 2. Dumbarton

Until it is recognized that Geoffrey of Monmouth was a *nom de plume* used by Henry Blois, commentators will find it difficult to understand the inconsistencies found in Merlin’s predictions. We should understand that Henry conflates his source material with the sole purpose of anchoring his supposed prophecies as if they were made in Merlin’s era, providing contemporaneity for them by events which records show transpired in the sixth century.

This gambit is also used in association with a location and its history. For ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’ Dumbarton represented the Brythonic Britons which was the Kingdom of Strathclyde and its northern half occupied by the Damnonii, belonging to the Cornish variety of the British race, but its first King Rhydderch Hael, (Columba’s and Kentigern’s friend) is the real reason it is mentioned because Henry has set VM in the court Rhydderch.

Dumbarton (from *Dún Breatann* or *Dùn Breatainn* means "fort of the Britons" and therefore links for ‘Geoffrey’ the Britons of Wales to the Strathclyde area and therefore merits attention in his prophecies. The inhabitants, (as he indicates not being rebuilt) are the wretched souls taken into slavery to Ireland we witness later on in the Vita where wretched people cross the water. In 869 AD, when Olaf the White, the Norse King of Dublin, brought a raiding army to plunder Scotland, Olaf and his brother Ivarr laid siege to the formidable rock fortress of Dumbarton. For four months starving the Britons out, until the fortress’ well dried up.

They ferried a ‘great host’ of Britons to Ireland as slaves on a fleet of 200 ships. The real reason that Henry concerns himself with Dumbarton is to place Merlin Caledonius in the North and predict occurrences about the north to establish the new northern Merlin. Merlin was of course corroborated as hailing from the north also through Blaise and Merlin being in Northumberland.... as presented in Robert de Boron’s work.

Geoffrey, unconcerned with exactitude in his concoction of the VM, has Rhydderch and Merlin with Taliesin and so indicates Taliesin as a partial...
source. Taliesin’s poem is a first-person eyewitness account (as Merlin’s presence on the battlefield pretends to be) and glorifies a victory by Urien, prince of Rheged, in which he led his warriors in defence against a host of invaders at a site in Gwen Ystrad.

The *Battle of Argoed Llwyfain*, details of which Henry Blois also conflates as witnessed at the end of the Vita comes from the early Welsh poem *Gwaith Argoed Llwyfain* also by Taliesin. The main purpose of the inclusion of a prophecy regarding Dumbarton is to make his audience believe that unlike the Merlin Ambrosius of HRB, this Merlin actually did make predictions concerning the north... in the area he is seemingly being portrayed to have lived in.

My guess is that many commented and were suspicious of the high relevance of the previous prophecies to Norman aspects and Henry’s family and to Winchester and concerns with the numbering of Kings up to Stephen originally suddenly being expanded up to six. To avoid suspicion, Henry relocates Merlin in VM, while at the same time linking him to Taliesin and Rhydderch... because people have asked questions about the prophecies. They must have enquired how it was that none had heard of Merlin before or in what area he lived. It is for this reason the northern Merlin persona is created in VM.

Appendix 3

*Porchester shall see its broken walls in its harbour until a rich man with the tooth of a wolf shall restore it.*

Portchester Castle is a medieval castle built within a former Roman fort at Portchester and is located at the northern end of Portsmouth Harbour. The Normans, at the beginning of the 12th century, commenced the erection of the Castle, under the orders of Henry Ist, and in 1133, at the instigation of Henry Blois. He gave a Charter to the Augustinian Monks of Normandy: *This Charter, ‘Granted to God, and the Church of the Blessed Mary of Portcestre,*
and to the Canons regularly serving there, the Church of St. Mary, there founded by him, with the land and titles belonging to the Church, for the benefit of the souls of his father and mother and William, his brother, his ancestors and successors, and for the prosperity and safety of his Kingdom. Dated at Burnham on our passage overseas, 1133.

It seems that the church was already erected and functioning in 1133 with the monks in possession. The Church is one of the finest Romanesque churches in Wessex and the most precisely dated. The Canons did not stay long at Portchester, for they were moved away between 1145 and 1153, to a more spacious house at Southwick and there built a new Priory by Henry Blois who controlled Southwick and its brothels. Papal Bulls issued by Pope Eugenius II in 1145 and 1153 were addressed to the Priors of Portchester and Southwick respectively, setting forth that the Pope received the Churches and the Priories under his protection.

After the Norman Invasion the manor of Portchester was granted to William Maudit, a powerful magnate, and it was probably he who built Portchester Castle. At this time it would probably have been defended by a wooden palisade and a moat, with the original Roman stone walls of the fort acting as the defence of the outer bailey. Maudit died in about 1100, and his property passed onto his son, Robert Maudit. He died in 1120, and a few years later the family estates came into the hands of William Pont de l'Arche through marriage to Robert Maudit's daughter. This same William Pont de l'Arche was also the man who refused to give Henry Blois the keys to Henry Ist coffers at Winchester just after King Stephen’s arrival.

The evidence for building at this time is that the stonework of the castle is similar to that of St Mary’s parish church, which was built in the 1130s in the outer bailey. The church was built for an Augustinian priory which Pont de l'Arche established within the castle in 1128. Given the relationship between Henry Blois and William, it is hard not to see that since the cannons were moved to Southwick, after the death of William Pont de l'Arche in 1148, one assumes it was taken over by Henry Blois. Although who inherited it is uncertain.

However, when the Bishop supported the Empress Matilda.... William Pont de l'Arche handed the royal castle over to the Empress for he was still Castellan. After the rout at Winchester when Henry Blois’ allegiance reverted to his brother and after the Angevin victory at Wilton, William Pont de l'Arche, picked a very serious quarrel with the King's brother, the
bishop of Winchester and was sent reinforcements in the person of Robert son of Hildebrand a person of low birth.

However, while holed up with the Castellan Hildebrand seduced William Pont de l'Arche’ wife and locked William in his own dungeon in portchester castle. Henry Blois as the writer of the Gesta Stephani takes great pleasure in describing Robert’s downfall from what sounds like syphilis: the traitorous corrupter lay in the unchaste bosom of the adulteress and crept through his vitals, and slowly eating away his entrails it gradually consumed the scoundrel. There is little doubt that William Pont de l'Arche would have been released after starting the calamity and one must assume since the cannons were moved to Southwick, that Henry had appropriated Porchester castle in 1143 in the episode described in the GS before a grant reinstating it to Henry Maudit.

The earliest extant reference to the castle is in a grant from 1153 in which Henry II granted the castle to Henry Maudit even though Henry II ascended to the throne in 1154 and Stephen was not even dead. Another reason for Portchester castle’s inclusion in the prophecy in the Vita Merlini is no doubt the connection to Marcus Aurelius Carausius; a one-time self-appointed Emperor of Britain. ‘Geoffrey’ refers to Portchester as Kaerperis so as to conflate it with one of Nennius’ unidentified cities and is then borrowed as such by Henry of Huntingdon.

One would suppose the rich man in the prophecy is Henry Blois himself even though history does not record his involvement in any rebuilding of walls; we might assume this is autobiographical. His reference to himself as the ‘fang of a wolf’ is part of his camouflage. When we understand that it is Henry writing Porchester shall see its broken walls in its harbour until a rich man with the tooth of a wolf shall restore it… one assumes he is alluding to himself. The wolf is derived from the association of ‘Wulf Island’, the old bishop of Winchester’s residence and this is why it is termed ‘Wolvesey Palace’, Henry Blois’ residence of splendour. My guess is that Henry organized the rebuilding of the wall’s and ‘Merlin’ just happened to see into the future way back in the sixth century, a wealthy person (with a connection to a wolf) doing the same.

824 Gesta Stephani- Henry Blois
825 See chapter on Henry Blois and Magister Gregorius, De mirabilibus urbis Romae
Appendix 4

The city of Richborough shall lie spread out on the shore of its harbour and a man from Flanders shall re-establish it with his crested ship.

Henry Blois substantiates part of his narrative from the HRB when Arthur returns from the continent to take his vengeance on Mordred.

All told, they numbered some eight hundred thousand Paynims and Christians, and in their company and relying on their assistance he came to meet Arthur on his arrival at Richborough haven.\textsuperscript{826}

The point of this prediction is that it is employed as a method of substantiating the arrival of Arthur in the HRB and therefore corroborates the HRB’s historical accuracy of Arthur returning from his continental campaign. It is supposedly what Merlin saw as a future event. If his audience believes the prophecies are credible; for the gullible the story of Arthur must also be true.... because Merlin predicted the event.

\textsuperscript{826} HRB XI, i
Appendix 5

The fifth from him shall rebuild the walls of St David’s and shall bring back to her the pall lost for many years.

This refers back to the passage in the Prophecies of Merlin where Menevia shall be robed in the pall of the City of the Legions, Henry Blois, writing as Geoffrey of Monmouth associates the metropolitan of Caerleon to St David’s (completely fictitiously and put forward to create Arthur’s utopian metropolis presented in HRB). It is upon this premise (from Rhygyvarch’s Life of St David) that bishop Bernard worked to reinstate the Archbishopric. We know Henry has read Rhygyvarch's Life of St David and because of the information supplied in the Life .... Henry attempts to help his friend Bernard to reinstate the Archbishopric, which once (according to Rhygyvarch and Asser), existed in Menevia.

‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB makes Caerleon one of the most important cities in Britain where he creates for it a long and glorious history from its foundation by King Belinus. King Belinus is fictional, but it becomes a metropolitan see; the location of an Archbishopric superior to Canterbury and York, under Saint Dubricius. We are told in the fiction found in HRB that St David therefore moved the ‘City of the Legions’ archbishopric to St David’s Cathedral.

At that time two of the Metropolitan Sees, York, to wit, and the City of the Legions, were vacant without their shepherds. Wherefore, being minded to consult the common wish of his peoples, he gave York unto Samson, a man of high dignity and illustrious by the depth of his piety; and Caerleon unto

---

827 HRB VII, iii
828 Henry names Padam and Teilo in DA; both names lifted from Rhygyvarch’s work to accord with the fictions presented in DA about St David.
829 The point being that Augustine had not even arrived in Britain yet.
830 Nennius ‘City of Legions’ is synonymous with Caerleon in Geoffrey.
Dubricius, whom the providence of God had before singled out as like to be right serviceable in that same place.  

The importance of the See is clear.... because ‘apparently’ Kings were crowned there, not in Roman Canterbury:

Dubricius, Archbishop of the City of Legions that he should crown as King Arthur.

In 1115, when this part of Wales was under Norman control, King Henry Ist of England appointed Bishop Bernard as Bishop of St David’s who commenced construction of a new Cathedral consecrated in 1131. In 1123, Pope Calixtus II had granted a compromise of Bishop Bernard’s request and bestowed a Papal privilege upon St David’s, making it a centre of pilgrimage, the Pope decreeing “Two pilgrimages to St David’s is equal to one to Rome, and three pilgrimages to one to Jerusalem!” This brought many pilgrims to West Wales. Henry pretends in the prediction found in the prophecy that the Menevian See is the same as that of Caerleon and it is also synonymous with the city of Legions of the HRB (as in Nennius).... but now had moved its inherited status to St. David’s. Bishop Bernard of St David’s was a friend of Henry Blois and we saw them together at Winchester (without the archbishop of Canterbury) both of them seen to be setting up the new short term monarch Empress Matilda as recounted in GS. However, ‘Geoffrey’s’ rendition of events is fictional:

At that time also died David, that most holy Archbishop of Caerleon, in the city of Menevia, within his own abbey, which he loved above all the other monasteries of his diocese, for that it was founded by the blessed Patrick who had foretold his nativity.

If the reader is still in doubt who is driving this myth one should consider that it was Henry Blois who miraculously found a ‘gem’ at Glastonbury belonging to St. David and know that Patrick’s association with Glastonbury is fictitious (which I will cover in the chapter on DA). Henry is

---

831 HRB VIII, xii
832 HRB IX, i
833 Gesta Stephani: Matilda was publicly welcomed into Winchester. She took up residence in the Castle and Bishop Henry handed over to her the keys to the Treasury and the Royal Crown. He then arranged a large meeting of the citizens of Winchester in the Market Place so they could salute her as "their Lady ". From here, the party entered the cathedral with great pomp. Matilda led the procession with Henry of Blois to her right and the Bishop of St. David’s to her left. Relatives of the Bishops of Salisbury, Ely and Lincoln were also present and Henry sent for Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury who arrived a few days later.
834 HRB XI, iii
using Rhygyvarch’s *Life of St David* and his own fabrications found in HRB to substantiate his further fictions presented in the interpolated part of DA.

This prophecy in the VM expresses the aspirations cherished by the Welsh of a re-established metropolitan long before Giraldus Cambrensis took up the cause from Bernard. It also shows that Henry repeats prophecies made in Vulgate HRB for consistencies sake in VM. His readership recognises these while he subtly changes the sense of some previous prophecies in HRB and also introduces us to new ones in VM. Bernard’s request for metropolitan is aligned with Henry Blois’ at Winchester. Bernard had been proposing a metropolitan based on Rhygyvarch’s *Life of St David* and Asser’s testimony, but his friend (Henry) attempted to bring his hope to fruition by predicting it in a bogus prophecy. According to Welsh belief (and now perpetuated by the cult of Arthur and Caerleon in the HRB), Menevia had been the seat of an archbishop until the time of Samson, twenty fifth from Dewi or David, who fled to Dol in Brittany taking the pall with him. The fifth as a number in the VM presents a problem in that it was Henry Ist (the third in the HRB and Vita numbering system) who rebuilt the walls and it cannot be Matilda (the fifth). Henry Blois is reticent to mention her as the ‘fifth’ in any of the prophecies whereas all the other numbered monarchs are easily distinguished. Yet, Matilda is the fifth in the sequence of rulers because Henry II is the sixth. Henry only refers directly to Matilda twice, firstly as the eagle in the ‘third nesting’ and then as her of the ‘broken covenant’. Since the sixth (Henry II) in the normal numbering sequence had already assumed the crown at the time of writing of the VM c.1156-7, the explanation to *the fifth from him shall rebuild the walls of St David’s* may well be that the ‘fifth’ in this instance applies to the pope. We vould

835 We know Henry compared himself to Cicero. Cicero has Quintus say: ‘what nation or what state disregards the prophecies of soothsayers, or of interpreters of prodigies’. When the first set of prophecies were written when King Stephen reigned, Henry was engaged in his own pursuit of Metropolitan status. If Bernard were granted Metropolitan more so would be Winchester be deserving based on the false testimony written in HRB of Winchester’s early religious house where Constans abided.

836 Giraldus Cambrensis, *De Menevensi Ecclesia Dialogus*.

837 Henry does also refer to Matilda obliquely in other updated prophecies such as when the two armies met at Wallingford: *Two Kings shall encounter in nigh combat over the Lioness at the ford of the staff.*
speculate that Henry wrote the prophecy assuming the next pope would be Anastasius V or more probably believed St David's would succeed in their quest after Adrian IV (1154-1159). Either way it was good odds that the next pope would be an Anastasius or an Adrian the fifth.

Bernard, however, claimed metropolitan jurisdiction over Wales and presented his suit unsuccessfully before six successive popes starting way back in 1120. Henry originally wrote this prophecy when Bernard was alive as part of the Libellus Merlini which circulated prior to the latest version found in HRB. However, a pope Alexander III was the next pope; so Henry’s prediction was wide of the mark. If there had been a pope which was a fifth and St. David's had gained metropolitan status, it would have been a major success in Merlin’s predictive ability.

David FitzGerald followed Bernard at St David’s after his death. His sister Angharad married William de Barri and she was the mother of Gerald of Wales. It was Gerald who persisted with this hope of a change in status and it is clear why Gerald of Wales was such a staunch advocate of the creation of St David's as a metropolitan. After Bernard died, David FitzGerald was consecrated in 1148 by Theobald of Bec, at the same time as Robert de Chesney. But, Theobald secured a promise from FitzGerald to no longer seek the elevation to metropolitan of St David's. However, this continued as a contentious issue driven partly by Henry's prophecy. Part of the intent of the prophecies was to manipulate events. It is fascinating that so many commentators actually relate Merlin prophecies to events after 1157. 1157 is where the VM prophecies end. In Asser’s Life of King Alfred, he clearly describes his kinsman, Nobis, (also of St David's), as Archbishop.

There seems little doubt that there was three metropolitans and Henry posing as Geoffrey speaking as Merlin makes it plain that Augustine usurped London’s status. In the Annales Cambriae, Elfodd is termed 'archbishop of the land of Gwynedd' in his obit, under the year 809. Rhygyfarch's Life of Saint David states Saint David was anointed as an archbishop by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, a position confirmed at the Synod of Llanddewi Brefi by popular acclaim:

*Then, blessed and extolled by the mouth of all, he is with the consent of all the bishops, Kings, princes, nobles, and all grades of the whole Britannic race,*

---

838 David FitzGerald followed Bernard after his death.

839 *The dignity of London shall adorn Dorobernia (Canterbury)*
made archbishop, and his monastery too is declared the metropolis of the whole country, so that whoever ruled it should be accounted archbishop.

St David's lost its status and fell under the metropolitan jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Asser's testimony is the basis for assuming it was ever a metropolitan. King Henry Ist, intruded Bernard, into St David's much to the annoyance of the Welsh. The Brut y Tywysogion states that Henry Ist 'made him bishop in Menevia in contempt of the clerics of the Britons'.
Appendix 6

The City of the Legions shall fall into thy bosom, O Severn, and shall lose her citizens for a long time, and these the Bear in the Lamb shall restore to her when he shall come.

Henry Blois switches back in time so that the Vita Merlini and the prophecies within it coincide and corroborate the storyline in HRB. The prophecy supposedly tells of the migration of Britons to Brittany. Caerleon on Usk is by the Severn and the citizens of old Briton who lived in the City of the Legions will lose her citizens for a long time. What or who ‘the bear in the lamb’ refers to is anybody’s guess. Maybe the bogus animal symbolism refers to Uther and Ambrosius or even Henry himself. We know he sees himself coming back to England as the adopted son at the time of writing VM and JC…. as he is doing his best to incite rebellion against Henry II in this three year period. It is plain to see that Henry Blois, writing as Merlin, sees the Normans originally as saviours overcoming the Saxons in the first set of prophecies. The obvious change of position is c.1156; he is writing in the persona of Merlin and ridding the foreigners from ‘our land’ and these are the Normans…. as he tries to incite the rebellion of the Celts against King Henry. Henry Blois sets up the Britons emigration to Brittany in general as being synonymous with the plight of the citizens of the City of the Legions i.e. the old Britons being forced abroad by the Saxons. The old Britons will be restored when he (Henry) will come (or at least that was the plan at the time of writing).

Amongst others he did lay out one upon the river Usk nigh the Severn sea, that was of many ages called Kaerusk, that was the mother city of Demetia. But after that the Romans came hither, the old name was done away and it was called the City of the Legions.\textsuperscript{840}

Whether or not Nennius’ Urbs legionum was always synonymous with Caerleon is debatable. What we do know is that Caerleon’s grandiose

\textsuperscript{840}HRB III, x
Arthurian history is totally fabricated by ‘Geoffrey’ based on the remnants of Roman architecture Henry Blois witnessed at Caerleon:

Howbeit, when he made known his desire unto his familiars, he, by their counsel, made choice of the City of Legions wherein to fulfil his design. For, situate in a passing pleasant position on the river Usk in Glamorgan, not far from the Severn sea, and abounding in wealth above all other cities, it was the place most meet for so high a solemnity.\(^{841}\)

‘Geoffrey’ has read Bede and knows of the martyrdom of Saints Julius and Aaron. He connects their names to religious houses in Caerleon for both cannons and nuns in the glorious city of the ‘legantine’\(^{842}\) primatial See. It is not by accident that it so happens to imitate the set up at Winchester with the cathedral and its new minster and its nunnaminster as Tatlock\(^{843}\) observes.

However, Tatlock is far from realising the reasons: Geoffrey shows much more concern, especially with Winchester and its Church. First of all he gives it a distinction which was coveted by other religious houses and which nothing justifies.\(^{844}\)

Tatlock seems to think that Winchester is overly glorified because: there was someone at Winchester who was worth pleasing.\(^{845}\) We should not forget one of Uther’s two dragons wrought of Gold was: in ecclesia prime sedis Guintonie, the ‘primatial’ See of Winchester. We should also understand with this glorification of Winchester, there is a marked contrast in ignoring Canterbury in HRB. It does not take much to work out why. What is astounding is that Tatlock discusses the erection of Winchester into an archbishopric through Henry’s friend Pope Innocent II and Henry’s disappointment with not gaining the Archbishopric of Canterbury without any suspicion of the involvement of Henry Blois as author of HRB or the prophecies.

It is not without irony that Winchester in the prophecies loses its archepiscopal See and the one person trying to re-establish this fictional standpoint in reality is never suspected as the author of the Merlin

\(^{841}\) HRB IX, xii
\(^{842}\) It is ridiculous to consider Legates at the time as indicated. By the time Henry finalised the Vulgate HRB, Henry had been Legate for a 3 year period.
\(^{843}\) The Legendary history of Britain J.S.P. Tatlock p. 70
\(^{844}\) The Legendary history of Britain J.S.P. Tatlock p. 36
\(^{845}\) The Legendary history of Britain J.S.P. Tatlock p. 37
prophecies or HRB. Without the obvious corroboration that each gives to the other HRB to VM and vice versa, there would be little historicity to establish either but the prophecies add to both.

However, Henry does betray himself as the author in HRB; he never mentions Glastonbury and Arthur himself is given no connection to Winchester so as to avoid the very suspicion.... which through his avoidance, highlights Henry Blois involvement as Author. Henry’s pursuit of metropolitan is always at the heart of his polemic in establishing the pre-existence and pre-eminence of Winchester before the arrival of Augustine: *Afterward Rome shall bring God back through the medium of a monk and a holy priest shall sprinkle the buildings with water and shall restore them again and shall place shepherds in them.*

Henry’s polemic is simple: How could Canterbury assume its primacy when Merlin is predicting the coming of Augustine? Especially when, prior to the Saxon invasion, ‘Geoffrey’s’ polemic in HRB makes it abundantly clear through Constans at Winchester that there was already a Briton Church. The reader will come to understood how important GR3 and DA interpolations combine with HRB to add credence to Henry’s case at Rome as we progress.
Appendix 7

Two hundred monks shall perish in Leicester and the Saxon shall drive out her ruler and leave vacant her walls.

This prophecy is in reference to the defeat of Brocmail and the slaughter of the monks at Leicester.⁸⁴⁶ ‘Geoffrey’ here either makes a mistake regarding the location of Leicester or as is quite normal, sets up an episode which is taken from a British annal such as Bede and then relays it incorrectly for his own ends to bring it in line with a future scenario he is about to concoct.

This is certainly the case here in the HRB where he uses Bede as his source when relating the massacre of Bangor. Bede in his Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum is in fact referring to the battle of Chester in which Brocmail, tasked with protecting the monks, abandons them to be massacred.

In ‘Geoffrey’s’ rendition of the event Brocmail dies bravely. In both versions, monks from Bangor die. It is to this historic episode, the location is wrongly apportioned to Leicester rather than Chester. The confusion may or may not be deliberate as Bede refers to Chester by its English name Legacaestir which is strikingly similar to Legecestria the term ‘Geoffrey’ uses for Leicester in the HRB from the Anglo Saxon Laegrecastrescir.

It is the HRB rather than Bede’s historic episode, to which the Vita Merlini prophecy refers. Regardless of the differences of historic Bede, HRB and Vita.... ‘Geoffrey’s’ number of monks does not agree with the annals, but it does agree with the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

In this whole section of VM Henry Blois seems to be presenting as prophecy some areas and topics which he had presented as the course of history in the HRB. This confirmation does in effect add credence to the history as presented in the HRB, because Merlin, (as he later attests at the end of VM), gave all these prophecies in the time of Vortigern. In effect the

⁸⁴⁶HRB XI, xiii
reader now sees them as past matter of fact events. We start to see how clever and conscious of history Henry Blois is. Henry in effect is rewriting it in the HRB and adding his own later confirmation in the Vita.
Appendix 8

He who first among the Angles shall wear the diadem of Brutus shall repair the city laid waste by slaughter. A fierce people shall forbid the sacrament of confirmation throughout the country, and in the house of God shall place images of the gods.

Commentators believe this passage to be directly relative to Athelstan....as he is said to be the first to wear the crown of the Saxons in Britain:

But the Saxons were more wise, kept peace and concord amongst themselves, tilled their fields and builded anew their cities and castles, and thus throwing off the sovereignty of the Britons, held the empire of all Loegria under their Duke Athelstan, who was the first to wear a crown amongst them.847

As we will get to later, when I cover the First Variant, (which was constructed for a Roman papal audience), we shall see that Henry has had to follow historical annals more closely than what he later redacted into the Vulgate HRB. However, this specific prophecy is looking backward through time and known history and the repair of the city probably refers to Leicester.

While on the subject of the crown of Brutus I will clarify another prophecy: ...the Lynx that seeth through all things, and shall keep watch to bring about the downfall of his own race, for through him shall Neustria lose both islands and be despoiled of her ancient dignity. Then shall the men of the country be turned back into the island for that strife shall be kindled amongst the foreigners. An old man, moreover, snowy white, sitting upon a snow-white horse, shall turn side the river of Pereiron and with a white wand hall measure out a mill thereon. Cadwallader shall call unto Conan, and shall receive Albany to his fellowship. Then shall there be slaughter of the foreigners: then shall the rivers run blood: then shall gush forth the fountains

847HRB, XII, xix.
of Armorica and shall be crowned with the diadem of Brutus. Cambria shall be filled with gladness and the oaks of Cornwall shall wax green. The island shall be called by the name of Brutus and the name given by foreigners shall be done away.

Henry Blois wrote the prophecy above which also refers to the crown of Brutus in the hope that he might return to England after Henry II had been defeated by a Celtic uprising (which he himself is trying to instigate) and have the crown himself. This is why he is so nervous about returning to England in 1158. The Lynx or ‘pest’ is Henry II. Henry Blois is predicting the present King is going to lose both Britain and Ireland.

The old man is him (as will cover later). Henry Blois has most probably a white charger and he did divert the River Parratt and build a mill on it. But the real trickery of Henry is inciting Conan from Brittany with the Welsh and other Celts referring to the Normans as foreigners. Henry Blois’ genius is having Merlin predict these things archaically referring to Neustria and Armorica as if these could only have been prophesied back in the sixth century.

Appendix 9

The husband, despising his wife, shall draw near to harlots, and the wife, despising her husband, shall marry whom she desires. There shall be no honour kept for the church and the order shall perish.

This may well just be an ‘of the day’ straightforward prophecy which reflects court behaviour of the day couched in prophetic language. It may well refer to Louis and Eleanore of Aquitaine. There is no doubt that Henry twists prophecies from HRB to VM.

The likeness of this prophecy in HRB: With the stench of their nostrils shall they corrupt women, and their own wives shall they cause to be as harlots...

848 This is plainly his plan as can been witnessed in John of Cornwall’s rendition.
shows that Henry causes so much confusion by squewing the prophecies and changing the icon or person that few can make sense of them if one applies a rigid accountability for each animal etc. mentioned in every circumstance.

Henry Blois was probably the first Bishop of Winchester to take in hand the brothels on his Southwark estate not by closing them, but by running them. It may have something in common with the prophecy, but it is a longshot!!

The reason I think they were squewed by Henry, but made to seem as if they were consistent from an early *Libellus Merlini* into Vulgate HRB and on to the VM version is because the first set of prophecies were seen to be too obviously concocted in the recent era by his audience. Also the propensity (as we shall cover shortly) to cover topics as affairs of state, the Anarchy, Henry’s close interests and his own family etc. must have made him wary of discovery.

However, Henry Blois, well versed in scripture, may just be using biblical analogy and highlights the differences in state and church affairs in a metaphor.

The Church was not side-lined as Henry tried his best to hold Stephen to the oath he had made to the church. King Stephen also betrayed the trust that Henry assumed would be forthcoming after his part in facilitating the usurpation of the crown. Therefore, the ‘wife’ in the Vita prophecy i.e. the Church despised Stephen and when it came down to the Council held at Winchester by Henry Blois; the Church bishops threw in their lot with Matilda.

Therefore one could speculate that ‘she’- the Church ‘marries who she desires’. The audience of the Vita may have interpreted the meaning in this way…. as the outcome of events after the Winchester council over which Henry presided. Later, Stephen’s wife pleads with Henry Blois, and Henry having found that Empress Matilda was worse than Stephen in keeping her word…. soon changed allegiances back to his brother.

In fact Henry Blois was probably the main instigator of the rumour that caused Matilda’s flight from London which lost her any chance of gaining the crown. The allusion by Henry Blois to the church…. couched in the same terms as in the prophecy, can also be witnessed in the GS.

Henry Blois similarly referenced the church in a speech made at the council of London amongst the pillars of the church to the effect: *that in King Henry’s*
time especially the church had been shaken; had been a prostrate and downtrodden handmaid and had suffered most disgraceful wrongs.\textsuperscript{849}

\section*{Appendix 10}

Then shall bishops bear arms, and armed camps shall be built. Men shall build towers and walls in holy ground, and they shall give to the soldiers what should belong to the needy. Carried away by riches they shall run along on the path of worldly things and shall take from God what the holy bishop shall forbid.

One of the causes of friction between the Church and the barons was that hereditary and aristocratic barons were nearly on a par with bishops in terms of wealth. As lands were donated to the church both by the crown and by those who bequeathed lands booking a place in heaven, the church and monasteries became richer.

It became necessary after Henry Ist died to protect these lands from marauding knights and barons as peace throughout the realm crumbled. Castles were put up in various bishoprics and a transposition took place were those who were supposed to be protectors of the flock became protectors of their own wealth. Even though abbeys and bishoprics were expected to provide knights for the crown, these were now stationed at the vast array of castles that were springing up all over the country.

The bishop of Winchester built castles at Winchester (Wolvesey), Merdon, Farnham, Bishops Waltham, Downton and Taunton.\textsuperscript{850} Alexander bishop of Lincoln had castles at Newark, Sleaford and Banbury. While plunderers, as has many times been revealed, were everywhere pillaging the property of the churches, some bishops made sluggish and abject by fear of them, either gave way or lukewarmly and feebly passed a sentence of excommunication that was soon revoked; others but it was no task for bishops) filled their castles full of provisions and stocks of arms, knights and archers and though they were supposed to be warding off the evil doers who

\textsuperscript{849} Gesta Stephani, 27  
\textsuperscript{850} Annales Monastici ii, 611
were plundering the goods of the church showed themselves always more cruel.\textsuperscript{851}

Henry Blois was one of the worst offenders and thus uses this ploy to state an understood fact as if it were a prophecy written back in the 6th century. At the same time he alleviates any suspicion of authorship of the Merlin prophecies to himself by implicating such inappropriate behaviour by the church of which he is guilty.

He makes the same complaint in the \textit{Gesta Stephani} for the same reasoning: \textit{likewise the bishops, the bishops themselves, though I am ashamed to say it, not indeed all but a great many out of the whole number, girt with swords and wearing magnificent suits of armour, rode on horseback with the haughtiest destroyers of the country and took their share of the spoil.}

The towers in holy ground could be a direct reference to himself building a castle like tower as part of Wolvesey palace near the holy ground of the abbey.... gave orders for a most vigorous investment both of the bishops castle which he had built in very elegant style in the middle of the town and of his palace, which he had fortified strongly and impregnably just like a castle.\textsuperscript{852}

There is no doubt as to the tower being in Winchester at the time as Roger of Wendover relates that Matilda `besieged the tower of the bishop of Winchester'. One castle which was in the middle of the city\textsuperscript{853} must have been near the cathedral (holy ground) and the other Wolvesey, (which had a tower also) is not far from the cathedral. At Wolvesey, the garderobe tower is that joining the north-east angle of the keep and the round tower of the ruins and is recorded to have been built by Henry Blois in 1138.

Henry bemoans the state of affairs of which he was very much part of. He at one stage had more knights at his disposal than Robert of Gloucester and paid their wages from ecclesiastical coffers. Henry is looking back at the dreadful state of affairs in the anarchy while relating them as if Merlin had foreseen exactly what his audience understood had transpired in their own age. Henry is morose and reminisces and seems to be castigating as an apologist not only his own materialism but that of the whole Anarchy.

He refers to the holy bishop in the prophecy and his audience must have thought that he is one of the culpable. Again, this is Henry’s tactic which

\textsuperscript{851} \textit{Gesta Stephani}, Henry Blois
\textsuperscript{852} \textit{Gesta Stephani}, Henry Blois
\textsuperscript{853} See appendix 22
avoids suspicion of authorship of the prophecies. Not only does it reflect the views of the GS; it has too much in common with the bishop himself. Bishops will then bear arms, will then follow the military life, will set up towers and walls on sacred ground and give to soldiers what should go to the poor!! What is more astounding is that any Scholar would even consider that Merlin as a seer would just happen upon such insights specific to the first half of the twelfth century.
What an unutterable crime that man, whom the Creator of the universe made worthy of heaven in honourable liberty, should be roped and led to the sale like a cow! You miserable man, you who turned traitor to your master when first you came to the throne; you shall yield to God.

When it is understood that Henry Blois is writing the VM in the period between 1155 and 1157, it is plain that he is twisting some of the prophecies from a previous version. He is actually referring to events which happened in the early Anarchy and may well have featured in the early *Libellus Merlini* or its update c.1150. We may speculate that Henry Blois is squewing the meaning here in VM so as to appear consistent with the previous set of prophecies put out in the *Libellus Merlini*.

When the King Stephen came to England, he held his council at Oxford; where he seized the Bishop Roger of Sarum, and Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, and the chancellor Roger, his nephew; and threw all into prison till they gave up their castles. (Anglo-Saxon chronicle 1137)

The prophecy is Henry Blois’ allusion to events in 1139 where the Bishops Roger of Salisbury and Alexander of Lincoln were seized by Stephen at the instigation of the Court, whilst Bishop Nigel of Ely fled to Roger’s castle at Devizes. Roger of Salisbury was dragged to Devizes and forced to open and surrender the castle. Roger had been ‘the throne’ (or was in charge of state affairs) while Henry Ist was away in Normandy and was well trusted by King Henry Ist. Roger may be understood to have abused his position for his own material gain during this time.

As we can see in the account below written by Henry Blois in the GS, King Stephen was being led astray on bad advice and Henry Blois was annoyed at his brother’s naivety. It was probably the Beaumont brothers who implied that Bishop Roger was planning to join the Angevin cause. Stephen was led to believe that if he did not act by seizing Roger of Salisbury and his relations castles.... they may be used against him; especially if Roger and his relatives joined Matilda.

Henry is at the heart of this decision and advises against such action. The Beaumont twins again influence the King to his detriment. It is for this
reason Henry Blois posing as Merlin includes this passage in the VM as it affected him greatly.... that his brother would not listen to his advice as we can plainly understand in GS.

By the King’s order, the captive bishops were kept apart from each other in abominable conditions. Roger was contained in the stall of a cowshed, and Alexander in a vile hovel; they were also kept from obtaining any food. King Stephen ordered Roger’s son to be brought forward, with a halter round his neck, threatening to hang him before the gates of the castle, unless the bishop of Ely surrendered forthwith.

We can see by the next two extracts how much this incident affected Henry Blois, as he knew it was the beginning of Stephen’s downfall. As I cover later, in the section on the Gesta Stephani, Henry knows this action was taken against Stephen’s own better judgement to placate courtiers:

The count of Meulan, and those other adherents of the King who were on terms of the closest intimacy with him, indignant at this splendid pomp of the bishops, were inflamed against them and with a furious blaze of envy, and far from stifling the fire of their malice, once it was a light they made many shameful and slanderous accusations of them to the King.

For they went on saying that those bishops owned the primacy of the Kingdom, all the splendour of their wealth, the whole force of men for personal ostentation and profit, not for the King’s honour; that they had built castles of great renown, raised up towers and buildings of great strength, and not put the King in possession of his Kingdom, but to steal his Royal Majesty from him and plot against the Majesty of his crown; wherefore it would be judicious and was most expedient for the Kings peace to lay hands on them, that they might give up to the King for his honour the castles and whatever else could give rise to strife and wars, but that there should be yielded to their disposal, in pious and Catholic fashion what pertained to the church and to the sacred character and rights of the Bishop.

If the King they said, were minded to follow their advice as he relied on their valour and wisdom, he would arrest those men without formalities and put them in custody not as bishops but as sinners against the Pacific office of the Bishop and suspected enemies of his peace and public order, until by the restoration to Caesar of their castles and those things that belonged to Caesar

---

854 C. Florence of Worcester p. 108, says the Bishop of Salisbury was put in a cowshed.
the King was safer from suspicion of rebellion (the charge alleged against the bishops) and his country was more tranquil.

On hearing these councils, which they goading him perpetually, put before him with more envy and suspicion than piety and justice, the King was in a quandary and great in decision of mind, since on the one hand it was a serious and unlawful step to commit a disrespectful assault on the priestly order, and on the other it went against the grain and seemed a slight not to listen to his intimate advisers and the chief men of his court. At length overcome by their persistent entreaties and the constant and vehement pressure that they brought to bear, for his own honour and a piece of the Kingdom he allowed them to do to the bishops as they asked. In this he certainly yielded to the weight of very foolish or rather mad advice, because if it is unfitting and forbidden to offend any man, according to the well-known maxim, 'do not do to another what you do not wish done to yourself'.

It is much baser and less permissible to show disrespectful violence in any way to the highest of the ministrants at the holy altar. For to do one in the sight of men is acknowledged to be a great transgression; to bring the other to pass is considered, and really is, a monstrous sin against God himself. Hence also the Lord says in the words of the prophet, 'he that touches you touches the apple of mine eye'. And in the gospel he that despiseth you despiseth me'. And to inflict dishonour so rashly and recklessly, or dishonourable extortion, on the ministrants at the holy altar he thus for bids them in the words of the prophet saying 'touch not mine anointed'. For my part, I proclaimed firmly and boldly that God himself cannot be more swiftly or more grievously offended by anything than by any man's offence, in word or deed, to those appointed to serve at his table. And indeed the sons of Korah, because they rose up proudly and haughtily against those set over them, not only incurred reproach from God but perished by being swallowed up alive. Saul too, because in imperious and unseemly fashion he rose up against the priests of the Lord, was not only dispossessed from his Kingdom in the sight of the Lord but fell by a most cruel death in war. Having set forth these few words to put straight the insolent despisers of God's servants, let me at length return to my subject.\textsuperscript{855}

William of Malmesbury said that after the three bishop's humiliation by King Stephen, the King had been urged to atone for his sin and finally had not

\textsuperscript{855}Gesta Stephani. Henry Blois.
rejected a summons to the church council. It can be seen in the next piece why this is so close to Henry’s feelings and why it is a Merlin prophecy in the VM. Henry Blois is recorded by William of Malmesbury on the same topic:

Next he (Henry Blois) made a speech before the council in Latin as he was addressing educated men on the indignity of arresting the bishops, of whom the Bishop of Salisbury had been seized in a room at court and the Bishop of Lincoln in his lodging, while the Bishop of Ely, from fear of such a precedent, had escaped disaster by a speedy flight to Devizes. It was a lamentable crime he said, that the King had been so led astray by those who instigated him to this as to order hands to be laid on his men, especially when they were bishops, in the peace of his court.

To the King’s disgrace he had added a wrong to heaven, in that, under pretence of the bishops being at fault, churches were robbed of their property. The King’s outrage upon divine law caused him so much grief that he would sooner suffer great damage to his person and possessions than that the dignity of bishops should be lowered by such a humiliation. The King moreover, had often been urged to atone for his sin and finally had not rejected a summons to the council. Therefore let the Archbishop and others take counsel together about what should be done; he himself would not fail to carry out the decision of the Council either out of regard for the King who was his brother, or philosophy property or even danger to his life.856

There can be little doubt as to the author of the Vita Merlini being the same as the Gesta Stephani. It is interesting to note though, Henry Blois forgets for a moment his anonymous authorship referring to the Bishop of Winchester as different from himself or in the third person, when he interjects; for my part, I proclaimed firmly and boldly that God himself cannot be more swiftly or more grievously offended by anything.

This obviously was a great offence to Henry. Ganieda prophesy’s again of the same event at the end of the VM; exposes definitively Henry as both author of Vita Merlini and GS. Henry understood Stephen’s actions against the three bishops offended God himself. He thought it was the very reason for the troubles Stephen endured in the Anarchy.

At the capture of Stephen when William of Ypres and the Count of Meulan had deserted; Henry even has Stephen admit his own fault in the

856 HRB Novella, William of Malmesbury.
GS: when at length they disarmed him and he kept on crying out, in a humble voice of complaint that this mark of ignominy had indeed come upon him because God avenged his injuries.

Henry Blois is in effect putting words into his brother’s mouth in the hope that posterity views his brother in a better light. This is in fact a defining moment in the Anarchy where Henry realised that his advice was no longer listened to by Stephen and the Beaumonts and other envious toady courtiers had (by their iniquitous advice), caused Stephen to make a grave error of judgement that offended Henry greatly.... and other clergy.

If Orderic Vitalis’ portrayal is more accurate in reality, he then confirms the Beaumont’s suspicions were in fact real. The fact that Orderic implies Roger of Salisbury as a pending turncoat, might be more accurate than Henry’s tarnished view (against church) in hindsight. Looking back, Henry sees this as the defining moment of Stephen’s downfall, but if the bishops had gone over to the Angevin cause, it would have been the end of the Blois brothers.

Orderic relates that Bishop Roger had: useful connexions, and strong castles, as he had been at the head of affairs throughout all England during the whole of King Henry's lifetime, obtained a bad reputation above all the great men of the realm for being disloyal to his King and lord, Stephen, and favouring the party of Anjou. He had accomplices intimately attached to him, in a son who was the King's chancellor, and two nephews of great influence, one of whom was bishop of Lincoln, and the other bishop of Ely. Emboldened by their vast wealth, these men presumed to harass the lords of their neighbourhood with various outrages.

Roused by these sharp attacks, many of them formed a league against the bishops, and when an opportunity offered, took arms by common agreement, and tried to obtain satisfaction for the wrongs which they had suffered. The two brothers, Waleran and Robert, with Alain of Dinan, and several others, raised a quarrel at the city of Oxford with the retainers of the bishops, and falling on them, several men were slain on both sides, and the bishops Roger and Alexander were arrested.

But the bishop of Ely, who was not yet come to the King's court, being lodged with his attendants in a vill outside the city, had no sooner heard the dreadful news than, moved by his evil conscience, he fled with all haste to the strong castle of Devizes. He then, having laid waste with fire the whole country round, put the castle in a posture of defence, and determined to
defend himself in it against the King with all the force he could muster. The King, much incensed on hearing this, marched an army towards the place, and, sending forward William d' Ypres, charged with severe threats, swore that bishop Roger should be kept without food till the hostile castle was given up to him.

He also seized Roger, surnamed ‘the Poor’, the bishop's son, and gave orders that he should be hung before the castle gates in sight of the rebels; for his mother, Maud of Rimsbury, the bishop's concubine, kept possession of the main building of the fortress. At last, the bishop of Salisbury, by the King's leave, had a conference with his nephew, and much blamed him for not retiring to his own diocese, but stealing away in a rage to a place belonging to another, when he found that the peace was broken; and reducing thousands to want by the devouring flames. But his arrogant nephew, with his followers, persisting in their rebellion, and the incensed King having commanded that Roger should be immediately hung on a gallows, his trembling mother being informed of the lamentable condition of her son, in her anxiety for him leapt up and said: "It was I that bore him, and I ought not to lend a helping hand to his destruction. Yea, rather I ought to lay down my own life to save his." Accordingly she immediately sent a message to the King, offering him the strong fortress.....

Henry of Huntingdon has a similar take on the events: For, after receiving amicably Roger, bishop of Salisbury; and his nephew Alexander, bishop of Lincoln; he (Stephen) violently arrested them in his own palace, though they refused nothing which justice demanded, and earnestly appealed to it. The King threw Bishop Alexander into prison and carried the bishop of Salisbury with him to his own castle of Devizes, one of the stateliest in all Europe. Therefore he tormented him by starvation, and put to the torture his son, the King's chancellor who had a rope fastened round his neck, and was led to the gallows. Thus he extorted from him the surrender of his castle. Unmindful of the services which the bishop had rendered him, more than all others, in the beginning of his reign. Such was the return for his devotedness. In a similar manner he obtained possession of Sherborne Castle, which was little inferior to Devizes. Having got hold of the bishop's treasures, he used them to obtain in marriage for his son Eustace the hand of Constance Lewis the French King's sister. Returning thence, the King took with him to Newark, Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, whom he had before thrown into prison at Oxford.
It is something that obviously struck Henry from personally witnessing a starving Roger in that awful situation.

One observation which strikes me is that if it had not been for Florence of Worcester, the relevance of the Cowshed and Henry’s allusion to being led like a cow for sale from it; the prophecy would have less relevance. In fact without the GS we would not have the insight on Ganieda’s prophecies. These Freudian slips of similar attitude from opinion in GS; becoming opinioned prophecy by Merlin, gives away Henry’s authorship of the Merlin prophecies. Don’t forget the consensus of scholars is that whoever wrote the Merlin prophecies wrote HRB because they discovered the prophecies add to the historicity of HRB as a device.
Appendix 12

Three shall wear the diadem after whom shall be the favour of the newcomers. A fourth shall be in authority whom awkward piety shall injure until he shall be clothed in his father, so that girded with boar’s teeth he shall cross the shadow of the helmeted man.

For consistency’s sake not all prophecies are changed from the original version but some are squewed in the updated Vulgate HRB prophecies from the original Libellus Merlini version and then the same words with another sense may be found in the VM. For instance in HRB we find similar: They that come after shall strive to outsoar the highest, but the favour of the newcomers shall be exalted.

Henry Blois is writing prophecies for consistency’s sake for HRB and the VM which originally had occurred in Libellus Merlini. Prophecies have been subsequently altered long after they have lost their usefulness. So, whereas Henry Blois may have composed a prophecy during the early reign of Stephen which spoke of three wearing the diadem of Brutus, to be followed by a fourth, and he and his brother were looked upon as new men or newcomers…. Henry has now diluted the meaning in VM, now his brother is dead; while mixing these with more pertinent prophecies from the anarchy which his audience can now recognize as having transpired.

The earliest set of prophecies which were in the Libellus Merlini which circulated separately were those which Abbot Suger refers to; and
concerned themselves with recent historical events such as the white ship sinking, the cut of coins, and dress code of the outer apparel etc. etc.

However, we will go back to the VM prophecy above concerning the three wearing the crown. These are William the Conqueror, William Rufus and Henry Ist up until the fourth which is Stephen. To understand this fully, the prophecies found in the *Libellus Merlini* and those found in the Vulgate HRB are used as a device by Henry Blois to expand upon and redeploy prophecies which have their sense changed or perhaps have been outdated and not come to fruition.

Henry ostensibly displays to his Anglo-Norman readers that the prophecies of Merlin in the Vulgate HRB are spoken of by the same person as those found in the VM....so a level of consistency is required. Any update or additional detail to the prophecy is still linked back to the concept of an original sixth century seer, but the reader allows discrepancy having had the sense of his prophecies slightly mistranslated or misunderstood.

The extract below from the HRB prophesies to which the one above is intrinsically linked back (to events at the Norman invasion of his Grandfather William the Conqueror).... is so that both the updated HRB prophecies and VM prophecies seem to come from and are consistent with the earlier *Libellus Merlini*. It also relates to how Henry Blois’ view of the world stood, 10 years before Henry wrote the *Vita Merlini*.

*The island shall be drenched in nightly tears, whence all men shall be provoked unto all things. Woe unto thee, Neustria, for the brain of the Lion shall be poured forth upon thee; and with mangled limbs shall he be thrust forth of his native soil. They that come after shall strive to outsoar the highest, but the favour of the newcomers shall be exalted. Piety shall do hurt unto him that doth possess through impiety until he shall have clad him in his father. Wherefore, girdled about with the teeth of wolves, shall he climb over the heights of the mountains and the shadow of him that weareth a helmet.*

The island of Britain is in tears because of the bedlam caused by the invasion. Referring to the Normans as if the author (i.e. Merlin) were not a

---

857 *Henry of Huntingdon*, VIII. Meanwhile, the remains of King Henry unburied in Normandy; for he died on the 1st of December, 1135. His corpse was carried to Rouen, where his bowels, with his brain and eyes, were deposited. The body being slashed by knives, and copiously sprinkled with salt was sewn up in ox hides to prevent the ill effluvia, which so tainted the air as to be pestilential to the bystanders.

858 HRB VII, iii
part of their heritage…. Henry Blois posing as Merlin then turns to the episode of his uncle Henry Ist body being readied for burial.

King Henry Ist (the lion in both HRB and VM) died on 1 December 1135. Henry’s uncle’s corpse was taken to Rouen accompanied by the barons, where it was embalmed; his entrails were buried locally at Port-du-Salut Abbey in Normandy, and the body preserved in salt was taken on to England, where it was interred at Reading Abbey. Henry of Huntingdon, tells us a man named Ewan was paid a large reward to sever the King’s head with an axe.

Therefore, as the supposed prophecy states his soft tissue (brain included) was buried in Normandy and his mangled limbs (the body), was buried in England (thrust from his native shore) i.e. Normandy. We are appraised that Henry Blois (through the voice of Merlin) is referring to his ancestors and what is common knowledge to his readership. He now turns to himself and his brother as he betrays his expectancy of future events: They that come after shall strive to outsoar the highest, but the favour of the newcomers shall be exalted.

The Anarchy was unfinished at the time these were originally written. Henry expects great things as he will be in charge of spiritual affairs (Legate) of the church and his brother those of state. As a team of ‘newcomers’, he envisages a new system of Gregorian values or Cluniac vision; of both state and church existing together, perhaps without papal interference.

Henry Blois envisions his brother accepting piety even though it was through impiety his brother gained the crown and predicts that his brother will be clothed in the father i.e. will embrace the church. Piety shall do hurt unto him that doth possess through impiety until he shall have clad him in his father. Henry Blois then refers to himself as his brother’s protector: Wherefore, girded about with the teeth of wolves, from Wolvesey the tooth of the wolf originally.

The point Henry was making is that the prophecy alluded to himself by vaticinatory pun, the Wolf from Wolvesey. Henry Blois wrote the original Libellus Merlini c.1141-5 a copy of which he had given to his friend Abbot Suger. When Henry brought out the updated version of prophecies found 859 Wolvesey Palace is the residence of Henry Blois. Bishop Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester 963 - 84, was the one to build the first Bishop's Residence on the small island in the middle of the Itchen. This island was originally called Wulf's Isle, a name that corrupted in time into Wolvesey.
in the Vulgate HRB, some of his future expectations written at that earlier
time for the *Libellus Merlini* had not come to fruition in 1155.

These were now squewed in the later Vulgate edition, but seemingly
(appeared to all) to have remained consistent with the *Libellus* edition. We
can speculate that in the interim period the First Variant had a set of the
*Libellus Merlini* prophecies added which have since been substituted to the
updated version from Vulgate.

The prophecy concerning the ‘Sixth’ was never even thought about in
the numbering system of Kings when the original *Libellus* was handed to a
few of Henry’s circle. The numbering system in the *Libellus Merlini* only
went to 4. No original First Variant has survived all copies have the
corrected and updated 1155 prophecies in all four copies.

The next sentence is one of the most important in the HRB and
prophecies as it dates the prophecies not before 1st march 1139. Briefly, as I
shall discuss this later, so as not to be led into digression, the first reference
to the *Primary Historia* is in 1139 at Bec but the man crossing the mountains
(the Alps) is Henry Blois to receive his legateship from the ‘Helmeted man’
i.e. the Pope.

Henry refers to himself in fatuous vaticinatory language as the shadow
of the pope i.e. the Legate. From 1143 to 1963, the papal tiara was solemnly
placed on the pope’s head during a papal coronation and resembled a
helmet: \[^{860}\text{Wherefore, girdled about with the teeth of wolves, shall he climb}
over the heights of the mountains and the shadow of him that weareth a
helmet.}\[^{861}\]

On 1 March 1139, during the reign of his brother Stephen, Henry
obtained a commission as papal legate, which in effect gave him higher
rank than Theobald of Bec and therefore rule over the English church.

What I want to make plain to the reader, as we have just covered this
prophecy from the HRB, is to show Henry Blois’ artifice in anchoring one
point, person, location, icon or episode to appear consistent with what he
had written many years before in the *Vita Merlini* or first set of prophecies.

Here in the *Vita Merlin* it still talks in the same vein as if the sense had
not changed but with Stephen’s death in the past now the prophecy is
squewed: \[^{860}\text{See Note 3, Papal Coronation}\[^{861}\text{HRB VII, iii}\]
puts on his father’s clothes and so, girt with boar’s teeth, crosses the shadow of the Helmeted Man.

Any person who studied the prophecies in the late twelfth century would cross reference this with the passage from the HRB or the Libellus thinking the sense had changed through interpretation of the oblique Latin and skimble skamble nature of the way the prophecies were written. This essentially highlights the erratic way in which Henry’s mind works and why little sense has been made by comparison of the two sets of Merlin prophecies in the Vita and those in Vulgate HRB.

Even if they had been compared and the icons changed no commentator has taken into account that essentially three versions were written. Most commentators have allowed the inaccuracies and inconsistencies and blatant addition because they have been duped into believing the prophecies were written by Merlin at one time long ago in the distant past.

862 The fourth version is that of John of Cornwall, written also by Henry Blois.
Appendix 13

Four shall be anointed, seeking in turn the highest things, and two shall succeed who shall so wear the diadem that they shall induce the Gauls to make war on them.

Again the likelihood that the sense of this prophecy has been squewed for the original in the *Libellus Merlini* is high. The four as we have discussed already are William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry Ist and King Stephen. They were anointed. Matilda is the fifth, but it is never stated as she is Henry’s nemesis; it is only understood when the sixth is mentioned as Henry II, the Empress Matilda’s son. This is why Henry Blois cleverly posits in words of prophetic foresight into future events that two shall succeed. Matilda was nearly crowned but due to the manipulative Henry Blois starting a rumour, caused Matilda to flee from London.

One not anointed, but both wearing the diadem i.e. fighting over the crown. When Robert of Gloucester and Matilda returned to establish Matilda’s claim to the throne, they brought with them mercenaries from the continent and it is these that caused havoc in the British countryside; these are the Gaul’s that make war. The reference to the Gauls also may be pretence to be in the character of Merlin looking on the Normans as Gauls or may refer to the Angevins in general.
Appendix 14

The sixth shall overthrow the Irish and their walls, and pious and prudent shall renew the people and the cities.

In September 1155, just before Henry Blois secreted his transportable wealth with Peter the Venerable and asked him to carriage it to Clugny, King Henry II held a council at Winchester. This was the last appearance of Henry Blois before self imposed exile at Clugny.

King Henry enthusiastically considered invading Ireland and discussed this amongst the bishops; one of which was Henry Blois. As a generous brother, King Henry II was hoping to give Ireland to William his younger brother, making him King. The plans were abandoned when their mother, the Empress Matilda, objected. She did not consider Ireland worth conquering. Henry, instead, made William one of the richest men in England, granting him seven manors.

The council at which the invasion of Ireland was discussed is corroborated in the Chronicle of Clugny⁸⁶³ (as Peter attended also) which supports Henry Blois’ knowledge of the proposed Irish invasion as a plan. Henry Blois writing the updated Vulgate version of prophecies, which one must assume he supposed would be acted upon while he was abroad in Clugny.... instigated the prophecy so that Merlin would be found to be a real prophet when the invasion took place. At Winchester about the time of Michaelmas in 1155 Henry II holds a council with his nobles to discuss the conquest of Ireland which he seems to have desired to give his younger brother William on terms of homage.⁸⁶⁴

---

⁸⁶³ Chronicle of Clugnyxxxviii
⁸⁶⁴ Robert of Torigni.
It was straight after this council in which the discussion took place about the various castles held by bishops and barons was discussed. King Henry saw these castles which had grown up throughout the land in the Anarchy as an obstacle of peace in the realm. The only problem was that without them the powerbase of any baron or bishop was potentially removed. Henry Blois had several and thus King Henry looked on the powerful bishop as a threat. At this meeting it was requested that bishop Henry hand them over to the King. Straight afterward Henry Blois left the country secretly without license from the king, probably leaving the country from a port in the very south of England.

One of the reasons for the Irish invasion was in 1155, three years after the Synod of Kells, Adrian IV published the Papal Bull *Laudabiliter*, which was addressed to Henry II. The *Laudabiliter* was issued in 1155 whereby the English pope Adrian IV gave King Henry the right to assume control over Ireland and apply the Gregorian reforms. He urged Henry II to invade Ireland to bring its Celtic Christian Church under Roman Catholic rule and to conduct a general reform of governance and society in Ireland. In Irish records, they seem to have known nothing of the plans of the prospect of an Angevin Norman invasion and many commentators mistrust whether the Papal bull was genuine. With Henry Blois’ prediction found here in the *Vita Merlini* it would seem to substantiate that there was such a bull.

The Normans did in fact invade Ireland, beginning with a small landing of Norman knights, but not until 1 May 1169 long after the *Vita Merlini* was written. A force of loosely associated Norman knights landed near Bannow, County Wexford at the request of Diarmait Mac Murchada, the ousted King of Leinster, who sought their help in regaining his Kingdom. It was not until the 18 October 1171, however (two months after Henry Blois’ death) that Henry II landed a much bigger army in Waterford to ensure his continuing control over the preceding Norman force. In the process he took Dublin and had accepted the fealty of the Irish Kings and bishops by 1172; thus creating the Lordship of Ireland, which formed part of his Angevin Empire.

Henry Blois had to wait four years from the time he wrote the prophecy in the *Vita* concerning the ‘Sixth and the Irish invasion’ until a partial realization of Merlin’s prediction which became fact with the small band of Norman Knight’s arriving in 1161. However, the vaticinatory vision ‘*and pious and prudent shall renew the people and the cities*’, was based upon
what he understood were going to be the implementations of Gregorian reform within Ireland which were proposed at Winchester in 1155.
Henry Blois is making an implication that Thanet is near to the implied Island of Alaron or Avalon. He wishes his audience to conflate the two stating 'Close to this island lies Thanet'. I think considering Henry Blois' objective throughout, which is to construe the Island of Avalon as being located at Glastonbury, we should understand his mind.... for this on the surface just seems an ill-informed statement 'Near to this island lies Thanet'. Henry Blois knows perfectly well where Thanet is, so why would he state contrary to Isedore that Thanet is near Alaron? Henry Blois, as we have seen, is the master of conflation.

His intention is clearly that; from Badon we are to assume Alaron as commensurate. There are only three traditions or accounts concerning Joseph of Arimathea which are not from later Glastonbury propaganda. The first is that Melkin’s prophecy states that Joseph is buried on the Island of Avalon and gives accurate directions to his burial site, a remarkable achievement for a man that never existed. The second is that Father Good makes the statement that Joseph is ‘carefully hidden in Montacute’. Thirdly, Joseph of Arimathea is held by Cornish tradition to be a tin merchant.

Although we can see that Henry Blois has taken a section from Isidore, the names of Isidore’s first three Islands, Thanet, the Orkneys and Ultima Thule, come from a Journal of a voyage made by Pytheas. The island of Ictis as described by Diodorus from the lost works of Pytheas was an Island to which tin was transported in large quantities by cart across a tidal sand spit. By coincidence the island which Melkin’s directions lead to in his prophecy concerning the Island of Avalon, fits Diodorus’ description as that which accords with Ictis.

Another coincidence is this same island would also seem to be that donated by a Devonian King to Glastonbury in 601AD called Ines Witrin recorded in a charter by William of Malmesbury. Does it not seems strange
that Henry Blois (who we know is the inventor of Avalon) invents *Alaron* as
a name which links back to Badon and Arthur and implies it is next to
Thanet, given the Pytheas connection.

Henry Blois writing as Geoffrey of Monmouth had no idea where the
Island of Ineswitrin is. Therefore, it became his design to locate it at
Glastonbury, both on account of it being Arthur’s last known location and
the fact that Joseph of Arimathea was buried there (since the substitution of
Ineswitrin for Avalon was made on the Melkin prohecy. Henry attempting
to substantiate his own island invention and its position relative to a known
location? It indicates he does not know the location of Ineswitrin, but, he
knows the location is real, just as he knows the 601 charter is real.

Henry Blois’ motive for writing the section on islands in VM is how he
first associated Glasonbury with Avalon by calling it *Insula Pomorum*. It is
clear how he manipulates the original text to suit that goal. He leaps from
Bladud and his association to Badon to *Alaron* and from there to *Insula
Pomorum* where wounded Arthur was taken. Henry Blois keen to have us
believe Thanet is near Alaron. The reason why Henry should make the
association of Thanet to *Alaron*; and the reason we should be suspicious of
it being connected to Pytheas’ Island of Ictis, is due to what follows
immediately after the mention of Thanet in the VM: *Our ocean also divides
the Orkneys from us. These are divided into thirty three islands by the
sundering flood; twenty lack cultivation and the others are cultivated. Thule
receives its name “furthest” from the sun, because of the solstice which the
summer sun makes there, turning its rays and shining no further, and taking
away the day, so that always throughout the long night the air is full of
shadows, and making a bridge congealed by the benumbing cold, which
prevents the passage of ships.*

In Pytheas book, the contents of which Diodorus relates (because
Pytheas’ book is no longer extant), Pytheas was the first to mention the
Orkneys, Thule, and pack ice. Certainly, Isidore sourced his information
from Pytheas which came through Diodorus or some previous
commentator on Pytheas.

Isidore writes: *Thanet is an island in the Ocean in the Gallic (i.e. English)
channel, separated from Britannia by a narrow estuary, with fruitful fields
and rich soil. It is named Thanet (Tanatos) from the death of serpents. Although
the island itself is unacquainted with serpents, if soil from it is
carried away and brought to any other nation, it kills snakes there. Ultima*
Thule (Thyle ultima) is an island of the Ocean in the north western region, beyond Britannia, taking its name from the sun, because there the sun makes its summer solstice, and there is no daylight beyond (ultra) this. Hence its sea is sluggish and frozen. The Orkneys (Orcades) are islands of the Ocean within Britannia, numbering thirty-three, of which twenty are uninhabited and thirteen colonized. Ireland (Scotia), also known as Hibernia, is an island next to Britannia, narrower in its expanse of land but more fertile in its site. It extends from southwest to north. Its near parts stretch towards Iberia (Hibernia) and the Cantabrian Ocean (i.e. the Bay of Biscay), whence it is called Hibernia; but it is called Scotia, because it has been colonized by tribes of the Scoti. There no snakes are found, birds are scarce, and there are no bees, so that if someone were to sprinkle dust or pebbles brought from there among beehives in some other place, the swarms would desert the honeycombs.

It is I believe Thanet’s association with Ictis which has attracted Henry’s attention as Henry thought it was an island from which tin was traded. Henry may have been aware of the tradition of Joseph of Arimathea as a tin Merchant as he had taken possession of Looe Island in 1144 in his hunt for the relics of Joseph of Arimathea. The fact that Joseph of Arimathea was buried on an Island called Ineswitrin in the original Melkin prophecy, is the reason Arthur ended up on the mystical island of Avalon and is the reason for Henry’s seemingly random tract on the various Islands.

Although Thanet is mentioned by Isedore of Seville, Henry Blois’ personal injection is adiacet huic- it lies near here, near Alaron, which shows he is leading us to some other motive other than just a rework of Isedore. It is not as if Henry Blois does not know where Thanet is located geographically which is certainly not near Kaerbadon. It is for this reason he is keen on splicing in his hidden agenda which appears to beTaliesin sounding forth with Island Mythology. Henry’s main objective is to conflate Avalon with Glastonbury and he achieves this by conflation with other island legends of the Fortunate isles. He changes Isidore’s order, of islands reversing the positions of Thule and the Orkneys and he exposes his devise as he also reverses the order of the "Gorgades" and the Fortunate Isles. He has now renamed the Island where Arthur was taken in the HRB called the Island of Avalon and has led his audience to believe Insula Pomorum as the same. He conflates an older island legend of the Fortunate Isles with Glastonbury Tor.
Also by splicing in the fact that Merlin’s madness also stems from apples he completes the illusory transposition of Avalon to *Insula Pomorum*. Taliesin supposedly saying he went with Barinthus to *Insula Pomorum* with Arthur leaves no doubt that the Avalon of the HRB needed to be relocated at Glastonbury. Henry the master of conflation helps us on our way to Glastonbury with the names of the sisters Glitonea, Gliten, Giton.
Appendix 16

The Irish influence on the *Vita Merlini* comes from the *Bhuile Suibhne Geilt*. *The Madness of Suibhne* is about a legendary King in Ireland. It seems likely that Henry Blois used this source for narrative ideas. There are several coincidences mutual to both the VM and *The Madness of Suibhne*. The madness of Merlin in the Vita is slightly confusing. It is not developed as one would expect as part of the narrative. It appears that Henry Blois started with the idea from the Irish source and forgot to develop it. Merlin’s madness comes across as incidental because as we have noted, Henry’s primary aims in the Vita are to provide new prophecies for his audience to puzzle over and to re-educate his readers upon certain facts related in the HRB.

A coincidence with the Irish story has Eorann, wife of Suibhne, taking a new mate in much the same fashion as Guendoloena does in the Vita. In the same story we find Suibhne speaking of his herd of stags and Merlin rides one in the VM. Also Suibhne has his madness softened in a very similar way by Loingreacan who played upon the harp and sang to him of his family, and finally persuaded him to return home just as Merlin returns.

The story line below from the VM is too close to be Coincidental:

*The messenger heard the prophet and broke off his lament with cadences on the cither he had brought with him that with it he might attract and soften the madman. Therefore making plaintive sounds with his fingers and striking the strings in order, he lay hidden behind him and sang in a low voice.... The messenger sang thus to his plaintive lyre, and with his music soothed the ears of the prophet that he might become more gentle and rejoice with the singer.*
Quickly the prophet arose and addressed the young man with pleasant words, and begged him to touch once more the strings with his fingers and to sing again his former song. The latter therefore set his fingers to the lyre and played over again the song that was asked for, and by his playing compelled the man, little by little, to put aside his madness, captivated by the sweetness of the lute. So Merlin became mindful of himself, and he recalled what he used to be, and he wondered at his madness and he hated it. His former mind returned and his sense came back to him, and, moved by affection, he groaned at the names of his sister and of his wife, since his mind was now restored to him, and he asked to be led to the court of King Rhydderch.
Appendix 17

The *Fortunate Isles*, also called the *Isles of the Blessed* and occasionally rendered as *Isles of the Blest* (μακάρων νῆσοι makárôn nêsoi) is where heroes and other favoured mortals in Greek and Celtic mythology were received by the gods. In Greek mythology, the islands were reserved for those who had chosen to be reincarnated thrice, and managed to be judged as especially pure enough to gain entrance to the Elysian Fields all three times. They are mentioned in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* by Flavius Philostratus and by Plutarch, who refers to the "fortunate isles" several times in his writings where they are called the *Isles of the Blessed*. 
Appendix 18

Many commentators on the HRB and the VM are perplexed by ‘Geoffrey’s’ beneficial treatment of those from Brittany and by his deprecation of the Welsh. The HRB links Brittany as the continental deposit of the residue of the Britons from an early migration. Many have assumed that ‘Geoffrey’s’ positive attitude toward Brittany is derived from a Breton association in Wales, because of the long standing assumption that Geoffrey was Welsh. If he was, he would hardly have been so derogatory about them. Henry Blois’ hatred of the Welsh is rather down to the rebellion of the Welsh against his brother Stephen, and his time spent in Wales in 1136. We can see how Henry who created Chivalric Arthur portrays the Britons in a good light before the Saxon invasion, has to rationalise how it is that the remaining population who did not flee (who he now sees as the Welsh) are so barbaric. Henry’s view is that the pocket of people left in Britain from the once noble Britons are the Welsh. This is partly the reason he sets his Arthurian epic there. Henry is clear about his favoured Britons. But, they were no longer recognisable by their residue, the Welsh: as barbarism crept in, they were no longer called Britons but Welsh.\footnote{HRB XII, xix}

The contemporary rebellious Welsh who Henry had been engaged with at Kidwelly\footnote{That Henry spent time in Wales is attested to by many facts which coincide during the course of this exposé.} were not to be associated as part of the Celtic Christian Briton by which Geoffrey is so endeared: ‘But the Welsh, degenerating from the nobility of the Britons’.\footnote{HRB XII, xix}

Orderic gives a good account of why Henry Blois would loath the Welsh. He was with his brother when they both thought it propitious to withdraw from a full frontal battle when Robert of Gloucester brought the Welsh hoards into England: Robert of Caen hospitably entertained under his own roof his sister Matilda after her arrival in England, and calling in the Welsh to his aid, atrocious
villainies were perpetrated in all parts. They say that more than ten thousand of these barbarians spread themselves over England, and that having no reverence for religion, they did not even spare the consecrated places, but gave themselves up to pillage, and burning and bloodshed. It is impossible for me to describe in detail the great afflictions which the church of God suffered in the persons of her sons, who were daily butchered like sheep by the knives of the Welsh.

Since there is nothing in the British annals that would commend the Britons to ‘Geoffrey’ to form his attitude, I suggest it stems from Henry’s recognition of an independent Christian Culture (i.e. not Roman) which existed in Britain prior to the Saxon invasion, the very culture that Gildas bemoans. Evidence of this lost ancient Briton church Henry found at Glastonbury and became a part of his case for metropolitan of Southern England. It may just be that because he invented a Chivalric Arthur that he holds the pretence of their nobility before the Saxon invasion.

As can be seen throughout the HRB, Henry uses a template or anchor in the form of location, situation or persona on which to build his narrative and nearly every instance in his writing can be traced to this method of composition. I would suggest that it was Melkin himself upon whom ‘Geoffrey’ bases Merlin in the HRB.\(^868\)

Henry transposes Merlin to Rhydderch’s court purely as a backdrop for the Vita.... in part because of the explosive material that the southern Merlin divulged in the Vulgate HRB. People might have been searching for the source of these seditious prophecies and Henry Blois tries to authenticate Merlin tying him to location and era and personas of the welsh Myrrdin.\(^869\) Henry Blois was not ignorant of the history of pre-Saxon Briton as he left a copy of the life of the Caesar’s to Glastonbury as Adam of Damerham records.\(^870\)

---

\(^868\) ‘Geoffrey’s’ Merlin Ambrosius might also be based on Melvas or Melkin, the King who donated Ineswitrin to Glastonbury. The VM’s Merlin is based on Myrddin Wyllt, Myrddin Emrys, who became Merlinus Caledonensis, or Merlin Sylvestris by association with such people as Rhydderch.

\(^869\) O.J. Padel’s analysis wrongly questions that VM is written in response to Gaimar rather than Henry Blois’ efforts trying to substantiate Merlin in VM as an historical figure conflating him with Myrrdin: Could Geoffrey’s decision to write another account of Merlin, following the existing Welsh legend much more closely, have been an indirect result of this claim by Geoffrey Gaimar? Gaimar’s epilogue was merely composed to substantiate ‘Geoffrey’ is not lying about his source.

\(^870\) Adam of Damerham witnesses that Henry Blois donated books to Glastonbury abbey, Lives of the Caesars, History of the Britons, History of the English, and History of the Franks amongst many others including St Isidores Etymologies.
The VM has little intrinsic structure. It can be recognised as a composite, and relies mainly on Taliesin and narrative ideas from *Bhuile Suibhne* and Isidore. Henry’s invention of locating of Arthur’s grandiose court in Wales in the HRB is based on several factors. His knowledge of Wales and their oral tradition of Arthur; and the fact that there were archaeological Roman remains at Caerleon.\(^{871}\)

The pro-Breton stance in the HRB is evident but the reasons for it are revealed here in the Vita. Henry Blois affinity with Brittany and Stephen’s claim to the throne are couched in terms of a right of the Ducal house of Cornwall which Henry believed gave his brother (and he himself if opportunity arose) legitimacy to the crown of Brutus.

Bertha of Blois was a Duchess consort of Brittany and a countess consort of Maine who was married in 1018 to Alain III, Duke of Brittany and in 1046 to Hugh IV, Count of Maine. She was the daughter of Odo II, Count of Blois and Ermengarde of Auvergne. Conan II of Rennes (c. 1033-1066) was Duke of Brittany from 1040 to his death. Conan was the eldest child and heir of Alan III, Duke of Brittany by his wife Bertha of Blois. He was the elder brother of Hawise, who succeeded him as *suo jure* duchess. Conan II died leaving no issue so he was succeeded by his sister Hawise, Duchess of Brittany who married Hoel, Count of Cornouaille with offspring of Alan IV. Alan IV married Constance, Princess of England and gave issue to Conan III. Conan III married an illegitimate daughter of Henry I, whose daughter was Bertha of Brittany. She Married Alan the Black giving rise to Conan IV.

It is this Conan IV who Henry Blois fixates upon as he incites rebellion as the inheritor of the ‘Crown of Brutus’ in VM; the returning royal strain and the reason he is trying to incite the Bretons, the Cornish, the Welsh and the Scottish to insurrection against Henry II. Conan had inherited the title Earl of Richmond from his father Alan the Black and became duke of Brittany when his mother died in 1156. How Henry Blois could conceive of such an uprising and the hope of spurring Conan into rebellion is because he had been commanded by Henry II to surrender his castles in 1155.

Between 1155 and 1158 Henry Blois, the Machiavellian plotter, is at Clungy having had his castles seized by Henry II and fears for his life, should he return to England. Archbishop Theobald is wrote threatening

\(^{871}\) Galfridus Arthur did not become a Welsh Geoffrey of Monmouth until the Vulgate HRB was published.
letters saying he had better return. He, on the other hand was planning to stay on the pretence of the popes instructions to re-organize Clugny, which had hit financial difficulties.

But here is Henry Blois’ Machiavellian hand at work provoking through his latest updated prophecies the precept.... (thought being the father of deed): It is the will of the most high Judge that the British shall be without their Kingdom for many years and remain weak, until Conan in his chariot arrive from Brittany, and that revered leader of the Welsh, Cadwalader. They will create an alliance, a firm league of the Scots, the Welsh, the Cornish and the men of Brittany. Then they will restore to the natives the crown that had been lost. The enemy will be driven out and the time of Brutus will be back once more.

The Prophecy was supposed to inspire the warring Celts to overthrow Henry II based upon a conflation with Armes Prydein. Henry’s plan failed, but this is the reason for the inspired return of Conan which fortuitously is mirrored in the Armes Prydein through Myrddin in the book of Taliesin which relates to Cadwmaladyr and Cynan (not Conan from Brittany).

It is upon this conflation Henry incites the rebellion; except, in the present era of 1155-1157, he includes the Scots and the Cornish as the Celts against ‘foreign’ invaders i.e. the Normans. The reader might think this fantastic that Henry Blois would instigate a war against his own people, but once we cover the Merlin prophecies supposedly put out by John of Cornwall the reader will understand that Henry Blois has every intention of returning as the leader of the fractious Celts as he sees himself to be ‘an adopted son’ when the rebellion is successful.

In 1158, Henry II was at Avranches and finally received the submission, of Conan of Brittany as Robert of Torigni relates. Henry’s attempt at sedition had failed and he returned to Winchester. ‘Conan in his chariot’ from Brittany, and that ‘revered’ leader of the Welsh, Cadwalader together were supposed to depose Henry II. Supposedly Merlin the seer had predicted such a re-emergence of the Celts driving out the ‘foreigners’ and re-installing the inheritors of Brutus.

Henry’s pro-Breton stance existed already in the HRB and thus the prophecy, although appearing to support the return of a utopian Britain,

---

872 See note 1
873 See appendix 19
has less to do with Henry’s romantic Celtic vision (the hope of the Britons) expressed in the Zeitgeist of the populace, but more of a hoped for vengeance in the present. Henry Blois returns to England slightly sidelined yet still involved politically to his death.

For the last 13 years of Henry Blois’ life there is a mutual but guarded respect between Henry II and Henry Blois. Henry takes on the guise of the venerated bishop and statesman in the period between 1158 and his death in 1171. But, as we shall cover, he is (all the while) propagating Grail literature…. and also in this period manufactured the grave of Arthur and Guinevere at Glastonbury.

Henry II attempted to obtain control of the Duchy of Brittany which neighboured his lands. King Henry had claimed to be the overlord of Brittany on the basis that the Duchy had owed loyalty to his Grandfather, King Henry I. A state of civil war had existed amongst the barons in the region since Conan III died. Conan’s uncle Hoel continued to control the county of Nantes to the east until he was deposed in 1156 by Henry II’s brother, Geoffrey.

Conan resisted the King’s brother and Henry II responded by seizing Conan’s English Earldom of Richmond. This was the state of affairs at the time Henry Blois was writing the Vita Merlini. Events did not transpire as Henry Blois had hoped or even prophesied. History relates that to put down the civil unrest in Brittany, Conan, in the end appealed to Henry II for aid. King Henry, in return, demanded the betrothal of Conan’s only daughter and heiress Constance, to Henry’s son Geoffrey Plantagenet. So the prophecy had no hope of becoming true, but the Vita prophecies had been written in this era.
Cadwalader.

Henry Blois is as devious as always in appearing to be speaking as Merlin back in the sixth century. He employs the device we have witnessed before of anchoring in time, references to his own HRB, and also to known events in the British Annals.

Henry’s aim is to speak prophecy as if it were the confused misinterpreted rambling of a mystic whilst leaving no doubt as to the person he is referring to; yet causing confusion, because of the apparent anachronism. In the confusion the Norman reader could take special notice of Cadwalader. In the HRB we hear of Cadwallo:

Now, a little later, a son was born unto King Cadvan of the Queen his wife, and thereafter were the two boys, whereof the one was called Cadwallo and the other Edwin. And when in course of time their boyhood had grown into youth, their parents sent them unto Solomon, King of the Armorican Britons...\textsuperscript{874}

Also in the HRB: Discord having thus arisen betwixt them, and the men of both having harried the lands of the other in a number of armed forays, both at last met on the further side of Humber, and in the battle that was fought Cadwallo lost many thousands of his men and was put to flight, making his way in such haste as he might through Albany unto the island of Hibernia. But Edwin, after he had won the victory, led his army through the provinces of Britain, and burning the cities, did grievously torment the citizens and husbandmen. But whilst that he was thus giving a loose unto his cruelty, Cadwallo was ever endeavouring to return unto his country by ships, but could never make shift to do so, for that unto whatsoever haven he steered his course there was Edwin with his host to meet him and forbid his landing. Now

\textsuperscript{874} HRB XII, i
there was come unto him a certain right cunning wizard out of Spain, by name Pellitus, who was learned in the flight of birds and the courses of the stars, and did foretell unto him all disaster that might befall, and along of him it was that Edwin had witting of Cadwallo's return so as thus he was able to meet him, shatter his ships and drown their crews, and close every port against him. Cadwallo, therefore, not knowing what to do, and well-nigh falling into utter despair of ever returning, at last bethought him or going unto Solomon, King of the Armorican Britons.⁸⁷⁵

Cadwallon ap Cadfan which the HRB refers to as Cadwallo died in 634 AD and was the King of Gwynedd. He was the King of the Britons who invaded and conquered Northumbria, defeating and killing its King, Edwin. His conquest of Northumbria made him the last Briton to hold substantial territory in eastern Britain.

He is therefore held as national hero by the Britons and as a tyrant by the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria. Geoffrey in the HRB has Cadwallo surviving until after the Battle of the Winwaed in 654 or 655. Geoffrey is never one for dates, just general era, so as not to disagree with the British annals. Henry Blois, as we have shown in appendix 18, is really trying to cause an insurrection in England against Henry II through Cadwaladr ap Gruffydd c.1096-1172. The prophecy is certainly aimed at the modern era not only by the spelling of Cadwalader but the fact he is linked to Conan of Brittany in the same era.⁸⁷⁶

Cadwaladr was the third son of Gruffudd ap Cynan, King of Gwynedd, and younger brother of Owain Gwynedd. Together with his brother Owain, Cadwaladr led three expeditions (1136–37) against the English stronghold of Ceredigion to the south killing the lord of Ceredigion, Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare. During the reign King Stephen, Owain and Cadwaladr extended the boundaries of northern Wales almost to the city of Chester. They captured five castles in the north of Ceredigion then later in the year launched a second invasion, inflicting a heavy defeat on King Stephen’s lord of Ceredigion, at the Battle of Crug Mawr, just outside Cardigan.

In 1137 they captured Carmarthen. Cadwaladr later married Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare's daughter Alice (Adelize) de Clare. Gruffudd ap Cynan died in 1137 and was succeeded by Owain Gwynedd, Cadwaladr's elder

---

⁸⁷⁵ HRB iv
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brother. Cadwaladr was given lands in northern Ceredigion by him. The forces of King Stephen of England had been besieging Lincoln Castle in 1141 but were themselves attacked by a relief force loyal to Empress Matilda and commanded by Robert, Earl of Gloucester, the Empress’ half-brother.

Cadwaladr joined with Ranulph, Earl of Chester in the attack along with Robert of Gloucester’s forces. In fact a later prophecy in the Vita Merlini which (we shall cover shortly) shows Henry has added prophecies after the fact which did not occur in the updated set in HRB:

*I see Lincoln walled in by savage soldiery and two men shut up in it, one of whom escapes to return with a savage tribe and their chief to the walls to conquer the cruel soldiers after capturing their leader*, refers directly to the battle of Lincoln.

The GS author, Henry Blois, narrates the same events that Ranulph Earl of Chester staying at Lincoln castle had heard of King Stephen’s entry into Lincoln and escaped to raise the army of Robert of Gloucester and Cadwaladr: *the Earl of Chester sent to Robert Earl of Gloucester, Miles also, and all who had armed themselves against the King, and likewise brought with him a dreadful and unendurable mass of Welsh.*

Henry Blois, as we witnessed in the HRB, despises the Welsh and calls them savages later in the VM. In the Gesta Stephani he holds the same opinion of them, ‘dreadful!’ Henry refers to Cadwallader as ‘revered’. But in 1156 he is in the guise of Merlin predicting a revolt of the Celts against Norman rule i.e. Henry II. Looking back in time to 1141, Henry Blois’ bother, was captured at the battle of Lincoln and taken prisoner to Earl Robert’s castle in Bristol. Cadwaladr was only probably at Lincoln because of his marriage alliance to Alice de Clare, daughter of Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare.

In the intervening years, after the battle of Lincoln, King Stephen died and Cadwaladr had a quarrel with his brother Owain which led to his exile in England. Henry II invaded Gwynedd in 1157 right at the time Henry Blois is trying to incite insurrection in the prophetic words of Merlin. As we now know through history his plan did not come to fruition. Like Conan in Brittany, Cadwaladr was appeased by Henry II, the terms of the peace agreement between King Henry and Owain Gwynedd included the stipulation that Cadwaladr should be given back his lands at Hess in Shropshire.
It is known that Henry II put stead in the earlier prophecies of Merlin along with his wife Eleanor of Aquitaine. Henry Blois’ plain aim was to incite both Celtic leaders to take up the crown of Brutus by rebellion against King Henry II. The Cornish and the Scots were only included for the aura of credibility of the prophecy; a total rebirth of the Christian Celtic nation ridding itself of foreign rule.

Motivating the Celts to their (prophetic) destiny, Henry Blois coaxes them to join forces to obtain self-rule and the return of the crown of Brutus. It just so happens that Henry II who is numbered the ‘sixth’ is replaced by the ‘adopted one’ who is seen as the ‘seventh’ in John of Cornwall’s set of Merlin prophecies also concocted by Henry Blois. The Celtic belief of Arthur’s return is interchangeable with the utopian ideal of the Briton state, a state which existed from Brutus to the Romans and then to Arthur in Henry Blois’ concocted faux-history.
The interest in *Arthurianna* is well known by the Plantagenet family and it is known that Henry II paid attention to the Prophecies of Merlin. Eleanor of Aquitaine and her daughter Marie of France, Countess of Champagne, was patroness to Chrétien de Troyes. Henry Blois was the uncle of the Countess’s husband, Henry Blois on occasion must have visited as he is the first promulgator of the Grail legens. Both Chrétien and Robert after hearing Henry Blois in the guise of Master Blihis at the court of his two young nephews (sons of his brother Theobald) and their wives, are responsible for further propagating the oral romances into literature.

After Henry II came to the throne of the British Isles, Brittany and Aquitaine were in the same political area, ruled over by the Plantagenet family. Brittany was conscious of its links to the pre-Saxon Britons and the link of Arthur to Brittany pre-existed Geoffrey’s HRB, but much of the Breton lore was oral.

The links between the Armorican peninsula named Brittany since the sixth century emigration of some Britons (mostly from Dumnonia as a Dumonian king ruled) provided a shared cultural heritage. The persistence, until the 13th century and beyond, of a linguistic and cultural community between Brittany, Wales and Cornwall were not ‘Geoffrey’s’ invention.

Saint Goeznovius was a Cornish-born Bishop of Léon in Brittany, who died c.675 and is venerated as a saint in the region around Brest and the Diocese of Léon. According to his *Legenda* he was born in Cornwall and became one of many of his countrymen who moved to the continent in the wake of the Anglo-Saxon incursions. The prologue to Saint Goueznou’s life, written in the 11th century bears testimony to the existence of a long standing cultural background:

---
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And so the Armorici islanders and the British, who use the same laws in brotherly love, treated themselves as a people of one country for a long time under the rule.

The Bretons of Brittany, (little Britain) and Britons on opposite sides of the Channel (later called Great Britain to distinguish the two) formed one people. The same consciousness of a common past is found. In the Book of Llandaff, it relates that the Welsh prince Guidnerth, guilty of murdering his brother, was sent to Dol in Brittany by his archbishop to do penitence, because: *He Guidnerth and the Britons and the archbishop of that land are of one tongue and of one national though the lands are spatially divided.*

Although we can see the attestations to cultural background, in the cartulary at the Abbey of Saint-Sauveur-Redon there are several occurrences of the name Arthur. Also we hear of a lineage of Arthuiu, Lord of Bain-de-Bretagne in the ninth century. Lailoken also appears as Lalocan in the middle of the ninth century. Saint Judicael ap Hoel c.590–658 (of Jewish descent) was the King of Domnonee and a Breton King in the mid-seventh century. According to Gregory of Tours, the Bretons were divided into various regna during the sixth century, of which, were named Domnonee and Cornouaille.

According to *Saint Judicael's Life*, his fellow, Taliesin sometimes stayed in the Abbey of Saint-Gildas-de-Rhuys in Brittany to study. It relates people asked Taliesin to explain King Judhael’s dream about his future son.

Regarding Henry Blois and his involvement in rewriting history, we can see in *Vita Merlini*, where Henry Blois’ has Merlin say: *Bid Taliesin come. I have much I wish to discuss with him, since he has only recently returned from Brittany, where he has been enjoying the sweets of learning under the wise Gildas.* (VM). All of this is tied up with Henry Blois’ impostering of Caradoc and the concoction of the life of Gildas.

Henry Blois sees himself as both from Norman and Breton heritage and part of the heritage which started to merge after the Vikings’ ravages of Normandy along with parts of Brittany at the beginning of the 11th century in an era where we see a double alliance between the ducal houses of

---
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Brittany and Normandy. The traditional rivalry between Brittany and Normandy continued at the close of the 11th century.

The Breton-Norman war of 1064–1065 was the result of William I of England's support of rebels in Brittany against Alan's grandfather, Conan II. However, the name of Arthur was in use on the continent as early as the middle of the 11th century and the name of Arthur is witnessed in Normandy. We find it in Fougères (‘Artur de Mansionili’), in the second half of the 11th century.\(^{881}\)

Also in 1087, in the course of William the Conqueror's funeral at Caen, Ascelin, son of Arthur, claimed that William’s grave site was owned before by his father Arthur, and had been stolen from him by William to found the Trinity's church of Caen.\(^ {882}\) Arthur, Ascelin’s father, appeared in records between 1056 and 1070 when he sold lands to Lanfranc.\(^ {883}\) Another instance is the lord Artus of Champeaux visited the hermit William Firmat in the forest of Passais.\(^ {884}\) Many Bretons came to England with William the Conqueror's army. Even before 1066, Normans and Bretons had already settled and been warmly welcomed there since the times of King Alfred the Great and his son Athelstan. This tradition of welcome even became a law under Edward the Confessor’s reign.\(^ {885}\)

The political relations between Henry Ist Beauclerc and Alan Fergant were very strong. Alan came to Henry's aid when the latter was fighting against his brother Robert Courteheuse for the throne of England. Alan Fergant’s natural son, Brian Fitz-Count, was fostered at Henry Ist court. His foster brother was Henry’s son, Robert of Gloucester, to whom Normans and Bretons had close connections even if these relations were not always harmonious. Bretons participated together in the first crusade under Robert Courteheuse's command, with Alan Fergant, Duke of Brittany.\(^ {886}\)


\(^{883}\) See Gallais, op. cit., 61, A5

\(^{884}\) See Raison, Chanoine Louis, René Niderst, 1948. Le mouvement érémitique dans l’Ouest, fin 11ème siècle, début 12ème siècle.


\(^{886}\) Much of this appendix supplied by Patrice Marquand. Cultural connections between Brittany and Aquitaine in the Middle Ages (10th-13th centuries): ‘The Matter of Britain ’ and the ‘Chansons de Geste.’
Appendix 21

*I see the city of Oxford filled with helmeted men, and the holy men and the holy bishops bound in fetters by the advice of the Council.* See also Appendix 11 which relates to the same event.

Roger of Salisbury and Alexander of Lincoln were taken into custody on June 24th 1139 while attending a council of King Stephen at Oxford. Roger of Salisbury, Henry Ist chancellor, had acquired vast land holdings and wealth while tending affairs of state during Henry Ist absence in Normandy. He was said to be worldly rather than pious. He built castles at Sherborne and Devizes and fortified Malmesbury Abbey. He had also taken possession of the Royal Castle at Salisbury.

His nephew Alexander of Lincoln to whom Geoffrey of Monmouth dedicates the prophecies of Merlin in the HRB, had also constructed a castle in Newark as well as having Sleaford Castle. Alexander was known for his ostentatious and luxurious lifestyle also. Roger and Alexander both supplied many knights for the King’s cause just as Henry Blois did from both Winchester and Glastonbury.

In 1138 there were rumours that the Empress and Robert of Gloucester were about to return England and seize the crown. Most of the barons had previously sworn allegiance to Matilda on the instructions of Henry Ist on the understanding that she was to inherit the crown on his death. The Beaumont twins, supporters of King Stephen had his ear and were able to manipulate him.

It is made clear in the *Gesta Stephani* that this situation riled Henry Blois as his relationship with his brother had become frosty on account of their whisperings against him. The Beaumont’s spread rumours to the King regarding Roger of Salisbury, Alexander and bishop Nigel that they might switch fealty *en masse* to Matilda and this would present serious problems for King Stephen if the power base, which the family relatives held, sided with Matilda’s and Robert.
According to Henry Blois, (the author of the GS), these rumours appear to have been started by a group of nobles led by twin brothers, Waleran de Beaumont, the Count of Meulan, (to whom Geoffrey of Monmouth supposedly dedicates some versions of the HRB), and Robert de Beaumont, the Earl of Leicester.

William of Malmesbury says that if only Stephen had not lent trusting ears to the whispers of the ill-disposed... counsellors who used to urge upon him that he should never lack money while the monasteries were full of treasure. The bishops, they said, forgetting they were churchmen, were mad with rage for castle building; no one should doubt that all this was being done for the King's ruin... Stephen needed a pretext for demanding a surrender of the three bishop's castles.

Stephen’s political position would have been more secure had it not been for the speed with which Stephen arrived in England after Henry I's death and the manipulations of the Bishop of Winchester who convinced William of Corbeil to crown Stephen quickly. All the barons who had sworn fealty to Matilda previously, knew that Hugh Bigod had told a lie to get Stephen crowned. Bigod had said that before Henry I's death, he had released all the barons from the oath they had sworn to the Empress Matilda. This gave rise to a situation where the barons in some cases did not know where their loyalty lay.

Few could accept a woman as their Queen anyway; and so with expedience Stephen had been crowned. Certainly Henry Blois as author of GS wants posterity to understand that expediency rather than manipulation led to Stephen being crowned. The rumours may have been untrue about Roger of Salisbury’s proposed change of affiliation to Matilda, but the Beaumont’s had planted a seed of doubt in Stephen’s mind.

Because of Stephen’s insecurity and the fact that he did not wish to offend the Beaumont's, he conspired to call a council at which Roger and his nephews the bishops of Ely and Lincoln would attend. Here it was contrived that some accusation would arise and they would be arrested. A preconceived controversy was arranged and a fight broke out between Bishop Roger's men and those of Alan, Count of Brittany over quarters. The argument was inflamed and swords were pulled and Alan's nephew was killed as well as one of Bishop Roger's soldiers. When Alan was called

887 Historia Novella, William of Malmesbury.
before Stephen, he charged the Bishop with plotting against the King just as the Beaumont’s had arranged. Not given time to give answer the accusation, Roger of Salisbury and Alexander of Lincoln were roughly arrested and tied in the King's presence.

This all transpired at Oxford. *I see the city of Oxford filled with helmeted men, and holy men and holy bishops bound on the decision of the Council.*

Nigel of Ely was supposed to be arrested also, but he was quartered outside Oxford and was not present at the fracas and managed to avoid the trap set by King Stephen. On hearing the news he fled to Roger of Salisbury’s Castle at Devizes where he refused to come out. Probably, Nigel fleeing to Devises gave the appearance of guilt; and for Stephen, substantiated Alan’s accusation in the first place.

As we have already elucidated in appendix 11, Stephen dragged Bishop Roger down to Devizes with him, to lay siege to his own Castle and to evict Nigel of Ely. William of Ypres, a knight of Stephen’s, threatened Nigel (who was within the castle), that should he not give himself up, Bishop Roger would be starved until he opened up and gave possession of the castle to the King. Nigel not caring for his uncle’s importunity said he would not submit.

Meanwhile, Bishop Roger, as we have covered already, was housed in a cowshed in the most awful conditions and separated from Bishop Alexander who was also housed in appalling conditions. Bishop Roger, half starving to death (Malmesbury said it was a voluntary fast), begged the King that he could plead with his nephew at the castle gates to open up. Roger was brought in front of the Castle and asked why Nigel had fled to Roger’s Castle rather than his own. Nigel did not come out, so Stephen dragged Nigel's nephew, Roger the pauper in front of the Castle with a noose placed around his neck and threatened to hang him. Roger le Poer, who was in fact Stephen’s chancellor was Roger of Salisbury's son. However, Roger the pauper's mother was actually in charge of defending her husband’s Castle and so quickly surrendered Nigel to Stephen. Stephen claimed all their castles and their treasures. The three bishops were then eventually allowed to return to their bishoprics, penniless and powerless.

This whole episode affected Henry Blois greatly. As the present legate to the Pope, he decided to do something about it. Henry Blois said that if the
bishops had in anything stepped aside from the path of justice, then it was not for the King to judge them, but for cannon law.\textsuperscript{888}

Stephen had not only previously affronted Henry in the election of Theobald of Bec as Archbishop (a position he had assumed would be his after overseeing the see for two years); but it was the affront to the church which went against Henry’s Gregorian values, that motivated him to bring his brother into line before abuse against the church went any further. He therefore held an ecclesiastical council at Winchester to which Stephen was summoned to attend and in which Henry's speech is recorded in appendix 11.

Henry's personal ire is evident in the GS account, but even William of Malmesbury relates about Henry Blois that: ‘neither fraternal affection nor fear of danger could turn him aside from the path of truth. He spent all his efforts in saying these things both in private and openly in the King’s presence, appealing to him to free and restore bishops, but on no subject would the King listen to him, wherefore, thinking he would try what force lay in the canon law he made his brother promptly to attend the council which he was to hold at Winchester on August 29.\textsuperscript{889}

While the Legate thus expressed himself deliberately and at length, the King, who did not lack confidence in his own case, sent earls to the council to enquire why he had been summoned. The legate answered in brief that one who remembered his own obedience to the faith of Christ should not complain if he had been summoned by Christ’s ministers to give satisfaction, when he knew himself guilty of an offence such as our times had nowhere seen; for it belonged to pagan times to imprison bishops and deprive them of their property.

Let them therefore tell his brother that if he thought it fit to acquiesce calmly in his advice he would by God's will give him advice to which neither the Church of Rome nor the court of the King of France, nor even Count Theobald the brother of them both, certainly a wise and religious man, could reasonably object, but which they ought to accept with favour. In the present juncture the King would act prudently if he either gave an account of what he had done or submit to judgement according to the canon law. It was also his

\textsuperscript{888}Historia Novella, William of Malmesbury.
\textsuperscript{889}HN p.28
bounden duty to favour the church, whose welcoming arms, not the prowess of his knights had raised him to the throne.

The earls went out with what he had said and returned not long afterwards with an answer. They were accompanied by Aubrey De Vere, a man practised in many kinds of cases. He gave the King's answer and did all harm he could to Bishop Roger's case (for Bishop Alexander, whom Roger supported was not there); yet he did it with restraint and without abusive language, though some of the earls standing by his side, often interrupted his speech by hurling insults at the Bishop.\(^{890}\)

The main contention was that even if Bishop Roger were guilty of a crime, it was the church's job to judge them and not for the King to deprive them of their possessions; the same argument was to ensue between Thomas a Becket and Henry II, which Henry Blois also had a secretive hand in, but we will cover this later.

Appendix 22

...and men shall admire the shepherd's tower reared on high, and he shall be forced to open it to no purpose and to his own injury. Or translated slightly differently: and men shall admire the shepherd's high battlements of his castle and he will be forced to unlock it without advantage and to his own hurt.

This follows immediately the prophecy concerning the arrest of the three bishops. It could just refer to the castle at Devises which we know through Henry Blois as author of GS....that he is very impressed with its construction. It could also be a prophetical allusion to Winchester.

\(^{890}\) HN. p 31
The Shepherd’s tower may be at Winchester and this could be a reference to Henry himself being forced by Matilda to surrender it. It seems the architectural reference is not to Bishop Henry’s castle, Wolvesey Palace at Winchester which had a fortified tower but to another tower he had built in the place where the old Anglo Saxon royal palace once stood (in the centre of the town). The old Anglo Saxon royal Palace was immediately North West of the cathedral. Wolvesey Palace is in the south east corner of Winchester, not in the middle of the city.

The royal palace which Matilda had occupied was built at the time of the Norman Conquest and was in the south west corner of the city and was not built by Henry but could be the building with Tower to which he refers. Henry had a passion for architecture and he engineered hundreds of projects, including villages and canals, abbeys and smaller churches throughout his life. His greatest project was at Glastonbury Abbey before the destructive fire of 1184 which destroyed his creation.

Henry also designed and built additions to many palaces and large houses including the castle of Farnham and began the construction of the Hospital of St Cross at Winchester before he died. In London he built Winchester Palace as a residence for the bishops of Winchester. He built the final additions to Winchester Cathedral and Wolvesey Castle within Winchester’s medieval walls including a tourist tunnel under the cathedral to make it easier for pilgrims to view relics.

It might be suggested he had greater plans in mind when he wrote the prophecies of Merlin in the Libellus, where Merlin prophesys’s about Winchester: say unto Winchester: 'The earth shall swallow thee: transfer the see of the shepherd thither where ships do come to haven, and let the rest of the members follow the head.'

He refers to himself as the hedgehog amongst other things as we have covered: The Hedgehog that is loaden with apples shall rebuild her..... He shall add thereunto a mighty palace, and wall it around with six hundred towers.... Within her shall the Hedgehog hide his apples and shall devise ways underground. The last sentence referring to the tunnel under the Cathedral that Henry Blois constructed. It is unclear where Henry Blois wanted to establish his own Metropolitan.... either in London or Winchester as both in the squewing of the prophecy are mentioned.

---
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Henry Blois was a keen observer of architecture. Building fortifications and structure are frequently commented upon sub-consciously in the GS even though it betrays his authorship unknowingly. He even refers to it himself in the Gesta Stephani as the bishops castle, which he had built in very elegant style in the middle of the town and of his palace, which he had fortified strongly and impregnably just like a castle. Henry refers to this structure which appears to have disappeared in Winchester. It must have been irreparably damaged or burnt in the fire in the siege as he himself as the author of the GS distinguishes it from his own fortified palace.

It is used as one of his rationales at his speech at Winchester\textsuperscript{892} when he was noting the state of affairs of which the bishops were culpable (and himself included) when he said: \textit{that they had built castles of great renown, raised up towers and buildings of great strength, and not put the King in possession of his Kingdom.}

Earlier in the VM in another prophecy he makes the very same observation as those in his speech to the bishops, except this time it is through the mouth of Merlin: \textit{Bishops will then bear arms, will then follow the military life, will set up towers and walls on sacred ground and give to soldiers what should go to the poor.}

Adam of Damerham writing about Glastonbury says that Henry Blois was a wonderful builder. \textit{He built a palatial residence, which was called a castle}....

However, the prophetic excerpt above specifically recalls events at what is commonly known as the Rout or siege of Winchester in 1141, where Matilda’s forces had attempted to attack Henry Blois. There could be no better example while on the subject of the rout of Winchester, than hear it in the words of Henry Blois from the \textit{Gesta Stephani}.

The GS is an apologist’s gloss as we have maintained before, especially where Henry plays down his involvement in the burning of Winchester. It was he who had made the citizens of Winchester swear allegiance to the Empress Matilda as their ‘lady’, but when Henry had been affronted by Matilda in London, he had organised her demise by the Londoners who had chased her from the city, just before she was about to be crowned. The citizens of Winchester suffered for keeping their word and their city was

\textsuperscript{892} See appendix 10
burnt. Henry even accuses them of perjury for having done so in not following Henry Blois’ change of allegiance back to his brother.

The ramifications of this in reality were huge after the Monks of Hyde complained to the pope about Henry.... but this account as so many in the GS, tend to soften his manipulative involvement and deny his change of sides. It should be noted the third person, distanced prose of an author practised in deception.

So when they had thus been frightened away from London, all who favoured the King and were in deep depression from his capture joyously congratulated each other, as though they used in the light of a new dawn, and taking up arms with spirit attacked the Countess' adherents on every side. The Queen was admitted into the city by the Londoners and forgetting the weakness of her sex and the woman's softness she bore herself with the valour of a man; everywhere by prayer or price she won over invincible allies; the King's lieges, wherever they were scattered throughout England, she urged persistently to demand their Lord back with her; and now she humbly besought the Bishop of Winchester, legate of all England, to take pity on his imprisoned brother and exert himself for his freedom, that uniting all his efforts with hers he might gain her a husband, the people a King, the Kingdom a champion.

And the Bishop moved both by the woman's tearful supplications, which she pressed on him with great earnestness, and by dutiful compassion for a brother of his own blood that he felt very strongly, often turned over in his own mind how he could rescue his brother from the ignominy of bondage and most skilfully restored him to his Kingdom. But the Countess of Anjou, cunningly anticipating his craft, arrived at Winchester with a highly equipped force to catch the Bishop if she could; and when she, surrounded by a very large retinue, had entered one gate before the citizens knew anything of her coming, the Bishop mounted a swift horse, went out by another gate, and made off to his castles at full speed.

Then she, sending out a summons on every side, gathered into a vast army the whole array of those who were bade her throughout England, and gave orders for most rigourous investment both of the bishops castle, which he had built in very elegant style in the middle of the town, and of his palace, which he had fortified strongly and impregnably just like a castle. I have thought it convenient to mention briefly the names and the importance of those who collected their forces there and were present to help her in carrying on the
siege, in order that with this knowledge the reader may perceive that it was not through the power of man, but rather the wondrous omnipotence of the divine virtue, that so strong and numerous swarm of warriors was as suddenly conquered and scattered, captured and annihilated as I shall show more fully in what follows.

King David of Scotland was there, he who, as has already been said, had twice been chased in shameful flight from England and was, with countless others, to be disgracefully chased from it a third time, not without information to himself and very great danger to his men. Robert Earl of Gloucester was there, Ranulph Earl of Chester, Baldwin Earl of Exeter, Reginald son of King Henry, but a bastard, Earl of Cornwall, miles of Gloucester, whom to the pleasure and satisfaction of all she then made Earl of Hereford, Roger Earl of Warwick, William de Mohun, whom she then made Earl of Dorset, and a certain count Boterel Brittany.

Of barons who yet were in no wise inferior to the earls in loyalty and deserts, valour and distinction, there were Brien, whom I have mentioned earlier, John surnamed the Marshal, Roger de Oilli, Roger de Nunant, William Fitz Alan, and likewise a good many others, to name whom individually would be a long and wearisome task. All of them with a wonderful concentration of large forces from every quarter devoted themselves alike to the siege of the bishop’s castle with one mind and the same unflagging zeal.

The Bishop, sending all over England for the barons who had paid the King, and also hiring ordinary Knights at very great expense, devoted all his efforts to harassing them outside the town. The Queen likewise, with a splendid body of troops and an invincible band of Londoners, who had assembled to the number of almost 1000, magnificently equipped with helmets and coats of mail, besieged the inner reign of besiegers from outside with the greatest energy and spirit.

The King had also intimate councillors, very closely bound to him in personal friendship, not men endowed with large estates but plain soldiers, of whom the most eminent work Roger de Chesney and his brother William, men of war and inferior to none in military merit or any good quality, who, when the King was captured, yet kept their faith to him unbroken and always and everywhere maintained a bitter struggle with his opponents.

And when the Kings of other supporters flocked to Winchester to overthrow his enemies they too, with the body of knights and archers very
ready for action, did them most effectual harm on one side of the city. This was a remarkable siege, nothing like it was ever heard of in our times.

The whole of England, together with an extraordinary number of foreigners, had assembled from every quarter and was there in arms, and the roles of the combatants were reversed in so far as the inner **besiegers of the bishops castle were themselves very closely besieged on the outside** by the King's forces never without danger to men, never without the heaviest loss to both parties. To say nothing of the Knights on one side or the other who were being taken in the daily fighting all were drawn by different fates to meet different deaths, some other misfortunes occurred; while the one side strove with skill and ingenuity to gain the bishops castle the besieged flung out **firebrands** and completely reduced to ashes the greater part of the town, including two abbeys.

Also, while the Kings forces, with pickets of armed men posted everywhere, watched the by road round the town very carefully to prevent any food being brought, a severe famine most egregiously tormented all the inhabitants of the city. So it was arranged, and what seemed a wise measure was taken by general agreement, that they should build a castle for a garrison of 300 knights at the Abbey of Wherwell, 6 miles from Winchester, that thereby the Kings forces might more easily be held in check and supplies brought into the city in more adequate quantities.

But the Kings forces perceiving that this plan was devised for their hurt suddenly and unexpectedly arrived at Wherwell in an irresistible host, and attacking them vigorously on every side they captured and killed a great many, and at length compelled the rest to give way and take refuge in the church, and when they used the church for defence like a castle the other side through wind torches from every quarter and made them leave the church, singed as they were and surrender at discretion.

It was indeed a dreadful and wretched site, how impiously and savagely bodies of armed men were ranging about in the church, a house of religion and prayer, especially as in one place mutual slaughter was going on, in another prisoners were being dragged off with thongs, here the conflagration was fearfully ravaging the roofs of the church and the houses, there cries and shrieks rang piercingly out from the virgins dedicated to God who had left their cloisters with reluctance under the stress of the fire.

Then Robert Earl of Gloucester and the other supporters of his party, on hearing that the grievous calamity just mentioned had come to pass,
despaired entirely of continuing the siege, and bethought themselves of seeking safety in flight as soon as they could. For it did not suit their welfare or advantage to stay there any longer after the lamentable loss of their men, it’s been clear that the town had been burnt in a frightful conflagration by the bishops troops and that the people were suffering very severely from the wasting hunger and lack of food, and that the same dreadful calamity immediately threatened them sell if they did not escape with all speed.

So they assembled their baggage and were emerging from the gates together (as a precaution for the withdrawal they were in close column, all retreating as one body) when behold, the Kings Army in numbers beyond expression surrounded them on every side, charge them heavily and unflinchingly, scattered in different directions the whole opposing host, and at length cut-off and captured, with almost all his force, the Earl of Gloucester, who was commanding and supervising the rear-guard.

Then it spread out all over the surrounding country to attack those of less account, and not only made prisoners any knights it caught but gained plunder of incalculable value which was scattered everywhere for the taking. You could have seen chargers finely shaped and goodly to look upon, here straying about after throwing their riders, there fainting from weariness and at their last gasp; sometimes shields and coats of mail and arms of every kind lying everywhere strewn on the ground; sometimes tempting cloaks and vessels of precious metal, with other valuables, flung in heaps, offering themselves to the finder on every side.

What am I to say about the Knights, nay, the greatest barons who cast away all the emblems of their knighthood and going on foot, in sorry plight, gave false names and denied that they were fugitives. Some fell into the hands of peasants and were most terribly beaten; some concealed themselves in sordid hiding places, pale and full of dread, and lurked there until they either had a chance to escape all were found at last by their enemies and dragged out in shameful and unseemly fashion. And what am I to say of the King of Scotland who was taken for a third time as the story goes, but let go as always, on consideration of a bribe and in grief and weariness could hardly get away to his own country with a few followers? What of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with some bishops and others of the most distinguished men in all England, who when their comrades were scattered and horses and clothing captured from some and viley stolen from others could scarcely escape the safe hiding places from this rout? The Countess of Anjou herself,
who was always superior to feminine softness and had a mind steeled and unbroken in adversity, was the first to fly, going to Devizes with only Brien and a few others to accompany her. But she and Brien gained by this a title to boundless fame, since as their affection for each other had before been unbroken, so even in adversity, great though the obstacle that danger might be, they were in no wise divided. Then while this flight and rout were taking different forms in different places, as has been explained, the Londoners together with a very large part of the King's troops, sacked the city of Winchester in a very terrible manner, and after they had broken open and pillaged houses and stores, and likewise a number of churches, they went away in great joy each to his home with many spoils and countless captives. Such was the rout of Winchester, so terrible and wonderful in the eyes of all that even the oldest man can hardly remember one like it in our age.

Then when the Earl of Gloucester had just been taken prisoner and a short period of time had elapsed an agreement was made and ratified between the partisans of each side that the King and the Earl should be exchanged for each other and they should return to the earlier position of the Civil War. These indeed were harsh and ill-judged terms and bound to do harm to the entire country, but because there could be no other pact of the and friendship between them for the moment, since the two parties were hotly at variance while negotiations were going on, this arrangement was made at last and gladly accepted by both sides.

Then, when the King was restored a superb and magnificent procession of barons went to meet him and accompanied him as an escort, and tenderness, wondrously intermingled with joy, heightened the festal celebrations of all, some shedding tears of compassion from friendship and religious feeling, because of God is gracious mercy vouchsafed to him with marvellous power, others breaking happily into cries of rejoicing and exultation that he was restored to them unharmed.

How, we should ask, does the author know that Henry often turned over in his own mind how he could rescue his brother? This is persuasive apologia. It is clear, even though Henry insists on referring to himself in the third person...... that the author is a strategist, (which Henry certainly was), but the author is an involved eye witness. He divulges such detail of their withdrawal by stating that as a precaution for the withdrawal they were in close column, all retreating as one body.
Most informed barons blamed Henry for much of what had transpired in the Anarchy, but both William of Malmesbury’s account and his own GS account show that he was able to reinstate or oust King as he thought fit. William of Malmesbury is in not taken in by Henry and witnessed his manipulations since they first met at Glastonbury. Malmesbury states:

*that the legate himself tried to diminish by great efforts of eloquence his unpopularity for what he had done. He said he had received the Empress not of his own will but under compulsion, because, when his brother had just suffered disaster and all the earls had either been put to flight or were waiting in a doubtful frame of mind to see how things would turn out, she and her men had surrounded Winchester with the noise of arms; that she herself had persistently broken all her pledges relating to the freedom of the churches. Moreover, he said, he had been informed on reliable authority that she and her men had plotted not only against his position but against his life; however, God in his mercy had given affairs at different course from what she hoped, that he might avoid destruction himself and rescue his brother from bondage.*

Henry was the power broker for both sides throughout the Anarchy and these events Henry recorded as if Merlin had seen them in the VM and were portrayed as prophecy as we can witness in appendix 23.
Appendix 23

I see Lincoln walled in by savage soldiery and two men shut up in it, one of whom escapes to return with a savage tribe and their chief to the walls to conquer the cruel soldiers after capturing their leader.

This directly relates the Battle of Lincoln of 2 February 1141 in which Stephen blockaded William de Roumare Earl of Lincoln and Randolf of Chester in Lincoln castle. Randolf of Chester managing to escape and return with the Welsh under Robert of Gloucester and capture Stephen. William of Malmesbury gives a good account of what transpired:

King Stephen had gone away in peace from Lincolnshire before Christmas and had conferred distinctions on the Earl of Chester and his brother. That Earl had married the Earl of Gloucester's daughter long since in King Henry's time. Meanwhile the burgesses of Lincoln, wishing to lay the King under great obligation informed him by messengers when he was staying at London that the two brothers had settled unsuspiciously in the city's Castle, that they could easily be surrounded, and that they themselves would see to it that the King got possession of the Castle with the greatest secrecy. He, unwilling to miss any chance of increasing his power, hastened thither joyfully; so the brothers were surrounded and besieged actually during the Christmas Festival.

This seemed unfair to many because, as I have said he had left them before the festival without any suspicion of ill will and had not, in the traditional way renounced his friendship with them, what they call 'defiance'. But the Earl of Chester, though involved in critical danger, yet made good his escape from the close siege of the Castle, by what device I do not determine, whether by the collusion of some of the besiegers or because Valour, when caught in a snare, is want to seek a plan in many ways and commonly to find it. Then, not satisfied with his own freedom, anxious about the safety of his brother and wife, whom he had left in the Castle, he turned his mind in every direction. It seemed the wisest policy to beg aid from his father-in-law, though he had long since offended him for various reasons, chiefly because he seemed faithful to
neither side. So he sent to him promising by the messengers a lasting fidelity to the Empress if, from motives of pity rather than any deserts of his own, he would rescue from wrong and those who were in danger and on the very brink of captivity.

The Earl of Gloucester was not hard to persuade since he could not bear the shame of the thing; and at the same time, loathing delay because his noble country for the sake of two persons, was being tormented by the plunder and slaughter of civil war, he preferred if God should allow it, to hazard a final decision. He also hoped for the divine approval in his enterprise because the King had wronged his son-in-law who was in no wise at fault, was besieging his daughter and had turned into a Castle the church of the blessed mother of God at Lincoln. How greatly these things must have influenced the Prince’s mind! Would it not be better to die and fall with glory rather than their so signal an affront? So to avenge God and his sister and to free his relatives he took the risk. The adherents of his party, most of them disinherited men inflamed to war by grief for what they have lost and consciousness of valour, followed him eagerly, though he cunningly concealed his purpose all the way from Gloucester to Lincoln, keeping the whole army in uncertainty, except for a very few, by taking an indirect route. The time of decision came on the very day of the purification of most blessed Mary, by the river that flows between the two armies, named Trent, which was then so much swollen by a heavy fall of rain as well as water from its source that there was no possibility of fording it. Only then did the Earl disclose his intention to his son-in-law, who had met him with a strong body of troops, and the rest of his followers adding that he had long since made up his mind that nothing should ever compel him to retreat; he would die or be captured if he did not win the victory. Then, as all filled him with good hope, he resolved to risk a battle at once, and strange to hear, swam across the racing current of the River mentioned above with all his men.

eager was the Earl to make an end of the troubles that he would sooner face the final danger than have the Kingdom’s misfortune prolonged; for the King on his side had broken off the siege and offered battle with spirit, accompanied by a great number of earls and no backward body of knights. The royalists first attempted that prelude to the fight which is called jousting, for in this they were accomplished, but when they saw that the ‘earlists’, if the expression may be allowed, were fighting not with lances at a distance but with swords at close quarters and, charging with their banners in the van,
were breaking through the King's line, then all the earls to a man, sought safety in flight (six of them had entered the battle on the King's side), but a number of barons of notable loyalty and courage thinking they should not abandon the King even at this desperate moment, were taken prisoners. The King himself, though he did not lack spirit in self-defence, was at length attacked on all sides by the Earl of Gloucester's Knights and fell to the ground on being struck by a stone....

The Gesta Stephani has it that: the Count of Meulan and the famous William of Ypres fled shamefully before coming to close quarters. So the Earl of Gloucester took the King with him and that Gloucester brought him before his sister the Countess of Anjou and then, by agreement between the two of them, put him under guard in the tower of Bristol to be kept there until the last breath of life, in this showing himself blind and entirely ignorant of the secret purpose of God.

So, as we have already covered: the Earl of Chester Robert Earl of Gloucester, Miles also, and all who had armed themselves against the King, and likewise brought with him a dreadful and unendurable mass of Welsh, all in agreement, in complete harmony, together to overthrow the King.

Does the reader not think it strange that Ganieda is so capable of seeing affairs pertinent to Henry Blois' life? How is it that Ganieda sees a person escaping and returning with the Welsh, who we know Henry Blois thinks are savages? I see Lincoln walled in by savage soldiery and two men shut up in it, one of whom escapes to return with a savage tribe and their chief to the walls to conquer the cruel soldiers after capturing their leader.

It is impossible to think that this applies to any other instance than the capture of King Stephen, yet even though it is Ganieda providing the images in the prophecies it is still Geoffrey of Monmouth in VM supposedly writing, who is in fact Henry Blois. It is quite clear that Henry Blois.... writing as ‘Geoffrey’, who supposedly has translated and inserted (by request) the Merlin prophecies in HRB.... is recounting more recent history as prophecy (readily recognised by his audience). It is worth also taking note of Orderic's account of the battle of Lincoln and how he quite unequivocally states that Henry Blois changed allegiance to the Empress. The only reason
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this should concern us is because, if it were so widely known.... how is it that our anonymous author of GS is so bent on having his audience think otherwise? This is purely because of vanity.... because Henry wished to go down well in History.

ORDERIC:

In the year of our Lord 1141, the fourth indiction, there were grievous troubles in England, and great changes occurred, to the serious loss of many persons. Then it was that Ranulf, earl of Chester, and his half-brother "William de Roumare, revolted against King Stephen, and surprised the fortress which he had at Lincoln for the defence of the city. Cautiously choosing a time when the garrison of the tower were dispersed abroad and engaged in sports, they sent their wives before them to the castle, under pretence of their taking some amusement.' While, however, the two countesses stayed there talking and jokes with the wife of the knight whose duty it was to defend the tower, the earl of Chester came in, without his armour or even his mantle, apparently to fetch back his wife, attended by three soldiers, no one suspecting any fraud. Having thus gained an entrance, they quickly laid hold of the bars and such weapons as were at hand, and forcibly ejected the King's guard. They then let in Earl William and his men-at-arms, as it had been planned before, and in this way the two brothers got possession of the tower and the whole city.

Bishop Alexander and the citizens sent intelligence of this occurrence to the King, who became greatly enraged at it, and was much astonished that two of his dearest friends, on whom he had lavished honours and dignities, should have acted so basely. In consequence, after Christmas, he assembled an army, and marching directly to Lincoln, took by a night surprise about seventeen men-at-arms who lay in the town, the citizens giving him their help. The two earls had shut themselves up in the castle, with their wives and most intimate friends; and finding the place suddenly invested on all sides, became very anxious, not knowing what to do. At last, Ranulf, who being the youngest was the most active and venturesome, crept out by night with a few horsemen, and made for the county of Chester, among his own vassals.

He then announced his quarrel with the King to Robert, earl of Gloucester, his father-in-law, and others his friends and relations, and raising the Welsh, with the disinherited and many others, in arms against the King, gathered forces in every quarter to enable him to bring relief to the besieged. He also sought a special interview with Matilda, countess of Anjou, and pledging his
fealty to her, earnestly entreated her aid, -which was most graciously granted. The two earls, having assembled a vast body of men under arms, marched towards the besieged place, and were prepared to give battle if any resistance was offered. But the King slighted the reports which he daily received of the enemy’s advance, and could not be persuaded that they were capable of, or would venture on, such an enterprise.

Meanwhile, he constructed engines and prepared for the assault of the besieged, who implored his mercy. At length, on Sexagesima Sunday, while they were celebrating the feast of the Purification, the King in person having ascertained that the enemy was near, he ordered together his great lords and asked for their counsel under present circumstances. Some were of opinion that he should leave a large body of troops with the loyal citizens to defend the town, while he should march out with all honour and levy an army from every part of England; with which he should return, when opportunity offered, and reduce the castle by storm with royal severity.

Others recommended him to show due reverence to the feast of the Purification of St. Mary, mother of God, and by an exchange of messages with a view to terms of peace defer the engagement; that through this delay neither party might be utterly prostrated, and human blood might not be shed to the sorrow of multitudes.

However, the obstinate prince disdained to listen to these prudent counsels, and thought it dishonourable to defer the engagement for any considerations: he therefore, gave orders for his troops to arm for battle. The armies met near the city, and being drawn up in order on both sides, battle was joined. The King divided his army into three bodies, and the same order was observed on the other side. The front rank of the royal army was composed of Flemings and Bretons, under the command of William d’Ypres and Alain de Dinan.

Opposed to them were a wild band of Welshmen, under their chiefs Meredith and Kaladrius. The King himself with some of his men-at-arms, dismounted, and fought on foot with great resolution for his life and Kingdom. In like manner, Ranulf, earl of Chester, with his cavalry, also dismounted, and encouraged the bold infantry of Chester to the work of slaughter.

As for Robert, Earl of Gloucester, who bore the most distinguished part in this expedition, he commanded that the men of Bath, and other disinherited gentlemen, should have the honour of striking the first blow for the recovery of their inheritances. At first, the battle was fought on both sides with great
desperation, and there was much effusion of human blood. The best knights and men-at-arms were in the King's army; but the enemy outnumbered them in infantry and the Welsh levies. It is certain that William d' Ypres with his Flemings, and Alain with his Bretons, were the first to give way; thereby emboldening the enemy, and spreading panic in the ranks of their confederates.

This engagement was disgracefully distinguished by the most scandalous treachery: for some of the great lords, with a few of their retainers, accompanied the King, while they sent the great body of their vassals to secure the victory to his adversaries. Thus they deceived their lord, and may justly be considered as perjured men and traitors. Count Waleran and his brother "William de Warrenne, with Gilbert de Clare, and other knights of high renown, both Norman and English, as soon as they saw the first rank routed, turned their backs and fled in alarm for their own safety. On the other hand, Baldwin de Clare, Richard Fitz-Urse and Gilbert de Lacy, stuck closely to the King during the battle, and fought stoutly by his side till the day was lost.

As for King Stephen, mindful of the brave deeds of his ancestors, he fought with great courage; and as long as three of his soldiers stood by him, he never ceased dealing heavy blows with his sword and a Norwegian battle-axe, with which some youth had supplied him. At last, worn out with fatigue and deserted by all, he surrendered to Earl Robert, his cousin; and being made prisoner, was by him soon afterwards presented to the Countess Matilda. Thus, by a turn of the wheel of fortune, King Stephen was hurled from his throne, and, alas! Incarcerated in the important fortress of Bristol in anguish and misery. Baldwin de Clare and the other brave young soldiers, who dismounted with the King and fought gallantly, as I have just said, were made prisoners.

The night before, while the people of God were keeping the eve of the feast dedicated to the honour of the Virgin Mother, and waited for matins, when a high mass was to be celebrated according to the rites of the church, a great storm of hail and rain fell in the western parts, that is, in France and Britain, and terrible claps of thunder were heard, accompanied by vivid flashes of lightning.

On the very day of the battle, while the King was hearing mass before the engagement, and his mind was agitated, if I mistake not, by anxious care and thought, the consecrated wax-taper broke in his hand, and fell thrice to the
ground in the presence of many witnesses. This was remarked by some judicious persons to be a manifest token of evil to come; and the fall of the prince on the same day clearly explained the omen. The King's disaster filled with grief the clergy and monks and the common people; because he was condescending and courteous to those who were good and quiet, and, if his treacherous nobles had allowed it, he would have put an end to their nefarious enterprises, and been a generous protector and benevolent friend of the country.

The townsmen of Lincoln who had taken the King's side, as they were bound to do, he being also the lord of the place, finding that the enemy had obtained a complete victory, abandoned their wives and houses and all that they possessed, and fled to the neighbouring river, intending to save themselves by becoming exiles. Rushing in great crowds to the boats, in their haste they so overcrowded them with their numbers, losing all order and self-possession in the imminent fear of death, and those who came latest jumping in upon those who were first, that the boats were upset in a moment, and nearly all who were embarked (some say as many as five hundred of the principal citizens) perished. William, a famous soldier and nephew of Geoffrey, archbishop of Rouen, fell on the King's side.

Of the others, as those report who were present, not more than a hundred were slain. Count Ranulf and his victorious comrades entered the city, and pillaged every quarter of it like barbarians. As for the citizens who remained, they butchered like cattle all whom they found and could lay hands on, putting them to death in various ways without the slightest pity.

After this battle and the capture of the King, a great division arose in England. Henry, bishop of Winchester, immediately joined the party of the Angevins; and receiving the countess with respect in the royal city, entirely deserted his brother the King and all who were on his side. Earl Waleran, William de Warrenne, Simon, and several other lords adhered to the queen, and pledged themselves to fight resolutely for the King and his heirs. Thus the mischief spread on all sides, and England, which formerly overflowed with wealth, was now miserably desolated, and abandoned to rapine, fire, and slaughter.

We have the same events recorded in the Anglo-Saxon chronicle if any reader still doubts that the prophecy relates to the battle of Lincoln: After this waxed a very great war betwixt the King and Randolph, Earl of Chester;
not because he did not give him all that he could ask him, as he did to all others; but ever the more he gave them, the worse they were to him. The Earl held Lincoln against the King, and took away from him all that he ought to have. And the King went thither, and beset him and his brother William de Romare in the castle. And the earl stole out, and went after Robert, Earl of Gloucester, and brought him thither with a large army. And they fought strenuously on Candlemas day against their lord, and took him; for his men forsook him and fled. And they led him to Bristol, and there put him into prison in close quarters.
Appendix 24

The Boar of Brittany, protected by an aged oak, takes away the moon, who brandished swords behind her back.

The Boar of Cornwall was originally Arthur ‘as the forests of Gaul shall he posses’. The Boar of Brittany may even be King Stephen and the aged oak is Henry Blois after the prophecies have been squewed from an original in the *Libellus Merlini*. When the Anarchy came to a head, Henry, again, cast his lot with Stephen having briefly changed allegiance (although not admitted in GS). Having been abused by the Empress Matilda and then begged by his brother’s wife Queen Matilda to aid his imprisoned brother, Henry at this stage sees himself as the ‘protector’ of Stephen. When Matilda was about to be crowned, Henry was allied with her and learns that the Empress is disrespectful of him and most other lords now that she thinks the crown is a *fait accompli*.

There is little more stultifying than a vain and arrogant Henry Blois traipsing around in the retinue of a vain and haughty Matilda. But, Henry also finds out in the brief period where he swapped allegiance to her that she could not keep her word and was not to be trusted and had few feminine or redeeming qualities. The Empress Matilda is outmanoeuvred by Henry Blois and her eventual downfall is the failure to stop Henry at the rout of Winchester where also her own brother was captured.

‘Taking away the moon’ alludes to the fact that Matilda’s power base was in effect removed by the guile and subtlety of Henry Blois’ manipulation of events. The sword behind her back is his allusion to her dishonesty; and may even refer to his own scheming which was the cause of her swift departure from London.

The artifice of Henry Blois in the Prophecies of Merlin is partly to confuse and partly to give the impression and sound like a prophet from the 6th century. It is also partly to employ the devise of using known information about historical events so as to appear as prophetic by giving the prophecies the aura of antiquity. William of Newburgh’s castigation of
Geoffrey of Monmouth gives the impression that an original set of prophecies genuinely existed written by Merlin. They were not Merlin’s and did not exist in antiquity!

Because of Henry’s later updated versions found in Vulgate HRB and VM,... later commentators such as Newburgh assumed that ‘Geoffrey’ had added and changed original verses written by Merlin. What Newburgh did not realise was that the original set which were created separately from the Primary Historia (which Newburgh implies have been manipulated) were in fact written by Henry Blois also.

However, one of these original icons was the ‘boar’ and Henry’s basic use of it changes where individuals are applied specifically to confuse and mix into the ‘soup’ of his later additions.... yet using some earlier icons to seem consistent. To speculate, we might posit that Henry’s understanding of the animal symbol is that of the hereditary line from Arthur which transmuted to Brittany and from thence into Normandy, eventually to be returned back into Britain as William the Conqueror, the first to return the crown of Brutus in its original sense.

So it is possible that the boar of Brittany refers to his Brother Stephen in this instance. Earlier in the Vita we understood that Stephen and Henry were William the Conqueror’s Nephews, and William the Conqueror was then the Boar of Cornwall.

_The nephews of the Boar of Cornwall cast everything into confusion, and setting snares for each other engage in a mutual slaughter with their wicked swords. They do not wish to wait to get possession of the Kingdom lawfully, but seize the crown._

However, the prophecies have been squewed from the original Libellus to the updated HRB rendition and then in to the VM edition, so that we cannot be certain sometimes to what the icon refers. This may more properly have referred to Arthur and Morgan in the original sense.

In this instance the ‘boar’ might be Stephen. Stephen is the fourth as we found earlier, and he is crossing the Legate (the shadow of the helmeted man who is the pope).This is Henry himself at a time when he and his brother were at odds following the election of Theobald of Bec as Archbishop of Canterbury. Henry in the VM prophecies refers to specific events and thus at that time he uses the terminology ‘crossed’ because that was the sentiment that he felt, crossed betrayed: _A fourth shall be in authority whom awkward piety shall injure until he shall be clothed in his_
father, so that girded with boar’s teeth he shall cross the shadow of the helmeted man.

In the Prophecies of Merlin in the HRB the boar seems to apply to Arthur. 

*For the Boar of Cornwall shall bring succour and shall trample their necks beneath his feet. The islands of the Ocean shall be subdued unto his power, and the forests of Gaul shall he possess.*

However, there is no end of Henry’s subtlety when again in the Prophecies of Merlin from the Vulgate HRB, he refers to himself as the Boar of commerce regaining the misappropriated lands of Glastonbury abbey: *Then shall the Boar of commerce arrive in the land, who shall recall the scattered flocks unto the pastures they have lost. His breast shall be meat unto the hungry and his tongue as drink unto them that thirst.*

This could as well be accounted as an illusion the Roman church and its obvious materialism connected to Augustine’s arrival. Lastly, the appellation of ‘boar’ goes back to Brutus an appellation supposedly because he landed there initially but this may well have been squewed: *After him shall succeed the Boar of Totnes, and with baleful tyranny shall he oppress the people.*
Appendix 25

Others rise up and attack the fourth fiercely and savagely but not one of them prevails, for he stands firm and moves his shield and fights back with his weapons and as victor straightway defeats his enemy thrice. Twice he drives him across the frozen regions of the north and a third (time) he (still) grants the mercy that he asks, so that the stars flee through all portions of the fields.

While writing the prophecies, at the end of the VM, Henry gets very specific about some of the incidents in the Anarchy and to certain people. No account of the Anarchy would be complete without hearing the account of the Scots and the part King David played as Empress Matilda’s uncle and ally during the troubles. Unfortunately the copy of the Gesta Stephani is missing several pages and most importantly....one part is about the two defeats of the Scots which are referred to in the Vita Merlini prophecy as the ‘Twice’. Fortunately Henry refers to them later in the GS so that we can be sure that this is what the above prophecy refers to.

Henry Blois does not like the Welsh and he does not like the Scots either. Both, he considers to be savages and were the cause of much strife to the Kingdom during the Anarchy. Henry Blois does not like David, King of Scotland; but during the time when Stephen was imprisoned, Henry had spent time with David as he followed Matilda around as part of her retinue. In this Vita prophecy, the ‘others’ who rise up and attack the fourth (Stephen) are the Scots, but the reference is to King David himself.

Stephen had defeated him twice and made a deal with King David; but after the rout of Winchester King David was caught a third time, at which, he begged to be set free and paid a bribe for his freedom. This is part of the extract from the GS we saw in appendix 22:

What am I to say about the Knights, nay, the greatest barons who cast away all the emblems of their knighthood and going on foot, in sorry plight,
gave false names and denied that they were fugitives. Some fell into the hands of peasants and were most terribly beaten; some concealed themselves in sordid hiding places, pale and full of dread, and lurked there until they either had a chance to escape all were found at last by their enemies and dragged out in shameful and unseemly fashion. And what am I to say of the **King of Scotland who was taken for a third time as the story goes, but let go as always, on consideration of a bribe** and in grief and weariness could hardly get away to his own country with a few followers? What of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with some bishops and others of the most distinguished men in all England, who when their comrades were scattered and horses and clothing captured from some and vilely stolen from others could scarcely escape the safe hiding places from this rout? The Countess of Anjou herself, who was always superior to feminine softness and had a mind steeled and unbroken in adversity, was the first to fly, going to Devizes with only Brien and a few others to accompany her.

It is not coincidence that the author of GS who opines that King David is set free a third time is the person writing the prophecy. Again, in the section below from the account concerning the rout of Winchester, we hear that the other defeats (the two earlier) have already been covered by Henry in the section of folio’s missing from the GS manuscript:

> **...so strong and numerous swarm of warriors was as suddenly conquered and scattered, captured and annihilated as I shall show more fully in what follows. King David of Scotland was there, he who, as has already been said, had twice been chased in shameful flight from England and was, with countless others, to be disgracefully chased from it a third time, not without information to himself and very great danger to his men.**

However, it is worth covering the early passage in the *Gesta Stephani* concerning the Scots until the point at which it breaks off at the missing folio’s:

> **In Scotland, which borders on England, with a river fixing the boundary between the two Kingdoms, there was a King of gentle heart, is born of religious parents and equal to them in his just way of living. Since he had in the presence of King Henry, together with other magnets of Kingdom, or rather first of all of them, found himself with an oath that on King Henry's death he would recognise no one as his successor except his daughter or her**

---

895 See Chapter: Henry Blois and the *Gesta Stephani.*
heir, he was greatly vexed that Stephen had come to take the tiller of the Kingdom of the English.

But because it had been planned and carried out by the barons themselves without consulting him, he wisely pondered the ultimate result and waited quietly for some time to see to what end the enterprise would come. And last King Henry's daughter sent him a letter, stating that she had been denied her father’s will and deprived of the Kingdom promised to her on oath, that the laws had been made of no account, justice trampled underfoot, the fealty of the barons of England and the compact to which they had sworn broken and utterly disregarded, and therefore she humbly and mournfully besought him to aid her as a relation, since she was abandoned, and assist her as one bound to her by oath, since she was in distress.

At this the King groaned deeply, and inflamed by zeal for justice, both on account of the ties of kinship and because he owed the woman the fealty he had promised, he determined to set the Kingdom of England in confusion, that when rebellion had been raised up everywhere against its King he might be compelled with God's help to leave to one more just than himself what he had seized, as the King of Scots thought, unjustly. To spur him on with frequent urging to create disorder the King had with him on the one side the son of Robert of Bampton and his kinsman, who had been banished from England, as has been said, and had fled to him in the hope of recovering their Country, on the other Eustace Fitz John, a great and influential friend of King Henry, and very many others, who were cultivating strife either for their own profit or on account of defending what they regarded as justice. So King David, for that was his name, sent out a decree through Scotland and summoned all the arms, and giving them free license he commanded them to commit against the English, without pity, the most Savage and cruel deeds they could invent.

Scotland, which is also called Albany, is a land hemmed in by marshy places, well supplied with productive forests, milk, and herds, encircled by safe harbours and rich islands, but it has inhabitants that are barbarous and filthy, neither overcome by excess of cold nor enfeebled by severe hunger, putting their trust in swiftness of foot and light equipment; in their

---

896 Henry of Huntingdon relates the eruption of the Scots into Northumbria, in the first month of Stephen’s usurpation, and the two occurrences at Durham.
own country they care nothing for the awful moment of the bitterness of death, among foreigners they surpass all in cruelty. From this people then and from the nearer parts of Scotland the King collected a mass of rebels into an incredible army and leading towards England, and after crossing the boundary between the two Kingdoms into the region of Northumbria, which was wide and populous and filled with supplies of all things needful, he there encamped. Then, organising squadrons and battalions against all the land, which was large and rich........

The GS breaks off for the loss of folio. It is in this section that I believe we would have found the corroborative evidence to match several of the following prophesies. As we have seen throughout the VM, everything can be related directly back to information in the Gesta Stephani, both written by the same person.

Since the history is missing from the GS, I will briefly recap here to cover the known history which probably would have been covered in the missing folios. David was the brother-in-law of Henry Ist. David was probably an important figure at the English court and was the Kings protégé. At the death King Henry Ist, David supported the claims of Henry's daughter Matilda, and so came into conflict with King Stephen as the Gesta Stephani makes clear. However David's support for Matilda was used as a pretext for land-grabbing; but David made it look like a sincere quest for justice since he had been the first to take the oath in 1127 to uphold the succession of Matilda. When Stephen was crowned on 22 December 1135, David went to war against Stephen straight away. Even though the later allusion in the VM a few lines down, that it all started with the Welsh; this is in reference to the era starting with William the Conqueror.

David marched into northern England just after Stephen was crowned and by the end of January he had occupied the castles of Carlisle, Wark, Alnwick, Norham and Newcastle. By February David was at Durham, where Stephen met him. Rather than fight a pitched battle, a treaty was agreed and this is what Henry Blois refers to as the first part of the ‘twice’ as seen in the prophecy.

Henry was annoyed that his brother, whose forces could have overpowered David, rather than fight, made a deal with David. As Stephen was to learn, (and it would surely have been written in the missing pages of the Gesta Stephani, Henry Blois would have advised against such a deal).... Stephen was to regret not removing David’s power first time. A deal was
struck. On Stephen’s side…. he received back some castles and David would do no homage to Stephen. Stephen was to receive the homage of Henry, David’s son, for both Carlisle and the other English territories already taken.

Stephen also promised that if in the future he was to resurrect the defunct earldom of Northumberland, David’s son would be considered. However the issue of Matilda was not part of the deal which indicates David was just using the whole affair as a land grab exercise using the affront to his niece as an excuse.

The first Durham treaty fell apart quickly after King David took umbrage at the treatment of his son Henry at Stephen's court. King David massed an army on Northumberland's border, to which the English responded by gathering an army at Newcastle. Once more, a pitched battle was avoided, and instead, a truce was agreed again. The treaty at Durham was broken for a second time when David demanded that Stephen hand over the whole of the old earldom of Northumberland. Stephen's refusal after many comings and goings led to the Battle of Standard in January 1138. Henry Blois is not alone in his revulsion for the Scots as Richard of Hexham called it: "an execrable army, savager than any race of heathen yielding honour to neither God nor man" and that it "harried the whole province and slaughtered everywhere folk of either sex, of every age and condition, destroying, pillaging and burning the vills, churches and houses".

King Stephen had in effect let David off the hook twice as both accords were broken. Stephen, however, was not at the battle of Standard, so it is not until the ‘third time’ at Winchester that Stephen (once released) lets him off the hook with another deal. Henry, writing as Geoffrey posing as Merlin’s sister Ganieda implies that the deal is brokered with a ‘bribe’, but what Henry is most annoyed at is setting David free one more time (thrice). Henry believes having broken his word twice why believe he will keep it a third time. Will you never learn he implies.... and writes So the stars flee throughout the field.
Appendix 26

*O what a shame it is that the stars should capture the sun, under whom they sink down, compelled neither by force nor by war!*

The stars are the magnates, barons and grandees, but the effect of referring to them as such gives the impression of ancient prophetic powers predicting events determined by the alignment of the stars and planets i.e. her prophecy is bound up in the movement of heavenly bodies.

Ganieda, Merlin’s sister, the seer, uses the time honoured method of astrology. What the prophecy relates to is the capture of Stephen at Lincoln. The King is captured as we witnessed in appendix 23. All the barons sink down in the Anarchy, brought low by their shifting allegiances, none of them being compelled to make war or forced into the situation. Henry’s point of view is the King is crowned and that should be the end of it. One point that is consistently made throughout the HRB and the Vita is that Britain would be much better off if it stopped fighting within its territories and advanced themselves from feudalism. The same point is made on several occasions in the Gesta Stephani: *meanwhile, when the English were conducting themselves in so disorderly and disastrous fashion and, loosening the restraints of justice, were freely indulging in every sort of impiety.*
Appendix 27

I see two stars engaging in combat with wild beasts beneath the hill of Urien where the people of Gwent and those of Deira met in the reign of the great Coel.

This is a difficult passage to grasp, especially to follow how and why Henry constructed it. Henry Blois’ conflates so many issues (which is his intention). Firstly, it is apparent from the earlier passage, Henry Blois, while at Clugny, hopes to start an insurrection against Henry II by citing Conan of Brittany and Cadwalladr from Wales as leaders of such a revolt. I think it becomes clear that he wishes his audience to recognise in the prophetic words of Ganieda the battle of Coleshill in July 1157.

We should note that all the previous prophecies are relevant to the readership at the time of publication of the Vita as relatively notable recently transpired events. However, to complicate the salad of his composition of the prophecies…. Henry employs his usual craft in prophecy construction. He cleverly links the prophecy back in time to the Battle of Argoed Llwyfain, so let us deal with that aspect first. The Battle of Argoed Llwyfain, was fought between the forces of the Kingdom of Rheged under the command of Urien and Owain mab Urien and the forces of the Kingdom of Bernicia under Fflamddwyn (Flamebearer). What little is known about the battle comes from the early Welsh poem Gwaith Argoed Llwyfain by the poet and bard Taliesin.

Taliesin’s inclusion in the contemporaneous scene with Ganieda presented in the VM is a part of Henry Blois’ subtlety in making the prophecies appear to coincide historically as contemporaneity is supported by Nennius. Taliesin’s Battle of Argoed Llwyfain is I think, from where

---

897 See appendix 19

898 The first written reference to Taliesin is found in Nennius’ Historia Brittonum: §62. ...At that time, Talhaiarn Tataguen was famed for poetry, and Neirin, and Taliesin and Bluchbard, and Cian, who is called Guenith Guaut, were all famous at the same time in British poetry. The great King, Mailcun, (Melkin) reigned among the
Henry finds his original reference to ‘Urian’ in the HRB prophecy: *And when he shall let loose his cruelty upon them, flesh and bones shall he devour them, yet shall be burned upon the top of Urian.*\(^{900}\)

A few lines later in the HRB we read: *The oaks of the forest shall come together and engage in conflict with the rocks of the Gewissi*, which also links it to this passage in the Vita. However, Henry Blois is hoping his audience will recognise in this prophecy the battle of Coleshill, and this is why Coel\(^{901}\) is introduced and the mention of the hill of Urien. This is how Henry’s conflation works using Taliesin’s poem:

> In the morning on Saturday there was a great battle.  
> From when the sun rose till when it set  
> Fflamddwyn marched in four hosts  
> To wage war against Goddeu and Rheged.  
> He came from Argoed to Arfynydd:  
> They were not suffered to remain for that one day.  
> Fflamddwyn of great bluster exclaimed,  
> “would they give hostages, are they ready?”  
> Him answered Owain, eager for the fray,  
> “They would not give hostages, they are not ready;  
> And Cenau, son of Coel, would have suffered torture  
> Stoutly, ere he would cede anyone hostage”.

> Uryen, lord of Yrechwydd, exclaimed  
> “If it must be an encounter for kith and kin,  
> Let us raise our lines above the mountain,  
> And let us hold up our faces above the edge,  
> And let us raise our spears above his men’s heads,  
> And let us attack Fflamddwyn in his hosts,  
> And let us kill both him and his company”.

> And before Llwyfein wood there was a copse;  
> Ravens were red with the blood of men.  
> And men who charged- the minstrel shall sing,
For many a year the song of their victory.

This battle account from the sixth century was fought in north Wales between the Britons of Goddeu and Rheged under Owein and his son Uryen against the Angles of Bernicia and Deira under Theodoric the Flame barer, son of Ida.

This is not as ‘Geoffrey’s’ HRB has it, a battle between the Gewissi and Deiri. The Hill of Uryen is only tentative suggestion but does seem to be suggested in the reference in the HRB. This is ‘Geoffrey of Monmouth’s’ source in this instance as there is Uryen’s ancestor Coel Godebog who, from the HRB, was King of the Britons’ The Great Coel.¹⁰⁰²

Supposedly on one Saturday, Fflamddwyn had surrounded the seat of power within Rheged and demanded that King Urien submit and provide hostages. Urien’s son Owain and his friend Cenau rejected this proposal. Urien then stirred his men and fighting began. In the ensuing combat Fflamddwyn was slain, temporarily freeing Rheged of the Anglian menace. Henry Blois puts Merlin in the battlefield in the beginning of the Vita; if anyone was there at the battle it would have been Taliesin from whom the poem and account derive. Anyway, old bardic material achieves its goal by linking Taliesin a prophet poet, with Merlin and his sister Ganieda (the one now giving this prophecy), causing a conflation for ‘Geoffrey’s’ readers and confusion for researcher’s into the Vita Merlini; all seemingly reading prophecies linked to a historical bard’s account of the same event.

We know Henry Blois in the VM has no interest in creating more novel history; this he accomplished in the HRB! His main interest now is to add credibility or weight to episodes in the HRB, reasserting and manipulating; but most of all to add new prophetic material: I see two stars engaging in combat with wild beasts beneath the hill of Urien where the people of Gwent and those of Deira met in the reign of the great Coel.

The two stars are in combat in Wales (wild beasts)⁹⁰³ beneath the hill where Urien fought back in the days of Coel. I believe this is how Henry Blois arrives at Ganieda’s prophecy about Coleshill by linking Coel to the hill of Urien in the hope his audience links this to the battle of Coleshill.

---

¹⁰⁰² HRB V, vi
⁹⁰³ Gesta Stephani, 7, ‘but it breeds men of an animal type’
The Battle of Coleshill was a battle fought in July 1157 between an army of 30,000 men led by Henry II and an army of 3000 men, led by the Welsh prince Owain Gwynedd. King Henry’s invasion of Gwynedd was to halt the land grab of Owain Gwynedd into the lands of Powys which Stephen in his reign failed to do. Henry II wanted to curb the Welsh rebellion against Norman control and to expand his empire into northern Wales. He did this with the support of the Prince of Powys Madog ap Maredudd and Owain's brother Cadwaladr ap Gruffydd who had fallen out with his brother. This is the same Cadwalladr Henry Blois is also trying to incite to rebellion against Henry by predicting a comeback of the Britons/Celts as mentioned previously.

At all times Henry Blois is conscious of several criteria that need to be adhered to in order that his audience believe that these prophecies of Ganieda are contemporaneous with those spoken by Merlin in antiquity as found in the HRB. Henry Blois is posing as Geoffrey of Monmouth and also setting himself the task of anchoring his whole Vita account historically in the 6th century or thereabouts. His words need to appear as those of a 6th century seer; but that seer needs to make accurate predictions that not only appear to transpire, but can be recognised by his audience. At the same time he needs to appear as Geoffrey of Monmouth who is merely translating prophecies that are not his but Merlin’s, Taliesin’s or Ganieda’s. Henry does imply that these events transpired where a battle took place previously; beneath the hill of Urien in the days of Coel…. So, at the same time Ganieda is seeing a different battle…. that of Coel’s hill.

This is speculation, but if I am correct in this assertion, this is the only prophecy of Ganieda’s that does not relate directly to Henry, his brother or the Anarchy. However, it does concern Henry as to the outcome…. if King Henry II had been killed. It would have made his return to England less hazardous as he is nervous about King Henry’s reaction on his return to England. This prophecy will have been the most up to date historical event at the time of writing VM.

Not only does he anchor the prophecy to the HRB, but also to Nennius and Taliesin’s poem of the Battle of Argoed Llwyfain. The reason I think it is this episode in 1157 to which he hopes his reader will believe the prophecy is about…. is because Henry purposely tries to conflate Coleshill with Taliesin’s historical account of the Battle of Argoed Llwyfain. If you
remember it is this battle which in effect sets the scene for Merlin in the beginning of the Vita and the aftermath of his madness.904

Providing this specific prophecy is not a later interpolation by Henry Blois (nor the allusion to Cadwalladr and Conan); this might be the method by which to determine the dating of the completion of the Vita Merlini. The entire sequence fits if we accept Henry wrote the Vita Merlini while at Clugny. He has used this last event as the closing prophetic truth of the VM. We know the battle of Coleshill took place in July 1157 and Henry Blois was now under serious pressure to return to his See at Winchester having been recalled to England by King Henry through several requests, masked with threats by Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury.905

It seems to me that this time at Clugny was a period in which Henry Blois had hoped to return to England, but judging by the letters in note 1 is afraid to. It is clear in the Merlin prophecies of John of Cornwall that Henry hoped for a rebellion to have occurred to unseat Henry II while Henry Blois was at Cluny. He delayed his return as long as he could until peace was finally made.... and there was no further hope of the success of a Celtic rebellion with those Henry had tried to incite under the pretence of Prophecy.

I do not wish to add to the confusion Henry Blois has left for posterity, but there is a small chance he might be referring to a similar incident that happened in his brother’s reign also said to have happened at Coleshill. Owain Gwynedd had annexed territory as part of Gwynedd in about 1150 during the Anarchy in Stephen’s reign. Owain Gwynedd then repelled an attempt to regain it, by the joint forces of Ranulf, earl of Chester and Madog ap Maredudd, prince of Powys. However, as all the other prophecies of Ganieda seem highly relevant to Henry Blois.... it does not seem to be this specific event the prophecy alludes to.

---

904 Joscelin's Life of Kentigern has a prose account of a madman cured by drinking water from a healing spring, just like the VM.
905 See note 1
Appendix 28

*O with what sweat the men drip and with what blood the ground while wounds are being given to the foreigners!*

This may or may not be a rhetorical expansion on the previous battle of Coleshill episode; but if not, it is an expression of the zeitgeist that every Briton who was not from Norman stock would have been empathic with. Throughout the HRB and *Vita Merlini* this feeling is expressed, of the indigents of Britain constantly being invaded. For the most part it is alluded to as by Divine judgement upon their sins that invaders have ruled over them. Henry Blois makes sure that the author of the Vita voices the same attitudes held by the indigents never losing sight that he is Geoffrey of Monmouth. ‘Geoffrey’s’ audience would have understood that it was a feeling commonly held among most of the peasant class.
Appendix 29

One star collides with the other and falls into the shadow, hiding its light from the renewed light.

This directly alludes to Stephen colliding with Matilda until she falls into the alluded shadows when she returns back to Normandy. The renewed light one might assume is Stephen after his release. It could possibly be Henry II, but I doubt Henry Blois would view King Henry’s reign as renewed light. Matilda’s forces defeated and captured King Stephen at the Battle of Lincoln in February 1141. He became a prisoner in her brother’s castle. When she arrived in London, the city was ready to welcome her and support her coronation. As the Gesta Stephani relates she used the title of Lady of the English and planned to assume the crown.

However, she refused the request of the citizens of London to reduce their taxes. Because of her own arrogance and Henry Blois' underhanded dealings and change of allegiance (due to Queen Matilda’s petitions to him to aid in the release King Stephen).... the Empress had to flee the city of London. Stephen was eventually freed and exchanged for Robert of Gloucester who was captured at the rout of Winchester in September of 1141 while facilitating his sister’s escape.

At the death of Eustace, Stephen’s son, Henry Fitz Empress and Stephen ratified the terms of a permanent peace. Stephen announced the Treaty of Winchester in Winchester Cathedral: he recognized Henry Plantagenet as his adopted son and successor, in return for Henry doing homage to him. King Stephen promised to listen to Duke Henry’s advice, but retained all his royal powers. Stephen's remaining son, William, would do homage to Duke Henry and renounce his claim to the throne, in exchange for promises of the security of his lands.

However, earlier in 1148, Matilda and Henry Fitz Empress had returned to Normandy, following the death of Robert of Gloucester, and the reconquest of Normandy by Geoffrey of Anjou. Upon their arrival, Geoffrey turned Normandy over to his son Henry Fitz Empress and retired to Anjou. Henry Plantagenet assumed the title Duke of Normandy, and Matilda
became Duchess of Normandy and retired to Rouen for her remaining years, where she maintained her own court and presided over the government of the duchy for her son who then ultimately became Henry II of England.
Appendix 30

Alas what dire famine shall come, so that the north shall inflame her vitals and empty them of the strength of her people. It begins with the Welsh and goes through the chief parts of the Kingdom, and forces the wretched people to cross the water. The calves accustomed to live on the milk of the Scottish cows that are dying from the pestilence shall flee.

Henry Blois, I think, is referring to the north as both northern Wales and Scotland. As we have discussed previously, a portion of the *Gesta Stephani* is missing about the wars in Scotland. I feel sure the missing folios would have corroborated his assertion of the depletion of inhabitants through constant feuding leading to famine. At the place in the *Gesta Stephani* Henry Blois is about to describe the effect of the wars in Scotland we are missing his account: *Then, organising squadrons and battalions against all the land which was large and rich...* [missing folios].

However, if the description of Scotland and the Scots takes the same format as that when Henry Blois describes the Welsh in the GS, I feel confident that if the pages were still extant, it would also describe similar circumstances of famine.

After starting the Welsh account, in the same fashion as that which he describes Scotland.... full of abundance etc.... he then launches into why the Welsh also are in famine:

*Therefore, when the Welsh were troubling the land in this fashion, it seemed to the King (Stephen) that he was striving in vain, in vain pouring out his last treasure to reduce them to peace; and so, advised by more judicious council (probably Henry Blois), he preferred to endure their insolent rebellion for a time, in order that, with fighting at a standstill and disagreement setting them all at variance, they might either suffer a famine or turn on each other and be exterminated by mutual slaughter. And indeed we have seen this happen in a short while. For being continually occupied in slaughter and plunder they left the whole land so untouched by the plough and so empty of men that no hope at all of the future livelihood remained, but worn out with*
plague and hunger, after the death of the animals which followed on the plundering of them, they themselves shared the same fate, since the air became pestilential from the rotting bodies. These things, happened in Wales at different times, I have brought together and dealt with briefly that I might not have to stray from the calls of my narrative whenever some conspicuous event required more adequate treatment in its proper place.

Unless Henry Blois has changed tack, the next line seems to be part of a whole lamentation of the destruction of people and landscape to the north.... as the next lines in VM also refer to the pestilence of dying cattle in Scotland: The calves accustomed to live on the milk of the Scottish cows that are dying from the pestilence shall flee.

It begins with the Welsh and goes through the chief parts of the Kingdom, and forces the wretched people to cross the water. What has often confused commentators on the HRB, is how could a man supposedly from Wales, have such low opinion of the Welsh? Henry’s conception, I believe is that the Welsh are the residue of the Britons.... which he presented as utopian Arthurian society. If this is the case, the meaning of the above prophecy might be about the early migration of the Britons across the channel.

Orderic relates that:

In the same week, a like good fortune smiled on King Stephen in another part of the Kingdom. For the earl of Albemarle and Roger de Mowbray had an engagement with the King of Scotland,' and having put to the sword a multitude of the Scots, avenged the cruel slaughter which these people had made of the English without any respect for the Christian religion. The Scots, it appears, fearing the sword which threatened them, fled towards the water, and rushing into the river Tweed where there was no ford, in their attempt to escape death, met it by drowning.
Appendix 31

He conquered the people of the Gauls after killing Frollo to whom the Roman power had given the care of that country; the Romans, too, who were seeking to make war on his country, he fought against and conquered, and killed the Procurator Hiberius Lucius who was then a colleague of Legnis the general, and who by the command of the Senate had come to bring the territories of the Gauls under their power.

It would be ludicrous, as most commentators assume, when referring to Geoffrey of Monmouth, that Henry Blois writing as ‘Geoffrey’ has not read Tacitus’ account of Agricola, Tacitus’ father in law. The *De vita et moribus Iulii Agricolae* concerns the Roman conquest of Britain.

Henry Blois is the master of deception and has certainly read Suetonius’ *the Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. Adam of Damerham attests that Henry Blois left the book to Glastonbury abbey amongst the other books. Henry is steeped in learning and probably the best informed on Roman and Gallic history.

Posing as Master Gregorius, one might even accuse him of infatuation with things Roman. Much of the sentiment in the HRB and VM is too coincidental for it not to have been written by the same hand as the *Gesta Stephani*. Henry Blois rarely invents without basis or a tie to something historical in the construction of both the HRB and Vita. His continental escapade of Arthur is the most difficult to anchor historically because the events are his own invention.

Henry Blois has a problem when it comes to Arthur in Gaul. Arthur on the continent may have some substance in Breton sources but his appearance against a Roman army at Langres and Autun is complete fiction. The landscape in which he set his battle scene, is 35 miles distant from Cluny. This is why Arthur is put on the continent by ‘Geoffrey’ in that

---

906 See chapter on Henry Blois and Master Gregorius
907 See appendix 20
location. Otherwise it is a difficult concept to deliver without a good knowledge of the region and its peoples.

Being well informed of genuine Roman history, without any credible anchor to historical events, Geoffrey employs his usual discord.... deriving names out of tentative connections. Henry Blois’ aim in the Vita in the passage above is to make a quick transit into the Arthurian continental episode and onto Mordred, just as a reassertion of the HRB’s historicity. Even Henry would know *Tacitus* and the *Lives of the Caesars* presents a very different picture of History than he concocts in the HRB; especially since there are other sources available of events in Gaul. Henry’s main gambit in this passage is to introduce more confusion into the Gallic episode by introducing Frollo instead of Flollo, while at the same time linking back to his fictional character Lucius Hiberius and that of Leo who is now Legnis.

Let us deal with Frollo first. Henry Blois’ mode of construction in both Vita and HRB employs what should be termed a ‘conflationary anchor’. Any one pursuing his inventions will usually find a discernible attachment or basis and it is for this reason Geoffrey leaves a trail of doubt in all his material. Acceptable historical proximity is usually maintained which provides enough credibility for the reader to accept that which is being proposed. Frollo or Flollo is purposely confused with Rollo because ‘Geoffrey’ has provided a name in Gaul which aids to anchor in location an entirely spurious episode.

Gregory of Tours’ history ends in the latter half of the fifth century without mention of continental Arthur; but Henry Blois needs a name that he can link to his spurious Gallic campaign of Arthur. Even though anachronistic, Rollo is nevertheless a grandee in Gaul. Rollo is a Latin translation from the Old Norse name Hrólfr or Rollo (c.846–931). He was numbered Robert I and was a Norse nobleman of Danish or Norwegian descent who was the first ruler of the Viking principality which became known as Normandy. His descendants were the Dukes of Normandy.

Rollo is the great-great-great-grandfather of William the Conqueror. This is probably as far back as Henry Blois could trace his ancestry and thus invents Frollo and Flollo just to add flavour of historical inaccuracy or scribal error. His seemingly misconstrued name acts as a confirmatory tie to a name in the region. Frollo hitherto had no existence in Gaul prior to the HRB, especially in the 6th century. Henry understands who he is basing Frollo or Flollo on, because two sentences before the following extract he
states that Arthur had brought into submission and had dominion over both Norway and Denmark.

The province of Gaul at that time had been committed to the charge of Flollo, Tribune of Rome, who ruled it under the Emperor Leo. Henry does not care that the Vita is set around Rhydderch Hael c.580–614; Rollo, Flollo or Frollo becomes part of the soup which now ties in to the fictitious names of Lucius Hiberius and Legnis or Leo in Gaul. Legnis, the General referred to as a colleague of Lucius Hiberius in the VM (as above) might be a mis-reading for the genitive Leonis since the HRB already makes Leo a colleague of Lucius, but it is probably purposeful confusion on the part of Henry Blois as he also changes Flollo to Frollo in VM.

So soon therefore, as the infamy of the aforesaid crime did reach his ears, he (Arthur) forthwith deferred the expedition he had enterprised against Leo, the King of the Romans, and sending Hoel, Duke of the Armoricans, with the Gaulish army to restore peace in those parts, he straightway hastened back to Britain with none save the island Kings and their armies. Now, that most detestable traitor Mordred.....

The Emperor Leo, as a colleague of Lucius Hiberius in the Vita, is merely Geoffrey’s ploy to anchor back to his spurious episode in Gaul in the HRB. A credible re-affirmation now in the Vita through the words of Merlin himself.... recounting Geoffrey’s dubious account in the HRB set 35 miles from Clugny with Langres not that much further away.

Lucius Hiberius meanwhile, taking these disasters sorely to heart, was mightily perplexed and distressed to make resolve whether it were better for him to hazard a general engagement with Arthur, or to throw himself into Autun and there await assistance from the Emperor Leo. In the end he took counsel of his fears, and on the night following, marched his armies into Langres on his way to Autun.

Loomis, Parry, Griscom, Zimmer, Tatlock, etc, all argue a hypothesis which assumes Geoffrey of Monmouth existed and some are much bemused that a man from the Welsh Marches has good topographical information in the region of Burgundy. It would be reasonable to assert that Henry Blois would have travelled to both Autun and Langres on several occasions, and

908 HRB IX, xi
909 HRB XI,i
910 HRB X, vi
it would be an ideal stage for Arthur’s campaign in an area, steeped in Roman ruins on lands controlled by Cluniacs in the region of Blois. Henry based the utopian Caerleon as Arthur’s court mainly for archaeological reasons and also Nennius mention of Urbs Legionum being synonymous with Caerleon.
Appendix 32

Eadmer’s letter to Glastonbury monks.

How it is that the monks of Glastonbury claim to have the body of St Dunstan.

Brother Eadmer, one of the least in goodness and learning among the sons and brethren of Christchurch, Canterbury, greets the glorious community of monks at Glastonbury Abbey with the loyal friendship and loving service in our Lord Jesus Christ.

I remember how I came to visit you once, some time ago. You received me with great rejoicing and honour, and for as long as I wished to remain with you, you kept me with great celebration and jubilation. Even now I feel grateful to you for this, and I shall continue grateful to you as long as I live. While this, therefore, ought to be and is my attitude toward you, I fancy it will surprise no one if I love your honour, if I applaud those things which benefit you, and if I loathe and detest whatever causes your shame. If I did otherwise, how could I be your loyal friend? How could I be said truly to observe the duty of brotherly love? The importance this should have for a Christian who would attain the Kingdom of God is seen by the man who puts his faith in the words of the apostle, saying that everyone who does not love his brother is a homicide and that such a man should have no share in the Kingdom of God and Christ. You will see my reasons for saying this at the beginning.

There are some among you, recent members of your community, as I am aware, who claimed that your fathers of old were thieves and robbers and, worse, that they committed sacrilege. They make it a point of praise that they did so, perhaps drunk on the same desire, ignoring the words of Sacred Scripture, ‘nor thieves nor robbers shall inherit the Kingdom of God’. Moreover, they reinforce their point, affirming that those men were like Judas the traitor who, though he kept the Lords purse, wickedly stole what he should have kept. Oh, men, who know your brethren! Who hear attentively the Lord’s words! A hundred and more years have passed since they left this
present life, those men whom these now claim to have been thieves and robbers. And now only at this late stage is such a grave reproach brought against them, and most unhappily they are now newly consigned to eternal punishment, to which according to judgement of these accusers they are condemned for torment. Truly, a great irreverence. For if those old men were not such as these now claim they were, the irreverence of their accusers is not lessened; no, without a doubt, it is worse, because they defame the innocent and reveal themselves to all and sundry as shameless liars.

God's truth is my witness, all knowing and all ruling. For when I was still a boy at school, Archbishop Lanfranc of blessed memory, Primate of all Britain, had all this performed: the whole people of Canterbury were ordered the fast; the body of the blessed father Dunstan was lifted from its first burial place, in the presence of Scotland, Abbot of St Augustine’s and of Gundulf (who was later to become Bishop of Rochester) and of the whole company of monks of both churches, that is of our own Christ church and of the neighbouring church of St Peter and St Paul, now usually called St Augustine’s. An untold crowd of men and women assembled, who all followed the heavenly treasure, rejoicing at with voice and heart, to the place where it was to be reburied. The whole day was spent full of joy and solemnity and made bright with divine miracles.

It is 50 years since that happened and now some of your community... if they really are your community.... have stood up and put it about wherever they like that, 100 years ago there were monks from your church assigned as keepers for ours, which was at that time left desolate, so they say, on account of the martyrdom of our glorious father Elphege, and that these keepers with deceitful cunning stole what was held most precious. Alas, men more wicked than all others! The mother church of all Britain was afflicted by the death of its father and its sons, and she took refuge as with a uniquely beloved daughter and... supposing for the sake of argument that this happened... They thereby trusted that your church should safeguard her relics and her very self.

Your church, as you yourselves claim, sent the best of her sons to do what was requested, but these men, having become keepers of the relics, invaded the womb of the mother they had come to protect, tore it open, looted her heart and bowels, snatched in carried away. The Jews, when they took custody of our Lord's body for fear that it might be carried off by the apostles, did not fail to regard it as long as they were able, nor did they attempt to steal
it or otherwise to make off with what was entrusted to them. Rather they accused others of having stolen it while they themselves slept.

If those keepers from Glastonbury had done this, that is, if they had said that the sacrilege for which they are praised had been committed by others while they themselves were asleep, perhaps they would have had some regard for their own reputation and would not have besmirched it in this detestable way. As it is, what are we to say? As we stated out at the beginning, we show that they were like Judas in their theft. But it is not we who says so; rather it is their own modern brethren at Glastonbury. Assuredly we know for certain that those men are not guilty of this sin.

What does this matter to the fellows who accuse their own brethren, nay, their own fathers, with such silly concocted lies. Surely neither brethren nor fathers. For if these fellows were brethren or sons of those men, surely natural affection or even common decency would teach them to curb their tongues and the mind their own reputations. But granted that the whole brethren of Glastonbury used their cunning to make possible the concealment of their theft from everyone, they are said to have brought with them the courts of one of their own abbots, whose name is unknown to those who put about the story, and have set this in the holy father Dunstan's coffin so that it should not stand empty. What forethought! Were there not bones of dead men between Canterbury and Glastonbury that it should have been necessary for them, in order to conceal their theft, to have carried the corpse of someone they knew not over a distance of perhaps 200 miles?

**Your reverence** must understand how, writing this, I am confounded by such patent stupidity, worthy of everyone's scorn, especially because it is said that these tales were made up by Englishman. Alas, why did you not look overseas, where they have more experience, more learning, and know better how to make up such stories? You could even have paid someone to make up a plausible lie for you on a matter of such importance. Oh, poor pitiable you, and men of my nation, to be blackened with such stupidity that you are forever judged worthy of universal derision.

So I ask these men who lay claim to this remarkable sacrilege that they tell me, their compatriot, did they really carry the body of their supposed abbot, recently deceased and still intact, from Glastonbury to Canterbury? And did he wear the chausuble and the pallium with its pin, as an Archbishop should, was he shod with Bishop sandals, or not? And if he had all these, how did it come about? Forgetting the rest for the moment, how did he come to have the
pallium? Surely the Abbots of Glastonbury did not wear the pallium in days gone by? This is only granted by Rome and the Holy See to patriarchs and primates and archbishops.

No one has ever heard of a patriarch of Glastonbury, or even the Bishop. So your predecessors carried to Canterbury a body dressed as an Archbishop in order to deceive posterity, they were committing an affront to the Roman pontiff and to all Christian men who keep the faith under the direction of St Peter, a notorious affront which deserves all manner of disgrace. It is known that they had no authority from the Apostolic See. They made it up at the devil’s prompting or they got it made up by persons like themselves. I can assure you that the body we found was in this condition, intact and fittingly adorned with chausuble, ring, pallium, pin, and sandals. With it was found in inscription on a lead tablet which clearly stated that there lay the body of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Have you, pray, any writings to prove matters stood thus? Namely to say that the body of that Abbott was decked out as I have described? Again, I ask, did your fathers and brethren of old, who were brought...so you say...to guard the relics of our deserted church, did they bring with them that body to replace St Dunstan's as being without worries as to the success of the coming theft? Or did they come here first and take away the Glastonbury the exhumed body of our father, and did they there despoil it of its pontifical garments, and then bring back here your own abbot, dressed in St Dunstan's robes, to be placed in the grave from which our father was taken? Whichever of these you may say happened, it is easy even for a blind man to see that it would be madness to believe you.

O unhappy men! who are so entangled in their own stupidity that they cannot understand how wiser men could not fail to detect this blundering. Christ who is the Truth says,' the truth shall make you free'. Yet your soothsayers today say, ‘our fathers theft and sacrilege and our own lies will bring honour to our church and to ourselves’. What a lie! ‘Our fathers, they say, stole the body of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all Britain, from his church, and they took our own abbot, removed the such sacrilege, since he was no use to us, to Canterbury and set him in St Dunstan's grave’. Oh joy! O sorrow! Oh that your church should be enhanced by so great a gain.

But what will you do, I beg you, enemies of pure truth, when Truth himself will come to destroy all who spread lies? For it is clearer than the light of day
to all that what you claim about your fathers is lies. When they were invited to Canterbury, they did not bring with them their Abbot's corpse. Nor, when they dwelt here, did they remove Dunstan's body and bring it in the other. The former would be an act of extreme and incredible stupidity... No, extreme and incredible madness; but the latter would be an act of audacity impossible to bring about. For when the saint himself had his grave dug, the account of his life truly bears witness to the fact that the depth of his grave was sunk as much as a man's height into the ground.

What possibility could there have been for such as scandalous theft? Moreover, the church was at no point destitute of its own sons, nor was the city of Canterbury ever emptied of its people. In addition one should consider that when the blessed martyr suffered death, the church itself was not burnt nor were its roof or walls damaged. For we know it was profaned and looted of many ornaments, and that an attempt was made to burn it, by a fire started from outside, so that the savage troops could force out the Bishop, protecting himself within when the invader had ordered him to leave.

When he came out and they seized him, they abandoned their fire and their other traps set to catch him. They killed a few monks in his sight and took him away, bringing him to the place intended for his death, where they afflicted him with tortures and injuries and destroyed him. Since these are the facts, how much effrontery does it take to claim that, in the sight of everyone, the floor of the church was dug up to the depth of the grave... 7 feet on all sides, for otherwise they could not reach the body? Then, the story goes, having removed the body of the Holy Father Dunstan, they left the grave open for a fortnight, while the monks return to Glastonbury with what they had stolen. There they found that their Abbot was dead on their arrival (I shall not say he was done to death), so they remove St Dunstan's pontifical adornments and dressed the Abbot's body in them. Then they hastily carried this body... was it on and ass's back?.... to Canterbury and placed it in the grave.

How much effrontery? Again I ask. What all the land between Glastonbury and Canterbury a deserted waste in those days, that they should be free to go and return without hindrance, carrying such a treasure wherever they would? Or was it not? Surely at the date when you claimed this was happening, the terror of the Danes swarmed all over. Nowhere was peaceful, nowhere safe, wars and troubles raged all around. On top of all this, as is surely known, the body of St Dunstan had been buried in the middle of
the choir at the foot of the steps leading to the high altar, in a lead coffin, and
a great depth, as the English once used to bury their dead.

How can it have happened, therefore, that the monks of Canterbury
tolerated such a gaping hole for so many days until the nameless Abbot was
brought and deposited in Dunstan’s empty grave? We know from what
Osebern relates that at least four monks survived the slaughter, not to mention
the clerks who assisted them in maintaining the service of the church. Their
patience was wonderful, and more wonderful was their awaiting the arrival
of the Abbot, whose name was perhaps Wlsinus.

For God’s sake, is there anyone who can help but laugh at such nonsense?
We could go on to pile up more arguments, no less suited to show the
foolishness of this pretence, but we should spare the embarrassment of your
sacred Abbey. It is a shame and disgrace that Glastonbury fosters, feeds,
embraces such men as so did fame it. No monks of Glastonbury came to
Canterbury in those days as they make out, nor did they dwell here. There
were none to snatch St Dunstan’s body, and it was never taken from us, nor
ever brought to you. But your claim is not that it was brought by others on
any other occasion. Confess therefore that your soothsayers have spoken
falsehoods, and that it is in every way untrue to claim that you have anything
of St Dunstan’s body. Look to your reputation, therefore, and curb your
tongues from such vanities. Let truth be brought to mind, even if you have
forgotten it.

Know... there is no room for doubt...that once Aethelnoth, Abbot, or rather
former Abbot of Glastonbury, and one or two of his monks lived for a long
time over Canterbury. I call him former Abbot because as a general synod of
the English church he was deposed of his abbacy by Lanfranc, Archbishop of
Canterbury, and he was placed under such confinement at Canterbury as
fitted his position. At that time the number of the monks serving Christ and St
Dunstan here exceeded sixty. If then there were ever monks of Glastonbury
who stole St Dunstan’s body, I think it was those. Yet during the period when
they were at Canterbury, the body had already been translated, as I have
described above, from its first burial place into a place where they could have
had no access. It was not taken by them; therefore it was not taken by any of
your monks.

If you listen to my advice, you will remove those bones which you have
loaded onto the image of our Redeemer, before He is Himself angry with you.
It is sufficient that He be honoured for Himself and there is no need to keep up
holiness on Him through dead men’s bones or otherwise. My brethren, think and think again, what is it honourable for you to think, what is it proper for you to say, what is it right for you to do?

100 years and more have passed since the martyrdom of St Elphege. No one who was present is still alive today, or at least no one who remembers being present. To this day I have never heard that anyone who was there at the time has ever said or written anything concerning these matters which you have put about... Not a single word, spoken or written, that any sane man could accept.

Drop these playground stories, therefore, and behave like mature and intelligent men, love St Dunstan as your father and patron and speak the truth about him. Then truly you will deserve his love. He is a member and a friend of the highest Truth and he cannot admit to the bosom of his love any who depart from the truth. God knows, and he knows to who is our father and our most sweet advocate that what I say, I say for your honour and help, nor do I have any purpose other than that God who is the truth should be magnified, praised, and proclaimed in St Dunstan, as is right, by you as well as by us and, if I could achieve it, by the whole world.

I know that I have gone a little beyond the usual length of a letter addressing you so, but my subject was so important that, although I intended to use few words, my speech spread to the length it has. Do not wonder. The way of man is not His way. So, my lords and my brethren, to whom God has opened the means of understanding matters of reason, brid of the wanton violence of your foolish young men who open their mouths only in order to seem to know how to speak, on whatever the flightiness of their hearts lead them to, thinking that they are something because others are innocent enough to listen to what they say. I once knew such youths, and perhaps I was one, so I do not doubt that young men are the same these days. I am now older white-haired, and many things which I valued greatly as youth I now rate is nothing. This will come to today’s young men too by God’s gift.

The length of this letter however, demands an end, so this is my last word. Although your fathers of old are now dead who live at Glastonbury a century ago, I think there will be some still living who were fostered in the monastic life before our Norman age. If there are, ask them whether they remember an Abbot there who every year on St Dunstan’s day used to come to Canterbury with four monks or more. They would stay among our brethren in the six days and longer, giving themselves to rejoicing and celebration for reverence of the
Holy Father. If any of these men remains alive today, I fancy he will confirm that what I say was the case. Anything else would be far from the truth. If then these men knew that they had sent Dunstan’s body at Glastonbury, why did they come to Canterbury to do reverence to it on his feast day? I say this to confound the errors of the foolish and to strengthen the sacred love of the wise towards us, which we much hope to receive. Farewell, therefore, in Christ Jesus. Pray for us.

It is fairly obvious to me that Eadmer cannot reference Henry Blois personally as the Grandson of William the Conqueror and Nephew to Henry Ist, but it is him as the propagator of the story that Eadmer is hoping to get his point across. One can tell in Henry’s interpolations in DA (even though there was no written record) Henry Blois establishes his polemic in rebuttal of Eadmer’s letter in writing supposedly authored by William of Malmesbury. It was William who had refused to include Henry Blois concocted story of Dunstan’s bones at Glastonbury in VD1 which initiated the change of ‘plan’ for William to write the DA; even though he continued finishing VDII.
Appendix 33

The Life of Gildas, By Caradoc of Llancarfon, AKA Henry Blois.

Nau, the King of Scotland, was the noblest of the Kings of the north. He had twenty-four sons, victorious warriors. One of these was named Gildas, whom his parents engaged in the study of literature. He was a boy of good natural disposition, devoted to study, and distinguished for his talents. Whatever he heard from his master he would repeat most diligently, and forgetfulness did not harm him. He eagerly and diligently studied among his own people in the seven arts until he reached the age of youth; when, on becoming a young man, he speedily left the country.

He crossed the Gallic Sea, and remained studying well in the cities of Gaul for seven years; and at the end of the seventh year he returned, with a huge mass of volumes, to greater Britain. Having heard the renown of the very illustrious stranger, great numbers of scholars from all parts flocked to him. They heard him explaining with the greatest acuteness the science of the seven rules of discipline, according to which men, from being disciples, became masters, under the master's office.

The religion of the very wise teacher was magnified and extolled to such a degree by the inhabitants of Britain, in that his equal was neither found, nor could be found, owing to superior merits. He used to fast like the hermit Antony: most thoroughly devoted to religion, he used to pray clad in goat's skin. If anything was given to him, he would forthwith expend it upon the poor. He abstained from milk-foods and honey: flesh was hateful to him: fresh-water herbs were rather a favourite dish with him: he ate barley-bread mixed with ashes, and drank spring water daily. He used not to take a bath, a habit very much in favour by this nation. Thinness appeared in his face, and he seemed like a man suffering under a very serious fever. It was his habit to go into the river at midnight, where he would remain unmoved until he had said the Lord's Prayer three times. Having done this, he would repair to his oratory and pray there on his knees unto the divine majesty.
until broad daylight. He used to sleep moderately, and to lie upon a stone, clothed with only a single garment. He used to eat without satisfying his wants, contented with his share of the heavenly reward; the longing of his heart was after heavenly rewards.

He warned men to contempt, he advised them to scorn mere transitory things. He was the most renowned preacher throughout the three Kingdoms of Britain. Kings feared him as a man to be feared, and obeyed him after hearing his acceptable preaching. In the time of King Trifinus, he preached every Lord's day in his church by the sea-shore, in the district of Pepidiauc, with a countless number of people listening to him. And when he was once just beginning to preach, the words of the preaching were checked in the preacher himself; and the people were struck with amazement at the wonderful retention. On finding this, St. Gildas bade all who were present to go out, that he might be able to know whether it was owning to one of them that this impediment to the divine preaching was caused; and yet, even after their withdrawal, he could not preach. He then asked whether there was any man or women hiding in the church. Nonnita, who was with child, and was destined to become the mother of the most holy boy, Dewi, answered him: *I, Nonnita, am staying here between the walls and the door, not wishing to mingle with the crowd.* Having heard this, he bade her go out; and when she had gone out he called the people. They were called, and came to listen to the preaching of the gospel. At the close of the sermon, he asked the angel of God the purport of the above-mentioned matter, to wit, why when he had begun to preach he had failed to proceed to the end. And he revealed the matter to him in such words as these: *Nonnita, a saintly woman, remains in the church, who is now with child, and is destined, with great grace, to give birth to a boy before whom thou couldst not preach, the divine power withholding thy speech. The boy that is to come will be of greater grace: no one in your parts will equal him.*

"To him will I leave this part of the country: he will quickly grow and flourish form one period of life to another. For an angel, the messenger of God declared unto me this as my true destiny." Whence it happened that the most holy preacher Gildas crossed over to Ireland, where he converted a great number of people to the Catholic faith.

St. Gildas was the contemporary of Arthur, the King of the whole of Britain, whom he loved exceedingly, and whom he always desired to obey. Nevertheless his twenty-three brothers constantly rose up against the afore-
mentioned rebellious King, refusing to own him as their lord; but they often routed and drove him out from forest and the battle-field. Hueil, the elder brother, an active warrior and most distinguished soldier, submitted to no King, not even to Arthur. He used to harass the latter, and to provoke the greatest anger between them both. He would often swoop down from Scotland, set up conflagrations, and carry off spoils with victory and renown. In consequence, the King of all Britain, on hearing that the high-spirited youth had done such things and was doing similar things, pursued the victorious and excellent youth, who, as the inhabitants used to assert and hope, was destined to become King. In the hostile pursuit and council of war held in the island of Minau, he killed the young plunderer. After the murder the victorious Arthur returned, rejoicing greatly that he had overcome his bravest enemy. Gildas, the historian of the Britons, who was staying in Ireland directing studies and preaching in the city of Armagh, heard that his brother had been slain by King Arthur. He was grieved at hearing the news, wept with lamentation, as a dear brother for a dear brother. He prayed daily for his brother's spirit; and, moreover, he used to pray for Arthur, his brother's persecutor and murderer, fulfilling the apostolic commandment, which says: **Love those who persecute you, and do good to them that hate you.**

Meanwhile, the most holy Gildas, the venerable historian, came to Britain, bringing with him a very beautiful and sweet-sounding bell, which he had vowed to offer as a gift to the Bishop of the Roman Church. He spent the night as a guest honourably entertained by the venerable abbot Cadocus, in Nant Carban. The latter pointed out the bell to him, and after pointing to it, handled it; and after handling it wished to buy it at a great price; but its possessor would not sell it. When King Arthur and the chief bishops and abbots of all Britain heard of the arrival of Gildas the Wise, large numbers from among the clergy and people gathered together to reconcile Arthur for the above-mentioned murder. But Gildas, as he had done when he first heard the news of his brother's death, was courteous to his enemy, kissed him as he prayed for forgiveness, and with a most tender heart blessed him as the other kissed in return. When this was done, King Arthur, in grief and tears, accepted the penance imposed by the bishops who were present, and led an amended course, as far as he could, until the close of his life.
Then the illustrious Gildas, a peace-making and Catholic man, visited Rome, and presented the aforementioned bell to the Bishop of the Roman Church; but when the bell was shaken by the hands of the bishop, it would give forth no sound. Therefore, on seeing this, he thus said: *O thou, man beloved of God and men, reveal unto me what happened unto thee on thy journey to make this presentation.* And he revealed that the most holy Cadoc, abbot of the church of Nancarvan, had wished to buy the bell, but that he had refused to sell what he had vowed to offer to the apostle St. Peter. When the Apostolic bishop heard this, he said: *I know the venerable abbot Cadoc, who seven times visited this city, and Jerusalem three times, after countless dangers and incessant toil. I consent that, if he comes again and wishes to possess it, thou mayest give it to him. For, in consequence of this present miracle, it has been decreed that he should have it.* Gildas, therefore, took back the bell after it was blessed, and returned; he brought it back and bestowed it gratuitously upon St. Cadoc. When received by the hands of the abbot and struck, it forthwith sounded, to the surprise of all. Then it remained as an asylum for all who carried it throughout the whole of Gwalia, and whosoever swore illegally throughout that land, he was deprived of the use of his tongue, or if an evil-doer would straightway confess his crime.

Cadoc, the abbot of the church of Nancarban, asked the teacher Gildas to superintend the studies of his schools for the space of one year; and on being requested, he superintended them most advantageously, receiving no fee from the scholars except the prayers of the clergy and scholars. And there he himself wrote out the work of the four evangelists, a work which still remains in the church of St. Cadoc, covered all over with gold and silver in honour of God, of the holy writer, and of the Gospels. The inhabitants of Wales hold this volume as a most valuable possession in their oaths, and neither dare open it in order to look into it, nor confirm peace and friendship between hostile parties, unless it be present, specifically placed there for the purpose.

At the close of the year, and when the scholars were retiring from study, the saintly abbot Cadoc and the excellent master, Gildas, mutually agreed to repair to two islands, viz., Ronech and Echin. Cadoc landed in the one nearer to Wales, and Gildas in the one that lies over against England. They were unwilling to be hindered in the church offices by the conflux of men; and, on this account, they could think of no better plan than to leave the
valley of Carvan and resort to the secrecy of an island. Gildas founded there
an oratory in honour of the holy and indivisible Trinity, and close by it was
his bed-chamber. It was not in it, however, that he had his bed, but placed
upon a steep cliff, where, upon a stone, he lay until midnight, watching and
praying to Almighty God. Then he would enter the church quite faint with
cold; but, for God's sake, the cold was sweet and endurable to him. He used
to take some small fish in a net, and eggs from birds' nests; and it was on
this, which sufficed him for nourishment, that he lived. The one used to
visit the other. This mode of living lasted for the space of seven years.

The supreme Creator, seeing that his chosen servant, Gildas had no
constant supply of water beyond the drops of rain which fell upon the
stones and were caught as they trickled down, caused a stream to flow out
from a steep cliff — and out it flowed, and still flows out, and will remain
without exhaustion. While St. Gildas was thus persevering, devoting himself
to fastings and prayers, pirates came from the islands of the Orcades, who
harassed him by snatching off his servants from him when at their duties,
and carrying them to exile, along with spoils and all the furniture of their
dwelling. Being thereby exceedingly distressed, he could not remain there
any longer: he left the island, embarked on board a small ship, and, in great
grief, put in at Glastonia, at the time when King Melvas was reigning in the
summer country. He was received with much welcome by the abbot of
Glastonia, and taught the brethren and the scattered people, sowing the
precious seed of the heavenly doctrine. *It was there that he wrote the
history of the Kings of Britain.* Glastonia, that is, the glassy city, which
took its name from *glass,* is a city that had its name originally in the British
tongue. It was besieged by the tyrant Arthur with a countless multitude on
account of his wife Gwenhwyfar, whom the aforesaid wicked King had
violated and carried off, and brought there for protection, owing to the
asylum afforded by the invulnerable position due to the fortifications of
thickets of reed, river, and marsh. The rebellious King had searched for the
queen throughout the course of one year, and at last heard that she
remained there. Thereupon he roused the armies of the whole of Cornubia
and Dibneria; war was prepared between the enemies.

When he saw this, the abbot of Glastonia, attended by the clergy and
Gildas the Wise, stepped in between the contending armies, and in a
peaceable manner advised his King, Melvas, to restore the ravished lady.
Accordingly, she who was to be restored, was restored in peace and good
will. When these things were done, the two Kings gave to the abbot a gift of many domains; and they came to visit the temple of St. Mary and to pray, while the abbot confirmed the beloved brotherhood in return for the peace they enjoyed and the benefits which they had conferred, and were more abundantly about to confer. Then the Kings returned reconciled, promising reverently to obey the most venerable abbot of Glastonia, and never to violate the most sacred place nor even the districts adjoining the chief's seat.

When he had obtained permission from the abbot of Glastonia and his clergy and people, the most devout Gildas desired to live again a hermit's life upon the bank of a river close to Glastonia, and he actually accomplished his object. He built a church there in the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity, in which he fasted and prayed assiduously, clad in goat's hair, giving to all an irreproachable example of a good religious life. Holy men used to visit him from distant parts of Britain, and when advised, returned and cherished with delight the encouragements and counsels they had heard from him.

He fell sick at last, and was weighed down with illness. He summoned the abbot of Glastonia to him, and asked him, with great piety, when the end of his life had come, to cause his body to be borne to the abbey of Glastonia, which he loved exceedingly. When the abbot promised to observe his requests, and was grieved at the requests he had heard, and shed copious tears, St. Gildas, being now very ill, expired, while many were looking at the angelic brightness around his fragrant body, and angels were attending upon his soul. After the mournful words of commendation were over, the very light body was removed by the brethren into the abbey; and amid very loud wailing and with the most befitting funeral rites, he was buried in the middle of the pavement of St. Mary's church; and his soul rested, rests, and will rest, in heavenly repose. Amen.

Glastonia was of old called Ynisgutrin, and is still called so by the British inhabitants. Ynis in the British language is insula in Latin, and gutrin is vitrea (made of glass). But after the coming of the English and the expulsion of the Britons, that is, the Welsh, it received a fresh name, Glastigberi, according to the formation of the first name, that is English glass, Latin vitrum, and beria a city; then Glastiberia, that is,
the City of Glass. Caradoc of Nancarban's are the words: whoever reads, may he correct; so wills the author.

It is this last sentence which is an addition to an already composed *Life of Gildas* by Henry Blois which goes on to aid immensely with his first agenda. The first part of *Life of Gildas* written before 1140; we know was to establish antiquity for Glastonbury with a dateable Gildas. This date as I have shown being established chronologically by the Modena Archivolt engravings.

At this stage Henry could not help himself linking this first part of *Life of Gildas* historically through Arthur to the antiquity of Glastonbury as he had only just finished the *Primary Historia*. However, in 1144 when Henry's first agenda transpired in his pursuit of a Metropolitan; it was necessary to show how Ineswitrin linked to the 601 charter and how it existed as an estate at Glastonbury. So, after the original Amen of the first composition the last sentence was added; *so wills the author*!!!!!!!
Appendix 34

Henry II is aware of Arthur’s remains at Glastonbury. The King’s involvement with the discovery is having been told by Henry Blois how deep the body was. Henry Blois relates in some way that a bard had informed him and King Henry relates to the source of who supplied the information of Arthur’s whereabouts.

Henry II had no active involvement at Glastonbury and as I have stated in the chapter on Gerald of Wales he may have been dead and Henry De Sully had come from Bermondsey a couple of months before Henry II’s death. So in this alternate scenario let us assume King Henry was dead when Arthur was disinterred, but it was either Eleanor of Aquitaine or John (the king’s brother) who persuaded Henry de Sully (who was King Richard’s appointment) to ensure that King Arthur was disinterred. The disinterment (if this scenario is the correct one) probably took place in 1191 as I shall elaborate.

The nonchalant mention in chapter 31 in DA of Arthur’s whereabouts, buried with Guinevere between the pyramids, was written by Henry Blois as discussed in the chapter on DA.

911 The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury Dom Aelred Watkin Volume 1, P 186-8. Carta Henrici Regis Secundi Filii Matildis Imperatricis De Libertatibus Concessis Ecclesie Glaston. The main features of the foundation legend and the building of the church by the disciples of Jesus and its dominical consecration (only in DA) are all referred to in a charter of Henry II attested between 2nd and the 16th of December 1184 (John Goodall). Arthur’s association with Glastonbury as seen here in the charter: Baldredo, Ina, inclito Arthuro, Cuddredo et multis aliis regibus Christianis... could only be derived from Life of Gildas or DA; both written by Henry Blois and surely after Malmesbury’s death.

912 There is no contradiction in Henry II having been responsible for telling the monks himself about what he had heard from Henry Blois. He might well have told the monks the information given by Henry Blois while at Glastonbury signing his Charter. That King Henry is conceived as having instigated the find is not what Giraldus actually says: But the clearest evidence came when King Henry II of England explained the whole matter to the monks (as he had heard it from an aged British poet): how the body would be found deep down, namely more than 16 feet into the earth, and not in a stone tomb but in an oak-hollow. There is no evidence to suggest that what is attributed to have been information supplied by King Henry was said at the time of the unearthing. Giraldus heralds it as part of the hearsay which surrounded the event.

913 ...but I omit it from fear of being tedious. I pass over Arthur, famous King of the Britons, buried with his wife in the monks Cemetery between two pyramids, and many other leaders of the Britons.
It is because of this fact and other propaganda by Henry Blois that Henry II mentions Arthur in his charter as early as 1184. It is from Gerald we learn of King Henry’s knowledge of the particulars of the grave. The location of the tomb existed in DA prior to the disinterment and we are assured that Henry de Sully knows where to find the body (any incidental factors which promoted the disinterment from either Eleanor or John or Richard I are now secondary) and Henry de Sully can no longer be held responsible for the fraud. Let us assume therefore, (so that Gerald’s testimony is not ignored), the location between the pyramids was known at Glastonbury to be where King Arthur’s gravesite was situated.

My belief is that Henry Blois passed information to King Henry II on Henry Blois’ death bed regarding the depth of the grave in the hope that after his death the disinterment would fulfil his entire fabricated edifice concerning chivalric Arthur. King Henry had no need to disinter King Arthur, but he may have related this information to others in his close family and supplied this anecdotal information specified by Gerald. Gerald relates that the pertinent information regarding the depth of the grave was as part of the reasoning behind digging so deep in locating the grave and not just relying on the cursory reference to the location found in DA.

One conjecture could be it was either John or Eleanor of Aquitaine who had persuaded Henry de Sully to carry out the disinterment. Hence, Gerald’s comment that it was King Henry II who had supplied the information and the possibility that the dig transpired in 1191 while Richard I was still imprisoned; (However, because this is connected with King Henry, Gerald makes the mistake of saying this happened in King Henry’s lifetime).

Henry II died in July 1189 and in September 1189 Richard I, just after his crowning at Westminster, appointed Henry de Sully Abbot of Glastonbury. Financial pressures were brought to bear at the abbey c.1190 due to the reconstruction after the fire. King Henry II had contributed generously and is reported to have promised either the total annual

---

914 Not only would the discovery of the leaden cross ensure Glastonbury was linked with Avalon ad infinitum, but also it would confirm the Grail’s association with Glastonbury also.

915 Adam of Damerham says: Unfortunately the new King thought of nothing but the crusades and took no interest in the building of the great church, then lately begun. So work was ceased, since there was no-one to pay the men’s wages.
revenues of his West Country demense or even the surplus revenue from the realm to complete the new building.

King Richard however, had other interests and any royal dispensation of funds dried up as he diverted all royal revenue toward the third Crusade (1189–1192). He stayed in England not more than a few months after having been crowned. The builders at Glastonbury were stuck financially and the disinterment of Arthur certainly would have had financial benefits for Glastonbury. I see no reason to distrust Gerald’s report about the involvement of Henry II either in supplying the information or promoting the project, i.e. granting permission while alive, or even instructing his nephew Henry de Sully to carry out the dig before his death. In all likelihood the dig transpired while Richard was abroad (if the dating is accurate). It was an event which coincided with the readiness of the new church to receive such an illustrious person into its newly appointed confines.

There may, however, have been an entirely different reason for disinterring Arthur and it was promoted by Eleanor of Aquitaine or John, King Richard’s younger brother. The accusation against Henry de Sully as the instigator of a fraudulent unearthing can be summarily dismissed as he can be discounted as the promoter of Avalon. It is obvious from what has been covered so far that Henry Blois is the promoter of Avalon. King Richard was on crusade and Arthur’s disinterment is said to have taken place by Adam in 1190 rather than 1191 as stated by Ralph. King Richard had left the coffers dry throughout the Kingdom and headed abroad. At

---

916 1) Having changed the name of the island on Melkin’s prophecy. 2) Having invented the name from the town in Burgundy. 3) Having been witnessed to promote this island (first put forward in HRB) as commensurate with Insular Pomorum at Glastonbury. 4) Having been the composer of St Patrick’s charter which unequivocally states in Henry’s epilogue to it in DA Chap 9 that St Patrick was first Abbot of Avalon. Lastly by having planted the bones with the cross to be found at a later date confirming Glastonbury at Avalon and by letting everyone know where this conclusive evidence is hidden by providing the location of Arthur’s grave in DA. It should not be forgotten also the inspiration for the Leaden cross (the ultimate proof that Glastonbury was once called Avalon), having been derived (as an idea of ‘total confirmation’) from Eadmer’s testimony of Dunstan also having a Leaden Tablet in his grave which provided a proof positive for Eadmer’s argument.

917 Adam states that Arthur had been in the cemetery for 648 years because Geoffrey of Monmouth has written in HRB XI, ii Even the renowned King Arthur himself was wounded deadly, and was borne thence unto the island of Avalon for the healing of his wounds, where he gave up the crown of Britain unto his kinsman Constantine, son of Cador, Duke of Cornwall, in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord five hundred and forty-two. Adam says the bones had lain near the old church between two stone monuments, formerly of noble workmanship, for 648 years. Simple math 542 + 648 puts Adam’s date at 1190 for the disinterment, but we should not forget Adam is writing after 1277. Even Adam states that prior to the dig: Abbot Henry had often been urged to have King Arthur’s bones more decently housed.
Glastonbury, Henry de Sully has no funds. At this time with the huge interest in King Arthur both on the continent and in insular Britain the zeitgeist of Arthur's return was still prevalent and in 1191.... John, King Richard’s youngest brother, who was next in line for the throne, was sidelined for his elder brother Geoffrey’s son as heir, whose name was Arthur. It is by this set of circumstances, we might speculate a scenario which was the catalyst to King Arthur’s disinterment in 1191 (if indeed Ralph is correct).

King Richard named the four-year-old Arthur of Brittany as the heir to the throne; and John by hereditary right, believing the crown should pass to him, was understandably upset. But, with the return of Arthur paramount as the ‘hope’ of the populace and on everyone’s tongue, the chances of John gaining his natural birth right over his nephew (if King Richard should die on Crusade), seemed poor odds. If John could prove to the British subjects that King Arthur died long ago and the ‘hope of the Britons’ was a myth, then the aspirations of the populace would be dashed.... rather than believing that his Nephew (Arthur) was somehow King Arthur returning.

In other words, if John could show King Arthur’s bones to the world there was no hope of his return and he would be the natural inheritor of the crown not his elder brother’s son. This is only conjecture and a rationalization of how events might have been motivated toward a dig. John, may have been the driving force behind insisting that Henry de Sully dig up Arthur, saying it had been his Father’s wish. This possible scenario becomes a little clearer if we relate the events described above in their historical context.

Richard was officially invested as Duke of Normandy on 20 July 1189 and was crowned King Richard I in Westminster Abbey on 3 September 1189. John’s elder brothers Henry, William and Geoffrey all died young. By the time Richard became king, John was the potential heir to the throne. But while Richard was on Crusade, John unsuccessfully attempted a rebellion against Richard’s royal administrators. When Henry the Young King died King Henry II had rearranged the succession; Richard was to be made King of England, albeit without any actual power until the death of his father; Geoffrey would retain Brittany; and John would now become the Duke of Aquitaine in place of Richard.

However, Richard did not relinquish Aquitaine so Henry II ordered John along with his other brother Geoffrey to regain the duchy by force. After
this, Geoffrey died leaving a posthumous son, Arthur. The duchy of Brittany was given to Arthur rather than John which is the start of the problem.

The uncertainty about what would happen after Henry II death was always an issue. Richard before his father was dead was desperate to go on crusade but was aware that if he went King Henry II might appoint John his successor. This was because Richard had discussed with Philip II the Capetian King of France during 1187, about a potential alliance; and Richard paid homage to Philip to strengthen his position against his father.

So, Richard had allied himself with 22-year-old Philip II, the son of Eleanor's ex-husband Louis VII by Adele of Champagne. Richard and Philip fought a joint campaign against King Henry II while John remained loyal to his father. Later, John changed sides when he thought Richard would prevail. By the summer of 1189 the King Henry II made peace with Richard promising Richard the succession.

So, understanding the family feud, King Henry II died and John's elder brother Richard became king. King Richard set about raising the huge sums of money required for his expedition through the sale of lands, titles and appointments. There was certainly nothing to be spared for Glastonbury's rebuild as Adam of Damerham makes clear.

Richard made sure before leaving the country on crusade that he would not face a revolt while away, so he made John, the Count of Mortain (in effect next in line) and married him off to Isabel of Gloucester and bestowed on him lucrative lands with the aim of ensuring his loyalty while he was away.

Richard and Philip agreed to go on the third Crusade together since each feared that during his absence the other might usurp his territories. Richard left political authority in England in the hands of Bishop Hugh de Puiset and William Mandeville and the Bishop of Ely became his chancellor. John was not satisfied by this decision and started scheming against William de Mandeville.

In September 1190 Richard and Philip arrived in Sicily. A certain Tancred had seized power after the death of King William II of Sicily in 1189. Tancred had imprisoned King William's widow, Queen Joan, who was Richard I's favourite sister, without giving her the money she had inherited in William's will.

So, King Richard attacked Messina, and after looting and burning the city, Richard established his base there; but this created tensions between
Richard and Philip II. Richard remained there until Tancred finally agreed to sign a treaty on 4 March 1191. The treaty was signed by Richard I, Philip II and Tancred. The treaty’s main terms were: Richard’s sister Joan was to receive 20,000 ounces of gold as compensation for her inheritance, but also more importantly (with reference to the disinterment of King Arthur), King Richard officially proclaimed his nephew, Arthur of Brittany, (Geoffrey’s son), as his heir to his throne (not John). This happened in 1191. Also in the terms Tancred promised to marry one of his own daughters to the young Arthur of Brittany when he came of age, giving a further twenty thousand ounces of gold that would be returned by King Richard if Arthur did not marry Tancred’s daughter.

On the news of this John was livid and may have sought to dispel a rumour that was circulating brought about by prophecy i.e. that Arthur may return.

Philip II returned from the Crusade before King Richard. Eleanor of Aquitaine most probably did not agree with the new plan for succession either and convinced Richard to allow John into England in his absence. Richard could not return because he was captured and imprisoned by the Emperor of Germany as Adam of Damerham relates.

While imprisoned in Germany King Richard sells Glastonbury for his freedom to Savaric. John revolted with the aid of King Philip thinking Richard was probably dead.

Amongst Philip's conquests in the period of Richard's imprisonment in Germany was Normandy. Richard forgave John when they met again and named him as his heir in place of Arthur of Brittany. But if the unearthing did happen in 1191... then John may have been the instigator.

This is all conjecture, but may be a part catalyst to the events which propelled the unearthing of Arthur while King Richard was away. John was simply trying to undo what the superstitions of the twelfth century dictated. Richard had tried to protect his crown by electing Arthur of Brittany his successor and when the populace heard this after what Merlin had prophesied, they assumed John’s elder brother, Geoffrey’s son, was to be the long awaited Arthur.

---

918 Eleanor was obviously not pleased either with King Richard’s attempts to marry his newly widowed sister Joan to Philip II of France, Eleanor’s ex- husband’s son by Adele
King Richard was so steeped in Arthuriana that one could speculate he may well have had this in mind when electing his young Nephew as successor and Geoffrey (Arthur’s father) had even asked permission to name him so.

My conjecture is that John sought to dampen this expectation by showing that Arthur had died back in the sixth century. Yet, his motivation conjoined with Henry de Sully’s prospect of increased alms. Henry de Sully actually found the set of bones which Henry Blois had deposited (possibly as much as 30 years ago) in the cemetery at Glastonbury. Both John and Glastonbury alms gained from the discovery.
Appendix 36

The section from Nennius from which Henry Blois models his introduction concerning Merlin in HRB.

The king, pleased with this advice, departed with his wise men, and travelled through many parts of his territories, in search of a place convenient for the purpose of building a citadel. Having, to no purpose, travelled far and wide, they came at length to a province called Guenet and having surveyed the mountains of Heremus, they discovered, on the summit of one of them, a situation, adapted to the construction of a citadel. Upon this, the wise men said to the king, "Build here a city; for, in this place, it will ever be secure against the barbarians". Then the king sent for artificers, carpenters, stone-masons, and collected all the materials requisite to building; but the whole of these disappeared in one night, so that nothing remained of what had been provided for the constructing of the citadel. Materials were, therefore, from all parts, procured a second and third time, and again vanished as before, leaving and rendering every effort ineffectual, Vortigern inquired of his wise men the cause of this opposition to his undertaking, and of so much useless expense of labour? They replied, "You must find a child born without a father, put him to death, and sprinkle with his blood the ground on which the citadel is to be built, or you will never accomplish your purpose."

In consequence of this reply, the king sent messengers throughout Britain, in search of a child born without a father. After having inquired in all the provinces, they came to the field of Aelecti, in the district of Glevesing, where a party of boys were playing at ball. And two of them quarrelling, one said to the other, "O boy without a father, no good will ever happen to you." Upon this, the messengers diligently inquired of the mother and the other boys,
whether he had had a father? Which his mother denied, saying, "In what manner he was conceived I know not, for I have never had intercourse with any man;" and then she solemnly affirmed that he had no mortal father. The boy was, therefore, led away, and conducted before Vortigern the king.

A meeting took place the next day for the purpose of putting him to death. Then the boy said to the king, "Why have your servants brought me hither?" "That you may be put to death," replied the king, "and that the ground on which my citadel is to stand, may be sprinkled with your blood, without which I shall be unable to build it." "Who" said the boy, "instructed you to do this? "My wise men," answered the king. "Order them hither," returned the boy; this being complied with, he thus questioned them: "By what means was it revealed to you that this citadel could not be built, unless the spot were previously sprinkled with my blood? Speak without disguise, and declare who discovered me to you;" then turning to the king, "I will soon," said he, " unfold to you everything; but I desire to question your wise men, and wish them to disclose to you what is hidden under this pavement:" they acknowledging their ignorance, "there is," said he, "a pool; come and dig: "they did so and found the pool. "Now," continued he, "tell me what is in it; "but they were ashamed, and made no reply. "I" said the boy, "can discover it to you: there are two vases in the pool; "they examined, and found it so: continuing his questions, " What is in the vases?" they were silent: "there is a tent in them," said the boy; "separate them, and you shall find it so; "this being done by the king's command, there was found in them a folded tent. The boy, going on with his questions, asked the wise men what was in it? But they not knowing what to reply, "There are," said he, "two serpents, one white and the other red; unfold the tent;" they obeyed, and two sleeping serpents were discovered; "consider attentively," said the boy, "what they are doing." The serpents began to struggle with each other; and the white one, raising himself up, threw down the other into the middle of the tent, and sometimes drove him to the edge of it; and this was repeated thrice. At length the red one, apparently the weaker of the two, recovering his strength, expelled the white one from the tent; and the latter being pursued through the pool by the red one, disappeared. Then the boy, asking the wise men what was signified by this wonderful omen, and they expressing their ignorance, he said to the king, "I will now unfold to you the meaning of this mystery. The pool is the emblem of this world, and the tent, that of your kingdom: the two serpents are two dragons; the red serpent
is your dragon, but the white serpent is the dragon of the people who occupy several provinces and districts of Britain, even almost from sea to sea: at length, however, our people shall rise and drive away the Saxon race from beyond the sea, whence they originally came; but do you depart from this place, where you are not permitted to erect a citadel; I, to whom fate has allotted this mansion, shall remain here; whilst to you it is incumbent to seek other provinces, where you may build a fortress." "What is your name?" asked the king; "I am called Ambrose (in British Embreguletic)," returned the boy; and in answer to the king's question, "What is your origin?" he replied, "A Roman consul was my father."
Note 1

The letters from Theobald of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury to Henry Blois bishop of Winchester.
Letter 1. c.1156.

In church and the glitches of the ills suffered by the churches of Christ through the absence of the Shepherd, although not unknown to us in the past, we might well have learned merely from the loss caused by your residence abroad. For it is two years since the famine began in your land, not indeed a famine of victuals, on which the people waxed fat and gross and thick, so that by their satiety they are turned away from the worship of God and oft times kick against his laws, but a famine of the word of God which is denied him. Indeed the little children have lacked bread and there was none to break it for them. But if we go to any of our neighbours to borrow only three loaves of the gospel for your household, we at once get into difficulty with those from whom we would borrow; we are met with such a host of excuses, that because his children are in bed scarce any man rises to answer our importunity and open the door even to us out of respect for our office. If out of sheer necessity we take refuge with a stranger or alien, we are afraid lest, if we ask for a fish he may give us a serpent, or if we ask for an egg he may give us a scorpion. Moreover your sheep either do not hear the voice of strangers or at best hear them but ill. In a word we cannot describe to you the loss of the Lord God, which they daily suffer in their life and character. Here therefore, dearest brother in the Lord the lamentation of the hungry, hear the voices of the little ones as they cry, hear the voice of the bride who is sick with love and pines with longing for you. Here also the voice of her spouse, who has set you over his family that you may give them their food in due season. Return to your church and illumine all this island with the rays of your wisdom and virtue; and do not, care for the loss of worldly goods, whose concern is the peril of men's souls. Surely it is better and more just that you should devote your vigilance and care to the churches committed to your charge rather than those that belong to others. Our Lord the King has assured us of your safety,
and except for two persons, whom he excludes by name, you will be able to introduce to his favour anyone you please; and we shall rejoice at your return and gladly give you all the help or counsel that we can. Farewell.

Letter 2. Written late 1156 to early 1157

We believe it to be our duty to point out to our friends in the hour of their temptation that path of wisdom which it seems to us should be chosen before all others being no less advantageous than it is honourable. And even though the mind of one in doubt may refuse to obey the righteous counsel of another, nonetheless the persistence of love will never rest until it draws the reluctant friend to follow the way of righteousness, even though it be against his will. Even so, my reverend and most loving brother in the Lord, we have already had demolished due to return to your own duties, for we believe that nothing could more conduce to your own honour or to the profit of the church. For to say nothing of other considerations, too long to set down here, assuredly the decay of walls; nor should you grieve for the loss of things temporal when you are incurring the loss of things eternal. For of two griefs within the same heart the greater diminishes the importance of the other. God forbid that any man should dare to suspect of one as wise as you, that wealth, the most worthless of all things should move you, when the peril for men's souls is so important. God forbid that malice should be enabled to assail you with the ancient proverb of which it is so fond saying: that which you weep for, proves you loved it once.

You have the choice between two alternatives. Either you desire to risk a quarrel, or you wish for peace. If you preferred the uncertainties of a quarrel, note that nothing is more shameful than to be defeated by your own weapons and to have your throat cut by your own sword; if you wish the peace, return, and it is peace. But you are afraid, and that too, when there is nothing to fear. It has never entered into the mind of our serene Lord the King to tarnish the innocence of his life, the integrity of his reputation and the glory of his realm with such dishonourable crime that he should for any reason stretched forth his hand upon the Lord's anointed, or should suffer him to be insulted by any man. He is indeed much distressed that you believe it necessary to seek for a safe conduct, since he has never hurt any of those who have come to him, however great that quarrel in the past. Why then were you afraid when he summoned you home by his letters and his voice, which was the voice of us
all? But, you say, the mandate of the Lord Pope and the necessity of your Cluniacs detains you. Nay, the Lord Pope himself will rejoice at your return, for he does not wish that this mandate should be prejudicial to your interest, and you surely do not doubt that you are far more strongly bound to the churches of Winchester and Glastonbury than to that of Cluny. Indeed you were given your release by the Cluniacs when you undertook the rule of those two churches. Why then did you leave them for Cluny? It is just that while they are hungry, Cluny should feed on their bread? This is the complaint, not merely of our Lord the King, but of almost everyone. Do you consider whether that complaint be just? He further complains that by your absence he has been deprived of your counsel and your aid in the necessities of the realm, although, according to the Lord's commands, the things that are Caesar's should be rendered to Caesar. Consequently there were a number of persons who urged him to deal hardly with your entire household and to lay hands on all the goods of your church, including its innermost treasured chambers. But he himself, though many egg him on, holds his hands and wait for your return, leaving matters as they are. If by this obstinacy you expose your church and all your followers to the King's indignation, it is to be feared that worse things even than you fear may come to pass and that you may find that the troubles which you foresee and are not willing to meet, may subsequently prove far more serious. We therefore pray you and in virtue of our love for you, counsel you to return; as soon as we hear that you have reach Boulogne, we will hasten to meet you on our shore, in order that we may arrange that you shall come to the King with all honour and that all your heavy toils may find a happy conclusion.

Letter 3. Written late 1157

We greatly rejoice to hear from your messenger that you are safe, but for your integrity of mind, which is steeled against all material loss, we thank the most high, the giver of all good things. The loss of your possessions would have been a grievous trial, had it not fallen on a courageous spirit; but your courage shall shine forth more brightly, if after having been tried by the fire of tribulation, you return to your fold, which owing to the absence of its Shepherd is exposed to the fangs of those who lie in wait for it. You need have no fear for the future, dear brother, because the King himself is longing for your return and promises peace and security of every kind; and that you may not have the least doubt of this, we are taking your safety into our hands by
giving you safe conduct from the coast to the King's presence, and we will provide for your lodging there, and return thence, if it be expedient. If therefore you love your church and if you love your soul, or rather because you do love both, not that the opportunity is offered delay your return no longer, lest, which God forbid it, as we have often said, your last state be ever worse than the first. For the indignation of the ruler whom the Lord has set over us will be doubled, if he sense that the favour he has offered has been scorned.
Note 2

Henry Blois, writing as Geoffrey, uses the court of Rhydderch Hael King of Strathclyde (c580-c612) for the setting of the stage for the *Vita Merlini*. In the Welsh triad, the three ‘Unrestrained Ravagings’ of the Island of Britain… the third ravaging refers to one Aedan the Wily coming to the court of Rhydderch Hael at Alt Cluid where *he left neither food nor drink nor beast alive.*

One of King Arthur's twelve battles, according to Nennius is called Cat Coit Celidon. The Calidonean forest takes its name from the Romans, who called Scotland *Caledonia*. Henry Blois uses all this to confuse future readers. Giraldus Cambrensis refers to a differentiated Merlin Celidonius and later French fables produce stories of Merlin and Celidoine. It all originates with ‘Geoffrey’ having chosen Rhydderch as his anchor point. Henry Blois sets his naturist epic of VM in the ‘woods of Calidon’. Nennius’s *Historia Brittonum*, names him Rhydderch Hen as one of the northern Kings who fought against the embryonic Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Bernicia. Another historical reference to Rhydderch Hael is in the late twelfth century *Life of St Kentigern*, written by Joceline, a monk from Furness Abbey in Cumbria, on behalf of the then Bishop of Glasgow. In this hagiography Rhydderch Hael appears as "King Rederech" where he is portrayed as Kentigern’s patron and grants the latter land at Glasgow in order to establish a bishopric. Henry Blois may have read this, as it also coincidentally contains the story of a madman.

Adomnan in his seventh century *Life of St Columba* records the existence of a King called Roderic, who sends a message to Columba, asking if he would be "*slaughtered by his enemies*", to which the saint prophesied that the King "*will die at home on his own pillow*".

It would seem that the "Rhydderch Hael" of the Welsh Genealogies, the "Rhydderch Hen" of the *Historia Brittonum* and Adomnan’s "Roderic" refer to the same person. If so, we can place Roderic or Rhydderch as the ruler of Strathclyde who, as a contemporary of St Columba came from Ireland in around 563. According to Joceline’s *Life of Kentigern*, Rhydderch died in the same year as Kentigern which according to the Annales Cambriæ was in 612.
Henry Blois is utilizing historical people in locations spoken of in bardic literature or insular annals, continental or Roman annals. In HRB the conflation made with Merlin was with Ambrosius as explained earlier. In VM, we have a Merlin of the woods....a Merlin Silvestris, or Calidonian Merlin in the Caledonian forest because Rhydderch was from Strathclyde, which becomes Robert de Boron’s Northumberland provenance for Merlin.

Henry Blois wanted to re-assert the prophetic accuracy of Merlin from the HRB who had gained such popularity with his readers, but no-one could place Merlin when the prophecies were being scrutinised and so he is anchored to Rhydderch in time and location and loosely to the Welsh Myrrdin to become the Calidonian Merlin.

Thus, from this effect, more prophetical vaticinations could be accomplished if Taliesin and Ganieda were also to speak for Henry Blois. The Vita provides a platform that re-affirms the prophecies are from the same era as that which Merlin is supposed to have lived in and much of the information and fallacious history found in the HRB is demonstrably confirmed in VM. What is most astounding is that if Merlin could see to the Sixth King i.e. to 1157 when Henry came to the throne, how could any scholar like Crick think the dedication to Alexander was real who died in 1148. Would the principle of backdating not occur to one so professed as the expert in Geoffrey’s quagmire of falsity. That Ganieda could see to 1157 is even more astounding when ‘Geoffrey’ died in 1154-55.

Note 3.

The papal tiara originated from a conical Phryian cap.
Names used for the papal tiara in the 8th and 9th centuries include *camelaucum*, *pileus*, *phrygium* and *pileum phrygium*.

A circlet of linen or cloth of gold at the base of the tiara developed into a metal crown, (this is Henry’s reference to the ‘helmed one’) which by about 1300 became two crowns. The first of these appeared at the base of the traditional white papal headgear in the 9th century. When the popes
assumed temporal power in the Papal States, the base crown became decorated with jewels to resemble the crowns of princes. The second crown is said to have been added by Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) as signifying both his spiritual and temporal power, since he declared that God had set him over Kings and Kingdoms. Let it be a certain fact that God never set the pope over anyone, least of all a third of the Globe’s Christian souls. The pope’s power is self-professed and based on the biggest fraud... over and above Henry Blois’.
Note 4

This is a letter to Suger, Abbot of St Denis, written by Henry Blois, requesting safe passage across Flanders:

*Henry official of the Church of Winchester by the grace of God to his venerable brother and dearest friend Suger Abbot of St Denis, greeting about those things which you sent word to us through Henry our chancellor and brother Savarum, we thank you and ask you that, when it is necessary, you have our message and carry into effect your command. And because an exceeding amount of caution does not hurt and control of all of Flanders all the way to the sea, with the count gone, is in the hand of the Countess, the choice seems to us that you send our message and the message of count Rodulf together with your letters and our message to the Countess of Flanders and ask her that, when it is necessary to cross those parts, for your love of crossing, she gave safe conduct to us and our men through her land and control, both in going and in returning; and if we request from her some of her men to lead us, she shall send them to us, and concerning all this, she shall send us letters hanging outside her seal in which these things are contained.*

*Concerning the rest, we ask you to send word to others if you receive anything from our Lord the King of France or his men, and if you received his letters, if you please, send those letters or copy of them to us. Farewell and thus act through your letters and your message to the Countess, so that she gives me firm conduct.*

Henry Blois is a friend of Suger, so it is hardly surprising that Suger has a copy of the early Merlin prophecies that I have termed his *Libellus*.... prior to the final publication of the Vulgate HRB, which has the updated prophecies to 1155.

Another letter dated around 1149-1151 from Henry to Suger as friends: *Henry, official of the church of Winchester, by the grace of God, to his venerable brother and friend Suger Abbot of St Denis, greeting. I entrust the*
business of the King, my brother, to your amiability, asking that you favour it in the usual way, and just as you know to be expedient to him, you shall not hesitate to bring it to an affect. And, because I have directed my longer messages neither to the King nor to you, this was for the reason that I was scarcely able to return safely and scarcely anyone is able to cross securely from our region to yours. Whereby, I send he who is a faithful man of the King; and me to the King and you. And have faith in the words which he speaks from our side to you, which are not contained in the writ.

Below is the map marking the two routes of Henry's journey over the Alps to Rome with some of the relevant places we have named in this discourse.
Note 5

‘Lying like an epitaph’ is one adage which cannot be adduced in the normal sense to Henry’s epitaph on the Meusan plates, because it was not written by others but by himself. As we saw in the elucidation of the Gesta Stephani, Henry Blois needs his legacy in History to that of a good man. He is very Trumpesque in the way he wants to control his own legacy and genuinely feels the benevolent Venerable Bishop.

We can say exactly the same for the following poetical piece as Henry’s vanity extended to being remembered well:

When the hastening light has withdrawn at the setting of the sun,
Henry, the noble Bishop, is dead.
The fading hours of his life worry us,
He has passed free from his bodily prison.
What is his death here but a passing or escape from death?
For whom after this life, will be everlasting?
The people without a pastor, over such a funeral for their father
Shall weep, senseless, and feel pain at having outlived him now.
The monks shall raise complaints, draw out sighs.
Henceforth the clergy shall bedew their faces and cheeks with tears.
Deadly rumour stirs each sex to mourn,
Everywhere casting down old sorrows,
Whatever age appears how much more mature.
As piety compels, is turned to tears.
All to be pained, recall a source of equal grief,
No one is believed to be equal to such a man.
He, renowned in morals, famous in life on birth,
He makes no one his pedigree with nobility.
Judge of justice, law, and patron of faith,
What is right, whatever is wrong he took long care to know.
Among priests, on the pulpit,
Exalted, he taught whomever, as seemed fitting.
How wise, how fluent he was in sermon
And brief in eloquence, scarcely either my reason
Or sermon shows, I double in this way, strong in gift:
**He was the Cicero of our time,**
Son of the generous stock of Kings, gem of parents,
**And he was a glory of the world, the summit of religion.**
**The guide of the Kingdom,** the defence and hope of the powerful,
Staff of the weak, loving covenant of peace.
Rome, head of the world, rich in foreign treasures,
Has been made wealthier by his gift.
The cities of Italy, which are from the Alps within,
**Hold famous the name of Noble Henry,**
But the land of his birth first was Gaul
He knew his plan and work for a long time.
His direction subjected to the direction of his kind.
**In no part was he empty of the honour of his praise,**
**So that I may reveal the truth,** which I have seen in our time,
**All England obeyed his rule.**
Shall I report each one? Which are greater in the narration,
Greater the series, by the purpose of the theme,
But how much this my brief letter requires an end.
I wish to add enough, few notes, to many.
Tell me the pontiff who functioned with so much honour,
How he conquered the flesh, how he overcame it?
A model of life, **his radiance shines on the world,**
-Free of blemish, by the ornament of modesty-
The fleeting seductions of pleasure do not tempt his mind.
A love of levity claimed none of that.
Honourably, he relieved hunger for the bread and thirst for drink,
What remains shall be cut short, he rejoices only to love.
In great wealth, in a heap of riches,
He was generous to the poor and sparing with himself.
Whatever he kept in his time, he raised prayer
For the utility of nature, reason alone the reigns.
He extended the habits of virtue to every condition
He thought that it were wicked to fall into vice.
**Strict rest, humble sleep, continuous fast,**
Press upon you lest your limbs swell from sleep.
Oh grief! He is your, Oh grace, rich foster son!
Ripped from us, the world pains at his loss.
Death has no rule over him, because it withdraws conquered,
Life rejoices that he is the victor.

Note 6

Saint Judicael ap Hoel c.590 –658 was the King of Domnonée and became a Breton high king at the time that Ineswirin was donated to Glastonbury. Judicaël King of Domnonia was also Judicael, King of the Bretons; Domnonia’s kings probably continue as high kings of Brittany since the emigration of the Britons to Brittany. It was a direct result of the secondary Saxon incursion into Devon c.570-600 which caused the King of Devon to donate the Island of Ineswitrin to Glastonbury in 601 which contains the relics of Joseph of Arimathea and Jesus. So, the kings of Domnonia effectively become listed as Kings of the Bretons. In the *Chronicle of Fredegar*, a Judicael is named as King of the Bretons at this time. This is probably the reason for his dealings with Dagobert and Eligius. In 635, Dagobert ordered Judicael to come to his palace at Clichy and renew fealty to him, threatening to invade Brittany if he did not. Is it surprising then that much of this secret lore surrounding a bloodline from Mary Magdalene and Jesus found its way in to France like the famous decryption: *To Dagobert II, King, and to Sion belong this treasure and he is there dead.*

There are two certainties. The resurrection does not involve a physical body. If we accept that premise.... then the second is that Joseph of Arimathea and Jesus’ remains are somewhere. It is only the scholars who deny what Melkin has clearly shown us and misunderstand what Henry Blois has obfuscated.
Note 6

ORDERICUS VITALIS. book II. CH.XXVI.

"The fatal hour is come, and Thomas's ill-fated ship, badly steered, struck on a rock and was wrecked! Melancholy event, when that youthful nobility was engulfed in the sea in one common ruin! The illustrious offspring of Kings suffer shipwreck, and sea-monsters devour those whom princes deplore. O boundless grief! Neither nobility nor fortune can recall to life those who are drowned in the sea. Purple and fine linen rot in its depths and the children of Kings are the food of fishes. Thus fortune mocks those who trust to its smiles; it gives, it takes away, it raises up and casts down. What availed thee, O William! Thy numerous retinue of nobles, thy wealth, thy glory, or thy grace of form? All the royal splendour has vanished, and for thee the waves have obliterated both the past and the future. Damnation pursues them in those dark waters, should not divine mercy vouchsafe to spare them. If, at the cost of their lives, their souls are saved, they will have reason to rejoice. Those may well exult who have a sure hope that the loved relatives whom they remember in their prayers have their salvation secured. But it is a grievous affliction to have no certainty that those who are engulfed in the sea enjoy everlasting rest".

This indeed could be a poem written by Henry Blois and passed onto Orderic as the end shows empathy with those who have lost family.... as Henry Blois himself had lost his sister in the same shipwreck. If the ‘illustrious versifier’ is not Henry Blois, terming those who died as ‘fish food’; it must be from where he derived the words to construct the prophecy of Merlin about the White ship disaster. There is no doubt that Henry Blois would have met Orderic. This may even be how he obtained his work as Orderic died in 1142. The Libellus Merlini started to circulate c.1135-6 and hence many of the older prophecies about his uncle came out. Henry Blois may well be the ‘distinguished Versifier’ to which Orderic
relates in the above passage. However his most vital interpolation into Orderic’s work would have been after 1142. I would imagine around 1155 when the new set of Prophecies came out the Orderic interpolation put an end to peoples scepticism because the prophecy of the ‘sixth in Ireland’ was included.

Note 7

In the ‘Dialogue of Arthur and Gwenhwyfar’, Gueneviere in the poem thinks she has seen Melwas before at his Court in Devon discussed by Evan Jones and Mary Williams. The Problem with this poem is that it locates Ines Witrin in Devon. There is only one person who is responsible for inventing the Chivalric Arthur and Guinevere and who knows of Melvas and Arthur’s relationship with him and of the name Ineswitrin.... and is interested in the ‘long’ table of King Arthur. It does not take much (once we know Caradoc’s Life of Gildas is a concoction by Henry) to divine the provenance of this poem regardless of what scholars may say about its dating. Henry Blois knows Ineswitrin is in Devon because it was donated to Glastonbury by the King of Devon on the 601 charter.

Jones has proposed that this is not a conversation including Arthur, but holds a more ancient oral tradition between Melwas Guinevere and Cai. It would seem that K. Hurlestone Jackson’s independent location for Ynis Witrin in Devon is entirely the same as Melvas’s and the same as the island indicated directionally by Melkin in his prophecy. The context is the abduction scene of Gwenhwyfar by King Melwas coincidentally related by the supposed Caradoc in the ‘Vita Gildae’.

In the Welsh poem there appears to be a basis for Melwas from Ynis Witrin. In reality, in history, Melwas or Melkin had donated the Island in

---
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the 601 charter witnessed by William of Malmesbury as a donation to Glastonbury. As this exposé clearly shows the Island of Ines Witrin was substituted in name by Henry Blois for Avalon on the Prophecy of Melkin. However, the King’s name is said to be illegible on the 601 charter by William. But now Henry (who we know has seen and employed the charter in his pursuit of metropolitan) has in this poem implied that the King of Devon was Melwas. In the ‘Dialogue’, as Jackson points out, Melwas is from Ines Witrin. Gwenhwyfar only partly recognises Melwas, but thinks she has seen him before at his court in Devon. We might speculate that there may have been an original version of the kidnap episode before it’s Glastonburianization by Henry Blois.... but this seems unlikely. Tatlock proves to us that nearly everything Geoffrey (or rather Henry Blois) has composed in HRB can be seen to have a source provenance elsewhere, so the fact that Arthur and Gwenhwyfar had visited Melwas in Devon makes one think that Henry Blois has invented the ‘Dialogue’ because only he is aware that Ineswitrin is in Devon.
We need only look at the image below to identify with Gerald’s description. Henry Blois could have been in possession of a Gorilla skull having inherited Henry Ist zoo. That he manufactured Arthur’s grave planting a skull and fibia would certainly dupe the medieval community of monks into believing Arthur was the Giant killer of HRB.
Ineswitrin and its five cassates.