



MEDIEVALISTA

N.º 34 | Julho – Dezembro 2023

ISSN 1646-740X

**Heroic Deeds and Heroic Failure: Robert of Normandy
and the Portrayal of the First Crusade in 12th and 13th
Century England**

**Proezas e fracassos heroicos: Robert of Normandy e o Retrato da
Primeira Cruzada na Inglaterra dos séculos XII e XIII**

Carol Sweetenham

University of Warwick, Royal Holloway College, University of London
Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX

carol@sweetenham.org

Data recepção do artigo / Received for publication: 2 de Novembro de 2022

Data aceitação do artigo / Accepted in revised form: 3 de Março de 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/medievalista.6954>

ABSTRACT

The First Crusade was evoked by Anglo-Norman English historians throughout the 12th and into the 13th Century. In the first third of the 12th Century it was recounted in detail by three leading historians: Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntington. By the middle of the 12th Century, however, it was already being depicted less as an enterprise in its own right and more as a backdrop for the participation of Robert, Duke of Normandy. Robert himself was depicted as a flawed hero, whose bravery on crusade was celebrated, but who failed in his ultimate duty by refusing the crown of Jerusalem. This paper traces the evolution of the portrayal both of the crusade and of Robert's part in it in 12th and 13th Century England, exploring how perceptions both of the crusade and Robert changed in line with political priorities and attitudes to crusade.

Keywords: First Crusade; Robert of Normandy; English historiography; Jerusalem; dynastic memory.

RESUMO

A Primeira Cruzada foi recordada por historiadores ingleses anglo-normandos ao longo do século XII e no século XIII. No primeiro terço do século XII, foi detalhadamente relatada por três importantes historiadores: Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury e Henry of Huntington. Em meados do século XII, no entanto, esta Cruzada já era retratada menos como um empreendimento, pelo seu próprio mérito, e mais como cenário para a participação de Robert, duque da Normandia. O próprio Robert foi retratado como um herói imperfeito, cuja bravura na cruzada foi exaltada, mas que falhou na sua última obrigação, ao recusar a coroa de Jerusalém. Este artigo traça a evolução da representação, tanto da cruzada, como da participação de Robert, em Inglaterra, nos séculos XII e XIII, explorando o modo como as percepções, quer da cruzada, quer de Robert, se alteraram em articulação com as atitudes e prioridades políticas relativamente à cruzada.

Palavras-chave: Primeiras Cruzadas; Robert of Normandy; historiografia Inglesa; Jerusalém; memória dinástica.



Heroic Deeds and Heroic Failure: Robert of Normandy and the Portrayal of the First Crusade in 12th and 13th Century England¹

“ob cuius rei magnitudinem digrediendi veniam a lectore postulo, nec enim si voluero tam miranda Dei magnalia tacere, vel coactus potero, cum nec absit causa Normannorum ducis occasio².”

“On the face of it, English participation in the [first]crusade was minimal and peripheral”³. The First Crusade inspired a wave of texts reflecting the diverse origins of its leading figures. In the immediate aftermath, the author(s) of the *Gesta Francorum* described events from the perspective of Bohemond⁴. Ralph of Caen and Fulcher of Chartres, both in Outremer, wrote respectively about Tancred and Baldwin I in the first decades of the century⁵. Albert of Aachen presented a Germanic view based on extensive eyewitness testimony⁶. The story was renarrated in the first decade of the 12th century by the Benedictine clerics Robert the Monk, Baldric of Bourgueil, and Guibert of Nogent, who set the events in a theological framework⁷.

¹ I am grateful to colleagues at the British Branch of the Société Rencesvals for helpful insights on Anglo-Norman historiography. Translations from Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon are those of their respective translators; all other translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

² HENRY OF HUNTINGDON – *Historia Anglorum: the History of the English People*. Ed. and trans. Diana Greenway. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. Hereafter HH. VII.5 pp. 422-423; “on account of the magnitude of the event, I beg the reader’s indulgence for a digression, for it would be impossible to keep silent about the wonderful and mighty works of God, even if I should wish or be compelled to do so, since they concern the Duke of the Normans”.

³ TYERMAN, Christopher – *England and the Crusades: 1095-1588*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1988; p. 15.

⁴ *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*. Ed. Rosalind Hill. London: Nelson, 1962. Hereafter *GF*.

⁵ RALPH OF CAEN – *Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus*. Ed. Edoardo d’Angelo. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. Translated by Bernard S. Bachrach; David. S. Bachrach – *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen. A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*. Guildford: Routledge, 2010. Hereafter RC. FULCHER OF CHARTRES – *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095-1127)*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1913. Translated by Frances Rita Ryan – *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095 – 1127*. University of Tennessee Press, 1969. Hereafter FC.

⁶ ALBERT OF AACHEN – *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem*. Ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Hereafter AA.

⁷ ROBERT THE MONK – *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*. Ed. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2013. Translated Carol Sweetenham – *Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005. Hereafter RM. BALDRIC OF BOURGUEIL – *Historia Jerosolimitana*. BIDDLECOMBE, Steven (ed.). Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2014.

The nearest approach to an Anglo-Norman crusade hero was Robert, Duke of Normandy and eldest son of William the Conqueror. There is though no contemporary Anglo-Norman account dedicated to the crusade let alone an account with Robert centre stage.

The crusade was repeatedly described by Anglo-Norman historians through the 12th and 13th centuries, starting with the accounts by Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, and Henry of Huntingdon⁸. It rapidly became synonymous in Anglo-Norman historiography with Robert. Robert himself however was an ambiguous figure: his achievements on the crusade were celebrated but stood in contrast to repeated criticism of his unfitness – and indeed reputed refusal – to rule.

The evolution of memory about the Crusade

Recent scholarship has focused on the importance of crusades in creating and memorializing the identity of ancestors: “aristocratic lineages relied heavily on crusading as a mark of past and future prestige”⁹. Achievements on the crusade were both geographically and socially distant, taking place in a psychogeography which offered freedom to shape individual and collective narrative: “the Crusades created a dynamic framework for the development and performance of medieval identity”¹⁰. What happened in Outremer did not stay in Outremer: it came back to the West shaped into narratives of heroism as well as narratives of failure.

Memories, though, are not static. The function of memory changes as events recede into the distance. Initial memories can be characterized as communicative: they are

Translated by Susan Edgington – *Baldric of Bourgueil: History of the Jerusalemites*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2020. Hereafter BB. GUIBERT OF NOGENT – *Dei Gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes*. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996. Translated by Robert Levine – *The Deeds of God through the Franks by Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy Guibert*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997. Hereafter GN.

⁸ ORDERIC VITALIS – *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. Ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-1980; books IX and X. Hereafter OV. WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY – *Gesta Regum et Anglorum*. Ed. and trans. Roger A. B. Mynors, completed by Rodney Thomas and Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, book IV, chs 343-374, 387-389. Hereafter WM. HH, book VII chs 5-18.

⁹ CASSIDY-WELSH, Megan – *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2017, page 5. See PAUL Nicholas – *To Follow in Their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages*. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 2012.

¹⁰ PAUL, Nicholas; YEAGER, Suzanne – *Remembering the Crusades: myth, image and identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012, p. 8.

about creating, interpreting, and socialising experiences. Over the period of a century or so, “as communicative memory fades, so cultural memory takes over... not memory as a subjective practice, but remembrance as a social, political and organizational force”¹¹. What began as personal perceptions of individuals and their reputations turn over time into more abstract representations of the roles played and/or perceived to have been played by those individuals in historical events. Past deeds were evoked and reshaped in patterns that fitted contemporary discourse.

We can trace the development of legends about Robert through this lens. Contemporary accounts of the crusade are clear about his heroism, although with an ambivalence that appears early on. Anglo-Norman historians writing in the first half of the 12th century adopt a differing balance between praise and criticism of Robert in the context of the disputed succession with Henry I: Robert’s personal qualities or lack of them become critical in their portrayal. Those writing towards the end of the 12th century similarly reflect this ambivalence, but in a post-Hattin context where crusading took on new relevance and urgency. By the 13th century, Robert had become a generic crusade hero to whom episodes could be attached which bear little relevance to what he might or might not have done, but make a rattling good story.

Robert on the crusade and on return: reality and reputation

Robert of Normandy was the eldest son of William of Normandy. The first decades of his life were spent in conflict with his father and his brothers, which ultimately led to him taking refuge with Robert of Flanders. On the death of William in 1087, Robert inherited the duchy of Normandy whilst his brother William Rufus was granted the crown of England. The brothers agreed that each would be the other’s heir; however this pact was shortlived, and Robert attempted unsuccessfully in 1088 to take the English throne from his brother William Rufus.

When Urban issued the call to crusade, Robert mortgaged his duchy to fund his departure to the Holy Land. The contemporary accounts of the First Crusade portray

¹¹ CASSIDY-WELCH, Megan – *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*, p. 6.

Robert as an experienced and capable leader¹². He played a significant role in rallying the Christian forces at the battle of Dorylaeum under intense pressure, something recounted in detail in Ralph of Caen and Guibert of Nogent (who were not there), but not mentioned by Fulcher or the author of the *Gesta Francorum* (who were)¹³. He led out a column at the Battle of Antioch, though is not mentioned as a leading figure in the battle¹⁴. By contrast, his feat in seizing the standard of the emir leading the Saracen forces at the battle of Ascalon was widely recognized¹⁵. There is no hint that he either coveted or was offered the rulership of Jerusalem; Aird suggests that he in fact played the role of mediator in the discussions¹⁶. His role was by no means undistinguished: “a personal triumph” for Aird, who emphasizes both Robert’s valour and his abilities as mediator and conciliator¹⁷. But arguably he captured the contemporary imagination less than Bohemond or Godfrey. Robert the Monk for example somewhat downplays his role, referring only in passing to his heroism at Dorylaeum and pointedly calling him “comes” rather than “dux”¹⁸.

Robert’s absence left Henry I free to claim the English throne on the death of William Rufus. Robert made an abortive attempt to invade in 1101. Henry was subsequently to invade Normandy in 1105. The ongoing dispute between the brothers concluded at the battle of Tinchebrai in 1106, where Robert was taken captive by Henry, and spent the rest of his life in captivity until his death in 1134; the duchy of Normandy was absorbed into England.

There was ambivalence about Robert’s *fama* almost from the start. His heroism was widely recognized. The mid-12th Century crusading window at the Basilica of St-Denis explicitly depicts Robert in combat, with the caption “*R Dux Normannorum*

¹² AIRD, William C. – *Robert Curthose: Duke of Normandy*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2008, pp. 153-190. Old but still useful is DAVID, Charles Wendell – *Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920.

¹³ RC ch. 90, p.26; GN III.10 p.154.

¹⁴ See e.g. FC I.23, AA IV.47, 49; GN VII.18 p. 297.

¹⁵ GF 95; AA VI.50; GN VII.18, p.297 and VII.20, p.299.

¹⁶ AIRD, William C. – *Robert Curthose*, pp.184-186; see GN VI.15 p.248.

¹⁷ AIRD, William C. – *Robert Curthose*, pp 189-190

¹⁸ RM transl. Sweetenham, p. 20 note 49.

*Partum Prosternit*¹⁹. The scene could refer to Robert's heroism at Dorylaeum, his exploits at Antioch (attacking Corbaran though we might have expected the caption to reflect this, or killing the Saracen emir Red Lion) or his combat with the emir at Ascalon²⁰. Whichever of these it was, Robert's heroism was perceived as such that he was one of only two leaders to be named in the window, the other being Robert of Flanders. Equally, however, there were murmurings about his weaknesses of character from an early stage. Ralph of Caen and Guibert of Nogent both criticize him for being too lenient towards wrongdoers and extravagant²¹. The Monte Cassino account of the crusade, dating from the second quarter of the century, describes Robert refusing the crown on the grounds that he wants to return home²².

"Tam miranda Dei magnalia": early 12th Century accounts of the crusade in Anglo-Norman England

We find detailed accounts of the Crusade in the three major Anglo-Norman historians of the first part of the 12th Century: William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis, and Henry of Huntingdon. William's account dates in its first form to around 1118, revised substantially in the mid-1130s; he relies on the account of Fulcher of Chartres²³. Orderic's account is likely to date to around 1135 and uses Baldric of Bourgueil as his main source²⁴. Henry wrote his account between 1123-1130 and continued to revise it up to 1154: there is no obvious main source²⁵. The fullest account is Orderic's, which occupies all of book IX and some of book X of his *Historia*

¹⁹ "Robert, duke of the Normans, overthrows a Parthian". BROWN, Elizabeth A. R.; COTHREN, Michael W., "The 12th Century Crusading Window of the Abbey of St-Denis: *praeteritorum enim recordatio futurorum est exhibitio*". In *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 49 (1986), pp. 1-40, in particular pp. 26-31.

²⁰ See *La Chanson d'Antioche: chanson de geste du dernier quart du XIIe siècle*, ed. Bernard Guidot. Paris: Champion, 2011. This is a poetic account of the crusade from the end of the 12th Century which draws in part on earlier material. Lines 8557-91 for attack on Red Lion, whom Robert kills at lines 9029-36; he attacks Corbaran and knocks him from his horse at lines 8750-68.

²¹ RC ch. 61 pp. 18-19; GN II.16 pp. 132-133; see also VII.37 p.336 for implied bad discipline at Laodicea.

²² *Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusalymarum (olim Tudebodis imitatus et continuatus)*. Ed. Edoardo d'Angelo. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2009, CXXX, pp. 128-129.

²³ THOMSON, Rodney M. – *William of Malmesbury*. Revised edition. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003, pp. 178-88.

²⁴ CHIBNALL, Marjorie – *Ecclesiastical History*, Introduction to vol. 5, pp. xi-xiii.

²⁵ GREENWAY, Diana – *Historia Anglorum*, Introduction pp.lxvi-lxxvii.

Ecclesiastica. William's account occupies around 12% of his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*²⁶. Henry's account is shorter but still substantial²⁷.

This explosion of interest some decades after the crusade, in a part of the Anglo-Norman realm which had not participated to any significant extent in the expedition, and in historical works partly at least about England, is striking. All three are clear, thirty years on, about the miraculous nature of the enterprise. Orderic for example comments: "*nulla ut reor unquam sophistis in bellicis rebus gloriosior materia prodidit, quam nostris nunc Dominus poetis atque libris tradidit, dum per paucos Christicolae de paganis in oriente triumphavit*"²⁸. All three mark it out as a discrete episode standing out from the rest of their narration.²⁹ They comment on the exemplary nature of the enterprise: William, for example, comments "*tam famosum his diebus expeditionem audiere sit operae pretium et virtutis incitamentum*"³⁰. And they use the modesty topos to underline the magnitude of the enterprise compared to their own powers to depict it³¹. There is little attempt to magnify Anglo-Norman participation: Orderic and William stay relatively close to their respective sources Baldric and Fulcher. There is no reason not to take at face value their own commentary: the crusade was a miraculous enterprise and therefore deserved to be recounted at length.

The crusade mattered. And this created a double dilemma. Robert had distinguished himself on the crusade, but had lost his lands to Henry and was in prison: his heroism on the crusade was cast into question by his defeat and the questions this

²⁶ WM IV chs. 343-373, 387-389. GRABOIS, Aryeh – "The description of Jerusalem by William of Malmesbury: a mirror of the Holy Land's presence in the Norman mind". *Anglo-Norman Studies* 13 (1990) pp. 145-156.

²⁷ HH VII.5-18, VII.22.

²⁸ "Never, I believe, has a more glorious subject been given to historians of warfare than the Lord offered I our own time to poets and writers when he triumphed over the pagans in the East through the efforts of a few Christians". OV, Prologue to book IX, pp. 4-5. Compare WM IV.372, p.90; HH VII.5 pp.422-423, "miraculum Domini magnum temporibus nostris factum". ("The Lord's great miracle that came about in our own time".)

²⁹ Orderic provides a prologue setting out the divine nature of the crusade and underlining its importance with six hexameters, IX pp.4-7; William provides a mini-prologue, IV.343 pp. 542-43; and Henry asks the reader's indulgence for his digression, VII. pp. 422-423.

³⁰ WM IV.304, pp. 540-543, "for to hear of such a famous enterprise in our own time is worthwhile in itself, and an inspiration to brave deeds"; compare OV IX Prologue pp. 6-7, "strenuos Christi agonithetas diligo, et eorum probos actus attollere gestio." ("I love the brave champions of Christ and delight in praising their valiant deeds").

³¹ WM IV.304, pp. 540-543; OV IX Prologue pp. 6-7.

raised as to how far he, in fact, enjoyed Divine favour. Henry had not been on a crusade, but ruled his brother's duchy and held the crown Robert had tried to claim: Robert's widely acknowledged heroism on a divinely favoured enterprise outweighed his brother's reputation. Crusade heroism could not be ignored or denied. But who enjoyed God's favour more? And who was the rightful ruler?

The three authors adopt different stratagems to navigate this awkwardness. Orderic minimises Robert's achievements by barely mentioning them and by repeated sharp criticism of his personal deficiencies. William similarly gives Robert little prominence in his account of the crusade itself, describing him separately from the events and giving greater prominence to Robert's failings than to his one albeit impressive achievement. Henry, who made no secret elsewhere in his work of his views on Henry I, is more favourably disposed to Robert: he reflects more of Robert's heroism and embeds it within the account of the crusade, compressing the story of the refusal into one sentence³².

Orderic says little of Robert's heroism at Dorylaeum³³. He is the only source to describe Hugh Bunel, an exile since 1077, approaching Robert and offering help, but says little about the use Robert made of Hugh³⁴. He retains the description from Baldric about Robert's capture of the standard at Ascalon and subsequent donation to the Holy Sepulchre³⁵. Conversely, he criticises Robert sharply elsewhere, describing him on his return from crusade as "*socordia nempe mollicieque damnabiliter detentus*", and referring obliquely to his desire to get home³⁶. Elsewhere he is repeatedly and sharply critical of Robert, notably in the prophecy made by a hermit to the Duke's mother that his rule will be disastrous for Normandy³⁷.

³² HH, *De Contemptu Mundi*, pp. 584-619; pp. 604-609, where he describes Henry's perjury towards Robert.

³³ OV IX.8 pp. 62-63.

³⁴ OV IX.15, pp. 156-159.

³⁵ OV IX.17, pp. 181-83 and 188-189; BB IV.20, 21.

³⁶ OV IX.17 pp. 300-301; X.12 274-75, "he was sunk beyond redemption in indolence and voluptuousness". See AIRD, William – "Orderic's secular rulers and Representations of Personality and Power in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*". In ROZIER, Charles C., et al. (Ed.) – *Orderic Vitalis: Life, Works and Interpretations*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016, pp. 189-216, at pp. 202-04.

³⁷ OV V.10, pp. 106-7; see also VIII.1 pp.114-15 for trenchant assessment of Robert's character.

William tells us rather more about Robert. He is shown more than once with Robert of Flanders and Stephen of Blois³⁸. There is little reference to him in the account William follows from Fulcher, though he does add a reference to Robert cutting through the centre of the enemy lines at the battle of Ascalon³⁹. After the end of his description of the crusade, he talks in detail about Godfrey including a number of anecdotes, returns to Fulcher for the early years of the kingdom, and talks in detail about Raymond IV. He then goes on to talk about Robert⁴⁰. He describes how Robert killed the Turkish leader Corbagaath at the Battle of Antioch. This is not true. But Kerbogha's attack was arguably the point on which success or failure hung for the crusade, and to credit Robert with killing him represented a major recognition of his importance. William goes into (eyewitness?) detail not found in any other source, describing how Robert fought alongside "*Philippus clericus*", son of the powerful Count Roger of Montgomery, and Warin of Taney in Maine; the three pretended to flee then wheeled about and killed a man each⁴¹. Conversely, William also tells us how Robert refused the kingdom of Jerusalem when it was offered to him by consensus as the son of a king on the grounds of "*laborum inextricabilium metu [...] [Deus] "omnes eius dulcedines amarissimis offensionibus offuscans". He qualifies this "ut fertur"*⁴². For William, therefore, there is a sharp contrast. On crusade Robert "*in multis quidem mirabilis apparuit, ut nunquam a Christiano vel pagano potuerit ex equite pedes effici*"⁴³. But his refusal of the crown "*indelibili macula nobilitatem suam respersit*"⁴⁴. This reflects William's more general criticism of Robert: he accuses him of being a wastrel, of attacking his brother and "*pro mollitie tamen animi numquam regendae reipublicae idoneus iudicatus*"⁴⁵.

Henry of Huntingdon's portrayal of Robert is notably more positive than those of William or Orderic. Henry describes how Robert saved the day at Dorylaeum by

³⁸ WM IV.350, pp. 612-613; ch. 357, pp. 628-631.

³⁹ WM IV.371, pp. 650-654; compare FC I.31.

⁴⁰ WM IV.389, pp. 700-707.

⁴¹ MASON, J. F. A. – "Roger de Montgomery and his sons". *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 13 (1963) pp. 1-28. WM IV.389 pp. 702-703

⁴² WM IV.389 pp. 702-703; "through fear of its insoluble difficulties... [God] darkened all his pleasures with most bitter pains".

⁴³ WM IV.389 pp. 702-03, "achieved by many feats a great reputation, such that neither Christian nor pagan could unhorse him".

⁴⁴ WM IV.389 pp. 702-703, "brought a lasting stain on his reputation".

⁴⁵ WM IV.389, pp. 704-707, "for his softheartedness never thought fit to rule a commonwealth".

rallying the troops, giving a rousing speech, and cutting his way through three Turkish battle lines; this is also in Robert the Monk but considerably embroidered by Henry⁴⁶. Robert grants a city to one Symeon, suggesting that he had territories at his disposal⁴⁷. He slices a Saracen down the middle at Antioch, an exploit placed alongside Godfrey's famous bisection and implicitly associating Robert with Godfrey's feat⁴⁸. Henry omits the battle of Ascalon and any reference to Robert's feat, although it is clear from a reference further on in the context of Robert's return to England that he was aware of it⁴⁹. Like William, he has the story of Robert refusing the crown though gives it little space: "*optulerunt igitur regnum Ierosolim Normannorum duci. Quod quia causa laboris repudiavit, offensus est in eum Deus, nec prosperum quid deinceps ei contigit*"⁵⁰.

It is clear from these accounts that stories and anecdotes were already circulating about Robert and probably during his lifetime⁵¹. Robert was indubitably a hero of the Crusade, an event which was by common consent an extraordinary manifestation of the power of God. His heroism needed not only to be acknowledged but magnified, not only in his own right but as the eldest son of the Conqueror and as an outstanding Anglo-Norman leader. Equally indubitable however was the fact that he had been comprehensively outmanoeuvred and defeated by Henry. On one level this could simply be explained as divine disfavour: victory goes to the righteous. However, the story that Robert had refused the throne of Jerusalem was the most damaging possible to his reputation. Whatever his heroism on crusade, he had failed Christ by refusing to defend His holy city and, implicitly, failing to emulate Him; and he had done so out of laziness and a desire for luxury. This both undermined his reputation as a heroic crusader and reflected existing criticisms of

⁴⁶ HH VII.7; RM III.10, who emphasises the role of Bohemond.

⁴⁷ HH VII.9.

⁴⁸ HH VII.10. See DZWIGALA Bartłomiej – "Evolution of the account of Duke Godfrey's deed of hewing the enemy through the middle with a single blow during the siege of Antioch by the First Crusade. A source study." *Przedal nauk historycznych* 17 (2018) pp. 5-28.

⁴⁹ HH VII.22.

⁵⁰ HH VII.18, "and so they offered the kingdom of Jerusalem to the duke of the Normans. Because he refused it on account of the labour involved. God was offended against him, and nothing favourable happened to him thereafter".

⁵¹ LE SAUX, *Companion to Wace* p. 264. See PARSONS, Simon Thomas – *The Use of Chanson de Geste Motifs in the Latin Texts of the First Crusade. C. 1095-1145*. Ph.D thesis, Royal Holloway College, 1997 for clustering of epic motifs around Dorylaeum, Antioch and Ascalon, the areas where Robert's heroism is most often highlighted.

his laxness. And it played to a political agenda. It implicitly justified Henry I's taking of the English throne: if Robert had refused the throne of the heavenly city, he was hardly fit to rule Normandy let alone England⁵². And there was a further implication: that the kingship of Jerusalem had been intended for an Anglo-Norman ruler, thus implicitly underlining the importance and legitimacy of the dynasty. This negative portrayal of Robert's conduct at Jerusalem was supported both by direct criticism of Robert as unsuited to rule, and by insinuations that he lost impetus and grip after the crusade⁵³.

The mid-12th Century: all about Robert

The lack of emphasis on the crusade in the historiography of the middle third of the 12th Century stands in sharp contrast to the detailed accounts of Orderic, William, and Henry. The crusade was a relatively distant memory. And the lack of English participation meant that there were few family memories to preserve. For historians interested in defining a nascent English nationhood, Robert was an obvious exemplar of Anglo-Norman heroism. So Anglo-Norman English historians in the middle of the 12th Century were more interested in the deeds of Robert on the crusade than in the crusade itself.

Geffrei Gaimar wrote an octosyllabic vernacular history, the first version dating from 1136-37⁵⁴. His account of the crusade is short and focused entirely on Robert⁵⁵. He has nothing but praise for Robert: "*suz ciel nen out meillor baron*"⁵⁶. In this account, Robert becomes rather startlingly the controlling intelligence of the entire crusade. Gaimar credits him with taking Jerusalem; killing Corbaran, which so impresses the Christians that they want him to be king; capturing Antioch of which

⁵² On crusading and Henry I see GRABOIS, Aryeh – "Anglo-Norman England and the Holy Land". *Anglo-Norman Studies VII: The Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1984*, ed. R. Allen Brown, 132-41; Tyerman, *England* pp. 30-32.

⁵³ PAUL, Nicholas – *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, pp. 228-233. SHOPKOW, Leah – *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997, p. 102 for negative portrayal of Robert as destroying Normandy in contrast with Henry I's wisdom and justice which save it. OV V.304-5; see below for similar references in Wace.

⁵⁴ GEFREI GAIMAR – *Estoire des Engleis/History of the English*. Ed. and trans. Ian Short. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. For dating see Introduction p. xxvii.

⁵⁵ GEFREI GAIMAR – *Estoire*, lines 5743-5774.

⁵⁶ GEFREI GAIMAR – *Estoire*, line 5744; "there was no better lord under the sun".

he is the “avoué”, handing it over to a Norman and entrusted with parcelling out the captured territories to the other leaders; and bestowing the kingship on Godfrey because he did not wish to remain himself. Gaimar wrote for the provincial aristocracy in Lincolnshire rather than the court, as he explains in detail; we might surmise that stories about heroic deeds by Anglo-Norman crusade heroes rather than deficient dukes went down well⁵⁷.

Wace was commissioned by Henry II to write a history of Anglo-Norman England, the *Roman de Rou*⁵⁸. He is consistently favourable to Robert and clear that he enjoyed divine favour⁵⁹. He summarises the crusade in some forty lines⁶⁰. Robert’s feats are crisply described: he distinguishes himself at Antioch and Jerusalem, fights with Corbaran, and captures the standard (presumably at Ascalon); Wace is alone in saying that Robert gave it to the Abbaye aux Dames founded by his mother in Caen. He is nothing but complimentary about Robert’s role on crusade: “*out il grant priés e grant onor/e mult en parlerent plusor*”⁶¹. However, he comments later that Robert was less vigorous in his conduct of affairs after his return from Outremer: “*por pereços fu mult tenuz/pois qu’il fu d’oltre mer venuz*”⁶². He also observes that the barons were unclear about Robert’s intentions⁶³.

Benoît de Ste-Maure was commissioned by Henry II to take on the work of Wace⁶⁴. The circumstances in which Wace was replaced by Benoît suggest that his approach did not find favour with Henry II⁶⁵. His positive description of Robert, however far

⁵⁷ Introduction p. x.

⁵⁸ WACE – *Le Roman de Rou de Wace*. Ed. Anthony J. Holden, 3 vols, Paris: Picard, 1970-1973.

⁵⁹ LE SAUX, Françoise – *A Companion to Wace*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005, page 260; lines 11304-11308 for the anecdote of the garden in Caen.

⁶⁰ WACE – *Le Roman de Rou*, lines 9657-9698

⁶¹ WACE – *Le Roman de Rou*, lines 9697-9698; “he gained great renown and honour, and considerable numbers of people spoke a great deal of him”.

⁶² WACE – *Le Roman de Rou*, lines 10923-10930; 10925-10926; “he was generally considered indolent on his return from Outremer”.

⁶³ WACE – *Le Roman de Rou*, lines 10121-10126.

⁶⁴ BENOIT DE SAINTE-MAURE – *Chronique des ducs de Normandie publiée d’après le manuscrit de Tours avec les variants du manuscrit de Londres*. Ed. Carin Fahlin, 4 vols. . Uppsala: 1951-1967. lines 43387-43408.

⁶⁵ LE SAUX, Françoise – *Companion*, pp. 259-74. URBANSKI, Charity – *Writing History for the King: Henry II and the Politics of Vernacular History*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2013, pp. 108-125. BLACKER, Jean – *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman regnum*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994, pp. 184-86; ASHE Laura – *Fiction and History in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007 pp. 20-21.

it might have reflected Robert's favourable crusading *fama*, may not have sat well with Henry I's grandson. Benoît takes a notably more critical view of Robert⁶⁶. He repeats the allegation that Robert was begged to stay in Outremer but returned home in folly, saying nothing about his conduct on crusade and commenting that he both failed to pay back his debt and promptly attacked Henry I on his return⁶⁷.

Robert of Torigni, an abbot of Mont St Michel who wrote between c.1150 and 1186, similarly gives a brief and selective account of the crusade, which focuses almost entirely on the deeds of Robert: Antioch is not even mentioned under his entry for 1098⁶⁸. He repeats the anecdotes familiar from Henry of Robert's bravery at Dorylaeum in rallying the troops and killing three Turks; his granting of a town to Symeon; his bisection of a Turk alongside the similar feat of Godfrey; and his capturing of the standard at Ascalon and purchase of another captured standard to give to the Holy Sepulchre. Robert also repeats near-verbatim Henry's account of Robert turning down the crown of Jerusalem but lays heavier emphasis on it; he comes back to this in the context of the defeat at Tinchebrai, commenting "*dampnavit igitur eum Deus deridia perhenni et carcere sempiterno*"⁶⁹.

None of these accounts show interest in the First Crusade other than as a backdrop for Robert's heroism: there is no comment on its extraordinary divinely inspired success, and it is not singled out as a freestanding episode. By the time we reach Benoît, the crusade is barely mentioned. And this in turn shows that, once the crusade was largely outside living memory, it ceased to be of interest at least to English chroniclers in its own right. The crusade is seen entirely through the lens of Robert's exploits, and this is what we might expect from historians whose objective was to explore nascent Anglo-Norman English identity⁷⁰. Clearly, stories about Robert's *fama* circulated widely and were largely positive, focusing on him as an

⁶⁶ URBANSKI, Charity – *Writing History*. pp. 171-183.

⁶⁷ BENOIT DE SAINTE-MAURE – *Chronique des ducs*, lines 43387-43408.

⁶⁸ ROBERT DE TORIGNI – *La Chronique de Robert de Torigni*. Ed. Léopold Delisle, 2 vols. Rouen: Le Brumant, 1872-1873; vol. 1, pp. 81-89.

⁶⁹ ROBERT DE TORIGNI – *La Chronique de Robert*, pp. 128-129; "and so God condemned him to everlasting contumely and eternal captivity".

⁷⁰ DAMIAN-GRINT, Peter. *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: inventing vernacular authority*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997.

Anglo-Norman crusading hero. However, there is also a perceptible shift towards the negative aspects of his reputation, coinciding with the accession of Henry II.

Angevin sources at the end of the 12th Century

The turbulence of the later years of Henry II's reign and the loss of Jerusalem led to a new wave of historical writing, with a focus on current events rather than constructing the past⁷¹. The First Crusade receives little emphasis. In part, this reflects the perception that it was never seen as an English crusade, in stark contrast to the Third Crusade⁷².

Most historians of this period who refer to the crusade give a summarised account stripped down to a narrative focused on Nicaea, Antioch, and Jerusalem which it is hard to ascribe to any particular source. There is little evidence of detailed use of contemporary First Crusade source material. The most detailed account is of Ralph of Diceto, whose account shows similarities to Henry of Huntingdon⁷³. There is a possibility that Roger of Hoveden may have had access to a version of the Old French Crusade Cycle. His description of events at Nicaea gives the names of *combattants* in Old French rather than Latin, his reference to Corbaran at Antioch similarly taking the Old French form, and the *combattants* at Nicaea themselves are drawn from the *Antioche*⁷⁴.

Accounts of the crusade continue to centre around Robert of Normandy, the only leader of the Crusade to be referred to in detail. We continue to see reference to, and if anything a strengthening of, his heroism. For William of Newburgh, Robert "*armis tantus fuit ut in illa magna et famosa expeditione Ierosolymitana inter fortissimos totius orbis proceres clarissimae militiae titulis fulserit*"⁷⁵. Roger of Hoveden follows

⁷¹ STAUNTON, Michael – *The Historians of Angevin England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017; ch. 2.

⁷² STAUNTON, Michael - *Historians*, p. 216.

⁷³ RALPH OF DICETO – *Radulfi de Diceto Decani Lunduniensis Opera Historica*. ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1876; vol. 1, pp. 221-223, 231-233.

⁷⁴ ROGER OF HOVEDEN - *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*. Ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols. London: Longmans, 1868-71. vol. I, pp. 151-155.

⁷⁵ WILLIAM OF NEWBURGH – *William of Newburgh: the History of English Affairs*. Ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1988; pp. 42-45, "so good at soldiering that in the great and celebrated expedition to Jerusalem he shone out with the glory of the

William of Malmesbury in referring to Robert killing Curbarand⁷⁶. Ralph of Diceto follows Henry of Huntingdon in laying emphasis on Robert's heroism at Dorylaeum, giving him a morale-rousing speech and describing him cutting his way through three battle lines; he later ascribes to Robert the same feat as Godfrey in cutting a Turk in half⁷⁷. Gervase of Tilbury refers to him as "*vir in armis strenuissimus*"⁷⁸. The Anglo-Norman poem known as the *Siège d'Antioche*, whilst emphasising the role of Godfrey and Bohemond, gives some prominence to Robert. He successfully gathers large amounts of plunder at Nicaea, where he fights a long and valiant battle against Soliman, and is shown requesting a succession of reluctant lords to seek help; at Antioch, he attacks Corbaran, then kills the Saracen leader Red Lion⁷⁹.

The perception of Robert as the flawed hero who refused the crown of Jerusalem was, however, equally tenacious. Roger of Hoveden says that Robert refused the crown on the grounds that he was being threatened by the ambitions of William Rufus, and makes the connection to defeat at Tinchebrai; he sets this in the context of Henry II's right to the crown of Outremer⁸⁰. Gervase of Tilbury comments crisply that Robert was "*utroque regno privatus, Hierosolymitano quod contempsit, Anglicano quod appetivit*"⁸¹. The legend travelled far: the annals of the monastery of Waverley echo Henry of Huntingdon in commenting "*quia causa laboris repudiavit, offensus est in eum Deus, nec prosperum quid deinceps ei contigit*"⁸².

most distinguished service amongst the bravest princes of the whole world", Walsh and Kennedy's translation.

⁷⁶ ROGER OF HOVEDEN – *Gesta Regis Henri Secundi abbatis: The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, 1169-92: known formerly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough*. Ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols, London: Longmans, 1867; vol. 1, p. 329.

⁷⁷ RALPH OF DICETO – pp. 222-223.

⁷⁸ GERVASE OF TILBURY – *Otia Imperialia: Recreation for an Emperor*. Ed. and trans. S. E. Banks and J. W. Binns. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002; pp. 480-481, "a man most valiant in arms" (Banks' and Binns' translation).

⁷⁹ *Siège d'Antioche*, *laissez* 38; 42; 304-305. The poem has yet to be edited in full: Linda Paterson, Simon Parsons, Lauren Mulholland and I are producing an edition and translation, from which these references are drawn. The poem survives in two manuscripts of which the older is 13th Century. See [The Siege of Antioch Project: Digital Approaches – Siege of Antioch Project \(fordham.edu\)](http://fordham.edu).

⁸⁰ ROGER OF HOVEDEN – *Gesta Regis*, pp. 328-329.

⁸¹ GERVASE OF TILBURY – *Otia Imperialia*, p. 445; "he was deprived of both kingdoms, that of Jerusalem because he spurned it and that of England because he sought to win it" (Banks and Binns' translation).

⁸² *Annales de Waverleia*, p. 207. In *Annales Monastici*. Ed. LUARD, Henry Richards. London: Longman, 1865, vol. 2; *Annales de Waverleia*, pp. 129-411; "because he refused it on account of the toil involved he offended God, and so nothing went favourably for him from then on".

This was, of course, not a new story; as set out above, it had been circulating from the first decades of the 12th Century, and had been used by Anglo-Norman English historians to underline Henry I's legitimacy as ruler. But in the hands of Angevin historians wrestling with the arguments around Henry II's participation – or non-participation – in the Third Crusade, it took on new relevance. Henry II had a double right to the kingdom of Jerusalem, not only through the line of Fulk and Geoffrey but as a descendant of William the Conqueror to whose son Robert the crown of Jerusalem had been offered⁸³. Looked at in this light, it remained important to emphasize Robert's heroism on the crusade. As Henry's ancestor, he provided an example to be praised and emulated. And his courage justified the offer of the crown. Conversely, Robert's refusal to accept that crown led to not only defeat and captivity but the loss of divine support: the implication is that this is an example Henry should learn from and not seek to emulate⁸⁴. And the fact that his claim to the throne had been defeated by Henry II's grandfather continued to cast a shadow.

13th Century portrayals of Robert and the crusade

13th Century historians continued to describe the events of the crusade and to emphasize the role of Robert. Roger of Wendover gives a long and detailed account⁸⁵. This was re-edited by Matthew Paris in his *Chronica Maiora* as a free-standing episode in his chronicle with little change to the substance⁸⁶. The main source for this version is William of Tyre, showing (obviously) that his *Chronicon* had made its way to the West. Roger and Matthew summarise and edit William, and add material from the earlier accounts by William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, and Baldric of Bourgueil. A number of additions emphasize Robert's heroism. In the account of the battle of Dorylaeum, there is a near-verbatim borrowing from Henry describing Robert's heroism in raising morale and killing

⁸³ STAUNTON, Michael – *Historians*, pp. 230-232.

⁸⁴ GILLINGHAM, John – “Roger of Howden on Crusade”. In GILLINGHAM, John - *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the 12th Century*. London: Hambledon, 1994, pp. 141-153; PAUL, Nicholas - *To Follow in their Footsteps*, pp. 207-241; STAUNTON, Michael – *Historians*, pp. 230-232.

⁸⁵ ROGER OF WENDOVER – *Rogeri de Wendover Chronica sive Flores Historiarum*, ed. Henry Coxe, 4 vols London: Bentley, 1841-1844; vol.2 pp, 56-151.

⁸⁶ MATTHEW PARIS – *Matthew Paris: Chronica Maiora*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, 7 vols., London: Longman and Trübner, 1872-1883, vol. 2 pp. 43-110; hereafter MP. VAUGHAN, Richard – *Matthew Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958, pp. 21-34.

three Turks⁸⁷. There is further material from Henry about Robert giving the city of Azena to Symeon⁸⁸. In battle during the siege of Antioch, there is another scene borrowed from Henry: a description of Robert cutting down through a Saracen, juxtaposed with the more famous episode of Godfrey bisecting a Turk, and repeating a comment by Henry comparing Robert Fitzgerald to a lion⁸⁹. When the crusaders enter Jerusalem, Robert of Normandy and Robert of Flanders are added to the list given by William⁹⁰. At the battle of Ascalon there is an addition from Baldric of Bourgueil, giving details of how Robert captures the emir's standard and subsequently buys and donates a standard to the Holy Sepulchre⁹¹. Whilst Matthew does include a reference from Henry of Huntingdon to Robert turning down the crown, he qualifies it with "*tradunt autem quidam*"; Roger of Wendover describes the episode in more detail⁹². Matthew wrote at a time when Henry III was strongly interested in the possibility of a crusade⁹³. So the First Crusade had obvious relevance, as did its homegrown Anglo-Norman hero.

The story about Robert's refusal of the throne continued to be retailed albeit with an emphasis on his choice as ruler rather than his refusal to do so. Roger of Wendover describes how the leaders of the crusade decided to choose the ruler of Jerusalem by keeping vigil with candles: the one whose candle spontaneously lit was the chosen one. Robert's candle was the first to be lit. He promptly blew it out, commenting that a better kingdom awaited him in England⁹⁴. This episode is also found in the 13th Century *Chanson de Jérusalem*, a heavily fictionalized poetic version of the crusade forming part of the Old French Crusade Cycle, where however Godfrey is the only one whose candle is lit⁹⁵. A different variant is found in the *Estoire de Jérusalem et d'Antioche*, a gloriously batty 13th Century French prose

⁸⁷ MP pp. 63-65; HH VII.7, pp. 428-429.

⁸⁸ MP pp. 65-66; HH VII.9, pp. 430-431.

⁸⁹ MP p. 74; HH VII.10, pp. 432-433.

⁹⁰ MP p. 100; WT VIII.18

⁹¹ MP pp. 104-105, p. 107; BB IV.21.

⁹² MP pp. 106-107, "some people also say"; HH VII.18; RW pp. 145-46.

⁹³ TYERMAN, Christopher – *England and the Crusades* p.117. BORENIUS, Tancred Borenius – "The Cycle of Images in the Palaces and Castles of Henry III". *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943), pp. 40-50 for paintings of the First Crusade commissioned by Henry.

⁹⁴ ROGER OF WENDOVER - *Chronica sive Flores Historiarum*, vol. 2, pp. 145-146.

⁹⁵ *La Chanson de Jérusalem* – Ed. Nigel Thorp. Vol. 6 (1992) of *The Old French Crusade Cycle*. Ed. Emanuel J. Mickel and Jan A. Nelson, 10 vols. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1977-2003; laisses 152-156.

account of the crusade and its aftermath⁹⁶. This describes the new ruler of Jerusalem being chosen on the basis of recommendations from friends: whilst this is in William of Tyre, the *Estoire* specifies that the four under consideration were Godfrey, Robert, Robert of Flanders, and (slightly surprisingly as he was not there) count William of Poitiers⁹⁷. Tales grow in the telling: the late 13th Century chronicler Peter Langtoft has Robert designated three times rather than once⁹⁸. More generally Robert was portrayed as a crusader to whom miscellaneous heroic exploits could be attached. In the *Chanson de Jérusalem* his heroism is commented on a number of times, notably when he fights so valiantly that his hand becomes cramped around his sword⁹⁹. The *Estoire* depicts Robert as the hero of something of a bromance with the Saracen Amidelis, whom he unhorses but does not kill, and who later seeks his help in converting to Christianity¹⁰⁰. The very mention of Robert's name is enough to dissuade Roger Borsa from the siege of Capua¹⁰¹.

At some point during the 13th Century, a wooden effigy of Robert drawing his sword was placed in Gloucester Cathedral. There is no firm date; it may be connected with the rededication of the Abbey of St Peter in 1239 but is unlikely to date to later than 1300¹⁰². During the 15th Century, it was placed on a mortuary chest carrying the arms of the Nine Worthies with the arms of Godfrey at one end, thereby underlining the connection to the crusade¹⁰³. Whatever the date and provenance of the effigy, Robert's heroism was still remembered and celebrated in the 13th Century as a crusade participant, with the details of what he might or might not have done blurred into a general perception of heroism.

⁹⁶ *Estoire de Jérusalem et d'Antioche, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* vol. 5 pp. 621-648. The text has been little studied: see however the note at <https://frenchofoutremer.ace.fordham.edu/index-of-sources/alphabetical-listing/estoire-de-jerusalem-et-antioche>.

⁹⁷ *Estoire de Jérusalem*, p. 639. WILLIAM OF TYRE, *Chronicon*. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1986. Translated by Emily A. Babcock and August. C. Krey, *A History of Deeds Beyond the Sea*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. IX.2,

⁹⁸ PIERRE DE LANGTOFT – *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*. Ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1866-1868 Vol. 1 pp. 458-460.

⁹⁹ *La chanson de Jérusalem*, *laissez* 17-18.

¹⁰⁰ *Estoire de Jérusalem*, pp. 629-630.

¹⁰¹ *Estoire de Jérusalem*, pp. 627-628.

¹⁰² WELANDER, David – *The History, Art and Architecture of Gloucester Cathedral*. Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1999; pp. 113-117.

¹⁰³ WELANDER, David – *Gloucester Cathedral*, p. 116.

Conclusion

The stories told about Robert's participation in the First Crusade show how memory evolved as the crusade receded into the past. The Anglo-Norman historians of the 1120s and 1130s are clear on the importance of the crusade even three decades afterward and the need to include it in their accounts. And this created a dilemma. Robert as crusade hero had been prominent in carrying out God's will. How then to justify his perceived and actual failures and his brother's accession, not only to the throne of England but Robert's own duchy and his imprisonment of Robert? The answer was a story suggesting that he was the author of his own misfortune: by turning down the crown of Jerusalem he forfeited divine support, and clearly, someone who did not have divine support and turned down the throne of Jerusalem could not be a king of England. A dichotomy between Robert as a true hero and Robert as a failed hero was thus created. These tensions may have eased with Robert's death in 1134 but did not disappear. As the First Crusade receded into history, accounts of it in England became increasingly focused on and synonymous with Robert. Stories both of his heroism and his unfitness for office continued to be told, with a gradual drift to the latter under Henry II. At the end of the 12th Century a renewed debate around participation in the crusade after the defeat at Hattin led to a new wave of historiography, in which Robert once again served as a proxy for discussion of royal attitudes to the crusade, and the stories from earlier in the century found a new lease of life. By the 13th Century, arguments about the legitimacy of Henry I as ruler and Henry II's failure to go on crusade were past history. But interest in the First Crusade as the only truly successful enterprise to Jerusalem remained strong. And in this context, Robert's fame as a hero of the First Crusade again became topical, albeit by now as a generic hero rather than the ambiguous figure of earlier depictions.

Bibliographic References

Printed sources

Latin

ALBERT OF AACHEN – *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem*. Ed. and trans. Susan B. Edgington. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Annales de Waverleia, In *Annales Monastici*. Ed. Henry Richards Luard. London: Longman, 1865, vol. 2; pp. 129-411.

BALDRIC OF BOURGUEIL – *Historia Jerosolimitana*. BIDDLECOMBE, Steven (ed.). EDGINGTON, Susan B. (trans.). Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2014.

Baldric of Bourgueil: "History of the Jerusalemites". Woodbridge: Boydell, 2020

FULCHER OF CHARTRES - *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095-1127)*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1913. Trans. Frances Rita Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095-1127*. University of Tennessee Press, 1969.

GERVASE OF TILBURY – *Otia Imperialia: Recreation for an Emperor*. Ed. and trans. S. E. Banks and J. W. Binns. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum. Ed. and trans. Rosalind Hill. London: Nelson, 1962.

GUIBERT OF NOGENT – *Dei Gesta per Francos et cinq autres textes*. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens. Turnhout: Brepols, 1996. Trans. Robert Levine. *The Deeds of God Through the Franks by Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy Guibert*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997.

HENRY OF HUNTINGDON – *Historia Anglorum: the History of the English People*. Ed. and trans. Diana Greenway. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hystoria de via et recuperatione Antiochiae atque Ierusalymarum (olim Tudebodus imitatus et continuatus). Ed. Edoardo d'Angelo. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2009.

MATTHEW PARIS – *Matthew Paris: Chronica Maiora*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, 7 vols., London: Longman and Trübner, 1872-1883.

ORDERIC VITALIS – *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. Ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-1980.

RALPH OF CAEN – *Radulphi Cadomensis Tancredus*. Ed. Edoardo d'Angelo. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. Trans. Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach. *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen: a History of the Normans on the First Crusade*. Guildford: Ashgate, 2010.

RALPH OF DICETO – *Radulfi de Diceto Decani Lunduniensis Opera Historica*. Ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1876.

ROGER OF HOVEDEN – *Gesta Regis Henri Secundi abbatis: The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I, 1169-92: known formerly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough*. Ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols, London: Longmans, 1867.

ROGER OF HOVEDEN – *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*. Ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols. London: Longmans, 1868-1871.

ROBERT DE TORIGNI – *La Chronique de Robert de Torigni*. Ed. Léopold Delisle, 2 vols. Rouen: Le Brumant, 1872-1873.

ROBERT THE MONK – *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*. Ed. Marcus Bull and Damien Kempf. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2013. Trans. Carol Sweetenham. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

ROGER OF WENDOVER – *Rogeri de Wendover Chronica sive Flores Historiarum*, ed. Henry Coxe, 4 vols London: Bentley, 1841-1844.

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY – *Gesta Regum et Anglorum*. Ed. and trans. Roger A. B. Mynors, completed by Rodney Thomas and Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

WILLIAM OF NEWBURGH – *William of Newburgh: the History of English Affairs*. Ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 2007.

WILLIAM OF TYRE, *Chronicon*. Ed. Robert B. C. Huygens, 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1986. Transl. Emily A. Babcock and August. C Krey, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*. New York: University of Columbia, 1943.

Old French

BENOIT DE SAINTE-MAURE – *Chronique des ducs de Normandie publiée d'après le manuscrit de Tours avec les variants du manuscrit de Londres*. Ed. Carin Fahlin, 4 vols. . Uppsala: 1951-1967.

La Chanson d'Antioche: chanson de geste du dernier quart du XIIe siècle, ed. and transl. Bernard Guidot. Paris: Champion, 2011.

La Chanson de Jérusalem – Ed. Nigel Thorp. Vol. 6 (1992) of *The Old French Crusade Cycle*. Ed. Emanuel J. Mickel and Jan A. Nelson, 10 vols. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1977-2003.

Estoire de Jérusalem et d'Antioche, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades vol .5 pp. 621-648; pp. 629-630. See also <https://frenchofoutramer.ace.fordham.edu/index-of-sources/alphabetical-listing/estoire-de-jerusalem-et-antioche>

GEFFREI GAIMAR – *Estoire des Engleis/History of the English*. Ed. and trans. Ian Short. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

PIERRE DE LANGTOFT – *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*. Ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1866-1868

Siège d'Antioche – [The Siege of Antioch Project: Digital Approaches – Siege of Antioch Project \(fordham.edu\)](https://www.fordham.edu/~antioch/).

WACE – *Le Roman de Rou de Wace*. Ed. Anthony J. Holden, 3 vols, Paris: Picard, 1970-1973

Studies

AIRD, William C. – *Robert Curthose: Duke of Normandy*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2008.

AIRD, William C. – “Orderic’s secular rulers and Representations of Personality and Power in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*”. In ROZIER, Charles C., *et alii* (Ed.) - *Orderic Vitalis: Life, Works and Interpretations*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016, pp. 189-216.

ASHE, Laura – *Fiction and History in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

CASSIDY-WELSH, Megan – *Remembering the Crusades and Crusading*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2017.

BLACKER, Jean – *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman regnum*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.

BORENIUS, Tancred – “The Cycle of Images in the Palaces and Castles of Henry III”. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943) pp. 40-50.

BROWN, Elizabeth A. R.; COTHREN, Michael W. – “The 12th-century Crusading Window of the Abbey of St-Denis: *praeteritorum enim recordatio futurorum est exhibitio*”. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 49 (1986), pp. 1-40.

DAMIAN-GRINT, Peter – *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: inventing vernacular authority*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997.

DAVID, Charles Wendell – *Robert Curthose Duke of Normandy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1920.

DZWIGALA, Bartłomiej – “Evolution of the account of Duke Godfrey’s deed of hewing the enemy through the middle with a single blow during the siege of Antioch by the First Crusade. A source study.” *Przedal naul historycznyoh* 17 (2018) pp. 5-28.

GILLINGHAM, John – “Roger of Howden on Crusade”. In GILLINGHAM, John - *Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the 12th Century*. London: Hambledon, 1994, pp. 141-153.

GRABOIS, Aryeh – “Anglo-Norman England and the Holy Land”, In *Anglo-Norman Studies VII: The Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1984*, (ed.) R. Allen Brown, pp. 132-41.

GRABOIS, Aryeh – “The description of Jerusalem by William of Malmesbury: a mirror of the Holy Land’s presence in the Norman mind”. In *Anglo-Norman Studies 13* (1990) pp. 145-156.

GREENWAY, Diana – “Authority, convention and observation in Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum*”. *Anglo-Norman Studies 18* (1995), pp. 105-121.

LE SAUX, Françoise – *A Companion to Wace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

MASON, J. F. A. – “Roger de Montgomery and his sons”. In *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 13* (1963) pp. 1-28.

PARSONS, Simon Thomas – *The Use of Chanson de Geste Motifs in the Latin Texts of the First Crusade, c. 1095-1145*. Ph.D thesis, Royal Holloway College, University of London, 2018.

PAUL, Nicholas – *To Follow in Their Footsteps: the Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.

PAUL, Nicholas; YEAGER, Suzanne – *Remembering the Crusades: myth, image and identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

RILEY-SMITH, Jonathan – *The First Crusaders 1095-1131*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

ROACH, Daniel – “Orderic Vitalis and the First Crusade”. *Journal of Medieval History 42* (2016), pp. 177-201.

SHOPKOW, Leah – *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.

STAUNTON, Michael – *The Historians of Angevin England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

THOMSON, Rodney M. – *William of Malmesbury*. Revised edition. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003.

TYERMAN, Christopher – *England and the Crusades: 1095-1588*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

URBANSKI, Charity – *Writing History for the King: Henry II and the Politics of Vernacular History*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2013.

VAUGHAN, Richard – *Matthew Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

WELANDER, David – *The History, Art and Architecture of Gloucester Cathedral*. Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1999.

COMO CITAR ESTE ARTIGO | HOW TO QUOTE THIS ARTICLE:

SWEETENHAM, Carol – “Heroic Deeds and Heroic Failure: Robert of Normandy and the Portrayal of the First Crusade in 2th and 13th Century England”. *Medievalista* 34 (Julho – Dezembro 2023), pp. 289-313. Disponível em <https://medievalista.iem.fcsh.unl.pt>.



Esta revista tem uma Licença **Creative Commons - Atribuição-NãoComercial 4.0 Internacional**.