

The Courage of the Normans— A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric

The Normans thought of themselves as a distinct 'race' or 'nation', a separate people different from other peoples. This belief took form as they developed a consciousness of their own historical identity, which is reflected by a number of histories written or commissioned by Normans.¹ The notion of 'racial' unity, however, was not unique. As G.A. Loud has shown, in the middle ages it was commonly thought that each and every *gens* had distinctive, innate characteristics.² For a people to hold such a belief about itself, it must identify with some tradition, some collective self-image or 'myth', and the Normans were no exception. Therefore, as R.H.C. Davis contends, if we are to understand the Normans, we must discover what their self-image was, for this would show what they thought distinguished themselves from other peoples.³ There are several outstanding modern works that analyze their notion of *Normanitas*.⁴

The Normans were pre-eminently a military people, and marvellously successful warriors. As William of Malmesbury described them, they scarcely knew how to live without warfare.⁵ Their expansion from Normandy, their exploits all over the known world, and their conquests in England, Italy, and the Holy Land have been often chronicled.

To have been so successful, they must have possessed the military virtues—courage perhaps above all—in considerable measure. That the Normans were brave warriors cannot be doubted, and courage played a primary role in their self-image. Indeed, while modern historians have focused on their military institutions, they themselves attributed their success 'to their innate martial valour.'⁶ However, one of the major functions of a 'national' tradition is to distinguish a people from others. Therefore, we may wonder whether the Normans' self-concept included a specifically Norman idea of courage. An investigation of their notion of bravery, in greater detail than it has received to date, may increase our understanding of an important aspect of the Norman 'myth.'

¹ See the Norman histories listed in R.H.C. Davis, *The Normans and Their Myth* (London, 1976), pp. 49-50, 88; G.A. Loud, 'The "Gens Normannorum"—Myth or Reality?', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, iv (1981), 104-16; E. Searle, 'Fact and Pattern in Heroic History: Dudo of Saint-Quentin', *Viator*, xv (1984), 123.

² Loud, p. 111.

³ Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*, p. 49.

⁴ For example, C.H. Haskins, *The Normans in European History* (Boston, 1915); D.C. Douglas, *The Norman Achievement, 1050-1100* (Berkeley, 1969); D.C. Douglas, *The Norman Fate* (London, 1976); Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*; R.A. Brown, *The Normans* (New York, 1984).

⁵ William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 306.

⁶ Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*, p. 7; see also p. 31.

One means of approaching the concept of courage, which shows its psychological structure in some detail, is provided by battle rhetoric. Battle orations form a well-defined literary genre in the medieval chronicles. Harangues to the knights abound in the histories of the central middle ages. Most of these speeches are given immediately before combat, but sometimes a commander has to rally his men during battle. Of course, these speeches are not verbatim reports of orations actually given; they were written years later by historians who had seldom been anywhere near the action. Nor were they simply copied from the classics.⁷ They are, rather, the chroniclers' own rhetorical inventions. As such, they contain the motive appeals the authors thought should have been used, and the persuasive strategies they thought would have been most appropriate and effective to bolster courage in battle.⁸ Battle speeches, thus, constitute a recurrent rhetorical form that concentrates and focuses the authors' concepts of the psychological dynamics of courage.

In the histories written or commissioned by the Normans there are a number of battle speeches from which we can extract a profile of their courage. Some of these speeches have

⁷ One occasionally sees the claim that the medieval chroniclers simply copied their battle speeches from classical models; e.g., B. Smalley, *Historians in the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), p. 20. The only detailed analysis I have found in which an historian attempts to demonstrate such copying is in Raymonde Foreville's edition of William of Poitiers. Foreville believes that William's version of the harangue before the Battle of Hastings is based on Sallust's *War with Catiline*; *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant* (Paris, 1952), pp. xxxix and 184 n. 1. William of Poitiers was indeed well educated in the classics, but there is very little evidence of direct borrowing. Foreville focuses on the parallel claims that they cannot flee, but this *topos* is actually very common in both ancient and medieval histories. As Elizabeth Keitel contends, in a different context, 'similarities in argument could be explained by the extreme situation the battle speeches address. Only so many arguments would be plausible and compelling when asking men to go into battle'; 'Homeric Antecedents to the *Cohortatio* in the Ancient Historians', *The Classical World*, lxxx (1987), 171. This also may apply to the parallels Latouche draws between speeches by Richer and Sallust; Richer, *Histoire de France, 888-995*, ed. R. Latouche (Paris, 1967, 2 vols.), i. 67 and ii. 89. In the second case, he does show the direct quotation of one phrase in a fairly lengthy oration.

⁸ Medieval chroniclers were writing in a tradition of historiography heavily influenced by rhetoric. See R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 1. The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. xx (1970), 173-96. J. O. Ward, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Writing of History in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *European History and Its Historians*, ed. F. McGregor and N. Wright (Adelaide, 1977), pp. 1-10. J. O. Ward, 'Some Principles of Rhetorical Historiography in the Twelfth Century', in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography*, ed. E. Breisach (Kalamazoo, 1985), pp. 103-65. Rhetorical doctrine, however, specified that the speeches the authors wrote, as any other rhetorical devices used, had to be plausible. For relevant precepts from the two most popular texts for the study of rhetoric at the time, see: Cicero, *De Inventione* 1.7.9., and 1.19.27-1.21.30; *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.2.3. and 1.8.11-1.9.16.

been used individually as evidence for the characteristics of *Normanitas*.⁹ But these battle harangues can also be analyzed collectively and systematically for the picture they show of their authors' notions of the psychological structure of Norman courage. Moreover, as G.A. Loud contends, in analyzing Norman historical writing, one should not consider it in isolation but in its total intellectual context, and view it 'against the mirror of the chroniclers of other areas.'¹⁰ That is precisely the procedure to be used here. The Norman speeches will be compared with non-Norman ones to discover what features are uniquely Norman. Since battle orations are a recurrent rhetorical form, they offer a much better basis for systematic comparison than do individual authors' random comments characterizing different peoples. Whether the Normans' concept of their own courage was true is not of concern here. What is in question is only their image of themselves, what they thought they were, or perhaps what they thought they should be, for a people's tradition or 'myth' has a prescriptive social function as well.

I have found in 91 chronicles written between approximately 1000 and 1250 a total of 331 battle speeches that are detailed enough to show the motive appeals the speakers supposedly used. Although not all of the Norman chroniclers wrote battle speeches, many of those who contributed most to the development of the Norman 'myth' did so. Among the totals are sixteen of their histories with thirty-six orations which Norman commanders address to Norman armies.¹¹ Thus, there is a significant number of Norman speeches that can be compared with a very large number of non-Norman ones.

While the battle orations contain some material that is not motivational—simple orders, for example—most of their contents is hortatory. Much of it consists of recurring appeals, rhetorical *topoi*, which give the genre some readily recognizable characteristics and allow us to extract a general 'vocabulary of motives' from them.¹² There are sixteen separate, identifiable appeals that recur with some frequency, and demonstrate what factors the chroniclers thought were important in boosting morale in combat.¹³ In order, from most to least significant, they are as follows:

1. Appeals to the martial, chivalric values are found in nearly half of all speeches. The speaker calls on his men: 'Be brave, show your valour, fight like men.' Closely connected with these virtues is the public recognition they produce: 'You can win glory and honour.'

⁹ Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*, p. 66 and Douglas, *Norman Achievement*, pp. 103-5.

¹⁰ Loud, pp. 104-5.

¹¹ See Appendix A for the kinds of discourses included and Appendix B for a list of the Norman speeches used for this analysis. Complete citations for all the battle speeches may be found in Appendix C.

¹² The concept is developed by C. W. Mills, 'Situating Actions and Vocabularies of Motive', *American Sociological Review*, v (1940), 904-13.

¹³ I discuss all the *topoi* in greater detail in 'Rhetoric and Morale: A Study of Battle Orations from the Central Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), 201-26. That article also includes a number of short speeches, excluded here, which contain orders or instructions but no motivational appeals.

2. Assurance of divine aid: 'God will help us win the victory.'
3. The justice of their cause: 'We are fighting for right, against the forces of evil.' As in the medieval theories of the just war, many different factors could make one's cause righteous.¹⁴
4. Military superiority: 'We are stronger than the enemy, better armed,' and the like.
5. Don't try to flee: 'You cannot escape by running away, you have to stand and fight.'
6. Plunder and wealth.
7. Defence: 'We are fighting to defend our families and country.'
8. The tradition of victory: 'Remember the many glorious victories we and our ancestors have won.'
9. Assurance of victory.
10. Vengeance.
11. The 'nation's' or 'race's' reputation: 'Remember the glorious past of our people.' This is a general appeal in which the speaker does not give specific accomplishments.
12. A few can beat a multitude. The speaker reassures his men when they face a more numerous foe.
13. Eternal rewards: 'Whoever falls in this battle will be blessed in paradise as a martyr.'
14. Crusaders are sometimes asked to fight for Christ or the Holy Sepulchre.
15. 'Follow my example.'
16. On a few occasions, the speaker reminds his men that they have long wanted this battle.

The relative frequencies of these appeals also establish a hierarchy of motives in war. The chroniclers clearly believed that some were more important and effective than others in persuading the knights to fight to the utmost of their ability, to kill and, if necessary, to die in the battle that was about to begin.

The Norman speeches use the same basic motivational terminology, but in a configuration significantly different from the non-Norman ones. The Normans seem to have had a notion of their own bravery that was structurally different from others. If we compare and contrast the relative importance of various appeals—a purely quantitative analysis—and also consider the different ways in which some are developed, we will see some distinctive features emerge.¹⁵ The result, a distinctly Norman profile of courage, constitutes an important element in the Norman myth.

¹⁴ For legal and theological concepts of the just war, see F.H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1975).

¹⁵ See Appendix A for the numerical comparisons.

One of the appeals appears much less frequently in Norman speeches than in the others: the plea for defence. In fact, it is used only once by the Norman historians. At the Battle of the Standard in 1138, Aelred of Rievaulx portrays Walter Espec addressing the Anglo-Normans as they face the invading Scottish army. Defence is a major motive in his harangue. 'We take up arms for our country (*patria*), we fight for our wives, for our children, for our churches, driving back imminent danger. Necessity urges us on.' He reminds them in great and gory detail of the atrocities the Scottish army has committed and warns them 'not to hope for gentler treatment if the Scots should conquer us.' He closes the oration on the same theme: 'Surely we must either conquer or die. For who would want to live if the Scots win, to see his wife subjected to their lust and his little ones spitted on their spears?'¹⁶ In Henry of Huntingdon's oration for the same occasion, attributed to Ralph, bishop of Orkney, defence plays no role at all.¹⁷ Defence was a minor motive for the Normans, of course, because they were usually the aggressors.

Some appeals, however, appear much more frequently in Norman speeches than in others. At the top of the list is the most important motive of all. While 45% of the non-Norman speeches ask the knights to be brave, fully 67% of the Norman ones do.¹⁸ Appeals based on the martial virtues provide the entire structure of William of Poitiers' oration for Duke William at Hastings: 'Now is the time for you to show your strength, and the courage that is yours. . . . If you bear yourselves valiantly you will obtain victory . . . Men, worthy of the name, do not allow themselves to be dismayed by the number of their foes. . . . The vigorous courage of a few men . . . must prevail . . . Only be bold so that nothing shall make you yield.'¹⁹ These appeals, however, are usually very short, often mere one-liners. For example, William of Apulia describes Robert Guiscard praising his men's valour in carrying out their great labours so far.²⁰ The Norman writers do not develop this topic any more extensively than the non-Norman authors; they are just more likely to use it.

If the knights are valiant and fight courageously, they will win public recognition and fame, and this also is an important aspect of the motive appeal. Orderic Vitalis describes the Battle of Bourgthéroulde (1124), in which some of King Henry's knights put down a

¹⁶ Aelred of Rievaulx, *Relatio de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, iii. 187, 189. Davis overlooks the major role this *topos* plays in Walter's speech; *Normans and Their Myth*, p. 67.

¹⁷ Henry of Huntingdon, *History of the English (Historia Anglorum)*, ed. T. Arnold, pp. 262-3; *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon*, trans. T. Forester (London, 1853), pp. 267-9.

¹⁸ The use of percentages in comparing rhetorical artifacts is not meant to imply any claim of 'statistical rigour' for this study. It is merely the easiest and clearest means of showing differences.

¹⁹ William of Poitiers, pp. 182-4; 'The Deeds of William, duke of the Normans and king of the English', trans. in *English Historical Documents*, vol. ii, ed. D.C. Douglas and G.W. Greenaway (London, 1953), p. 225.

²⁰ William of Apulia, *La Geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed. M. Mathieu (Palermo, 1961), p. 178.

rebellion. One of them encourages 'the fainthearted' by pointing out that 'today on this battlefield the courage and determination of every champion will be manifest to all.'²¹ Exhorting the knights who are about to scale the walls of Palermo, Robert Guiscard promises them great honour.²² At Hastings, according to William of Poitiers, the duke claims: 'If you bear yourselves valiantly you will obtain . . . honour.' He then turns to the negative side of this appeal, and warns that if they are not valiant, they will be defeated and incur 'abiding disgrace.'²³

Evidence from the speeches at times seems inconsistent with some common characterizations of the Normans. According to Orderic Vitalis, the Normans 'are all too ready to do wrong;' they 'often become enemies to truth and loyalty through the ardour of their ambitions.'²⁴ By contrast, however, the speeches portray the Normans as more concerned than others to think that they have right on their side. They claim to be fighting for just and worthy causes considerably more frequently than do others—47% against 30%. William the Conqueror went to great lengths to establish the justice of his claim to England, even obtaining the blessing of the papacy. In his speech before the Battle of Hastings the duke stresses that they are about to fight for right and justice. William of Poitiers' version is the shortest; he merely mentions their 'just cause.'²⁵ Henry of Huntingdon and Wace focus on the evil deeds of the English to establish the justice of the invasion. Henry has William remind his men that Harold has committed perjury, and he recalls Godwin's murder of Alfred, brother of Edward the Confessor.²⁶ Wace develops the appeal to the greatest extent. He condemns 'the felonies, treasons and falsehoods which the men of this country have always done and said to our people. They have done much ill to our kindred, as well as to other people, for they do all the treason and mischief they can.' He then dredges up memories of crimes going back some two generations. Beyond the murder of Alfred and the decimation of his men, he recalls the massacre of the Danes on St. Bryce's day in 1002, by order of King Aethelred.²⁷ At the Battle of the Standard, Walter Espce is

²¹Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969-80, 6 vols.), vi. 348-9.

²² Amatus of Monte Cassino, *Storia de'Normanni*, ed. V. de Bartholomaeis (Rome, 1935), p. 279.

²³ William of Poitiers, p. 182; (*EHD*, ii. 225).

²⁴ Orderic Vitalis, v. 24-5. Cf. O. Capitani, 'Specific Motivations and Continuing Themes in the Norman Chronicles of Southern Italy: Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in *The Normans in Sicily and Southern Italy* (Oxford, 1977), p. 41: 'The Normans always fight for a just cause and punish injustice because this is their duty.' The speeches support Capitani's characterization.

²⁵ William of Poitiers, p. 184; (*EHD*, ii. 225).

²⁶ Henry of Huntingdon, p. 202; (trans., p. 211).

²⁷ Wace, *Roman de Rou*, ed. A. J. Holden (Paris, 1970-3, 3 vols.), ii. 159-60; *Chronicle of the Norman Conquest*, trans. E. Taylor (London, 1837), pp. 160-1. While vengeance does not appear as an especially important motive for the Normans, it is interesting to note that both Wace and Henry of Huntingdon seem to have thought that there was an element of the blood feud in the invasion of England. After reciting the stories of the

concerned to establish that the Anglo-Norman cause is righteous on two different grounds. 'None will deny the justice of our cause, since we take up arms for our country.'²⁸ He also assures his men that Stephen, in whose cause they are fighting, is rightfully king of England, contrary to the claims of their enemy.²⁹

During the eleventh century the concept of holy war, as one specific type of just war, was evolving. David C. Douglas stresses the Normans' contribution to propagating the notion, and he uses some of their speeches in supporting this claim.³⁰ The rhetoric is indeed impressive. Their histories often portray them claiming that they are waging war in God's cause. For example, when Robert Guiscard decides to invade Sicily, he tells his men: 'My desire is to deliver the Christians and Catholics from servitude to the Saracens ... and to avenge the injustice to God.'³¹

Promises of eternal rewards appear frequently in speeches to the crusaders, who were engaged in the greatest of holy wars. Of the Norman orators, the priest who preaches a sermon before the assault on Lisbon has a prime opportunity to use this appeal, and he rises to the occasion. Near the conclusion of a very long speech, he says: 'Under this ensign [the cross], if only you falter not, you shall conquer. Because, if it should happen that anyone signed with this cross should die, we do not believe that life has been taken from him, for we have no doubt that he is changed into something better. Here, therefore, to live is glory and to die is gain.'³² Ralph of Caen has Duke Robert of Normandy speak to Bohemond during the Battle of Dorylaeum: 'Either the victor's crown or a glorious death awaits us: there will be glory in either fate, but it will be the greater glory which makes us sooner martyrs.'³³

Spiritual rewards are not limited to crusaders. Bishop Ralph, in Henry of Huntingdon's account, closes his harangue at the Battle of the Standard:

Now, then, if any of you who this day are called to avenge the atrocities committed in the houses of God, against the priests of the Lord and his little flock, should fall in the battle, I, in the name of your archbishop, absolve them from all spot of sin, in the name of the Father, whose creatures the foe have foully and horribly slain,

English crimes against their ancestors, both authors have William cry for revenge. Wace, ii. 160; (trans., p. 161). Henry of Huntingdon, p. 202; (trans., p. 211).

²⁸ A defensive war was just, in the legal and theological theories. However, this is one of the very few military harangues in which a speaker explicitly claims that a war is just because it is defensive. Normally, in developing this appeal the leaders do not even mention justice; they only stress that it is necessary to defend themselves and their loved ones.

²⁹ Aelred of Rievaulx, p. 187.

³⁰ Douglas, *Norman Achievement*, chap. 5.

³¹ Amatus of Monte Cassino, p. 234.

³² *The Conquest of Lisbon (De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi)*, ed. and trans. C. W. David (New York, 1936), pp. 156-7.

³³ Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Hierosolymitana*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, (Paris, 1844-95, 5 vols.), iii. 622.

and of the Son, whose altars they have defiled, and of the Holy Ghost, from whose grace they have desperately fallen.³⁴

Aelred, too, claims that the Anglo-Norman army was promised forgiveness of sins, but it is not part of his oration.³⁵

When waging a holy war, one could also expect assistance from God. In the speeches, promises that God will help them win are of great importance in bolstering courage. Bohemond and his men were once even exhorted directly from heaven. In a campaign against the Greeks, 'wavering uncertainly in the thick of battle, Bohemond called inwardly on God in his distress, and help came by divine grace; a voice from Heaven was heard, saying, "Bohemond, what are you about? Fight on bravely. He who helped your father will likewise help you, if you put your trust in him and fight faithfully in his service." The Normans were revived and encouraged by this voice,' and their foes turned and fled.³⁶ In Walter Espec's oration at the Battle of the Standard, Aelred of Rievaulx uses his considerable rhetorical ability to embellish this promise more elaborately than in any other speech.

Divine aid is at hand. The whole heavenly court will fight for us. Michael, whose church they defiled with human blood, whose altar they polluted by placing a human head on it, will be here with his angels to avenge his injury. Peter and the Apostles, whose churches they turned into stables and brothels, will fight for us. The holy martyrs, whose shrines they burned, whose churchyards they filled with slaughter, will go before our army. The holy virgins might doubt whether they may take part in battle, but they will fight for us with their prayers. Even more, I say, Christ himself will take up arms and shield and rise up to help us.³⁷

The Norman historians clearly included the new ideas of holy war in their concept of Norman courage. However, the rhetoric of holy war, stirring as these examples may be, is not uniquely Norman. These appeals, also amplified most impressively, are found frequently in non-Norman speeches. But their structure, once again, shows some interesting differences. God's help is assured to the Normans considerably more frequently than for the rest: 44% against 31%. But promises of eternal rewards from fighting in the coming battle are roughly equivalent: 8% and 10%. The Normans adopted the new ideas of holy war but they focused, much more than did other people, on the purely military advantages to be gained from fighting in a holy cause. In the battle orations, thus, a general concern for the justice of their cause clearly distinguishes the Normans from others, but the rhetoric of holy war does so only in part.

It is reassuring to soldiers when going into battle to know that they are superior to the enemy in some important way, that they have some decisive military advantage. The assurance appears in the Norman historians' rhetoric much more frequently than in others—39% against 18%. This appeal is particularly interesting because it can take two

³⁴ Henry of Huntingdon, p. 263; (trans., p. 269).

³⁵ Aelred of Rievaulx, pp. 195-6.

³⁶ Orderic Vitalis, iv. 28-9.

³⁷ Aelred of Rievaulx, pp. 188-9.

different forms. The commander can point to his own men and claim that they enjoy some positive military advantage—they are more numerous than the enemy, or the terrain works in their favor, or they have surprise on their side, and the like. At the Battle of the Standard, both Henry of Huntingdon and Aelred of Rievaulx have their speakers assure the men that they are better armed, better trained, better disciplined than their foes. Henry's version uses greater amplification.

They do not cover themselves with armour in war; you are in the constant practice of arms in times of peace, that you may be at no loss in the chances of the day of battle. Your head is covered with the helmet, your breast with a coat of mail, your legs with greaves, and your whole body with the shield. Where can the enemy strike you when he finds you sheathed in steel? What have we to fear in attacking the naked bodies of men who know not the use of armour?³⁸

On the other hand, the leader can point to the enemy and claim that they are mere weaklings, just so many stupid animals, worthless rabble, of no account as fighters. The vast majority of the Norman appeals are of the latter type. In the speeches at the Battle of Hastings this assessment of the enemy is prominent. In the *Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio*, the monk whom William had sent as a messenger to Harold returns and exhorts the duke, telling him that the English are effeminate and sluggish in the art of war. They are just like sheep or foxes terrified by thunder.³⁹ In Henry of Huntingdon's account of the duke's speech, he says that the English are 'a people accustomed to be conquered, a people ignorant of the art of war, a people not even in possession of arrows.'⁴⁰ When his men start to flee, William rallies them. William of Poitiers portrays him telling them that they are letting themselves be destroyed by creatures they could butcher like cattle.⁴¹ The *Carmen* has William tell them, 'You fly from sheep, not men.'⁴²

³⁸ Henry of Huntingdon, p. 263; (trans., p. 268). See also Aelred of Rievaulx, p. 186.

³⁹ *The Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio of Guy Bishop of Amiens*, ed. and trans. C. Morton and H. Muntz (Oxford, 1972), pp. 22-3. This poem has long been the subject of much controversy. For the most recent case against its value as a source for the Norman conquest of England, see R.H.C. Davis, 'The Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio', *EHR*, xciii (1978), 241-61. Davis' arguments were rejected and the value of the *Carmen* defended by L.J. Engels, 'Once More: The Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, ii (1979), 3-18; see also the summary of the discussion following Engels' paper, pp. 18-20. Elisabeth van Houts also defends the authenticity of the poem and its attribution to Guy of Amiens; 'Latin Poetry and the Anglo-Norman Court 1066-1135: The Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio', *Journal of Medieval History*, xv (1989), 39-62. The last word in this controversy has presumably not yet been said. I have included speeches from the *Carmen* since several authorities still accept the poem as an important source. Even if it is rejected, however, using the speeches would not significantly affect the results of this study, for Davis observes that the author, whoever he may have been, 'was aware of the Norman myth,' and it is reflected in the poem; Davis, 'Carmen', 257.

⁴⁰ Henry of Huntingdon, p. 202; (trans. p. 211).

⁴¹ William of Poitiers, p. 190; (*EHD*, ii. 226).

⁴² *Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio*, pp. 30-1.

Geoffrey Malaterra uses, albeit rather weakly, an approach fairly common in classical battle speeches, but most unusual in medieval ones: he makes disparaging remarks on the quality of the enemy's generalship. 'If they have changed commanders, this one is just of the same nation, quality and religion as the others.'⁴³ The two forms of this *topos* can also be combined. At Bourghéroulde, the rebel knights encourage each other: 'See, the flower of knighthood of all France and Normandy is here... . Heaven forbid that these country bumpkins and mercenaries should frighten us.'⁴⁴

One might expect that the Normans' self-image would build up the strength and ability of the enemies they conquered, as a way to magnify their own accomplishments. But their historians do quite the opposite, and only William of Malmesbury notices the anomaly. Concerning the conquest of England, he writes: 'Those persons appear to me to err, who augment the numbers of the English, and underrate their courage; for while they thus design to extol the Normans, they in fact degrade them. A mighty commendation indeed! that a very war like nation should conquer a set of people who were obstructed by their multitude, and fearful through cowardice!'⁴⁵ A common contempt for their enemies, the historians apparently believed, was an important aspect of the Normans' self-image.

Yet, the Normans placed great emphasis on the exploits and victories of their compatriots all over the world. William the Conqueror, for example, would bolster his courage by contemplating the deeds of Robert Guiscard.⁴⁶ In their battle speeches, much more frequently than in the non-Norman exhortations (36% to 10%), the army is reminded of their own past victories and those of their ancestors.⁴⁷ Psychologically, this appeal has a double effect. It recalls a tradition of victory, a record of success that the knights would want to maintain intact. It also reassures them: since they have won so often before, they can do so once again. There are several outstanding instances, ranging from very simple to fully amplified. William of Poitiers has Duke William remind the Normans before the Battle of Hastings 'that with him for their leader they had always proved victorious in many perilous battles.'⁴⁸ Count Roger exhorts his men not to fear those whom they have often conquered.⁴⁹ The monk exhorts William at Hastings: 'Remember your ancestors, great duke, and may you achieve what your grandfather and your father achieved! Your

⁴³ Geoffrey Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis et Roberti Guiscardi Ducis fratris eius*, ed. E. Pontieri, in *RIS*, ed. L.A. Muratori, new ed. (Bologna, 1927-8), v, pt. 1. 50.

⁴⁴ Orderic Vitalis, vi. 350-1.

⁴⁵ William of Malmesbury, i. 282; trans. J. Stevenson, *Church Historians of England* (London, 1854-8, 5 vols.), iii, pt. 1. 216.

⁴⁶ William of Malmesbury, ii. 320.

⁴⁷ For the Normans' general interest in the deeds of their compatriots, see Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*, chap. 2 and E. Jamison, 'The Sicilian Norman Kingdom in the Mind of Anglo-Norman Contemporaries', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xxiv (1938), 237-85.

⁴⁸ William of Poitiers, p. 182; (*EHD*, ii. 225).

⁴⁹ Geoffrey Malaterra, p. 50.

forefather subdued the Normans, your grandfather the Bretons, your sire laid the neck of the English under the yoke.¹⁵⁰

By the mid-twelfth century, when the Norman tradition had been fully developed, the rhetoric of their past glorious victories had become most impressive. In Henry of Huntingdon's exhortation for William at Hastings, the duke reminds his men that victory 'never by any chance or obstacle escaped your efforts.' Some two-thirds of this relatively long speech is a detailed list of Norman conquests, mostly over the French, going all the way back to Hasting and Rollo. William closes this section with a challenge: 'Let any one of the English whom our predecessors, both Danes and Norwegians, have defeated in a hundred battles, come forth and show that the race of Rollo ever suffered a defeat from his time until now, and I will submit and retreat.'¹⁵¹ In both versions of the harangue before the Battle of the Standard, by Henry of Huntingdon and Aelred of Rievaulx, the speakers remind the army of the many Norman victories all over the world. Henry has Bishop Ralph of Orkney claim: 'No one ever withstood you with success. Gallant France fell beneath your arms; fertile England you subdued, rich Apulia flourished again under your auspices; Jerusalem, renowned in story, and the noble Antioch, both submitted to you.'¹⁵² Aelred omits the conquests in the Holy Land, but adds successes over the Manceaux, Angevins, Aquitainians, Sicilians, Calabrians, Greeks and Germans, as well as William the Conqueror's victories over the predecessors of their current foes. He also embellishes several of the conquests, where Henry merely lists them. For example, he dwells on the defeat of the French: 'We saw, we saw with our own eyes the king of France and his whole army turn their backs on us. The best nobles of his kingdom were taken by us, some to be ransomed, some to be bound in chains, some condemned to prison.' Indeed, Aelred goes so far as to claim that victory has been given to the Normans by God '*quasi in feudum*.'¹⁵³ No non-Norman speech even comes close to equalling these extensive and detailed traditions of victory. The Normans, at least when they came to write their battle rhetoric, seem to have been much more conscious than other people of their ancestors, history, and past exploits.

Similar to the record of victories is the appeal to remember their 'nation's' glorious reputation. Here, the appeal is general, with no specific accomplishments or conquests mentioned. Almost a quarter of the Norman speeches, but only a tenth of the others, use this *topos*. Geoffrey Malaterra, for example, has Count Roger ask the army to remember their ancestors and their race, and avoid any marks of scandal on their reputation.¹⁵⁴ At Hastings William of Poitiers has Duke William 'remind the Normans ... of their fatherland, of its noble history, and of its great renown.'¹⁵⁵ As his army flees, Baudri of Bourgueil portrays Duke William rallying them by asking them to show 'the bravery of your ancestors.'¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁰ *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, pp. 22-3.

¹⁵¹ Henry of Huntingdon, pp. 201-2; (trans., pp. 210-1).

¹⁵² Henry of Huntingdon, p. 262; (trans., pp. 267-8).

¹⁵³ Aelred of Rievaulx, pp. 185-6.

¹⁵⁴ Geoffrey Malaterra, p. 46.

¹⁵⁵ William of Poitiers, p. 182; (*EHD*, ii. 225).

¹⁵⁶ Baudri of Bourgueil, *Les Oeuvres Poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil*, ed. P. Abrahams

Nearly three times as frequently as in the non-Norman orations (25% vs. 9%), the Normans are told that it is possible for a few valiant men to defeat a multitude of enemies. In the *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, the monk reports to William on the number of the English. 'Where [Harold] goes he leads forests (of spears) into the open country and he makes the rivers through which he passes run dry!' He then abruptly shifts to exhortation. 'Perhaps you fear the number? But the greater number lacking greater strength often retires worsted by very few.'⁵⁷ Robert Guiscard assures his men that 'God is able to give victory to our small and faithful race over the multitude of infidels.'⁵⁸ Walter Espec tries to reassure the Anglo-Norman knights that 'victory does not depend on a multitude ... but may be obtained from omnipotent God.'⁵⁹ Bishop Ralph expands on this theme:

What have we to fear ...? Is it their numbers? It is not so much the multitude of a host, as the valour of a few, which is decisive. Numbers, without discipline, are a hindrance to success in the attack, and to retreat in defeat. Your ancestors were often victorious when they were but a few against many. What, then, does the renown of your fathers, your practice of arms, your military discipline avail, unless they make you, few though you are in numbers, invincible against the enemy's hosts?⁶⁰

Of course, the Normans' military achievements are perhaps most remarkable for their enormous success with relatively few men. Their historians' battle rhetoric shows how proud they were of their achievements.

With all the emphasis on their innate bravery and valour, on their military superiority over despicable weaklings, on their great string of victories, and on their notable ability to defeat more numerous enemies, the Normans thought of themselves, in the words of William of Jumièges, as the '*gens ferocissima*,' whose enemies invariably turned and fled from the battlefield.⁶¹ It is therefore most surprising to find that almost twice as frequently as others, the Normans are warned not to flee from battle: 25% versus 14%. Robert Guiscard tells his men before fighting the Byzantines that they will find safety only in their arms; if they flee all will be butchered like sheep.⁶² In their versions of William's exhortation at Hastings, both William of Poitiers and Wace give great prominence to this plea. William has the duke warn the men that if they are not valiant they will be slaughtered or led captive. 'There is no road for retreat. In front, your advance is blocked by an army and a hostile countryside; behind you, there is the sea where an enemy fleet bars your flight.'

(Paris, 1926), p. 208.

⁵⁷ *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, pp. 22-3.

⁵⁸ Amatus of Monte Cassino, p. 242.

⁵⁹ Aelred of Rievaulx, p. 185.

⁶⁰ Henry of Huntingdon, p. 263; (trans., pp. 268-9). Cf. one of the maxims of Vegetius: Valour is superior to numbers; Flavius Vegetius Renatus, *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, ed. C. Lang (Stuttgart, 1967), p. 122. See below, note 67, for the use of Vegetius' manual in the middle ages.

⁶¹ William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. J. Marx (Société de l'histoire de Normandie, 1914), pp. 77, 93; cited by Loud, p. 111.

⁶² William of Apulia, p. 226.

And when they nevertheless do turn and flee, the duke asks, 'What is this madness which makes you fly, and what way is open for your retreat? ... by flight none of you can escape destruction.'⁶³ Wace's speech is even more striking. After telling his men that they are the bravest army ever assembled, William continues: 'There will be no safety ... in flight ... You may fly to the sea, but you can fly no further; you will find neither ship nor bridge there; there will be no sailors to receive you; and the English will overtake you and kill you in your shame... Flight therefore will not secure you.'⁶⁴

Here, again, one might expect something quite different in the development of the Norman tradition: that the chroniclers would play down this temptation to flee when the going got really tough, in order to build up the Normans' reputation as warriors. But they do not seem to think it is particularly demeaning or degrading to claim that the brave Norman warriors had to be warned, much more often than others, not to cut and run.

The surprising frequency of this *topos* may reflect several things. It may have had a didactic purpose. National 'myths' have a prescriptive social function; they inculcate standards of behaviour for members of the group. Capitani argues that the Normans valued their histories for the role they played in the education of their youth. They provided young people with 'moral and practical examples on which to model their conduct.'⁶⁵ The warning not to flee may, therefore, be part of a process of 'enculturation,' attempting to build up a belief that Normans are the sort of people who should not run from battle.⁶⁶

On the other hand, the speakers may be reflecting the sound advice of Vegetius' *De Re Militari*, which was the standard military manual of the time.⁶⁷ Vegetius says that a general should never trap an enemy, but should always leave them a way open for escape. If they are cornered, they will fight to the death out of sheer desperation. But if they think they can escape, they will try and can easily be cut down from behind as they run.⁶⁸ Sometimes the speakers may be pointing out to their armies that they are in just such a desperate position as Vegetius describes. Indeed, it is possible that the commanders, on occasion, purposely placed their men in such a situation. Two chroniclers claim that before

⁶³ William of Poitiers, pp. 184, 190; (*EHD*, ii. 225, 226).

⁶⁴ Wace, ii. 161-2; (trans., pp. 161-2).

⁶⁵ Capitani, pp. 18, 23.

⁶⁶ John Benton contends that similar pleas in the *Song of Roland* had an educational function; "'Nostre Franceis n'unt talent de fuïr": The *Song of Roland* and the Enculturation of a Warrior Class', *Olifant*, vi (1979), 237-58.

⁶⁷ C.R. Shrader, 'A Handlist of Extant Manuscripts Containing the *De Re Militari* of Flavius Vegetius Renatus', *Scriptorium*, xxxiii (1979), 280-305. J.A. Wisman, 'L'*Epitoma rei militaris* de Végèce et sa fortune au Moyen Age', *Le Moyen Age*, lxxxv (1979), 13-31. C.R. Shrader, 'The Influence of Vegetius' *De re militari*', *Military Affairs*, xlv (1981), 167-72. P. Contamin, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. M. Jones (Oxford, 1984), pp. 210-2. B.S. Bachrach, 'The Practical Use of Vegetius' *De Re Militari* During the Early Middle Ages', *The Historian*, xlvii (1985), 239-55.

⁶⁸ Vegetius, p. 111.

the Battle of Hastings Duke William destroyed his ships so no one would be tempted to make a run for them.⁶⁹ Aelred of Rievaulx and John of Hexham similarly report that at the Battle of the Standard the Anglo-Norman knights dismounted and left their horses in the rear, so no one would be tempted to flee.⁷⁰

Tactical considerations may also be involved in the frequency with which the Norman chroniclers use the "don't flee" *topos*. In medieval warfare, it was normally prudent to avoid battle. Military objectives could usually be attained without taking the risks inherent in a pitched battle. An army simply retreated when the enemy was near in full force.⁷¹ When a commander chose to (or had to) depart from the typical tactics, he may have needed to reinforce the decision by telling his men that they had to confront the foe this time. The fact that there is, in the chroniclers' estimation, nothing scandalous about indicating that the knights were told not to flee may reinforce this explanation of the frequency of the warning.

These warnings are, in any event, realistic reflections of normal human reactions to battle. In his analysis of the psychology of medieval armies J. F. Verbruggen argues that we should reject idealized or romanticized accounts which portray the knights as totally fearless men with insatiable lust for fighting. The knights were human, with all the normal human fears of death and mutilation.⁷² His conclusions surely apply to Norman warriors as well as to others. The Normans did indeed sometimes succumb to fear. At Hastings, whatever one may think of the accounts of feigned flight, it is clear that there was a real one.⁷³ According

⁶⁹ Wace, ii. 129; *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. E. Searle (Oxford, 1980), pp. 34-5.

⁷⁰ Aelred of Rievaulx, p. 189. John of Hexham, *The Chronicle of John, Prior of Hexham*, in *The Priory of Hexham*, ed. J. Raine, (Surtees Society, 1864-5, 2 vols.), i. 119. Neither of the speeches on this occasion, however, includes a warning not to flee. Having the knights dismount not only made flight very difficult; it also was an important tactical move. See the speech Orderic Vitalis writes for Odo Borleng before the Battle of Bourghéroulde, vi. 348-9.

⁷¹ John Gillingham, 'Richard I and the Science of War in the Middle Ages', in *War and Government in the Middle Ages, Essays in Honour of J.O. Prestwich*, ed. John Gillingham and J.C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 78-91. John Gillingham, 'William the Bastard at War', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill, Christopher J. Holdsworth, Janet L. Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 141-58.

⁷² J.F. Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe During the Middle Ages*, trans. S. Willard and S.C.M. Southern (Amsterdam, 1977), pp. 39-41.

⁷³ There has been much controversy over the story that the Normans tricked the English into breaking their lines by a feigned flight. See B.S. Bachrach, 'The Feigned Retreat at Hastings', *Medieval Studies*, xxxiii (1971), 344-7, and the authorities he cites on both sides of the issue. He concludes that feigning flight was a well known tactic. So also does R.A. Brown, 'The Battle of Hastings', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, iii (1980), 14-6. The issue has apparently not yet been closed: J.M. Carter, 'The Feigned Flight at Hastings Reconsidered', paper presented at the Sixth Annual Haskins Society Conference, November, 1987; abstract in *The Anglo-Norman Anonymous*, (newsletter of the Haskins Society),

to Ralph of Caen, at the Battle of Dorylaeum, Bohemond himself was among the Christians who fled. He portrays yet another Norman, Duke Robert, rallying the crusaders.⁷⁴ According to Orderic Vitalis, on his deathbed Robert Guiscard tried to bolster the courage of his men so they would retain the lands won from the Greeks. But, Orderic adds, 'on the contrary all preferred to turn their minds to making good their escape.'⁷⁵ The Normans, too, were human. Undeniably, they were often brave in the extreme, and were the most effective warriors of their time. But, following Verbruggen's analysis once again, that is no reason to believe that they were supernatural, fearless creatures. It is much better to try to discover how they overcame their fears.⁷⁶ And the battle speeches, with their prominent pleas not to flee, seem to show that, as a pre-eminently military people, the Normans included in their 'national' self-image a realistic assessment of human reaction to battle.

The remaining *topoi* are relatively less important as components of courage, and are not significantly different in Norman orations than in others. One of these, however, merits further notice for it, once again, seems to contradict an important and common characterization of the Normans. In their prime the Normans seem to have been motivated largely by material gain, and were merely grasping for possessions wherever they could find them. Geoffrey Malaterra characterized them as a people 'seeking to grow rich by other means than tending their hereditary fields.'⁷⁷ It is therefore somewhat surprising to find

vi, no. 1 (January, 1988). That there was a very real flight, however, is not disputed. See the accounts by William of Poitiers, p. 190; (*EHD*, ii. 226); Orderic Vitalis, ii. 174-5; *Carmen de Hastingsae Proelio*, pp. 28-31; Baudri of Bourgueil, p. 208. There is a picture of Duke William trying to stem the panic in the Bayeux Tapestry; *The Bayeux Tapestry*, ed. F. Stenton (New York, 1965), plate 68.

There was another incident before the battle began which indicates that the Normans were not completely fearless fighting machines. Several chroniclers report that as he was arming himself, William got his hauberk on backwards. The knights around him thought this was a terrible omen and were afraid of doing battle that day. William of Poitiers says (p. 182) that the duke merely laughed and did not let it disturb him. Other chroniclers treat it as a more serious crisis in morale that required William to reassure his men. Wace, the *Battle Abbey Chronicle* and the *Brevis Relatio* relate that the duke agreed that it could be taken as an unlucky sign, but he had never believed in omens and did not trust fortune tellers. He placed all his trust in his creator. Wace and William of Malmesbury have the duke give the omen a favorable interpretation: it signifies that the duke will be changed into a king. Wace, ii. 163-4; (trans., p. 163). *Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, pp. 36-7. *Brevis Relatio de Origine Willelmi Conquestoris*, in *Scriptores Rerum Gestarum Willelmi Conquestoris*, ed. J.A. Giles (Caxton Society, iii, 1845), p. 7. William of Malmesbury, ii. 302; (trans., p. 232). (These short responses by William have not been included in the lists of battle harangues.)

⁷⁴ Ralph of Caen, p. 622.

⁷⁵ Orderic Vitalis, iv. 32-9.

⁷⁶ Verbruggen, p. 52. Lord Moran, in his classic work, states that courage is not the absence of fear but 'the care and management of fear'; *The Anatomy of Courage* (Boston, 1967), p. 38.

⁷⁷ Geoffrey Malaterra, p. 8; trans. Loud, p. 104. Capitani stresses that none of the

promises of plunder or the wealth and land of their enemies far down in the list, in ninth place, in less than a fifth of the Norman speeches. Promises of plunder do appear, of course, for booty was a normal part of the rewards of a martial career. Wace has Duke William before the Battle of Hastings play on this desire for riches. He begins the harangue by thanking his men for coming with him, and apologizing because he cannot at the moment give them more appropriate rewards. But if he wins, he promises, they will win; if he obtains lands, so will they. Later in the speech, he returns to this theme: 'When we have conquered them, we will take their gold and silver, and the wealth of which they have plenty, and their manors, which are rich.'⁷⁸ Count Roger, before the Battle of Mersmeton, asks his men to behold the plunder 'given to us by God.'⁷⁹ However, the battle rhetoric indicates that plunder was not, in their self-concept, a more important motive for Normans than for others.

This comparison has shown that several appeals are considerably more frequent in Norman battle orations than in others. This is due in part to the fact that the Norman historians wrote more extensive speeches. Many of the longest and best harangues are Norman ones. The orations before the Battle of the Standard and the Battle of Hastings and the priest's sermon before the attack on Lisbon are very long and fully developed. Although non-Norman chroniclers did write full length orations, the typical speech is just a few lines or a short paragraph. Moreover, even some of the shorter orations in the Norman histories are outstanding for the large number of *topoi* the authors include. William of Poitiers' exhortation at Hastings is perhaps the most remarkable of all, for he weaves a marvellous texture of many motive appeals into a relatively short speech. Geoffrey Malaterra also had this considerable rhetorical talent.⁸⁰ Consequently, many of the Norman speeches include more appeals than average, and their overall percentages are thereby increased. This, too, seems to be significant for the Normans' self-image. The Norman writers apparently thought it was very important to characterize in detail the courage and motivation in war of their heroes. Morale and courage were apparently a more important element in the traditions of the Normans than in those of other peoples. The psychological elements which bolstered their fighting spirits received more attention, and perhaps more careful thought, which is reflected in the speeches. On the other hand, the Norman writers were selective; they did not simply use every single one of the available *topoi* more frequently.

In sum, this comparative study shows that the Normans' self-image or 'myth' included a profile of courage for themselves different in its internal structure from that of the non-Normans. Defence played a very small role, for the Normans were usually the aggressors.

chroniclers conceals the fact that the Normans were 'avid for gain'; Capitani, p. 35. Loud mentions 'insatiable appetite for wealth' as a typical characterization of the Normans; Loud, p. 114.

⁷⁸ Wace, ii. 159-61; (trans., pp. 159-61).

⁷⁹ Geoffrey Malaterra, p. 50.

⁸⁰ See Geoffrey Malaterra, p. 50.

On the other hand, although the Normans often seem to have been merely grabbing for possessions, it was apparently more important to them than to others to believe that they were actually fighting for just and worthy causes. Prowess, valour, bravery—the martial virtues—were important to all but above all to the Normans. Yet, much more than others, they liked to know that they were about to fight unworthy and despicable opponents: mere weaklings, unwarlike rabble. It was also more important to the Normans to believe that God would help them in the battle. Consequently, even when they were greatly outnumbered, they often thought they could still win. It was far more important to them than to others to think that they were members of a race that had a long and glorious military reputation, with victories all over the world. They wanted to keep that tradition alive and the reputation unstained. And yet, in spite of all that, the Normans had to be warned much more frequently than others not to run away from a battle. The Normans' notion of their own courage as it appears in the battle speeches thus contains some elements that appear to be highly dissonant. It also, on occasion, contradicts some of the Norman historians' characterizations of this distinct people. However, as Davis observes, 'logic and consistency are not necessarily the strongest features of a national myth.'⁸¹ Indeed, 'the classic anthropological definition of the function of myth is that of Levi-Strauss, "to mediatize contradiction."⁸² And the Norman myth did so in its own unique way.

*Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas*

JOHN R. E. BLIESE

⁸¹ Davis, *Normans and Their Myth*, p. 62.

⁸² Loud, p. 114.

Appendix A

Motive appeals

For these comparisons, I have only used discourses which contain some motive appeal; speeches with only orders or instructions have been omitted. Since this analysis concerns western knights, comparing Norman with non-Norman, accounts of speeches attributed to Greek and Moslem leaders have also been excluded. The chroniclers sometimes borrowed wholesale from earlier medieval works. When they adopted battle orations, except as noted below, they have been counted as separate speeches, because the borrowers were at least choosing to reinforce the appropriateness of the speeches they copied. The Norman speeches are found in the chronicles listed by Davis, Loud and Searle as those that contributed to the Norman 'national' image; see note 1 above. I have also included a very short speech from the *Brevis Relatio de Origine Willelmi Conquestoris*; see Searle's discussion of this work, *Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, pp. 19-20.

In separating Norman rhetoric from the rest, three incidents raise some difficulties. 1) Henry of Huntingdon's account of the Battle of the Standard was later copied by Roger of Wendover, Matthew Paris, and Roger of Hoveden. I have counted the speech and its appeals only once, in the Norman column. 2) The story of Robert of Normandy rallying the fleeing crusaders at Dorylaeum was frequently told. One chronicler, Ralph of Caen, specifically claims that his speech was addressed to a Norman audience. Henry of Huntingdon at least implies that most of those who heard it were Normans. In the other versions, the discourse is directed to crusaders in general. I have included the two speeches in the Norman column, and the rest in the non-Norman category. 3) There are several versions, in both Norman and non-Norman chronicles, of Bohemond encouraging his standard bearer, Robert Fitz-Gerard, at the Lake of Antioch. I have included the various accounts in their respective categories.

<i>Motive</i>	<i>Norman</i> 36 speeches	<i>%</i>	<i>Non-Norman</i> 295 speeches	<i>%</i>
Bravery, glory	24	67%	132	45%
Just cause	17	47%	88	30%
Divine aid	16	44%	92	31%
Military advantage	14	39%	52	18%
Past victories	13	36%	30	10%
Don't flee	9	25%	41	14%
Few can beat many	9	25%	26	9%
Nation's Reputation	8	22%	29	10%
Plunder	6	17%	42	14%

Vengeance	5	14%	32	11%
Promise victory	3	8%	39	13%
Eternal rewards	3	8%	30	10%
Defence	1	3%	45	15%
Fight for Christ	1	3%	2	7%
Here is the battle				
we wanted	1	3%	11	4%
Follow me	—	—	23	8%

Appendix B

Norman Speeches

Several chroniclers chose the same battles for their rhetoric (and this is true of the non-Norman authors as well), but the speeches they wrote are largely independent versions. (Full citations appear in the bibliography.)

Aelred of Rievaulx, *Relatio de Standardo*

pp. 185-9 Walter Espec's harangue to the Anglo-Norman army at the Battle of the Standard, 1138.

Amatus of Monte Cassino

p. 234 Robert Guiscard, after deciding to take Sicily, speaks to his men.

pp. 241-2 Robert Guiscard addresses his army before the first major battle against the Saracens under Ibn al-Hawas, Battle of Enna, 1061.

p. 279 Robert Guiscard encourages an assault party during the attack on Palermo, 1072.

Baudri of Bourgueil

p. 208 During the Battle of Hastings, Duke William rallies his fleeing army.

Brevis Relatio

p. 7 Duke William speaks before the Battle of Hastings.

Carmen de Hastingae Proelio

pp. 16-9 Duke William exhorts his men the day before the Battle of Hastings.

pp. 20-3 The monk sent as a messenger to Harold by Duke William returns and exhorts the duke, just before he draws up his lines.

pp. 28-31 Duke William rallies his men as they flee.

The Conquest of Lisbon

pp. 146-59 A priest delivers a long sermon to the Anglo-Norman crusaders who are about to attack Lisbon during the Second Crusade.

Geoffrey Malaterra

p. 17 Robert Guiscard speaks before a battle in Calabria, 1054.
 pp. 43-4 Count Roger's speech before the Battle of Cerami, 1063.
 p. 46 Count Roger exhorts his army before battle on Mount Turone, 1064.
 p. 50 Count Roger's speech before the battle of Miselmeri, 1068.
 pp. 71-2 Robert Guiscard's speech to his troops on the island of Corfu, 1081.

Gesta Francorum

pp. 36-7 Bohemond encourages his standard bearer, Robert Fitz-Gerard, during the Battle of the Lake of Antioch, 1098.

Henry of Huntingdon

pp. 200-2 Duke William's oration before the Battle of Hastings.
 p. 221 Duke Robert of Normandy rallies the crusaders at Dorylaeum, 1097.
 pp. 262-3 Bishop Ralph of Orkney's speech before the Battle of the Standard, 1138.

Orderic Vitalis

ii. 174-5 Duke William during the Battle of Hastings tries to stop the flight.
 iv. 28-9 A voice from heaven encourages Bohemond during a battle against the Greeks.
 v. 78-9 Bohemond exhorts Robert Fitz-Gerard at the Battle of the Lake of Antioch.
 vi. 348-51 Odo Borleng encourages King Henry's forces, Battle of Bourghéroulde, 1124.
 vi. 350-1 The rebels against Henry persuade the waverers to fight, Battle of Bourghéroulde.

Ralph of Caen

p. 622 Duke Robert of Normandy at Dorylaeum, trying to stop the crusaders from fleeing, directs his speech to Bohemond.

Robert of Torigni

p. 264 Henry II exhorts his Norman barons, 1174.

Stephen of Rouen

pp. 617-8 Rollo speaks to his army before battle against the French.
 pp. 620-1 Rollo, about to attack Rouen, addresses his men.
 pp. 643-5 Duke William's address before the Battle of Hastings.
 pp. 682-4 Henry II exhorts his men before the attack on Chaumont, 1167.

Wace, *Roman de Rou*

ii. 159-62 Duke William's harangue before the Battle of Hastings.

William of Apulia

pp. 178-80 Robert Guiscard's speech before the assault on Palermo, 1071.
 p. 226 Robert Guiscard speaks to his men before battle against the Greeks, Battle of Durazzo, 1081.

William of Poitiers

- p. 98 Duke William encourages his army as he attacks the castle of Mayenne.
 pp. 182-4 Duke William's harangue before the Battle of Hastings.
 p. 190 Duke William tries to stop the flight during the Battle of Hastings.

Appendix C

Bibliography of Medieval Battle Orations
 (Accounts written between c.1000 and 1250.)

- Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia Regum Anglorum*, *PL*, cxcv. 721.
 ———, *Relatio de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1884-90, 4 vols.), iii. 185-9.
 Aimoin of Fleury, *Miracula Sancti Benedicti*, in *Les Miracles de Saint Benoît*, ed. E. De Certain (Paris, 1858), pp. 117-8.
 Alberic of Troisfontaines, *Chronica*, *MGH SS*, xxiii. 900.
 Albert of Aix, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iv. 320, 363, 381 (1), 381 (2), 382, 401-2, 492, 496, 509, 522, 552, 617, 620.
 Amatus of Monte Cassino, *Storia de' Normanni*, ed. V. de Bartholomaeis (Rome, 1935), pp. 234, 241-2, 279.
 Ambroise, *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, ed. G. Paris (Paris, 1897), lines 4948-4954, 6395-6402, 10,390-10,396, 11,123-11,126, 11,471-11,485.
 André of Fleury, *Miracula Sancti Benedicti*, in *Les Miracles de Saint Benoît*, ed. E. De Certain (Paris, 1858), pp. 188-9.
Annales Erphesfurdenses, *MGH SS*, vi. 539.
Annals of Margam, in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864-9, 5 vols.), i. 34.
Annals of Waverley, in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1864-9, 5 vols.), ii. 279.
 Baldericus, *Gesta Alberonis Archiepiscopi*, *MGH SS*, viii. 256.
 Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iv. 34, 45-6, 46, 47, 100-1.
 ———, Poem CXCVI, in *Les Oeuvres Poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil*, ed. P. Abrahams (Paris, 1926), p. 208.
 Bardo, *Vita Anselmi Episcopi Lucensis*, *MGH SS*, xii. 20.

- The Battle of Maldon*, in *English and Norse Documents Relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready*, ed. and trans. M. Ashdown (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 22-3 (1), 22-3 (2), 26-7, 30-3, 32-3 (1), 32-3 (2), 34-5, 34-7.
- [Benedict of Peterborough], *The Chronicle of the Reigns of Henry II and Richard I*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1867, 2 vols.), i. 52-3; ii. 163, 169, 191.
- Brevis Relatio de Origine Willelmi Conquestoris*, in *Scriptores Rerum Gestarum Willelmi Conquestoris, Regis Angliae*, ed. J. A. Giles (Caxton Society, iii, 1845), p. 7
- Capitula de Miraculis et Translationibus Sancti Cuthberti*, in Simeon of Durham, *Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1882-5, 2 vols.), i. 233, 242.
- The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio of Guy Bishop of Amiens*, ed. and trans. C. Morton and H. Muntz (Oxford, 1972), pp. 16-9, 20-3, 28-31
- Carmen in victoriam Pisanorum*, ed. H. E. J. Cowdrey, "The Mahdia Campaign of 1087", *EHR* xcii (1977), 25-6.
- The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. E. Searle (Oxford, 1980), pp. 66-7.
- The Conquest of Lisbon*, ed. and trans. C. W. David, (New York, 1936), pp. 146-59.
- Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronica*, *PL*, cliv. 921, 982.
- Encomium Emmae Reginae*, ed. and trans. A. Campbell (Camden Society, 3rd series lxxii, 1949), pp. 24-5, 26-7.
- Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe (London, 1848, 2 vols.), i. 174, 177; ii. 25.
- Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iii. 375, 392, 401, 409, 412.
- Galbert of Bruges, *Histoire du Meurtre de Charles le Bon*, ed. H. Pirenne (Paris, 1891), p. 164.
- Geoffrey Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis et Roberti Guiscardi Ducis fratris eius*, ed. E. Pontieri in *RIS*, ed. L. A. Muratori (new ed., Bologna, 1927-8), v, pt. 1. 17, 43-4, 46, 50, 71-2, 96.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, in *La Légende Arthurienne*, ed. E. Faral (Paris, 1929, 3 vols.), iii. 88, 206, 207, 213, 232, 232-3, 260, 265-6, 266-7, 269, 272, 277 (1), 277 (2).
- Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral (Paris, 1961, 2 vols.), ii. 168.
- Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, in *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series 1879-80, 2 vols.), i. 113-4, 114-5, 115-6.
- Gesta Alberonis Metrica*, *MGH SS*, viii. 242.
- Gesta Consulum Andegavorum et Dominorum Ambaziensium*, in *Chroniques d'Anjou*, ed. P. Marchegay and A. Salmon (Paris, 1856), pp. 83, 84, 107-8, 119-20, 146-7, 149, 196-7.

- Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, ed. and trans. R. Hill (London, 1962), pp. 19, 19-20, 36-7, 46, 91, 94-5.
- Gesta Obsidionis Damiate*, in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores*, ed. R. Röhricht (Osnabrück, 1968 reprint; originally published, 1879), pp. 109, 111, 113.
- Giraldus Cambrensis, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, ed. and trans. A. B. Scot and F. X. Martin (Dublin, 1978), pp. 42-5, 44-7, 46-9, 80-1, 152-3, 162-3.
- Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei Per Francos*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iv. 160, 161, 177, 178, 227, 235.
- Helmold of Bosau, *Cronica Slavorum*, *MGH SS in Usus Scholarum*, xxxii. 76, 121, 127.
- Henry, Bishop of S. Agata dei Goti, Letter 259, to Pope Innocent II, July, 1132, in *Monumenta Bambergensia*, ed. P. Jaffé (Berlin, 1869), p. 443.
- Henry of Huntingdon, *History of the English (Historia Anglorum)*, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1879), pp. 17, 200-2, 221, 262-3, 268, 268-71, 272-3.
- Henry of Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'Empereur Henri de Constantinople*, ed. J. Longnon (Paris, 1948), pp. 35, 36, 37-8, 39, 41, 42-3, 43-4.
- L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, Comte de Striguil et de Pembroke, Régent d'Angleterre de 1216 à 1219*, ed. P. Meyer (Paris, 1891-1901, 3 vols.), lines 16,137-16,196, 16,277-16,400, 16,577-16,580, 17,219-17,260, 17,313-17,328, 17,337-17,344.
- Historia de Expeditione Friderici Imperatoris*, in *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*, ed. A. Chroust (Berlin, 1928), p. 84.
- Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, in Simeon of Durham, *Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1882-5, 2 vols.), i. 206, 214.
- Historia Peregrinorum*, in *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*, ed. A. Chroust (Berlin, 1928), pp. 168, 169.
- John of Marmoutier, *Historia Gaufredi Ducis Normannorum et Comitis Andegavorum*, in *Chroniques d'Anjou*, ed. P. Marchegay and A. Salmon (Paris, 1856), pp. 302-3, 303-4, 305-7.
- John of Tulbia, *De Domino Iohanne, Rege Ierusalem*, in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptores Minores*, ed. R. Röhricht (Osnabrück, 1968; originally published, 1879), p. 134.
- [John of Wallingford], *The Chronicle Attributed to John of Wallingford*, ed. R. Vaughan (Camden Society, 3rd series xc, 1958), p. 35.
- Jordan Fantosme, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981), pp. 12-3, 14-5, 16-9, 74-5, 92-3.
- Lambert of Ardre, *Chronicon Ghisnense et Ardense, 918-1203 (Chronique de Guines et d'Ardre)*, ed. G. de Ménilglaise (Paris, 1855), pp. 129 (1), 129 (2).
- Leo of Ostia, *Chronicon Casinense*, *PL*, clxxiii. 677-8, 838, 864, 864-5.

- Liber Duellij Christiani in Obsidione Damiate Exacti*, in *Quinti Belli Sacri Scriptorum Minores*, ed. R. Röhricht (Osnabrück, 1968; first published, 1879), p. 161.
- Liber Eliensis*, ed. E. O. Blake (Camden Society, 3rd series xcii, 1962), p. 174.
- Lisiardus Turonensis Clericus, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, PL, clxxiv. 1603, 1606-7.
- Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Series, 1872-84, 7 vols). The first part of this chronicle was written or compiled by Roger of Wendover. The speeches cited here are from Matthew's part of the work: iii. 408 (1), 408 (2); v. 154-5, 219-20, 646; vi. 156.
- _____, *Historia Anglorum (Historia Minor)*, ed. F. Madden (Rolls Series, 1866-9, 3 vols.), i. 85 (1), 85 (2).
- Nicolas de Bray, *Gesta Ludovici VIII Francorum Regis*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, xvii. lines 677-699, 1186-1198, 1501-1512, 1583-1592, 1747-1754, 1763-1780, 1798-1800.
- Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969-80, 6 vols.), ii. 174-5; iii. 314-5; iv. 28-9; v. 60-1, 78-9, 180-1, 348-9; vi. 236-7, 348-51, 350-1, 498-501, 504-5, 526-7.
- Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*, MGH SS in Usum Scholarum, xlvi. 148, 202-4.
- Otto of St. Blasien, *Chronica*, MGH SS in Usum Scholarum, xlvii. 23-4.
- Peter Tudebode, *De Hierosolymitano Itinere*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iii. 26, 44, 56, 109, 113.
- Pierre de Vaulx-Cernay, *Hystoria Albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon, (Paris, 1926-30, 3 vols.), i. 268; ii. 152.
- Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in Expeditione Jerosolymitana*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iii. 622, 660, 698, 707, 716.
- Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson (Rolls Series, 1875), pp. 46-7, 48.
- [Ralph of Coggeshall], *Libellus de Expugnatione Terrae Sanctae per Saladinum*, in *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson (Rolls Series, 1875), pp. 211, 211-2, 212.
- Ralph of Diceto, *Abbreviationes Chronicorum*, in *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1876, 2 vols.), i. 222.
- Rangerius, *Vita Anselmi Lucensis Episcopi*, MGH SS, xxx. 1292.
- Richard, Canon of Holy Trinity, London, *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, in *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1864-5, 2 vols.), i. 69, 104, 207, 225-6, 268, 416-7, 420.
- Richard of Devizes, *The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First*, ed. and trans. J. T. Appleby (London, 1963), p. 23.

- Richer, *Histoire de France, 888-995*, ed. R. Latouche (Paris, 1967, 2 vols.), i. 20-2, 66, 88; ii. 88-90, 202, 284.
- Richerus, *Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae*, *MGH SS*, xxv. 294.
- Robert of Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. P. Lauer (Paris, 1956), pp. 50, 66, 72, 77.
- Robert of Torigni, *The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1884-90, 4 vols.), iv. 54, 74, 264.
- Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolimitana*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, iii. 829-30, 832, 867, 873-4.
- Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1868-71, 4 vols.), i. 82, 84, 199, 200-1, 202-3; iii. 106-7, 112.
- Roger of Wendover, *The Flowers of History*, ed. H. G. Hewlett (Rolls Series, 1886-9, 3 vols.). This is the conclusion of Roger's chronicle, starting with 1154. The first part, which he compiled from earlier histories, appears in the Rolls Series edition of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*. The speeches cited here are the ones Roger adopted or wrote himself. Matthew Paris, i. 216, 222, 279, 495, 497; ii. 64. Roger of Wendover, ii. 213; iii. 84.
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, ed. J. Olrik and H. Raeder (Hauniae, 1931), pp. 44-5, 53-61, 65, 185, 191-2, 218 (1), 218 (2), 398-9, 410, 424, 430, 479, 498.
- Simeon of Durham, *Historia Regum*, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold (Rolls Series, 1882-5, 2 vols.), ii. 78, 150, 152.
- Stephen of Rouen, *Draco Normannicus*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1884-90, 4 vols.), ii. 617-8, 620-1, 643-5, 682-4.
- Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. H. Waquet (Paris, 1964), p. 160.
- Vita Heinrici IV Imperatoris*, in *Quellen zur Geschichte Kaiser Heinrichs IV*, ed. F.-J. Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott (Darmstadt, 1968), p. 428.
- Wace, *Roman de Brut*, ed. I. Arnold (Paris, 1938-40, 2 vols.), pp. 404, 407-8, 491-2, 623-4, 641-8, 650-3, 660, 662-3, 671.
- _____, *Le Roman de Rou de Wace*, ed. A. J. Holden (Paris, 1970-3, 3 vols.), ii. 159-62, 173-4.
- Walter the Chancellor, *Bella Antiochena*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck, 1896), pp. 72, 73, 75, 82, 84, 86 (1), 86 (2), 87 (1), 87 (2), 113-4.
- William of Apulia, *La Geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed. M. Mathieu (Palermo, 1961), pp. 178-80, 226.
- William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett (Rolls Series, 1884-90, 4 vols.), i. 185, 326-7.

William of Poitiers, *Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant*, ed. R. Foreville (Paris, 1952), pp. 98, 182-4, 190.

William of Tyre, *Historia Rerum in Partibus Transmarinis Gestarum*, in *RHC: Hist. Occ.*, i. 132-3, 200-1, 262, 455-6, 583-4, 925.

William the Breton, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, Historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, ed. H.-F. Delaborde (Paris, 1882-5, 2 vols.), i. 273.

_____, *Philippidos Libri XII*, in *Oeuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton, Historiens de Philippe-Auguste*, ed. H.-F. Delaborde (Paris, 1882-5, 2 vols.), ii. 81-2, 85, 167, 185, 186, 222-3, 234-6, 310, 313-4, 315-6, 320.