Undergraduate Dissertation coversheet & feedback form

PLEASE COMPLETE THE TOP SECTION OF THIS FORM AND SUBMIT ONE COPY WITH YOUR DISSERTATION

For completion by student:		
Student Name: James Forder *Student **University** Email: 1701007@student.uwtsd.ac.uk*		
Module code: HPHI6017	*Student ID number: 1701007*	*Educational support needs: No*
Dissertation title: Normanni Troiae: An Investigation into the Usage of Trojan Ancestry in Norman Genealogical Histories		
Supervisor: Dr Ruth Parkes	*Word count: 10,139*	
I confirm that this is my original work and that I have adhered to the University policy on plagiarism. Signed James Forder		
***For completion by the first marker**:* *Comments:*		
First Marker's Mark: Signature:	*Date:*	

For completion by the second marker (if appropriate): Comments:	
Second Marker's Mark: Signature:	Date:
NB. All marks are provisional until confirmed by the final examination board.	

How agreed mark was decided upon—comments for External Examiner: Proposed Mark: Signature of External Examiner:
Final Agreed Mark:

Normanni Troiae: An Investigation into the Usage of Trojan Ancestry in Norman Genealogical Histories

James Forder

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment

of a B.A. (Hons.) in Ancient and Medieval History

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

May 2020

Contents

Abstract 3

Acknowledgements 4

List of Abbreviations 5

List of Illustrations 7

Introduction 8

Sources 10

Literature Review 15

Chapter 1: Content and Subtext 18

Part 1: Glory and Prestige 18

Part 2: Religious Legitimacy 21

Part 3: Criticism and Subversion 26

Chapter 2: Historiography 32

Chapter 3: Historical Developments 40

Conclusion 45

Bibliography

Primary Sources 46

Modern Scholarship 48

Abstract

The Normans first attributed their ancestry to Antenor of Troy in Dudo of Saint Quentin's *Historia Normannorum*, written in c.996-1020. From this, it became a key feature of their identity, both internal and external. This dissertation attempts to determine the intention and purpose of the Trojans in Norman genealogy, how this differed according to the ideology and methodology of the author, and how it was influenced by historical events. By analysing the content of the text, the texts used as a methodological basis by the authors and the historical context, it argues that the political turbulence and the increasing association of noble families with land led to a need for elites to find an ancient ancestral link to their land to justify their rule. The Trojans offered a lineage older than any possible in secular history, making it particularly effective in this regard. The economic productivity increases and resulting increase in urban populations also created a situation where clerical historians, with their Virgillian approach to history, became the dominant form of this myth, at the expense of monastic historians, with their Augustinian approach.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr Ruth Parkes for the guidance and feedback on this project. I would also like to thank Dr Harriett Webster for her module on the Normans in my second year, which started my interest in the subject, and for her book recommendations. I also thank the participants of the 2019 Gregynog Conference for continuously referring to Trojan origins of peoples in their presentations, which gave me the initial idea for this dissertation. Helen Douglas for lending me books and listening to me ramble about my semi-coherent ideas in the early stage of writing this dissertation. Laura Evans for being my "medieval buddy". I thank all my friends at Lampeter for making this such a great three years. Lastly, thank you to my family for the support.

List of Abbreviations

Ael. Rie. *G.R.A.*: Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia regum Anglorum.*

Aug. *C.O.G.*: Augustine, *City of God.*

Aug. *Conf.*: Augustine, *Confessions.*

Ben. *Chron.*: Benoît of Saint-Maire, *Chronique de ducs de Normandie.*

Dar. Phr.: Dares Phrygius, *de excidio Trojae historia*.

Dic. Cret.: Dictys Cretensis, *Ephemeris belli Trojani*.

***Don. Const.*:** *Donation of Constantine.*

Dud. *H.N.*: Dudo of St Quentin, *Historia Normannorum/ de moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum/ Gesta Normannorum.*

Eus. *Vit. Const.*: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini.*

Fred. *Chron*: Fredegar, *Chronicle*

***GND*:** William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum Ducum.*

H.H. *H.A.*: Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum.*

***HRB*:** Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae.*

***Il. Lat.*:** *Ilias Latina.*

***LHR*:** *Liber Historiae Francorum.*

Ord. Vit.: Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

Virg. *Aen.*: Virgil, *Aeneid.*

Wace, *Rom. Bru.*: Wace, *Roman de Brut*

Wace, *Rom. Rou.*: Wace, *Roman de Rou*

List of Illustrations

Figure 1: Sketch of London skyline from British Library Royal MS 13 A III f. 14 r. available at: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal_ms_13_a_iii_fs001r, [Accessed 11th May 2020].

Figure 2: Royal Arms of England (1154-1189), available at: <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b4/Royal_Arms_of_England_%281154-1189%29.svg>, [Accessed 11th May 2020].

Figure 3: Royal Arms of England, available at: <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/97/Royal_Arms_of_England.svg>, [Accessed 11th May 2020].

Introduction

The use of Trojan ancestry is a very common feature of national origin myths in the Middle Ages. The first known use of this was the 7th century *Chronicle of Fredegar*, containing the story of Francus, a descendant of Trojan survivors, becoming the eponymous first king of the Franks,[1] followed by the 8th century *Liber Historiae Francorum*,[2] telling a similar origin story, albeit with some differences.[3] This trend continued into the 9th Century, with the writing of the *Historia Brittonum*, introducing the tale of Brutus of Troy, the legendary founder of Britain, descended from Aeneas.[4] From here, many other peoples claimed Trojan descendance in their own origin stories. Some examples of these include Venice,[5] Scandinavia,[6] and the subject of this study, the Normans.

This dissertation will argue that the purpose of the Trojan ancestry in Norman histories was dependant on the author in question's ideological viewpoint, specifically if they were part of monastic or clerical scholarship. The monastic historians, with their Augustinian world view, used the Trojans as a means of highlighting the Normans' pagan origins, explaining their tendency towards brutality. This contradicts the clerical historians, who used the Trojans as a way of giving their rulers prestige and legitimacy through their ancient bloodline, and their integration into the wider

---

[1] Fred. *Chron.* 2.4-5.
[2] *LHR* 1.1.
[3] For discussion of these sources, see R. Waswo, 'Our Ancestors, the Trojans: Inventing Cultural Identity in the Middle Ages', *Exemplaria*, 7.2 (1995), 269–90 (pp. 269–72).
[4] For an English translation of this text, see *Six Old English Chronicles.* ed. J. A. Giles. (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848). Available at: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/nennius-full.asp> [Accessed 28/04/2020].
[5] Martino da Canale, *Les Estoires de Venise*, trans. L. K. Morreale. (Padova: Unipress, 2009). For discussion of details of Venice's Trojan myth, see A. J. Goldwyn, 'Trojan Pasts, Medieval Presents: Epic Genealogy in Eleventh to Thirteenth Century Genealogical Histories', in *Brill's Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic*, ed. by Robert Simms (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 154–74 (pp. 169–72).
[6] Snorri Sturluson, *Prose Edda, Prologue* 3-5; for discussion, see Goldwyn, pp. 164–69.; H. Tétrel, 'Trojan Origins and the Use of the Æneid and Related Sources in the Old Icelandic Brut', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 109.4 (2010), 490–514.; K. I. Wanner, *Snorri Sturluson and the Edda: The Conversion of Cultural Capital in Medieval Scandinavia* (Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 147–49.

classical mythos. The social and economic developments of the time, such as the increasing importance of cities and association of noble families with specific areas of land, led the clerical historians' work to become the more popular approach among the elites, at the expense of the monastic approach. Therefore, the context of scholarly differences, combined with historical context, led the Normans' Trojan origins to be interpreted and used for various purposes, but with the purpose of prestige and power winning out.

The objective of this dissertation is to determine the intention of and purpose for the use of Trojan ancestry for the Normans at various stages of their development. To achieve this, the dissertation will be split into three main chapters. The first chapter will look at the content of the sources themselves, split into three sections. Section 1 will examine the ways in which the Trojans exhibit prestige and glory, section 2 will consider the issue of religious legitimacy and the third section will scrutinise any examples of possible subversive connotations, and how the Trojans were used as a way to criticise and explain Norman actions of cruelty. The second chapter will then explore differences in historiographical approaches between texts, and how their sources and ideologies affect their reception and use of Trojan origins. Specifically, it will focus on Dudo of Saint Quentin's Carolingian educational upbringing, contrasting with the monastic education of William of Jumièges and Orderic Vitalis. It will also discuss Geoffrey of Monmouth's clerical approach. The final chapter will add historical context for the developments above. It will regard the instability of Norman rule in the recent past before Dudo's work was commissioned, the economic and social changes from the 10th to 12th centuries and their effects on historical scholarship, followed by the effect of the turbulent times from the Norman conquest of England to The Anarchy.

Sources

The first of the primary sources used in this dissertation is Dudo of St Quentin's *Historia Normannorum.*[7] This work is dated around the years of 996 and 1020,[8] and is dedicated to Adalbero, bishop of Laon.[9] Of particular importance to the topic of this dissertation are the first two books, covering the deeds of Hasting and Rollo. The first book opens with a geographical description of the region of Dacia, going on to describe the brutal and expansionist nature of its inhabitants.[10] Dudo next states the descent of the Dacians/ Danes from Antenor, a Trojan survivor of the Trojan War using an adapted variation of an extract from Virgil's *Aeneid,*[11] changing the geography in the *Aeneid* from the Po Valley, to Illyria in general.[12] This is followed by a description of Hasting, a rather stereotypical Viking, who violently persecutes Francia and its church, including the burning of the church in St Quentin.[13] This culminates in Hasting's men laying waste to much of Francia, eventually leading to the sacking of Luna, which Hasting believed to be Rome.[14] The second book tells of Rollo, son of a very successful Viking chief, exiled from his homeland by a tyrannical king.[15] Rollo then receives various prophecies that he is destined to convert to Christianity and win glory in Francia.[16] After setting out for Francia, they encounter storms, destroying their oars, and leaving their destination in the hands of the winds. After Rollo prays, however, the winds subside and his band reach the shores of

[7] Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans,* trans. by E. Christiansen (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998).
[8] E. Christiansen, 'Introduction', in *Dudo of St Quentin: History of the Normans* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998), p. xiii; F. Lifshitz, 'Dudo's Historical Narrative and the Norman Succession of 996', *Journal of Medieval History*, 20 (1994), 101–20 (pp. 106–7).
[9] Dud. *H.N.*, p. 3.
[10] Dud. *H.N.*, 1.1-2.
[11] Dud. *H.N.*, 1.3; Virg. *Aen.* 1.242-3.
[12] P. Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', *Cahier de Annales de Normandie*, 1990, 215–36 (p. 228).
[13] Dud. *H.N.*, 1.4.
[14] Dud. *H.N.*, 1.4-8.
[15] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.1-4.
[16] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.4-5.

Walcheren, Zeeland.[17] Rollo fights various battles against the Frisian inhabitants of Walcheren, before receiving another vision, urging him to cease dawdling and make his way to Francia to fulfil his destiny.[18] Rollo then invades Francia, including besieging Paris, capturing Bayeux, and marrying one of its noblewomen.[19] The king of France then offers Rollo a three month truce, with the condition that, if he converts to Christianity during that time, he will be granted extensive land.[20] Rollo eventually does convert, and swears an oath of loyalty to the king, however ordering one of his men to kiss the king's foot for him, during which he flipped the king onto his back.[21] Following this, Rollo was granted the lands consisting of the Duchy of Normandy. The remainder of Dudo's work consists of the deeds of the following dukes of Normandy up to duke Richard I, for whom the work was commissioned, possibly dying in the same year as its completion.

Two other sources used are William of Jumièges' *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* and Orderic Vitalis' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, from c. 1070 and c. 1141, respectively. The *GND*, like Dudo's account, also attributes Trojan ancestry to the Normans, albeit going further back in his genealogy, to Noah.[22] The narrative of the first four books closely follows that of Dudo's, charting the deeds of Hasting and Rollo, up to Richard I. However, William's account omits the prophetic content found in Dudo. The fifth to seventh books of the *GND* deal with the events up to and including the Norman conquest of England. Van Houts, in the introduction to her edition of the text, is of the opinion that William of Jumièges wrote most of the text before the Norman invasion, and that his account of the conquest was added after.[23] Orderic Vitalis' work however,

---

[17] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.8-9.
[18] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.9-10.
[19] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.11-19.
[20] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.20.
[21] Dud. *H.N.*, 2.28-30.
[22] William of Jumièges, *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, translated by E. Van Houts, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992). 1.2-3.
[23] E. Van Houts, 'Introduction', in *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. by E. Van Houts, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), I, xix–xciv (pp. xxxii–xxxv).

covers history from the life of Christ up to his own time.[24] Orderic's account of the Normans' Trojan ancestry differs from that of Dudo and William of Jumièges, in that Orderic explicitly regards the Normans as a treacherous people, with the account of their Trojan origins following his description of the Normans as such.[25]

The final main source which will be used is Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae,* dated to c. 1136.[26] The first book of Geoffrey's creation tells of Brutus, great-grandson of Aeneas who, after accidentally killing his father with a bow aged 15, was exiled from his original home of Italy.[27] From here, he discovers some Trojans held captive by a Greek king, Pandrasus, from whom he rescues, and gets elected as their leader.[28] Brutus then leads a series of campaigns against Pandrasus, whom he defeats and takes his daughter in marriage and demands a fleet to carry him to a new home.[29] Brutus and his band then sail to the island of Leogetia, containing a temple to Diana, in which he receives a vision of his destiny to settle and found a new kingdom on an island beyond Gaul.[30] Brutus then travels via north Africa and Mauritania to Aquitaine, where he battles with Goffar, the king of Aquitaine, also founding the city of Tours in the process.[31] Despite his military success, Brutus is doubtful of whether he can sustain his campaign against such a large population and therefore decides to seek out his destined land, where he came ashore at Totnes, Devon.[32] Brutus and his men decide that this island should be their new home, and name it Britain, after their leader.[33] Brutus then founds his capital *Troia Nova,* now London on the banks of the Thames, and in the beginning of the second book, splits

---

[24] Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy,* trans. By T. Forester, 4 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853).
[25] Ord. Vit. 9.3
[26] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain,* trans. By L. Thorpe (London: Penguin, 1966).
[27] *HRB,* 1.3
[28] *HRB,* 1.3-5.
[29] *HRB,* 1.5-11.
[30] *HRB,* 1.11.
[31] *HRB,* 1.11-15.
[32] *HRB,* 1.15.
[33] *HRB,* 1.16.

his kingdom between his sons.[34] The Kingdom was split between Locris, who gained England (Loegria/ Lloegr), Kambris who gained Wales (Kambri/ Cymru), and Albanactus, who received Scotland (Albany/ Alba).[35] The rest of Geoffrey's account tells of the history of Britain up to the Anglo-Saxon domination, via the prophecies of Merlin and legends of King Arthur.

Figure 2: Sketch of London skyline from British Library Royal MS 13 A III f. 14 r.

Other medieval sources which will be used to supplement these main sources include the later vernacular sources, such as Wace's *Roman de Brut*,[36] and *Roman de Rou*,[37] from c. 1155 and c. 1170, respectively. These sources adapt the works of Dudo, William of Jumièges and Geoffrey of Monmouth, among others, into the vernacular French and verse form. Other sources of use will be Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*,[38] from c. 1154 and Aelred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia regum Anglorum*,[39] dating from c. 1153-4. The *Historia Anglorum* tells of the Norman conquest of

[34] *HRB*, 1.17-2.1.
[35] *HRB*, 2.1.
[36] Wace, *Arthurian Chronicles: Roman de Brut*, trans. By E. Mason (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).
[37] Wace, *The History of the Norman People: Wace's Roman de Rou,* trans. By G. S. Burgess (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004).
[38] Henry of Huntingdon, *The History of the English People: 1000-1154*, trans. D. Greenway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[39] Aelred of Rievaulx, 'The Genealogy of the Kings of the English', in *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, trans. By J. P. Freeland, ed. by M. L. Dutton (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005), pp. 39-122.

England and the subsequent Norman rule. The *Genealogia* is a tracing of Henry II's ancestry back to the biblical Adam, via his matrilineal line.

The dissertation will also make use of various classical sources which were available to scholars of the time. Firstly, is the two main sources of the Trojan War available to medieval scholars of western Europe, Dares Phrygius and Dictys of Crete's accounts.[40] Both of these sources are said to be witness accounts of the Trojan War from the Trojan and Greek sides, respectively, with Dares allegedly being a Trojan priest of Hephaestus,[41] and Dictys being a native of the city of Knossos, Crete.[42] However, these sources are likely to have originated some time in the 4th-5th Centuries C.E. Another source available at the time is the *Ilias Latina,* a single book Latin summary of Homer's *Iliad,*[43] attributed to Roman senator Publius Baebius Italicus, during the reign of Nero (54-68 C.E).[44] The next classical source is Virgil's *Aeneid,*[45] which has been well documented in scholarship as one of the main inspirations for the narratives of Rollo and Brutus.[46] Finally, of particular importance to the historiography chapter, is Augustine's *City of God.*[47] This text gives, according to Ingledew, was an alternative approach to history, used by those who rejected the Virgillian methods.[48] These sources will give a good indication as to how the sources

[40] Dares Phrygius; Dictys of Crete, *The Trojan war: the chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian,* trans. by R. M. Frazer (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1966).
[41] Hom. *Il.* 5.9, 27; *Il. Lat.* 403.
[42] Dar. Phr. *Preface.*
[43] *The Ilias Latina: A Study of the Latin Iliad, Including Translation, Commentary, and Concordance*, trans. by W. A. Tilroe (PHD Thesis: University of Southern California, 1939).
[44] E. Dickey, *Review of G. A. Kennedy, The Latin Iliad* (Bryn Mawr Classical Review, 1999).
[45] Virgil, *The Aeneid,* trans. By W. F. Jackson Knight (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956).
[46] Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie'; F. Ingledew, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Brittanniae', *Speculum*, 69.3 (1994), 665–704; N. Birns, 'The Trojan Myth: Postmodern Reverberations', *Exemplaria*, 5.1 (1993), 45–78 (p. 49); E. Albu, *The Normans in Their Histories* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001), pp. 12–17, 238; Goldwyn, pp. 154–64, 172–73; R. W. Hanning, *The Vision of History in Early Britain* (New York; London: Columbia University Press, 1966), p. 103; N. J. Higham, *King Arthur: Myth-Making and History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002), p. 124; L. Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997), p. 150.
[47] Augustine, *City of God*, trans. By H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).
[48] Ingledew, pp. 671–72.

available to the medieval authors were used as inspiration for their narratives, and some potential allusions to their themes within the subtext.

Literature Review

Generally speaking, it is agreed among most scholars that the primary purpose of Trojans within the work of Dudo and Geoffrey is to link the Norman and British ancestors to that of the Romans, giving the Normans and British their own equivalent of Aeneas.[49] Ingledew states that Geoffrey of Monmouth marks the culmination of a return to a classical Virgillian view of Norman history that started with Dudo of St Quentin, particularly through the use of prophecy as a driving force behind the narrative, that the Normans were predestined to gain their territory through divine sanction, a view also held by Goldwyn.[50] He also notes a distinction between clerical historians, such as Geoffrey and Dudo, and their monastic counterparts, such as William of Jumièges and Orderic Vitalis, in that monastic historians rejected the Virgillian method, in favour of a more Augustinian approach.[51] He also states that the increasing importance of clerics, resulting from the rise in standing of cities, at the expense of the largely isolated monasteries, largely based on the work of Duby and Jaeger .[52]

An earlier study by Bloch also has similar conclusions to this, saying that noble families required an ancestry that traced back to antiquity to give them prestige and a

[49] R. Cavendish, *King Arthur and the Grail: The Arthurian Legends and Their Meaning* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), p. 27; R. Barber, *King Arthur: Hero and Legend*, 3rd edn (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1986), p. 35; Ingledew; Birns, p. 53; Goldwyn, pp. 154–63; Higham, p. 124; R. H. Bloch, *Etymologies and Genealogies: A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), p. 81; W. Pohl, 'Conceptions of Ethnicity in Early Medieval Studies', in *Debating the Middle Ages*, ed. by L. K. Little and B. H. Rosenwein (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), pp. 15–24 (pp. 20–21); Lifshitz; P. Bouet, 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', *Cahier de Annales de Normandie*, 1995, 401–13 (pp. 401–4, 412); Waswo, p. 272.
[50] Ingledew; Goldwyn, pp. 158–59.
[51] Ingledew, pp. 692–94.
[52] Ingledew, pp. 690–92; G. Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 211–12, 214, 216, 233; C. S. Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939-1210* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), pp. 211–12.

family connection with their associated land as a justification for their jurisdiction.[53] These views are also held by Waswo, who interprets the prevalence of towns and cities as part of the cultural legacy that the Trojan ancestry is said to have given to northern Europe.[54] Shopkow adds to this discussion, by introducing parallels to biblical texts and the life of Constantine, as well as the classical sources.[55] Lifshitz also attributed biblical parallels between Dudo's account and the Hebrew bible's description of the Israelite settlement of Canaad.[56] She also attributes the primary purpose of Dudo's work being the ensuring of a smooth transition of power from Richard I to his son, Richard II in 996.[57] Dalton sees Geoffrey of Monmouth's work having a similar purpose, as a call for peace and unity during the contemporary civil war between Stephen and Matilda.[58] Liu, in her 2011 PhD thesis, adds to this by introducing the idea of the Trojans being used to represent and reflect on the trauma of the 11th and 12th centuries in England, and offer lessons of how to avoid a repeat of such misfortunes.[59]

However, Albu is of the belief that the use of Trojan ancestors for the Normans in Dudo is, in fact, evidence of a subversive subtext, with the Trojans used as a signifier of treachery.[60] Regarding Geoffrey of Monmouth however, she attributes the Trojans as a means through which the Anglo-Normans can assimilate into English society and shed their "burden of Normanness".[61] Although this argument does certainly hold some merit when considering the sources available for the Trojan War, the context of

---

[53] Bloch, pp. 66–68, 80–82.
[54] Waswo, pp. 277–79.
[55] Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, pp. 38, 68, 151.
[56] Lifshitz, pp. 110–11.
[57] Lifshitz.
[58] P. Dalton, 'The Topical Concerns of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae: History, Prophecy, Peacemaking, and English Identity in the Twelfth Century', *Journal of British Studies*, 44.4 (2005), 688–712.
[59] S. Y. Liu, 'A Regnal Genealogy in Trouble: The Trojan Myth as a Traumatic National Historiography in Medieval England' (unpublished PhD thesis, Indiana University, 2011).
[60] Albu, p. 15.
[61] Albu, pp. 220–21, 237–39.

political instability makes it more likely that this was intended as a warning to outsiders against attempting invasion, rather than as a subversive criticism.

Chapter 1: Content and Subtext

This first main chapter will focus on the internal contents of the main sources outlined previously, along with the sources used by the authors of these texts, to determine the explicit meanings and purposes of the use of Trojan genealogy, along with any potential subtext. The first area of focus will be how the Trojan lineage grants the Normans a prestigious status in the narratives, and how this is used to justify Norman rule in Normandy and Britain. Of particular attention will be the parallels between Rollo, Brutus and Aeneas and how this creates an association with antiquity, rather than their Viking history. The second area will involve how the tales create religious legitimacy for the Dukes of Normandy's rule through the use of prophecy and allusions to Christian and biblical figures, to present the Norman dukes as transmitters of the Christian faith to a previously heathen people, and how the Trojan ancestry . The third section of this chapter will investigate the way Trojan origins were used to evoke connotations of treachery and cruelty, and will consider the possibility of subversive content within Dudo and Geoffrey's work.

Part 1: Glory and Prestige

Most scholars would agree that the inclusion of Trojan ancestry in Dudo of St Quentin's account was intended to give the Normans a past rooted in the glory associated with the classical world. Perhaps the most obvious example of this is the granting of the Norman dukes a shared ancestry with the Roman Empire.[62] In many ways, the second book of Dudo's narrative are a condensed and simplified retelling of the *Aeneid.* In both tales, the protagonist is driven away from their homeland by losing a war as a result of treachery,[63] who are destined to found a new homeland, which they reach, via various misinterpretations and diversions. There are also many

[62] Birns, p. 53; Goldwyn, pp. 155–56; Pohl, pp. 20–21; Bouet, 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', p. 403; A. Villing and others, *Troy: Myth and Reality* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2019), p. 189.
[63] Dud. *H.N.* 2.1-4; Virg. *Aen.* 2.

other allusions to the *Aeneid* in the text, as documented extensively by Bouet, such as borrowing of language on the destruction of Troy for describing the ruins of Rouen,[64] and the lifting of a phrase from the massacre at Pallas to the massacre at Luna in book 1.[65] In shadowing the *Aeneid*, Dudo gives the Normans their own hero equivalent to Aeneas, therefore allowing the Normans to imagine themselves as Trojan refugees, rather than a people who gained power through force alone.[66] It also provides the Normans with the prestige associated with antiquity, putting them on equal footing with other European powers, allowing them to evade the inconvenience of their leaders coming from outside of the former jurisdiction of the empire.[67] The parallels between Rouen and the burning of Troy which Bouet pointed out also mean that the Normans' own Aeneas restored the ruins of a city equivalent to those of Troy.[68] This is an example of Waswo's classification of the Trojans as "culture bringers",[69] in that they transformed a previously desolate landscape into a prosperous civilisation. Overall, the Trojan ancestry gives the Normans a justification for ruling a part of the former Roman Empire, through its shared ancestry with that of the Romans, as well as giving them a lineage more prestigious than their Viking history could otherwise allow for. It also gives the impression that the Normans are bringing an ancestral legacy of cultural prosperity.

Geoffrey of Monmouth's account of Brutus origins has similar themes and is arguably an even closer recreation of the *Aeneid* than Dudo. Like Dudo, Geoffrey gives the British a shared ancestry with the Romans, but rather than being descended from Antenor, they are descended from Aeneas himself via his great-grandson.[70] This gives

---

[64] Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', p. 227.
[65] Virg. *Aen.* 10.465; Dud. *H.N.* 1.7; Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', p. 220.
[66] Goldwyn, p. 154.
[67] Goldwyn, pp. 154–56; Bouet, 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', p. 412; Villing and others, p. 189.
[68] Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', p. 227.
[69] Waswo, pp. 281–82.
[70] *HRB* 1.3.

the British an even closer genealogical link to the Roman Empire than other European powers. The associations of prestige and imperial justification are like that of Dudo, shared ancestry with Rome gives justification for control over its former lands.[71] However, not only does Geoffrey give the British a shared ancestry with the Romans, but also the Normans with the British. This presents the coming of the Normans as a return of the Trojans,[72] exhibiting the Normans and British as brothers of sorts, much like how Waswo describes the Frankish Trojan origins as a means to present the Franks as the brothers of the Romans.[73] In the context of the prophecies of Merlin in book 7, the Normans could be viewed as the return of the "red dragon" of the British, driving out the "white dragon" of the Saxons.[74] Dalton interprets the prophecy of the two red dragons as referring to William Rufus and Robert Curthose, sons of William the Conqueror, who succeeded as King of England and Duke of Normandy, respectively.[75] Robert was killed under his brother Henry I's captivity, just as one of the dragons is killed "under the sting of envy".[76] They are then followed by the "lion of justice",[77] representing Henry I, with the reference to the "towers of Gaul" shaking referring to his campaigns to secure Normandy.[78] The reference to a lion is also particularly interesting, as it is speculated that Henry himself used a symbol of a lion to

Figure 2 Royal Arms of England (1154-1189), available at: https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b4/Royal_Arms_of_England_%281154-1189%29.svg

Figure 3 Royal Arms of England, available at: https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/9/97/Royal_Arms_of_England.svg

[71] Cavendish, p. 27; Barber, p. 35; Hanning, p. 104.
[72] Ingledew, p. 687.
[73] Waswo, p. 272.
[74] *HRB* 7.3
[75] Dalton, pp. 696–97.
[76] *HRB*, trans. Thorpe 7.3.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Dalton, p. 697.

represent himself, (fig. 2) eventually morphing into what would become the Plantagenet heraldic symbol (fig. 3). An interesting potential crossover between Geoffrey and Dudo is that Rollo misinterpreted his prophetic vision, interpreting the dream as intending for him to go to England, just as Aeneas misinterprets Apollo as instructing him to travel to Crete.[79] This gives the Normans another link to Britain. By taking control of England, the land of their Trojan ancestral brothers, they are also tracing the steps of their founder, who also travelled to Britain. Therefore, the inclusion of the shared Trojan ancestry between Normans and Britons allows the Norman nobles to consider themselves as the return of the original inhabitants of Britain, rather than simply as invaders. This gives them the ancestral right to rule not only through their association with the Roman Empire and Aeneas, but also as the rightful heirs of British heroes, such as Brutus and Arthur.

From this, we can see that, in the case of Dudo of St Quentin and Geoffrey of Monmouth, the Trojan lineage of the Normans acts as to give them a more prestigious background than their Scandinavian origins would allow. It also gives a shared heritage with the peoples they rule over, allowing them to present themselves as brothers to their subjects, as opposed to foreign invaders and occupiers, helping to incorporate them into local administration.

Part 2: Religious Legitimacy

Another proposed purpose of the Trojan narrative is to instil onto the Normans a religious legitimacy. Goldwyn particularly emphasises the role of prophecy in this regard, asserting that Dudo's adaption of the prophecies of the *Aeneid* into a Christian context gives divine sanction, and guarantees the success and continuation of the Norman dynasty.[80] Shopkow also raises the idea that Hasting was a scourge under God's employment, but lacked the divine sanction to establish a settlement, even

[79] Dud. *H.N.* 2.5; Virg. *Aen.* 3.93; Albu, p. 17.
[80] Goldwyn, pp. 158–59.

pretending to convert to Christianity, a false foreshadowing of Rollo's future conversion.[81] Rollo, however, acts in a way that is divinely guided and pious,[82] such as not staying at the monastery of St Peter, due to its holy location, instead staying at the chapel of St Vedast, where he possibly naively places the body of the virgin Hameltrude on the altar.[83] This culminates in Rollo finally gaining his territory once he finally submits to the Christian faith.[84] What the differences in these two people suggest is that their Trojan ancestry alone was not enough to guarantee the existence and continuity of Norman rule, with dedication to God being necessary to ensure their survival. However, as Bouet explains, the Trojan origins of the Normans does grant them a form of integration into Christian and Latin Europe, more than simply converting would have done.[85] The Roman connections that this gives is also important, as the Roman Empire was the location for the origin of the Christian faith, with its large expanse and inter-connectedness providing the possibility for its spread throughout Europe.[86]

Related to this, Shopkow points out that Rollo's life also mirrors that of Constantine in the *Donation of Constantine,* in that Rollo received divine assistance throughout his career before being baptised towards the end of his life.[87] Rollo also has a vision which mirrors an episode in Constantine's life, where he contracts leprosy, as Constantine did, cured by his baptism, whereas Rollo in his dream is cured by washing in a fountain.[88] Shopkow also points another possible reference to

---

[81] Dud. *H.N.* 2.4-7; Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 69; L. Shopkow, 'The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), 19–37 (p. 28).
[82] Lifshitz, p. 117.
[83] Dud. *H.N.* 2.11.
[84] Dud. *H.N.* 2.28-30.
[85] Bouet, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', p. 231.
[86] Bouet, 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', p. 403.
[87] Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 69.
[88] Dud. *H.N.* 2.6, 11; *Donation of Constantine,* trans. by E. F. Henderson, 1910, available at <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/donatconst.asp> [Accessed 4th May 2020]; Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 151.

Constantine later on in Dudo, when Richard I promises to fight under the standard of the cross,[89] referring to Constantine promising to fight under the Labarum.[90] In imitating Constantine, Dudo presents Rollo and the future Norman dukes as following the actions of the first Christian ruler of the empire that their ancestral brothers founded. In doing so, the dukes can be perceived as divinely ordained purveyors of Christianity to a previously pagan people, in the same mould as Constantine. This would certainly explain future Norman nobles' enthusiasm for crusading, as they seemingly already had a self-perception of being "warriors of Christ", as well as already having experience with fighting as *crusignati*.

Lifshitz also notes that Dudo shares many parallels with the settlement of Jerusalem under David and Solomon, in that they, like the Norman dukes, take a polyethnic community and unites them through association with a territory, and a divinely ordained dynasty.[91] In this parallel, both David and Rollo are the founders of an eternal dynasty once their wanderings come to an end, leading their subjects to their own promised land.[92] Another analogy is that David paid for the land that the Temple of Jerusalem was eventually built on,[93] and Rollo gave a large amount of land to the church of St Mary in Rouen, which became the main cathedral in Normandy.[94] These biblical allusions add an even greater aspect of the religious legitimacy of the Normans. Overall, Dudo's presentation of the Dukes of Normandy is that of a dynasty descended from the ancestors of the first Christian empire, who are destined to follow

[89] Dud. *H.N.* 4.108.
[90] Eusebius of Caesarea, *The Life of the Blessed Emperor Constantine*, trans. by Bagster, available at <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/vita-constantine.asp> [Accessed 4th May 2020], 1.27-9; Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 151.
[91] Lifshitz, pp. 110–11.
[92] 2 Samuel 7: 1, 12-16; 2 Chronicles 13: 5; Dud. *H.N.* 2.5; Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 68.
[93] 2 Samuel 24: 24.
[94] Dud. *H.N* 2.30.

in the footsteps of not only their forebears, but also of the founders of the previous divinely ordained Kingdom of Israel and the first Christian Roman Emperor. William of Jumièges' account of Rollo contrasts, in that he is presented in a much less pious fashion. The most obvious of these differences would be the omission of the passages of Dudo relating to prophecy, but there are other examples of this being the case. For example, the episode where he refuses to stay in the monastery of St Peter, is omitted, while the passage about the depositing of the body of Hameltrude is still present.[95] This is then followed by a description of Rollo being still a pagan at heart, thirsting "like a wolf for the blood of Christians",[96] along two subsequent references to Rollo's paganism.[97] Another difference is that, rather than being appointed as the leader of the Normans by God, Rollo is instead chosen to be leader by lot from his people.[98] William also omits any reference to the granting of land to St Mary's in Rouen.[99] The lack of any prophetic content, and the selecting of Rollo by lot is clearly an attempt to show Rollo as a more stereotypical Viking, who was pacified by his conversion, rather than as a holy figure in God's employ. This, therefore, makes Normandy's success dependent on the Normans following through on their conversion, also making the Dukes of Normandy more fallible and accountable for their actions. Therefore, rather than Rollo being a figure destined to convert to Christianity and lead his people into a perpetual dynasty reminiscent of Roman and Biblical figures, instead he is depicted as a brutal Viking who was transformed into a civilised person through his acceptance of Christ. This, therefore, reduces the significance of the Trojan ancestry considerably. Rather than being a device to

[95] *GND* 2.3; c.f. Dud. *H.N* 2.11.
[96] *GND* 2.3-4.
[97] *GND* 2.5; 2.11
[98] *GND* 2.3.
[99] *GND* 12-13; c.f Dud. *H.N.* 2.30.

indicate a sacrosanct, eternal dynasty, it may have other motives, which will be discussed below.

Geoffrey of Monmouth's tale of Brutus differs in that he does not convert on the founding of his kingdom, instead converting under King Lucius in the mid-2nd Century.[100] The significance of this could be that, by converting on the foundation of their realm, Rollo and his descendants may be interpreted as having a higher status in the eyes of God. Therefore, because the Normans are regarded higher than the Britons, it is right from God's point of view that the Normans should rule over the Britons' land. On the other hand, the British did still convert to Christianity long before the Normans were said to have done, so this interpretation is certainly far from conclusive. Ingledew interprets the lack of immediate conversion by the Britons as a secularisation of Dudo's template of foundation.[101]

However, the idea of the secular nature of Geoffrey of Monmouth is not held by Birns. He points out that, although both Aeneas and Brutus have close relations with goddesses,[102] Brutus receives his prophecy from Diana, a virgin goddess, who could be an allusion to the Virgin Mary.[103] In a 2016 PhD thesis, Ionescu argues that the worship of Diana/ Artemis survived the rise of Christianity in the form of the Virgin Mary.[104] The fact that Geoffrey chose a goddess that has such connections to Mary is certainly interesting if done consciously, and Brutus' piety towards Diana could certainly be utilised similarly to Rollo's piety in Dudo. However, the choice of Diana could just as easily be coincidental, and whether a medieval audience would know of the similarities between Diana and Mary is also doubtful.

---

[100] *HRB* 4.19.
[101] Ingledew, p. 686.
[102] Venus sends Mercury to deliver a message to Aeneas in Virg. *Aen.* 4.26-278; Brutus receives his prophecy from Diana in *HRB* 1.11.
[103]Birns, p. 60.
[104] C. Ionescu, 'The Enduring Goddess: Artemis and Mary, Mother of Jesus' (unpublished PhD thesis, York University, 2016).

Using all the examples above, we can determine that Dudo and Geoffrey likely intended to present the descendants of Trojans as sacrosanct leaders, destined to rule. Dudo achieves this by appropriating the prophetic themes of the *Aeneid* into a Christian context and evoke comparisons to great Christian leaders of the past, alongside Classical heroes. Rollo is presented as an agent of God whose destiny to rule is finally accomplished when he adopts Christianity. William of Jumièges however, attaches none of this sacred destiny to the Trojan people, instead making Norman rule dependant on their Christian piety, rather than being guaranteed by their descent. Geoffrey though, does evoke the prophetic nature of Dudo and Virgil for the British kings, but likely does not attach any Christian themes to such prophecies. In the context of the prior work of Dudo, this could be an indication that, as Rollo's destiny was ordained by God, and his conversion was a fundamental part of his dynasty's foundation, the Norman nobility's divine nature places them above the heathen prophecies of the British kings. This therefore gives the Normans greater religious legitimacy, over that of the British.

Part 3: Criticism and Subversion

The closing matter that this chapter will consider is the way the Trojans could reflect poorly on the Normans. Firstly, the most obvious example of this is contained within Orderic Vitalis. On one hand, Orderic describes William the Conqueror as a pious, church-building leader, who was justified in their conquest of England by the perjury of Harold Godwinson.[105] The remaining Norman nobles meanwhile, are presented as brutal and insolent, ignoring the King's pleas for tolerance, leading the English to rebel against their lords.[106] William's response to this rebellion was swift and harsh, but he does offer pardon to those who repent.[107] The rebellions continue however,

[105] Ord. Vit. 4.1.
[106] Ord. Vit. 4.3-4.
[107] Ord. Vit. 4.4.

forcing the Normans to fortify themselves in newly built castles.[108] Nevertheless, the revolts continued, forcing William to viciously crush the rebellions, particularly in York, in Orderic's words:

> Never did William commit so much cruelty; to his lasting disgrace, he yielded to his worst impulse, and set no bounds to his fury, condemning the innocent and the guilty to a common fate.[109]

After these campaigns, Orderic resumes his depiction of William as a pious patron of the church, focussing on his funding of churches and founding of monasteries, and how the Normans eventually integrated themselves into English communities amicably.[110] Eventually however, the lords again found themselves acting as tyrants.[111] Later, in book 9 of his text, Orderic discusses the ethnic origins of the Normans, describing them as:

> a turbulent race, and, unless restrained by a firm government, are always ready for mischief. In all societies wherever they are found, they struggle for the mastery, and disregarding all the sanctions of truth and good faith, are incessantly actuated by a fiery ambition.[112]

He then outlines the origins of the Trojans and how the Normans descend from Antenor, adding that they inherited the warmongering and fierceness of their Trojan ancestors to his day.[113] In placing the discussion of ancestry within this wider dialogue about the Normans' unstable and fierce nature, the Trojans are used more as a signifier of cruelty and destruction, rather than nobility.[114] In many ways, Orderic's William the Conqueror represents an inverse of Dudo's and, to an extent, William of Jumièges' Rollo, in that a pious and tolerant leader becomes a brutal tyrant, corrupted

---

[108] Ibid.
[109] Ord. Vit. 4.5. trans. Forester
[110] Ord. Vit. 4.6-7.
[111] Ord. Vit. 4.8.
[112] Ord. Vit. 9.3. trans. Forester
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ingledew, p. 692; Albu, p. 194.

by his heathen bloodline, rather than a heathen who becomes pious with a noble bloodline. It also leads to the conclusion that, unless this heathen tendency for violence is held in check by strong leadership, chaos and desolation are an inevitable outcome.

Although the previous sections have illustrated the ways in which the Trojans represent a noble and grandiose origin for the Normans, this idea of them being a representation of chaos and violence may have been part of the narrative from the beginning. Albu makes a particularly firm case for this, arguing that rather than intending to honour the Normans, Dudo was in fact merely pretending; the Trojan ancestry of the Normans in fact acted as a warning of a predisposition towards treachery.[115] When the available sources for the Trojan War are taken into account, this argument certainly does hold some merit. The choice of Antenor as the progenitor of the Normans especially indicates this. In both Dares' and Dictys' accounts of the Trojan War, Antenor, along with Aeneas, betray their people by allowing the Greeks into Troy to save themselves and their families, thus being presented as cowardly traitors.[116] In linking the Normans to such a figure, although it may seem that the Trojan origins are a signifier of glory and destiny, the presentation of their ancestor in the available classical sources on the Trojan War paints a very different picture of the Normans as descendants of a traitor.

The future representation of the descendance in William of Jumièges does appear to follow on from this, stating that Antenor was "forced to flee by his betrayal".[117] This, according to Albu, reaffirms the reputation of Antenor as a traitor, and that William understood Dudo's implication of the Normans' bloodline predisposing them to treachery.[118] Orderic's presentation of the Trojan origins explained above is possibly

[115] Albu, p. 15.
[116] Dar. Phr. 39-42; Dict. Cret. 4.22.
[117] *GND* 1.3; Albu, p. 63.
[118] Albu, p. 63.

further evidence that this interpretation became widespread enough to allow the previous subtext to be submitted explicitly. Orderic seems to confirm that he indeed interpreted Dudo's presentation of the Normans in this way, writing that Dudo "Wrote with care concerning the arrival of the Normans and their barbarous cruelty".[119] This shows that there certainly was a reception of Dudo among at least some, that he did in fact intend for the Trojan Norman origin to be interpreted as evidence of treachery and barbarism.

The depiction of the fall of Antioch in the First Crusade, led by the Norman prince Bohemund of Taranto, is also very reminiscent of Antenor's betrayal of Troy. In this episode, one of the guards of the city gates is befriended by Bohemund, who allows the besieging army into the city at night.[120] Bohemund then takes personal control of Antioch, rather than ceding control to the Byzantine Empire, as were the terms of an oath made upon departure.[121] In presenting the fall of Antioch in this way, Bohemund is taking back Antioch in a way that resembles the way the Greeks took his distant ancestors' home city, albeit in the equivalent role of the Greeks, while repeating the theme of betrayal and treachery that echoes throughout his dynasty's history.

Henry of Huntingdon also illustrates the Normans as savage people, writing that God specifically chose the Normans to wipe out the English because nobody else could surpass them in savagery and they could not help but act brutally.[122] The description of them being chosen by God to destroy the English is interesting, as it echoes Dudo's description of Hasting as being the "scourge of God". This once again shows that the

---

[119] Ord. Vit. 6.10. p.298.

[120] *Gesta Francorum*, trans. by A. C. Krey, in *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921), p.p. 151-53; Raymond D'Aguiliers, trans. by A. C. Krey, in *The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921), p.p. 153-5.

[121] For accounts of the oath, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiad* 10.11; *Gesta Francorum*, trans. Krey (1921) p.p. 93-4.

[122] H.H. *H.A.* 2.38.

bloodline of the Normans is tainted by an urge towards violence. However, this predisposition has a use in God's divine plan, for punishing sin.

According to these interpretations, the barbarous representation of the Normans led to a desire for the Anglo-Norman elites to disassociate themselves from their Norman past by time of Geoffrey of Monmouth.[123] Over time, the Normans assimilated into the peoples and cultures they conquered. The association of cruelty with the Normans in England led to a need for the elites to find a way to incorporate themselves into Britain, escaping the burden of their Normanness.[124] In this interpretation, the shared Trojan origins of the Normans and British established in Geoffrey of Monmouth allows the Normans to come to terms with their roots as Trojans, but instead allow them to embrace the British identity without having to change the fundamentals of their background. However, there are some manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth, which are paired with Dares and/ or Dictys, which could have been included as a potential reminder of Aeneas' treachery.[125]

Although, just because future historians may have interpreted the Trojan roots of the Normans as a source of cruelty and disloyalty, this does not mean Dudo himself thought of it that way. Though there is certainly evidence that the use of Antenor is used to evoke connotations of brutality, particularly expressed through Hasting, this does not necessarily indicate any denunciation of Norman rule. Instead, it could be intended as a warning aimed towards potential enemies that the Normans,[126] though just in their rule and ordained by God, are a people of great military prowess, and will stubbornly resist any attempt at conquest. This presentation is particularly prevalent in the account of Rollo's submission to France. In technically submitting to the king by

[123] Albu, pp. 220–21.
[124] Albu, pp. 237, 239.
[125] NLW MS 13210D; British Library Stowe MS 56; see Liu, p. 21 for discussion of the association of Aeneas with treachery.
[126] Albu does acknowledge the idea that this was a warning to the Normans' enemies, but presenting it a "sinister cast", rather than an indication of military prowess (p. 15).

having a subordinate kiss his foot, but flipping the king in the process, Rollo is showing that, although they are allies, they should not be treated as inferiors. With this, the Trojans act as an indicator of strength and military prowess, a way of giving the Normans a background that exhibits classical prestige, while putting fear into their enemies from the warning of brutality.

To summarise this chapter, the Normans' Trojan ancestry was presented in different ways by different authors. Dudo of St Quentin uses the Trojans as an indicator of prestige and prophetic destiny, with a subtext warning their enemies against their violent nature. This subtext was then picked up by future historians, such as William of Jumièges, the author of the *Gesta Francorum* and Orderic Vitalis, who either directly or through allusions, used their ancestry to indicate a tendency towards treachery, supported by the depiction of Antenor in Dares and Dictys. This led to a widespread perception of Normans as inherently vicious people, creating a difficulty for the Normans to claim to legitimacy. Geoffrey of Monmouth's use of the Trojan origins for the British helped to overcome this problem, by giving the Anglo-Norman elites a way to create commonality with the people they governed, thus allowing them to incorporate themselves into their community. However, the reasons why certain ideas were represented and interpreted in different ways is not expressed in the text alone. The next two chapters will add some extra context, both historiographically and in historical context, to determine how different approaches to history affected intention and reception, and how historical developments led to certain approaches becoming more widespread.

Chapter 2: Historiography

This chapter will determine the historiographical approaches of the authors in question, and how this influenced the presentation of Trojan ancestry in Norman histories. Of particular note will be the differences between clerical historians, such as Dudo and Geoffrey, and monastic historians, such as William of Jumièges and Orderic. This chapter will argue that the differences in historiography led clerical historians to be more inclined to utilise Virgil's *Aeneid*, whereas the monastic historians were more inclined to base their methods on Augustine's *City of God.* These differences led to the clerical historians using Trojan ancestry in a way that represents the Normans as inheritors of antiquity, whereas the monastic historians used them to represent a warning against the dangers of earthly power, and the importance of devotion to God. However, this chapter will also show that it is not entirely clear cut in this way, and that Augustinian themes can also be found within the clerical histories.

Prior to Dudo, the writing of history was a primarily monastic affair, mainly using Augustine's *City of God* as a template for their approach, with the works of Virgil not seen in a particularly positive light.[127] Even clerical figures who wrote history, such as Gregory of Tours had a negative view of Virgil, referring to his work as "lies".[128] Augustine, who shared this view repudiation of Virgil,[129] responded with *City of God*. This provided an alternative view of history, imbued with the values of Christianity. In *City of God,* Augustine attempts to demonstrate the folly of the Romans trusting in the same gods which failed to protect Troy from destruction, thereby negating the idea of a prophetic destiny of the Romans to rule.[130] The destruction of Troy is thereby

[127] Ingledew, p. 671.
[128] Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Martyrs,* trans. by R. Van Dam, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004), *preface,* p. 1.
[129] Aug. *Conf.* 1.13-15.
[130] Aug. *C.O.G.* 1.4, 3.1-8; Ingledew, p. 671.

presented as an example of the perils of earthly pride, rather than as a moment of divine intervention.[131] Instead, Augustine says that to obtain the "Empire without end",[132] one must be dedicated to God, who truly has the authority to bestow such power.[133] For this reason, the only genealogy worthy of being honoured is that of the spiritual lineage, descended from Noah and Seth.[134]

Dudo of Saint Quentin, on the other hand, marked the early stages of a turn from the prevalence of monastic historiography, toward that of clerical historiography in Norman history writing.[135] Dudo himself was dean of St Quentin, dedicating his work to bishop Adalbero of Laon.[136] This put him within the clerical system of the church, giving him a different scholarly and ideological background to that of the monastic historians. His dedication to the bishop Adelbero suggests that he desired to incorporate himself into the episcopal culture,[137] with Adalbero being a well respected scholar of the Carolingian tradition, and a member of a powerful family in Lorraine and the Ardennes regions.[138] From this, we can gather that Dudo was likely educated in the traditional Carolingian method, probably at Liège, a rather conservative institution in its teaching.[139] This means that his curriculum while studying would have consisted primarily of the *Aeneid* and hagiographies.[140] This Carolingian curriculum would be a good explanation for the variety of parallels to the *Aeneid* and biblical and Christian figures noted in chapter 1. In writing his history, he emulated and combined the styles and themes of the works he familiarised himself with during his education. Specifically, he took the themes of prophecy and divine lineage from

---

[131] Ingledew, p. 672.
[132] Virg. *Aen.* 1.278.
[133] Aug. *C.O.G.* 2.29; Bouet, 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', p. 403.
[134] Aug. *C.O.G.* 15.20; Ingledew, p. 672.
[135] Ingledew, p. 689.
[136] Dud. *H.N.* p. 3
[137] Ingledew, p. 689.
[138] Lifshitz, p. 107.
[139] Shopkow, 'The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin', p. 25; Shopkow, *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, p. 146.
[140] Shopkow, 'The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin', p. 24.

the *Aeneid* and combined it with the deeds and piety of saints expressed in the hagiographies. The use of prophecy in Virgil and Dudo presents a situation in which history is inevitable and realised, rather than made.[141] This combined with the influence of hagiographies, creates a history in which the success of the Normans is guaranteed by the prophecies associated with their bloodline, and the dukes act the agents of this divine will through their saintly actions.

There is also the possibility that some of the *Aeneid* references in Dudo's works may have been derived second-hand from other sources. Shopkow for example, says that although the theme of the storm in 2.8 echoes Virgil, it more closely follows the language of a storm in Heiric's *Miracula sancti germani,*[142] suggesting that Dudo followed Heirc's reference to Virgil, rather than quoting Virgil directly.[143] This could also be an indication, however, that Dudo used the references to Virgil in hagiographies as inspiration to create a work that more closely follows the original thematically, and perhaps thought Heiric's use of language was particularly effective in that passage. Overall though, it is clear that, inspired by his Carolingian training, Dudo chose to present the Dukes of Normandy as saintly figures, similar to the hagiographies he was exposed to,[144] combining this with the themes of prophecy and migration he found in Virgil, which he felt was a good way to incorporate the Normans' foreign origins. Dudo's Carolingian education meant that he was also likely familiar with Frankish works such as the *Chronicle of Fredegar*,[145] which previously used Trojans for the origins of the Franks. Therefore, he was likely emulating the origin stories he was familiar with, using the template of the texts that comprised his education.

---

[141] Ingledew, p. 671.
[142] Heiric of Auxerre, *Miracula sancti germani,* in *Poetae latini aevi Carolini,* vol 3, (Hannover, 1886), p.p. 421-517, 420.377ff.
[143] Shopkow, 'The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin', p. 23.
[144] Shopkow, 'The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin', p. 30.
[145] N. Webber, *The Evolution of Norman Identity: 911-1154* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005), p. 27.

William of Jumièges though, was a monk of the abbey of Jumièges.[146] This means that he likely followed the methodology of Augustine, as described above. It is therefore no wonder that William read some sinister implications from Dudo's inclusion of Trojans into the equation, and why he extended his genealogical tracing back to Noah, following Augustine's example.[147] Therefore, rather than indicating that William understood Dudo's true implications,[148] it is likely that this was simply from using a differing ideological framework which rejected the Virgillian tendencies of his predecessor. The elimination of the prophetic passages and the emphasis of the pagan nature of the Normans before conversion is also evidence of this ideological difference. From the Augustinian perspective, the Normans prior to conversion were putting their faith in the same gods that failed their ancestors, all the way back to the Trojans, which negates these prophecies just as it did for the Romans.[149] This makes the prophetic content of Dudo utterly useless according to William's methodology. In William's narrative, it is only through devotion to God that they gained their realm, taking a first step towards Augustine's advice in 2.29. The continuity of Norman control is therefore dependent on the piety of its leaders and population, rather than being pre-ordained. It is clear though, that the idea of the Normans being of Trojan origin must have been rather widespread in discourse beyond the intellectual elite for it to be included in William's work.[150] Therefore, it would have been rather foolish for William to omit the Trojan origins from the narrative entirely. For this reason, he decided to use the Trojans as a way to demonstrate the Normans' pagan past and the breaking of the cycle of destruction of his ancestors by accepting Christianity. Thus, William offered a more theologically sound adaptation, removing the prophetic

[146] *GND, epistola.*
[147] *GND* 1.2-3; Aug. *C.O.G.* 15.20.
[148] Albu, p. 63.
[149] Aug. *C.O.G.* 1.4; 3.1-8
[150] Albu, p. 63.

verses, instead placing the importance regarding the perpetuation of the Norman dynasty on their faith. This work proved to be the most widely circulated of the Norman histories, so this adaptation clearly had appeal.[151]

By the time of Geoffrey of Monmouth however, the Virgillian tendencies found in Dudo re-emerged. Like Dudo and Virgil, the inclusion of prophecy also adds a sense of inevitability to the historical narrative. According to Birns, the inclusion of the Trojans is, in a way, a reaction to the monastic historians; by splitting the British Trojan ancestry from Aeneas before the foundation of Rome, Geoffrey tried to avoid the problems with the discrepancy between empire and church.[152] By separating Britain's Trojan ancestry from Rome's earlier, Geoffrey does not associate the failures of Rome to Britain. However, if this truly was what Geoffrey was attempting to achieve, he did a rather poor job of it. In Augustine's model, the prophecies made to Brutus are still negated by his receiving it from a pagan goddess, still putting his trust in his ancestral gods.[153] For this reason, Birns' argument here is rather unconvincing. Instead, it is more likely that the Virgillian model just had such an appeal to Geoffrey, that he did not feel the need to wrap up the foundation of Britain in Christian moralism, as Dudo did. The popularity of the Trojans in vernacular works, such as those of Wace and Benoît,[154] certainly shows that the idea of Trojan origins without an overtly Christian theme was accepted by the 12th century. The fact that Henry II commissioned Wace and Benoît to write these works also suggests that this approach was preferred over the more theological monastic approach.[155] Therefore, Geoffrey of Monmouth in some ways was signalled a full acceptance of Virgil's prophetic approach to history among the nobility.

---

[151] Albu states that there are 47 existing manuscripts (p. 51), while Webber attributes 47 (p. 24).
[152] Birns, p. 53.
[153] Aug, *C.O.G.* 1.4, 3.1-8.
[154] Wac, *Rom. Rou.*; Ben. *Chron.* 645-650.
[155] Ingledew, p. 694; J. Rajsic, 'Looking for Arthur in Short Histories and Genealogies of England's Kings', *The Review of English Studies*, 68.285 (2017), 448–70 (p. 448).

Meanwhile, there appeared to be a response to this from some monastic scholars of the period. Orderic, like William of Jumièges, does include the Trojan genealogy of the Normans, but also goes back further, albeit to Scythians rather than to Noah, referring to them as *feroci gente* (wild/ fierce people) .[156] Ingledew interprets this as echoing the anti-imperialism of Augustine, intended as a response to the clerical works of his time.[157] This description of the Normans' ancestry as *feroci,* and using it as an explanation for their brutality is another example of the rejection of the prophetic associations the Trojan descendants have with the Virgillian method. Instead, the emphasis on the piety of William the Conqueror acts as the true reason for the Normans' successful conquest of England, as the framework of Augustine sets out.[158] Therefore, the Anglo-Norman people should not look to their wild, pagan ancestors to find any justification for their rule, and instead act as an example through spiritual devotion to ensure their reign continues.

Another possible example of a monastic reaction is Aelred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, which traces Henry II's ancestry to Adam through his Anglo-Saxon, matrilineal line, avoiding any classical associations.[159] Ingledew interprets this as a desperate attempt to arrive at the bible, indicating that this allegedly desperate strategy means that this cause was already lost.[160] The imminent works of Wace and Benoît suggest that the Trojan origins had certainly drawn enough of an interest to justify the production of vernacular works about it. However, this does also mean that knowledge of the Trojan origins of the Normans and Britons would have been so widespread that emphasising it in his genealogy would have been rather futile. Aelred does also acknowledge that Henry had noble blood on both sides.[161] Consequently,

---

[156] Ord. Vit. 9.3. (This phrase is translated as "barbarous tribes" by Forester).
[157] Ingledew, p. 692.
[158] Ord. Vit. 4.6-7; Aug. *C.O.G.* 2.29.
[159] Ael. Rie. *Gen. Reg. Ang;* Ingledew, pp. 693–94.
[160] Ingledew, p. 694.
[161] Ael. Rie. *Gen. Reg. Ang.* 1.

rather than being a desperate attempt to discredit the idea of Trojan origins, he could have just intended to examine another, more neglected genealogy, to demonstrate how his ancestry combines both the Anglo-Saxon biblical ancestry, alongside the classical Norman ancestry, thus presenting him as a perfect representative for uniting his people.[162]

This distinction though, was not entirely clear cut. Robert of Torigni, a very high ranking monk, holding positions of prior at Bec and eventually abbot at Mont Saint-Michel, amended William of Jumièges' work by adding the prophetic content of Dudo into the *gesta.*[163] This shows that, even among some in the monastic elite, there was an increasing acceptance of Virgillian allusions. Robert however, was likely more interested in the chronology and organisation of historical events than in any moral or ideological messages.[164] Therefore, he may have been less concerned about the prophetic elements in works such as Dudo and Geoffrey interfering with any theological positions. Thus, although the distinction between monastic and clerical historiography is certainly useful, and does signify some methodological and ideological differences, it is important not to over-generalise and to consider each individual author's background, as well as which groups they belonged to.

On the whole, although it is important not to oversimplify, the time from Dudo of St Quentin up to the 12th century was marked by a clash of historiographical methods. Generally speaking, histories written by clerics took inspiration from Virgil and hagiographies, making their histories an example of prophesised history being made through the actions of divinely chosen figures. In this, the Trojans act as a means to

---

[162] Another example of this would be in Aelred of Rievaulx, 'The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor', in *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works,* trans. By J. P. Freeland, ed. by M. L. Dutton (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005), pp. 271-280, *Prologue,* p. 127.

[163] Robert of Torigni, *Gesta Normannorum Ducum,* trans. by E. Van Houts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 2.2-9.

[164] M. Gibson, 'History at Bec in the Twelfth Century', in *He Writing of History in the Middle Ages; Essays Presented to Richard William Southern,* ed. by R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 167–86 (p. 176).

emulate Virgil's model of a divine bloodline. Monastic historians on the other hand, rejected this in favour of the approach of Augustine, who rebuffed this idea, placing the importance onto the devotion of leaders and their people to God, considering the idea of prophecy a pagan folly. In this branch of historiography, the continuation of the Norman dynasty was placed back into the hands of human agency, relying on their dedication to God, rather than any pre-ordained destiny. Over time, the clerical approach appears to have gained in popularity, to the point where vernacular texts were aiming to emulate them. The next chapter will discuss some reasons why this may have been the case, looking at how the historical context surrounding the authors may have influenced the production and reception of Norman Trojan roots.

Chapter 3: Historical Developments

This chapter deals with the historical background of the works described previously, and how they affected their production and reception. It will argue that the need to secure Richard II's control from potential challengers created a need for an origin which could unite the various residents around their land. Dudo's use of the Trojans to integrate the Normans into the wider Latin European mythos is therefore a response to threats to Norman power. It will also examine some of the possible reasons why Dudo may have included some subversive subtext, but why this was not his main intention. The chapter will then examine the changes to the social structure in the time leading up to the 12th century, particularly the centralisation of the power of nobility around specific areas of land, and the increasing significance of large towns and cities. It will then assess how this created a need for tracing ancestry to justify control, and the increasing importance of cathedrals and their clerics giving the clerical historians more cultural influence. Finally, it will consider the events of the Norman conquest of England and The Anarchy, and how they created a need for unity in a similar way to that which Dudo experienced. It will also consider the traumatic nature of the events, and how they may have influenced the writing of history in the time, and how the Trojans reflect those influences.

Firstly, Dudo of Saint Quentin's work was dated at a time following periods of instability in the Duchy of Normandy. For example, William Longsword's reign was marked by rebellions from Bretons,[165] and a war with the expanding County of Flanders, leading to his murder by Arnulf, Count of Flanders.[166] Richard I's reign was then marked by yet more revolts, including from pagans,[167] and a conflict with Otto I, Holy Roman Emperor, supported by Arnulf and Louis IV of France.[168] For this

[165] Dud. *H.N.* 3.39-41
[166] Dud. *H.N.* 3.59-63.
[167] Dud. *H.N.* 4.123
[168] Dud. *H.N.* 4,94-99.

reason, it was important for Richard I to establish his son as legitimate, in order to avoid a repeat of these actions. Richard likely also wanted to warn his son about the dangers of placing too much trust in his neighbours, with such trust leading to the death of his father, and the betrayal of the Franks they swore allegiance to.[169] Therefore, if the Norman elites were not happy with the resulting work, it likely would not have been distributed. The fact that Dudo sent copies of his work to Francia suggests that the Normans were indeed happy with what he had written, and that his presentation of Norman origins was representative of how the Normans viewed themselves.[170] Dudo's choice of Adalbero of Laon as the intended audience is also particularly important with this, as it spreads the message of Richard II's legitimacy to a reputable and power figure in Frankish church politics.[171] Therefore, the attachment of Adalbero to the work imbues an extent of political legitimacy to the work outside of Normandy itself, helping to create an external impression of legitimacy as well as an internal one. As for the more brutal actions of the Normans, Dudo's narrative also gives a scapegoat, in the form of Hasting.[172] Therefore, given the unstable recent past and uncertain future regarding Richard II's succession, it is unlikely that Dudo had any anti-Norman ideas while writing his history. The situation of the time meant that Richard I had to commission a history which would ensure the legitimacy of his son was not questioned internally or externally. This means that the purpose of the Trojans within Dudo's story must have been consistent with the ideas the duke desired to project.

The time from Dudo up to the 12th Century, where Geoffrey, Orderic and the early vernacular histories were written, was also marked with some significant developments in social and economic structure. The period from the 10th-12th century

[169] Lifshitz, p. 115.
[170] Webber, pp. 23–24.
[171] Lifshitz, p. 107.
[172] Ingledew, p. 683.

was marked by a large increase in agricultural productivity and population growth, especially in France.[173] This in turn led to a move from primarily subsistence agriculture, to the ability to sell surplus production, allowing for an increase in the population of towns and cities.[174] From this increase in population emerged an increase in importance of cities, and with that, a rise in the importance of bishops, at the expense of monasteries.[175] Thus, the increase in status of clerical figures, and relative decline of monastic personnel, also created a shift in values, as Hanning and Ingledew alluded to.[176] In this case, the greater status of the clerics meant that their works held more prestige, and therefore were more widespread and available. The reign of Henry I in England was of particular note for the increasing appointments of clerks who served the royal household as bishops, an environment Geoffrey of Monmouth served in.[177] These economic and political developments had therefore led to an increased proliferation of clerical historiography, and with it, the idea of classical ancestry. This culminated in the commissioning of clerics Wace and Benoît to write the vernacular histories that would mark the dominance of the clerical view of history.

This time period was also marked by a change in how noble families related to and obtained their land. Prior to the 10th-11th centuries, aristocratic families did not have fixed residences, and their relations to living patrons proved more important than their lineage.[178] However, by the 11th century land increasingly became a familial possession, with a family's identity being inseparable from the land they owned, and

[173] For details see J. Gimpel, *The Medieval Machine: The Industrial Revolution of the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), pp. 54–62.
[174] Waswo, pp. 277–78.
[175] Ingledew, pp. 690–91; Duby, pp. 211–12.
[176] Hanning, p. 103; Ingledew, p. 690.
[177] Ingledew, p. 691; J. A. Green, *The Government of England under Henry I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 173–76; C. A. Newman, *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), pp. 96–97.
[178] Bloch, pp. 65–66.

their income being primarily from inheritance rather than patronage.[179] This can partly be attributed to the increasing agricultural production noted above making produce of the land a significant part of a noble's income, and to the building of castles.[180] This inseparability of land from its owner was then expanded onto a national level. A fixation emerged of making the name of a nation derivative of a mythical founder.[181] For example, if there is a "land of Britons", then there must have been an individual whose name the land bears who we inherited the land from, in this case, Brutus.[182] This entanglement of family and land created a need for rulers of the land to push their ancestral links as far back as possible, to justify their current dominion.[183] For the Normans and eventually Anglo-Normans, the Trojan War is as far back in secular history as was possible, without having to resort to biblical history. Therefore, having their dominions founded by individuals fleeing from the earliest event in known history gives them a claim to have inherited the land since as early in time as feasible. In England, the time between the 11th and 12th Centuries was also marked by the traumatic events of the Norman Conquest and The Anarchy. Van Houts argued that many of the traits of English and Norman histories after the conquest resulted from the English coming to terms with the destruction of their people and the Normans with the guilt they felt for their acts of cruelty.[184] Liu points out that the continuity of Anglo-Norman kings after the conquest up to The Anarchy was constantly unstable, with his work demonstrating the difficulties of establishing a new royal lineage by highlighting the traumas and instability that repeats through history.[185] She also draws parallels between events in the *HRB* and contemporary events. For example, Brutus

[179] Bloch, pp. 67–68; Ingledew, p. 674.
[180] Bloch, pp. 67–68, 80.
[181] Waswo, p. 276.
[182] Ibid.
[183] Bloch, p. 80.
[184] E. Van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe: 900-1200* (London: MacMillan, 1999), pp. 123–50.
[185] Liu, pp. 32–35.

killing his father with an arrow, and the death of Locrinus, also by arrow, with that of William Rufus, killed by an arrow in 1100.[186] Therefore, the *HRB*, written at the start of The Anarchy, can be viewed as a call for peace and unity, to avoid repeating the same mistakes of the British kings of the past and ensure the continuation of the Anglo-Norman dynasty's rule.[187] The inclusion of the Trojan ancestors of the British is therefore a way of simultaneously demonstrating the traumatic events of treachery, war and regicide persistent in its history, and to create a shared identity among the Normans and British and with it, a path to end this cycle through unification.

The historical context of Norman historiography is therefore of vital importance. The instability of the early periods of Norman rule in Normandy and England created a need for creating an origin myth which could unify their territory around their leaders. This, combined with the development of towns and cities and the increasing importance of clerical scholars, and the increasing entanglement of families with their lands, created a tendency to justify the rule of areas of land through tracing their familial associations as far back as possible. On a national level, this meant attributing the founding of dominions and their ruling dynasties to Trojan refugees, giving them the oldest possible secular origin.

[186] Liu, p. 22.
[187] Dalton, pp. 689–91, 693-694.

Conclusion

In closing, the Trojan ancestry of the Normans represents different things at different times and to different authors. The turbulent context of Norman history created a need for a lineage which would provide prestige, antiquity, and legitimacy to their bloodline. This was aided by Dudo of Saint Quentin's Carolingian approach, borrowing the traits and narrative of Virgil's Aeneas, combined with the hagiographies of his educational curriculum, to create the story of Rollo. Rollo offered the Dukes of Normandy a divinely sanctioned ruler, with a bloodline stretching as far back into history as possible, destined to rule over their people. The monastic historians responded to this by emphasising the treacherous and pagan nature of their Trojan origins, using them as an explanation for the often brutal nature of Norman warfare. To them, following Augustine's principles, the idea of a prophetically sanctioned bloodline was against the moral framework through which they ruled the world. Instead, they believed that a dynasty's rule was only guaranteed by devotion to God.

The increasing economic productivity and population growth of this time period created an increasing importance of towns and cities, and with it, their clerics. This led to the clerical interpretation of the Trojan origin gaining precedence over that of the monastic interpretation. Along with this, the time period was marked by noble families becoming more attached to their land, making the ancient ancestry of their approach very appealing for justifying their control of their land. The traumatic events in England of the Norman conquest and the Anarchy also created a contemporary situation in which the Trojans offered a device to draw parallels and learn from, to avoid the continuation of instability and conflict of their mythical ancestors.

Therefore, the context of the time and events of the Norman ruling dynasty created a scenario in which the Trojans could be used to unite their identity around a bloodline attached to areas of land, and to integrate themselves into the territories they ruled.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Historical Works,* translated by J. P. Freeland (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005).

Augustine, *Confessions,* translated by G. Willis (London: Penguin, 2011)

Augustine, *City of God,* translated by H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

Benoît de Saint-Maure, *Chronique des ducs du Normandie* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1836).

Dares Phrygius; Dictys of Crete, *The Trojan war: the chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian,* translated by R. M. Frazer (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1966).

Donation of Constantine, translated. by E. F. Henderson (1910), <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/donatconst.asp> [Accessed 4th May 2020]

Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans,* translated by E. Christiansen (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998).

Eusebius of Caesarea, *The Life of the Blessed Emperor Constantine*, translated. by Bagster, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/vita-constantine.asp> [Accessed 4th May 2020]

Fredegarii et aliorum chronica, edited by Bruno Krusch, MGH, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, volume 2 (Hannover: Hahn, 1888).

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain,* translated by L. Thorpe (London: Penguin, 1966).

Gesta Francorum, translated by by A. C. Krey, in The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921).

Gregory of Tours, *Glory of the Martyrs*, translated by R. Van Dam, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004)

Heiric of Auxerre, ‘Miracula sancti germani’, in *Poetae latini aevi Carolini*, vol 3, (Hannover, 1886).

Henry of Huntingdon, *The History of the English People: 1000-1154*, translated by D. Greenway (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Martino da Canale, *Les Estoires de Venise*, translated by L. K. Morreale. (Padova: Unipress, 2009).

Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, translated By T. Forester, in 4 volumes (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853).

Raymond D’Aguiliers, trans. by A. C. Krey, in The First Crusade: The Accounts of Eyewitnesses and Participants, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921).

Six Old English Chronicles. ed. J. A. Giles. (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848), <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/nennius-full.asp> [Accessed 28/04/2020].

Snorri Sturluson, *The Prose Edda*, translated by J. L. Byock (London: Penguin, 2005).

The Ilias Latina: A Study of the Latin Iliad, Including Translation, Commentary, and Concordance, translated by W. A. Tilroe (PHD Thesis: University of Southern California, 1939).

Virgil, *The Aeneid*, translated by W. F. Jackson Knight (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956).

Wace, *Le Roman de Brut* (Paris: Sociétè des anciens textes Français, 1938).

Wace, *The History of the Norman People: Wace’s Roman de Rou,* translated by G. S. Burgess (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004).

William of Jumièges; Orderic Vitalis; Robert of Torigni, *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, translated by E. Van Houts, in 2 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

Modern Scholarship

Albu, E., *The Normans in Their Histories* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001)

Barber, R., *King Arthur: Hero and Legend*, 3rd edn (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1986)

Birns, N., 'The Trojan Myth: Postmodern Reverberations', *Exemplaria*, 5.1 (1993), 45–78

Bloch, R. H., *Etymologies and Genealogies: A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983)

Bouet, P., 'De l'origine Troyenne Des Normands', *Cahier de Annales de Normandie*, 1995, 401–13

———, 'Dudon de Saint-Quentin et Virgile: L'Énéide Au Service de La Cause Normandie', *Cahier de Annales de Normandie*, 1990, 215–36

Cavendish, R., *King Arthur and the Grail: The Arthurian Legends and Their Meaning* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978)

Christiansen, E., 'Introduction', in *Dudo of St Quentin: History of the Normans* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998)

Dalton, P., 'The Topical Concerns of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae: History, Prophecy, Peacemaking, and English Identity in the Twelfth Century', *Journal of British Studies*, 44.4 (2005), 688–712

Dickey, E., *Review of G. A. Kennedy, The Latin Iliad* (Bryn Mawr Classical Review, 1999)

Duby, G., *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1980)

Gibson, M., ‘History at Bec in the Twelfth Century’, in *He Writing of History in the Middle Ages; Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 167–86

Gimpel, J., *The Medieval Machine: The Industrial Revolution of the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976)

Goldwyn, A. J., ‘Trojan Pasts, Medieval Presents: Epic Genealogy in Eleventh to Thirteenth Century Genealogical Histories’, in *Brill’s Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic*, ed. by Robert Simms (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018), pp. 154–74

Green, J. A., *The Government of England under Henry I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Hanning, R. W., *The Vision of History in Early Britain* (New York; London: Columbia University Press, 1966)

Higham, N. J., *King Arthur: Myth-Making and History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002)

Ingledew, F., ‘The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Brittanniae’, *Speculum*, 69.3 (1994), 665–704

Ionescu, C., ‘The Enduring Goddess: Artemis and Mary, Mother of Jesus’ (unpublished PhD thesis, York University, 2016)

Jaeger, C. S., *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939-1210* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985)

Lifshitz, F., ‘Dudo’s Historical Narrative and the Norman Succession of 996’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 20 (1994), 101–20

Liu, S. Y., ‘A Regnal Genealogy in Trouble: The Trojan Myth as a Traumatic National Historiography in Medieval England’ (unpublished PhD thesis, Indiana University, 2011)

Newman, C. A., *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988)

Pohl, W., ‘Conceptions of Ethnicity in Early Medieval Studies’, in *Debating the Middle Ages*, ed. by L. K. Little and B. H. Rosenwein (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), pp. 15–24

Rajsic, J., ‘Looking for Arthur in Short Histories and Genealogies of England’s Kings’, *The Review of English Studies*, 68.285 (2017), 448–70

Shopkow, L., *History & Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997)

———, ‘The Carolingian World of Dudo of Saint-Quentin’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), 19–37

Tétrel, H., ‘Trojan Origins and the Use of the Æneid and Related Sources in the Old Icelandic Brut’, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 109.4 (2010), 490–514

Van Houts, E., ‘Introduction’, in *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, ed. by E. Van Houts, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), I, xix–xciv

———, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe: 900-1200* (London: MacMillan, 1999)

Villing, A., J. L. Fitton, V. Donnellan, and A. Shapland, *Troy: Myth and Reality* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2019)

Wanner, K. I., *Snorri Sturluson and the Edda: The Conversion of Cultural Capital in Medieval Scandinavia* (Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 2008)

Waswo, R., 'Our Ancestors, the Trojans: Inventing Cultural Identity in the Middle Ages', *Exemplaria*, 7.2 (1995), 269–90

Webber, N., *The Evolution of Norman Identity: 911-1154* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005)