

Introduction

KATHRYN HURLOCK AND PAUL OLDFIELD

The reputation of the Normans is rooted in an uneasy interplay between warfare and faith. The Normans were famed as warriors and at the same time noted for their religious devotion; their association as builders of both great castles and cathedrals is seemingly symbolic of the key juxtaposition inherent in Norman history. Yet, we might add a third defining feature of the Normans, one that underpinned the other two: mobility. The Norman proclivity to operate on and beyond established frontiers, and to move between different theatres of action across the medieval world, is a noteworthy one. In the Middle Ages few activities offered a better conduit to combine warfare, religiosity and movement than crusading and pilgrimage. It is no surprise then that both feature heavily in the phenomenal rise of the Normans from the tenth through to the early thirteenth century. And yet it is a surprise that the Norman relationship with crusading and pilgrimage has hitherto not received extensive scholarly treatment, at least not in the form of a single, focused volume.

Certainly, several journal articles and book chapters have been published on the subject of the Norman role in crusading and/or pilgrimage; for example, contributions by Emily Albu, John France, Aryeh Grabois, Natasha Hodgson, Graham Loud and Léan Ní Chléirigh.¹ Likewise, broader works on crusading, pilgrimage and sanctity address Norman input, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly; for example in the works of Thomas Asbridge, Samantha Kahn Herrick, Kathryn Hurlock, Paul Oldfield, Jonathan

¹E. Albu, 'Probing the Passions of a Norman on Crusade: The *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*', *ANS* 27 (2005), 1–15; John France, 'The Normans and Crusading', in *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War: Essays in Memory of C. Warren Hollister*, ed. Richard P. Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach (Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 87–102; A. Grabois, 'Anglo-Norman England and the Holy Land', *ANS* 7 (1985), 132–44; N. Hodgson, 'Reinventing Normans as Crusaders? Ralph of Caen's *Gesta Tancredi*', *ANS* 30 (2008), 117–32; G. A. Loud, 'Norman Italy and the Holy Land', in *The Horns of Hattin*, ed. B. Kedar (London, 1992), pp. 49–62; L. Ní Chléirigh, 'Gesta Normannorum? Normans in the Latin Chronicles of the First Crusade', in *Norman Expansion: Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, ed. K. J. Stringer and A. Jotischky (London, 2013), pp. 207–26.

Riley-Smith, Christopher Tyerman and Simon Yarrow.² But collectively – in addressing the inter-relationship between the Normans, crusading and pilgrimage – these existing works might only deal broadly with the subject, and do not aim to delve deeper; alternatively they might focus closely on one restricted area of it, or in many cases their main focus might lie elsewhere, and the Normans appear as a rather peripheral presence. Taken together, these works testify to the value and potential in studying crusading and pilgrimage in the Norman world, but demonstrate the clear need for more extensive examination collected within one volume. Inevitably, a single volume alone cannot fill completely such a lacuna in such a wide subject-field. But it is the aim of this present work to offer a first step towards doing so.

At the outset, in order to provide a framework for the present volume, it is necessary briefly to contextualise the subject, and to locate it within existing historiographical trends, some of which (crusader studies in particular) shift rapidly. First, it is crucial to acknowledge how contested and amorphous the very notion of a ‘Norman world’ is. Recent research continues to confirm that medieval identities were flexible constructs which could function in multiple forms. The Normans, as scholars such as Emily Albu, Marjorie Chibnall, Joanna Drell, John Gillingham, Graham Loud, Hugh Thomas and Nick Webber affirm, were expert at shifting their own identities, constructing them through historical writing, in opposition to ‘others’, and through the process of movement and conquest.³ As the works of Webber and Léan Ní Chléirigh show, Normans looked different from different vantage points.⁴ While internal Norman sources from the central Middle Ages might show us Normans who were labelled so due to certain characteristic features, some medieval commentators external to the

²T. Asbridge, *The Creation of the Principality of Antioch, 1098–1130* (Woodbridge, 2000); S. Kahn Herrick, *Imagining the Sacred Past: Hagiography and Power in Early Normandy* (Cambridge MA, 2007); K. Hurlock, *Britain, Ireland and the Crusades, c. 1000–c. 1300* (Basingstoke, 2013); P. Oldfield, *Sanctity and Pilgrimage in Medieval Southern Italy, 1000–1200* (Cambridge, 2014); J. Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, 2nd edn (London, 2009); C. Tyerman, *England and the Crusades 1095–1588* (Chicago, 1988); S. Yarrow, *Saints and Their Communities: Miracle Stories in Twelfth-Century England* (Oxford, 2006).

³E. Albu, *The Normans in Their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge, 2001); M. Chibnall, *The Normans* (Oxford, 2006); J. Drell, ‘Cultural Syncretism and Ethnic Identity: The Norman Conquest of Southern Italy and Sicily’, *JMH* 25 (1999), 187–202; J. Gillingham, ‘Henry of Huntingdon and the Twelfth-Century Revival of the English Nation’, in *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 123–44; G. A. Loud, ‘The Gens Normannorum. Myth or Reality?’ *ANS* 4 (1982), 104–16; H. M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity, 1066–c.1220* (Oxford, 2005); N. Webber, *The Evolution of Norman Identity, 911–1154* (Woodbridge, 2005).

⁴Webber, *Evolution of Norman Identity*; Ní Chléirigh, ‘Gesta Normannorum?’ pp. 207–26.

Normans might as easily subsume them under wider ‘national’ groupings and the Normans disappear from sight. Furthermore, the Normans often opted for a strategy of assimilation with the native communities with which they interacted, and this could have obvious problematic consequences for Norman identity. In R. Allen Brown’s apposite phrase, the Normans eventually ‘adapted themselves out of existence’.⁵

This leaves the modern historian in something of a quandary when it comes to ascertaining who or what was Norman and when. In answer, all we can say for certain is that we might identify two poles of the spectrum: a maximum and a minimum view if you like. The former would view expansion (military or otherwise, but both denoting influence at the highest political echelons) and dynastic/regime change as key markers for mapping the Norman world. Thus, from their heartlands in Normandy – where the Normans could trace their roots back to the treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte in 911 – the Normans expanded into England (from 1066), into Wales (1070s), into Scotland (early twelfth century), and into Ireland (late twelfth century). They also moved into southern Italy (from c. 1000), into the Iberian peninsula and into Byzantium (both from the mid-eleventh century), and into the Holy Land, particularly Antioch (from 1098). Moreover, from the 1140s, the kings of ‘Norman’ Sicily took control of a section of coastal North Africa (equating to parts of modern-day Tunisia and Libya). These Norman arenas would remain Norman, and the Normans within them would retain some form of Norman identity, as long as the political elites dominating them could trace their lineage back to Normandy, or as long as they individually retained certain affinities with it. Thus, England (and parts of Wales) might have remained Norman until the Angevin takeover of 1154, or indeed until the loss of Normandy in 1204.⁶ Southern Italy could have been Norman until the Sicilian kings, of Norman Hauteville descent, were ousted by the German Staufien dynasty in 1194. Antioch could have been Norman until the descendants of the Norman Bohemond were replaced by Prince Raymond of Poitiers in 1136. Other zones in the Mediterranean – Iberia, Byzantium and North Africa – might too be incorporated into the Norman world, albeit more fleetingly, so long as individuals of Norman descent (however loosely defined) wielded significant territorial and political power in parts of these regions. Normandy of course, always remained Norman.

⁵R. Allen Brown, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge, 1985), p. 25.

⁶For a recent, important analysis of the relationship between Normandy and England see D. Bates, *The Normans and Empire* (Oxford, 2013).

In contrast, the minimum view would privilege direct links with the territory of Normandy in order to identify Normanness. Once these disappeared, so too did the Normans and their world. This approach focuses on the effects of movement and assimilation. Thus, in England, intermarriage, the declining influx of Normans arriving from Normandy, and the cultural reorientation of second-generation Normans who were not born in Normandy and who showed increased attachment to an English identity, could mean that we should not legitimately speak of 'Norman' England much past the first quarter of the twelfth century. This framework can be applied across all the zones of Norman activity; thus, for example, Norman southern Italy might have ended as early as c. 1100. In the present volume we do not intend to preference one model over the other, or indeed any of the variations that might fit between those two contrasting interpretations. Cautious of the highly subjective boundaries it can create, we have opted to implicitly acknowledge the maximum view, but only to allow room for manoeuvre for both our contributors and readers to make their own judgements.

Turning to crusading and pilgrimage, it is clear that the Normans made significant contributions to both movements. But to understand this fully we must again consider ongoing scholarly debates, particularly within crusader historiography. First, research over the last few decades has nuanced our understanding of certain features of crusading which were once widely accepted. Scholars like Paul Chevedden have, not without notable opposition it should be noted, pushed further than ever the notion that the call for a crusade by Pope Urban II in 1095 and the First Crusade (1096–99) that followed were not the beginning of the crusading movement proper.⁷ In this interpretation, defining features of what would be identified as crusading post-1095 were already in place, certainly by the mid-eleventh century. Whatever one's view of the validity of such a thesis, it does carry significance for our subject, for at the very least it focuses attention on evidence for an earlier gestation of a 'crusading' ethos within three zones in the mid- to late eleventh century – Iberia, the south Italian mainland (and specifically the papal defeat by the Normans at the Battle of Civitate in 1053)

⁷ Paul Chevedden, "A Crusade from the First": The Norman Conquest of Islamic Sicily, 1060–1091, *Al-Masaq* 22 (2010), 191–225; and more broadly: P. E. Chevedden, "The Islamic View and the Christian View of the Crusades: A New Synthesis", *History* 93 (2008), 181–200. For a brief critique of Chevedden's approach see Christopher Tyerman's review in *Crusades* 13 (2014) of Chevedden's contribution in the volume *Cultural Encounters during the Crusades*, ed. Kurt Villads Jensen, Kirsi Salonen and Helle Vogts (Odense, 2013).

and Sicily – in which the Normans were highly active.⁸ Thus the Normans might be considered protagonists in some of the formative episodes which both pushed the Islamic frontier back and shaped subsequent crusading mentalities and papal ideologies. That the Normans had earlier experience of a redefined manifestation of holy warfare should encourage us to reconsider their subsequent actions in the First Crusade.⁹ For it was in this latter venture that we arguably see Norman intervention at its most apparent, with separate Norman crusading forces led by Duke Robert Curthose and Bohemond of Taranto playing significant parts in the expedition and its immediate aftermath.

However, if we look beyond 1099 and the capture of Jerusalem, more traditional scholarship would claim a subsequent marked decline in Norman interest in crusading. How far we agree or disagree with this depends on our views on three important methodological approaches. First, returning to the earlier discussion, we must decide how to identify Normans. If we ascribe to the maximum view, we might indeed see their presence more frequently in the ensuing crusading movement. Second, we must consider how we define crusading. In the twentieth century, rather distinct ‘schools’ emerged which subscribed to vastly differing notions of what constituted a crusade. For some, it could only be a movement associated with the Holy Land. For others it was a movement defined by certain criteria, such as the way it was initiated, and the existence of distinct crusader vows and privileges, so that crusading could occur across a wide geographic expanse. Thus Iberia, the Baltic, and even movements against heretics and political enemies could be labelled crusades.¹⁰

This wider view of crusading inevitably then opens up the possibility of a wider Norman contribution. Furthermore, within crusader studies there has been an increased focus on a more holistic understanding of crusading activity. So, attention has diverted to crusading that falls outside those large expeditions which have traditionally been assigned numbers, the First, Second, Third Crusades, and so on. Smaller waves of expeditions and movement continuously moved back and forth between Europe and the various destinations of crusading, particularly the Holy Land, and these in many ways were as crucial to its functioning as the grander ventures. Here

⁸One might add here also Pope Alexander II's alleged bestowal of a papal banner to William the Conqueror in support of his claim to the English throne.

⁹See for example: J. Birk, ‘Imagining the Enemy: Southern Italian Perception of Muslims in the Wake of the First Crusade’, in *Just Wars, Holy Wars, and Jihads: Christian, Jewish, Muslim Encounters and Exchanges*, ed. S. H. Hashmi (Oxford, 2013), pp. 91–106.

¹⁰C. Tyerman, *The Debate on the Crusades* (Manchester, 2011), pp. 218–35.

again, we might find continued Norman activity. Equally, some studies have focused on the impact of crusading on the so-called 'home-front' in western Europe. People on a communal and individual level all across Europe were exposed to the culture of crusading through preaching, commerce and personal contact, and also contributed to it financially, emotionally and logistically without ever directly participating in a crusade.¹¹ Britain, Normandy, Iberia and southern Italy – all zones of Norman activity – were no exception.

Significantly too, this expansive interpretation of crusading also has relevance for an understanding of pilgrimage, which experienced a golden age of activity in the period from c. 1000 to c. 1300.¹² Particularly since Christopher Tyerman's seminal article, in which he demonstrated the amorphous and disorganised nature of crusading in the twelfth century, historians have increasingly acknowledged the overlap between crusading and pilgrimage.¹³ Both movements often shared comparable terminology and spiritual frameworks, had certain performative acts in common, and also passed along similar routes heading for similar destinations.¹⁴ The crusader could often metamorphose into a pilgrim and vice versa. When we see a Norman crusader it might well be worth considering whether he was a pilgrim too. Certainly, as many studies have made clear, and this current volume confirms, pilgrimage was very much at the heart of the Norman story.¹⁵ There are many examples to choose from, but Norman devotion

¹¹There is a vast literature on the interconnections between Europe and the Crusades: C. Tyerman, 'What the Crusades meant to Europe', in *The Medieval World*, eds. P. Linehan and J. L. Nelson (London, 2001), pp. 131–45; C. Morris, *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2005); R. C. Smail, 'The International Status of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem', in *The Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, ed. P. M. Holt (Warminster, 1977), pp. 23–43; Oldfield, *Sanctity and Pilgrimage*, chapter 5; *Il mezzogiorno normanno-svevo e le crociate*, *Atti delle XIV giornate normanno-sveve*, Bari, 17–20 Ottobre 2000, ed. G. Musca (Bari, 2002); M. Barber, 'Supplying the Crusader States: The Role of the Templars', in *The Horns of Hattin*, ed. Kedar, pp. 314–26; Loud, 'Norman Italy and the Holy Land', pp. 49–62; P. J. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, MA, 1991); C. T. Maier, *Preaching the Crusade: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1998).

¹²Valuable overviews can be found in J. Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of Mediaeval Religion* (London, 1975); D. J. Birch, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change* (Woodbridge, 1998); see also Oldfield, *Sanctity and Pilgrimage*, chapters 5 and 6.

¹³C. Tyerman, 'Were There any Crusades in the Twelfth Century?' *EHR* 110 (1995), 553–77. It should be noted that Tyerman's position remains contested; for a concise summary of alternative positions see N. Housley, *Contesting the Crusades* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 14–23.

¹⁴The development of saints associated with crusading highlights one way in which it merged with pilgrimage; see, for example: E. Lapina, 'Demetrius of Thessaloniki: Patron Saint of Crusaders', *Viator* 40 (2009), 93–112; M. Favreau-Lilie, 'The German Empire and Palestine: German Pilgrims to Jerusalem between the 12th and 16th Centuries', *JMH* 21 (1995), 321–41.

¹⁵See the valuable collection of essays in: *Culte et pèlerinages à Saint Michel en occident: les trois monts dédiés à l'archange*, ed. P. Bouet et al. (Rome, 2003); and also *Pellegrinaggi e itinerari dei santi nel mezzogiorno medievale*, ed. G. Vitolo (Naples, 1999); Saint George was also very popular among

to Saint Michael at Mont-Saint-Michel and Monte Gargano in southern Italy, the famous pilgrimage to Jerusalem of Duke Robert of Normandy in 1035 and the pilgrim origin-stories of the Normans in southern Italy all testify to a long-standing connection between Normans and pilgrimage, and one that predated, and undoubtedly shaped, the Norman response to crusading.

The third and final methodological approach that we need to be aware of is linked to the ongoing debates over how to define the motivations of crusaders and pilgrims. Crusader historiography is littered with works addressing this theme, and they offer up a plethora of explanations: spiritual, psychological, eschatological, political, sociocultural and economic motivations seemingly influence some crusaders; notions of adventurism, family traditions or the need to assert status influenced others; while some may simply have been forced to go.¹⁶ Since Jonathan Riley-Smith's important essay on crusading as an act of love, the idea of genuine religious motivations has enjoyed something of a resurgence.¹⁷ However, taking the corpus of research as a whole it would seem that the current consensus, and the more compelling conclusion, is that multiple motivations co-existed in the same individual. Arguably it would be arbitrary and misleading to extract one, and, of course, profit and piety (the two traditional poles on the debate over motivations) could simultaneously motivate the same crusader. The Normans – deemed as warriors, parvenu Christians and opportunists (especially a figure like Bohemond) – feature heavily in these debates. But in this new light we might be able to arrive at more nuanced understandings of what prompted them to participate. Equally, the same motivating dynamics can be applied to acts of pilgrimage. Saints and their relics were considered to have supernatural qualities. A relationship with them could bring spiritual sustenance and help in the afterlife, and also cures and protection in the here and now. Saints and their shrines offered validation

the Normans: E. D'Angelo, 'San Giorgio e i normanni', in *San Giorgio e il Mediterraneo*, ed. G. de' Giovanni-Centelles (Vatican City, 2004), 195–217. See also C. Walsh, 'The Role of the Normans in the Development of the Cult of St Katherine', in *St Katherine of Alexandria: Texts and Contexts in Western Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Jenkins and K. J. Lewis (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 19–35.

¹⁶ A brief, but useful overview of possible Crusader motivations is found in J. Flori, 'Ideology and Motivations in the First Crusade', in *The Crusades*, ed. Helen. J. Nicholson (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 15–36; see also J. France, 'Patronage and the Appeal of the First Crusade', in *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, ed. J. Phillips (Manchester, 1997), pp. 5–20 and N. L. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (New York, 2012).

¹⁷ J. S. Riley-Smith, 'Crusading as an Act of Love', *History* 65 (1980), 177–92. See also M. Bull, 'The Roots of Lay Enthusiasm for the First Crusade', *History* 78 (1993), 353–72, and his more extensive study: M. Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970–c. 1130* (Oxford, 1993).

and support, not to mention the potential for great financial profit for the guardians of cults who would oversee pilgrim donations. Numerous communities and political elites aimed thus to establish links with particular saints, and so potent was this need that groups competed vigorously and resorted to violence and theft to gain possession of relics.¹⁸ As we have already touched upon, and will see in the present volume, the Normans were not immune to these competing pressures and imperatives. Just as we have opted to avoid subscribing to one model for Norman identity, so too, and for the same reasons, have we decided to allow for as broad a perspective on definitions on crusading and pilgrimage, and on the debates over motivation and the extent of Norman participation in both. We feel that it is important to highlight the potential for conflicting approaches to the same subject, and even more important not to be prescriptive about its parameters. We hope that freedom enables the contributors to demonstrate the diverse ways of interpreting these contested points, and provides the reader with the tools to locate themselves within those same debates.

The collection of contributions gathered here has its roots in a symposium held at Manchester Metropolitan University in September 2012. Six of the essays in this volume were originally delivered at that event, with the remaining five contributors identified by the editors as being able to specifically address key themes which would complement and complete the overall project as envisaged by the editors. This collection of articles covers the entire geographic expanse of Norman activity – from the Celtic fringe via the Mediterranean to the Holy Land. It is hoped that together the contributions within the volume will enable the reader to form an understanding of two key underpinning themes: first, what was unique or different about the Normans and their relationship with crusading and pilgrimage; and second, how and why crusade and pilgrimage were important to the Normans. All the contributions, some explicitly, some implicitly, are informed by one or both of these questions. The contributions have been grouped into four thematic parts, the rationale for this hopefully being apparent from the preceding discussion in this introduction.

Part I examines the Normans and the First Crusade. William Aird's and Alan Murray's essays here address one of the pivotal episodes in the

¹⁸P. J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ, 1978); also useful are S. Barton, 'Patrons, Pilgrims and the Cult of Saints in the Medieval Kingdom of León', in *Pilgrimage Explored*, ed. J. Stopford (York, 1999), pp. 57–77 and J. Van Herwaarden, 'Pilgrimages and Social Prestige: Some Reflections on a Theme', in *Wallfahrt und Alltag in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, ed. G. Jaritz and B. Schuh (Vienna, 1992), pp. 27–79.

Norman inter-relationship with crusading. In doing so they contribute to our understanding of what motivated the Normans to participate in the First Crusade, how it was recorded and why it played an integral role in Norman identity.¹⁹ Part II explores ongoing crusading initiatives, revealing in what ways and why Normans continued to engage with the movement after the First Crusade. Joanna Drell examines the evidence for Norman southern Italy, Kathryn Hurlock for England and Wales, David Spear (through the specific prism of cathedrals) for Normandy, and Lucas Villegas-Aristizabal for Iberia. Part III comprises two essays which examine the significance of pilgrimage in diverse parts of the Norman world. Andrew Abram investigates the pilgrimage and crusading activities of the Anglo-Norman earls of Chester, while Paul Oldfield explores why pilgrims were deemed so important in southern Italy and the reasons why some of them were exploited, and consequently why pilgrimage could represent such a contentious topic.

Finally, the essays in Part IV focus on the ways in which crusading and pilgrimage were recorded in Norman narrative. As alluded to above, the Normans (following Marjorie Chibnall's well-known opinion) were in many senses constructed by the histories written about them, many of which they commissioned.²⁰ Thus, it is crucial to examine the messages and information derived from these sources. Emily Albu uses a range of Norman and non-Norman sources to explore the Normans' experience of Antioch and what this reveals about their wider attitude to crusading. Leonie Hicks' essay analyses a range of Norman historical works in order to elucidate how connections were made between landscape and sanctity. And, finally, Natasha Hodgson seeks to establish, through analysis of crusading narratives, how the Normans were perceived in the context of other crusading masculinities at a time when gendered identities were being radically redefined.

It should, hopefully, be clear that crusading and pilgrimage were European-wide phenomena. The Normans had no monopoly over either of them. The Normans were thus not unique in being involved in both, and this volume is driven as much by the aim to find comparison as it is to find difference. Ultimately, this volume aims in some respects to revise, in others to confirm, and to collectively offer a more holistic understanding

¹⁹ Connor Kostick has looked at courage and cowardice in an article published after the symposium at which William Aird's paper was presented. Aird's paper takes a different approach to Costick's, looking at cowardice explicitly in relation to Norman identity. Connor Kostick, 'Courage and Cowardice on the First Crusade, 1096–99', *War in History* 20 (2013), 32–49.

²⁰ Chibnall, *The Normans*, p. 3.

of, the established paradigm of the Normans as crusaders *par excellence* and as opportunists who used religion to serve other agendas.