

University of Groningen

Gesta Normannorum Ducum. Een studie over de handschriften, de tekst het geschiedwerk en het genre

Houts, Elisabeth

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1982

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Houts, E. (1982). *Gesta Normannorum Ducum. Een studie over de handschriften, de tekst het geschiedwerk en het genre*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

The main object of this study is to establish which of the transmitted versions of the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* (*GND*) is the original one and how and when the subsequent redactions have originated from it. It is intended as a preliminary study for a new text edition.

In the first chapter a survey is given of the history and current state of research concerning the *GND*.

The next three chapters treat the development of the *GND* from, respectively, a codicological, a textual and a historical point of view. The following conclusions have been reached.

Redaction C is the oldest version of the *GND*, written by William of Jumièges about 1070/71; his autograph has not survived. Within the C-redaction manuscript C4 (ca. 1100, Normandy, possibly Lyre) is nearest to the original text. The new edition of the *GND* therefore has to be based on this manuscript. My study has confirmed the hypothesis of Professor R.H.C. Davis, who in 1980 concluded, mainly on historical grounds, that the C-redaction represents the original text of the *GND*. It consists of a dedicatory letter from William of Jumièges to William the Conqueror, seven books which, apart from the first, each contain the history of a Norman duke from Rollo to William the Conqueror, and the long epilogue.

Redactions D, E and $\alpha\beta$, the latter the direct precursor of A and B, independently derive from C. Redaction $\alpha\beta$, which has not survived in any manuscript, must have consisted of the dedicatory letter, seven books, and the short epilogue; Book VI c. ii, contained an interpolation concerning Nicholas, abbot of Saint-Ouen at Rouen. Mainly because of this addition I attribute the hypothetical redaction $\alpha\beta$ to an anonymous monk of Saint-Ouen. The redaction can be dated to the period 1096-1100.

Redaction A, consisting of the complete work of Dudo of Saint-Quentin followed by Books V, VI, VII and the short epilogue of the *GND*, derives from $\alpha\beta$. It originated in Normandy in the period after 1096-1100.

Redaction B contains the text of $\alpha\beta$, to which have been added four anecdotes in Books V and VI and, at the end of the *GND*, the small text *De Obitu Willelmi* (*DOW*). The anecdotes date from 11th-century Normandy, whereas *DOW* was written by an anonymous author from the entourage of William Rufus, probably Geraldus Cancellarius, in the period 1096/98-1100. The B-redaction was composed at the beginning of the 12th century, somewhere in the Anglo-Norman Empire.

Redaction D consists of the dedicatory letter and seven books, of which the last lacks the ending. All manuscripts of this redaction more or less agree in omitting the text from Book VII c. xvi (xxxvii) onwards. Because of some geographical misreadings I conjecture that D was written in England, and not in Normandy or France. The redaction can be dated to the period from 1106 to 1120-1130, when its oldest manuscript, D1, was written.

About 1113 Orderic Vitalis, monk of Saint-Evroult, wrote his version of the *GND*, redaction E, consisting of the dedicatory letter, seven books and the long epilogue. The whole text has been stilistically rewritten and many interpolations have been added, especially in Book VII.

About 1139 redaction F was used by Robert of Torigni, monk of the monastery of Bec, to write the F-redaction. This version consists of a slightly altered dedicatory letter, eight books and the so-called *Addimenta*. William of Jumièges' epilogue, at the end of Book VII, was omitted by Robert because of his addition of an eighth book on Henry I. After

1151 Robert even considered having the *GND* continued by a history of Geoffrey of Anjou as duke of Normandy.

The second purpose of this study is to examine the problem of the *gesta*, the genre to which in the modern literature on medieval historiography, the *GND* are usually reckoned. The fifth and last chapter begins by outlining the modern theories concerning the medieval literary and historiographical genres. Within the field of the theory of literature there is a tendency to identify genres by studying the reception of a text, in other words the interaction between author and public. On the other hand modern historians, e.g. Guenée and Melville, try to classify medieval historiography according to contemporary medieval criteria based on the medieval titles of the works. They leave out of account, however, the origin, the age and the value of these titles.

The second section pays attention to the so-called *gesta*-histories, and establishes that the term *gesta* has not been studied properly. It appears, both from modern literature and from the present study, that in the Middle Ages titles were applied most inconsistently. This leads to the conclusion that *gesta* was not used to indicate a genre. Following Grundmann most historians today understand by *gesta*: historical narratives about the deeds of a series of persons holding the same office. Some historians, however, give other definitions. They also count among *gesta* historical narratives about one person from such a series, about one individual, one nation or even one region. Bautier and Sot confine their definition to a less extensive category, namely *gesta episcoporum* and *gesta abbatum*. The *gesta* of secular princes have not so far been studied as a separate category, but only in the context of historical narratives about a single nation, genealogies, and biographies or *vitae*.

Modern literature as well as Sot's recent study offers four criteria to be satisfied by *gesta*: 1. emphasis laid on the office rather than on the bearer, 2. the close bond of the author with the region where the story has been written, 3. legitimisation as purpose to write such a historical narrative, 4. the 'open' character of these texts.

In the third section the development of the *GND* is studied in the light of these criteria. Whereas the text written by William of Jumièges does answer these criteria, the subsequent redactions do so far less. It appears that the first phase of the *GND* is mainly concerned with the succession from father to son as duke of Normandy. The relation with the duchy of Normandy is thus close, although attention is paid to English affairs, a fact which hardly surprises because the text was written shortly after 1066. The first redaction of the *GND* also throws some light on the monastery of Jumièges. Although the legitimisation of the Norman Conquest is one of William of Jumièges' purposes in writing a history of the Norman dukes, he is above all interested in his own country and the line of succession there. He therefore holds out to his readers the prospect of a continuation of the *GND* to deal with Robert Curthose, as duke of Normandy, and not with William the Conqueror, as king of the English. This very intention to continue the *GND* shows the 'openness' of the work.

Among the different versions of the *GND* each redaction does answer one or more criteria, none however all four. Structurally the work consists of books, each devoted to the history of one duke, and this basic structure has been respected by the interpolators and continuators. But in every redaction one finds textual changes where the succession in office is concerned, e.g. in Book VII c. ix (xxi) with regard to Robert Curthose as his father's successor. Both Orderic Vitalis and

Robert of Torigni do not only pay attention to matters connected with the office of duke or with the ducal succession, but also, and mainly, to affairs which have some relation to their own monasteries. They obviously write for their fellow monks. The aspect of legitimisation can only be found in the work of William of Jumièges, his precursor Dudo of Saint-Quentin, and Robert of Torigni. Attention is also drawn to the fact that the contemporary political situation influences the different authors of the *GND*. In uncertain times, but after a period of stability, the *GND* were continued, or plans were made to do so (C, F ca. 1139 and after 1151). In peaceful periods, but after tension or disagreement over the succession, the text was only interpolated ($\alpha\beta$, E).

Whether or not these findings are typical for this type of history, viz. *gesta*, can only be said after a proper evaluative study of the criteria mentioned. Such a study, based on more texts than only the *GND*, remains to be written.

Dossier I contains an elaborate description of the 45 manuscripts of the *GND*.

Dossier II lists all substantive variants between the different redactions.

12442/09